This is to certify that the
dissertation entitled

A SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH TO FIELD
INSTRUCTION PRACTICE: HELPING INTERNS LEARN TO
TEACH ALL STUDENTS

presented by

ALISA JEAN BATES

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Ph.D.	degree in	Curriculum, Teaching and Educational Policy

Cheryl L. Rosaen
Major Professor's Signature

4-5-05

Date

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.
MAY BE RECALLED with earlier due date if requested.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE

A SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH TO FIELD INSTRUCTION PRACTICE:
HELPING INTERNS LEARN TO TEACH ALL STUDENTS

By

Alisa Jean Bates

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Teacher Education

2005

ABSTRACT

A SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH TO FIELD INSTRUCTION PRACTICE: HELPING INTERNS LEARN TO TEACH ALL STUDENTS

By

Alisa Jean Bates

This study focused on the social constructivist field instruction practices I used in work with a set of three interns on issues of student diversity in the classroom. This research explores the terrain of how to meet intern learning needs at the same time that I pushed them to meet student learning needs. The research question was: During critical incidents where interns are working to address learning needs of diverse students, how does the field instructor support three interns who are learning to teach responsively to meet these needs? The subsidiary research questions are divided into three areas – those focused on interns, those focused on the field instructor/instruction, and those that provide information on the context in which this research study is taking place.

To address these questions, I examined my own field instruction practice during the 2003-2004 school year at a local, suburban elementary school. Three interns were selected from the six I worked with and additional observations, interviews, and material collection were done. The focus of our work together was on helping interns learn to meet the diverse learning needs of their students in the regular education classroom. This included work with English Language Learners, diverse ability issues, and socioeconomic status in the classroom. Observations were videotaped and debriefing conferences were audiotaped after each lesson. Interviews were conducted in the fall and spring with each intern and with his/her collaborating teacher. Additional interviews

were done in the spring with each intern to discuss the students in each classroom by working our way through the class list. Field notes were taken in each observation, as well as of reflection on my practice in general. Additional field notes were taken for each intern that focused on the specific interactions I had with the intern and collaborating teacher that addressed students in the classroom.

The analysis for this study centered on a critical incident for the work each intern did that responded to issues of student diversity with a particular student or population of students in the classroom. Additional analysis work was done to compare the social constructivist stance I used with the work of Glickman et al.'s (1995) supervisory belief continuum for practicing teachers. Also, Schon's (1987) conception of naming and framing was used to explore the ways that each intern and I conceptualized the work we did together on the critical incident identified in each case. Findings revealed that the interns faced significant challenges in learning to address student learning needs in the classroom and met this challenge to varying degrees of success. In particular, social constructivist practices were more or less successful depending on the intern's readiness to teach and their comfort level with the issue of student diversity in the classroom. Also, when the intern and I name and framed (Schon, 1987) the problem in similar ways, we were able to work more effectively to manage the challenges of student diversity in the classroom.

Implications from this study further develop social constructivism as an approach to field instruction practice, identifying ways to improve field instruction practice with interns around issues of student diversity.

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES

x

Chapter 1

THE CHALLENGES OF EDUCATING TEACHER CANDIDATES FOR STUDENT DIVERSITY

Each spring for the past three years, interns returned from mock interviews held by the College of Education to report that at least one of them had been told they would have difficulty finding a job. When I would ask them to explain this comment, inevitably I would hear that the interviewer felt that the candidate did not have enough experiences with a diverse student population because of their internship location (in a middle to upper middle class suburban elementary school). My interns were faced with a challenge: how to prove to employers that they were prepared to address the diverse needs of the students in their future classrooms when, on the face of it, the students in their internship site did not seem "diverse." As a field instructor, I faced the challenge of helping them become prepared to teach in a school where teachers did not speak much about aspects of diversity besides learning ability. My research began as a result of this concern about the preparation of teacher candidates for diversity when interning in a suburban school system.

A noticeable demographic shift is currently under way in our public schools. Nationally, the student population has grown consistently along multiple facets of student diversity over the last few years. In 2002, the public school student population was 17.1% Hispanic, 17.2% Black/Non-Hispanic, 60.3% White, 1.2% American Indian/Alaska Native, and 4.2% Asian/Pacific Islander (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002). This growth will continue over the coming decades with projections that place the number of ethnic minority students in K-12 schools as a numerical majority by 2035 (US Department of Commerce, 1996 cited in Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

1

Immigration to the United States continues at a strong pace, increasing the number of students with limited English proficiency in the schools. Approximately 16% of the student population aged 5 to 17 spoke another language at home during the 1999 school year (US Census Bureau, 1999). Additionally, poverty continues to plague our youth with 16.2% of children under the age of 18 living in poverty as of the year 2000 (Children's Defense Fund, 2000). Further, a high percentage of children in poverty are also of minority backgrounds (Hodgkinson, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 1999). Large percentages of students receiving special education services in the public schools are of minority backgrounds (Ladson-Billings, 1999).

These trends show that the student population in U.S. schools is ethnically, linguistically, and socioeconomically diverse and continuing to grow in these ways. Although not all schools currently educate students possessing the entire range of factors represented above, indications suggest that the continuing diversification of the student population will affect all teachers in the not so distant future (Zehr, 2001). As the diversity in our schools increases, the instructional strategies and social approaches traditionally found in the schools will need to be examined to determine if they meet the needs of these students.

These changes draw our attention and concern to the population of teachers who will begin careers as public school teachers in the near future and who will face many of these demographic shifts in their classrooms. Teacher education continues to be a career field dominated by the young, white middle class female teacher candidate (Banks, Cookson, & Gay, 2001; Gomez, 1994; Howey, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Nieto, 1998). This is in stark contrast to the growth of minority populations in the schools.

Moreover, there is concern that the diversity among teachers and students is seen as more of a problem than a resource by the teachers working in these schools (Cattani, 2002; Gomez, 1994; Nieto, 1998; Taylor & Sobel, 2001). This is a disconcerting state of mind as the student population continues to change. Complicating teacher educators' attempts to work with these dichotomous issues between teachers and students is the intractability of preservice teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning (Ladson-Billings, 1999; Marxen & Rudney, 1999; Wideen, Mayer-Smith, & Moon, 1998). It is not safe to assume that the prospective teachers in education programs today will simply return to the schools of their childhoods to engage in thirty year careers teaching students most like themselves. Many of the beliefs about teaching and learning that prospective teacher candidates have developed throughout their personal education may not transfer well to these new settings. With the continued change in student demographics, teacher candidates must be prepared to work with a wide range of student learning needs in the heterogeneous classroom.

<div align="center">Teacher Education's Response</div>

In attempts to work with and respond to these issues, teacher educators often engage preservice teacher candidates in field placements in a range of diverse school settings (Deering & Stanutz, 1995; Marxen & Rudney, 1999; Mason, 1997). Many scholars advocate placements in diverse settings so as to better prepare teachers for the challenges of teaching in urban settings, in ethnically diverse settings, etc. (Gay, 2000; Gomez, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 2001; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Research and writing on these experiences has been primarily limited to the early field experiences that occur before student teaching or internship placements. While this research base is useful for

the purposes of considering effective ways to support early teacher growth, we lack knowledge about the most critical time of field-based learning. This focus on early experiences creates a gap in our understanding of how to best utilize lengthier and more intense experiences such as student teaching or internship placements to foster growth around diversity issues in teacher candidates (Grant & Zozakiewicz, 1995; McIntyre, Byrd & Foxx, 1996).

Relying on the field placement situation to bear the brunt of educating future teachers to work effectively with diverse students raises a number of issues on how to best do this, including the challenge of finding a large enough number of appropriate field placements for students. This results in placements for teacher candidates in a range of school settings that vary in their diversity, including those that are perceived of as less diverse by the interns working there (Bates & Rosaen, 2004). Interns must learn to perceive the range of diversity present in any classroom – and not rely solely on visible features of diversity (such as race) to define diversity. However, much of the work of teacher education is done and likely will continue to be done outside of areas with natural connections to urban settings or visibly diverse student populations. Teacher education programs in large universities and colleges of education face the challenge of educating primarily white middle class teachers to be responsive to diversity at the same time that they place preservice teachers in field placements located in suburban schools. Teacher candidates' experiences in those settings may more closely support the preconceived notions that preservice teachers bring with them from their past experiences.

One challenge of educating prospective teachers is helping them to perceive the range of diversity that is present in their classrooms even when it is less apparent initially.

(Bates & Rosaen, 2004; Grant & Zozakiewicz, 1995). Diversity is more than a global set of features that exist in the classroom. Interns must learn to perceive the array of dimensions of diversity present in the classroom and respond to this through their instruction. Nieto (1998) argues that multicultural education is for all students regardless of diversity of the student body because of the rich multicultural nature of the broader society. Even those children who go to school in classrooms with greater homogeneity would benefit from a multicultural stance towards education as preparation for adult life in a diverse society. Marxen and Rudney (1999) found in their research on rural student teachers who had urban learning opportunities in Chicago that, "If they see their school as having no diversity, they do not seem to view multicultural education as a curricular priority" (p. 6). Part of this challenge lies in helping intern teachers to develop richer conceptions of diversity as well as helping them to identify sources of diversity in their classrooms and find meaningful ways to explore this to support their students' learning. A critical need is to determine some strategies that are most helpful to interns in learning to broaden their definitions of diversity as well as to identify and address their students' diverse learning needs. For example, interns need to determine diverse factors that affect student learning such as socioeconomic status and develop strategies to help students succeed academically in ways that do not limit them because of a lack of learning resources in the home (such as computers, books, or newspapers).

Limited information about how internship experiences engage future teachers in learning about diverse student populations is coupled with a lack of information about how university supervisors support the learning of their interns as they try to respond to diverse student populations (Grant & Zozakiewicz, 1995). Most of the writing and

research focused specifically on supervision dates from the late 1970's and early 1980's and is more concerned with the programmatic logistics (for example, number and length of observations) and the interpersonal relationship among members of the student teaching triad than with the actual support that the supervisor may potentially provide in fostering instruction that is responsive to all students (Hoover, O'Shea, & Carroll, 1988; Richardson-Koehler, 1988; Zahorik, 1988). There was been a brief bit of attention to supervision in the 1990's including several articles responding to supervision and the relationship to changes in the attitudes and beliefs of student teachers. For instance, Howey (1994) writes of how the traditional supervisory experiences fail to address the actual attitudes, beliefs or understandings of the student teachers, instead focusing primarily on observable behaviors. Borko and Mayfield (1995) found that little change in attitudes or beliefs of student teachers was deemed attributable to the work with the university supervisor over the semester. Others provide an alternate perspective that suggests perhaps that university supervisors do facilitate growth (Friebus, 1977; Zimpher, DeVoss & Nott, 1980). Friebus (1977) found that the university supervisor either superceded or was a close second to collaborating teachers in influential areas, such as "'coaching' the student teacher, and in 'providing legitimation' for the student teacher" (cited in Zimpher, DeVoss & Nott, 1980, p. 12). Zimpher, DeVoss and Nott (1980) found that the university supervisor was the person who ensured that the student teacher reflected on the experiences of learning to teach instead of simply replicating the cooperating teacher's practice. The university supervisor was also the primary source of constructive feedback and ensured that student teachers were considering what was not going well in addition to acknowledging teaching and learning that was a success. These

two studies help to show the potential of supervision as a valuable and necessary component of student teaching experiences. A clear need exists to explore how intern teacher candidates make sense of their learning about diverse student populations in connection with the activities and relationships they undertake with their university supervisors in a year-long internship program.

The purpose of this study is to document the events and opportunities provided to three interns in a suburban school and describe how and what sense the interns make of these opportunities as well as what actions they may take. This study documents and examines how my own field instruction practices act as opportunities to help interns learn to work with the diverse learning needs of all students in their classrooms. This study focuses on the interactions I had with three interns around issues of diverse learning needs present in their classrooms. The study considers how my social constructivist stance as a field instructor does or does not provide opportunities for a purposeful development of teaching practices that are responsive to the variety of diverse characteristics present in the students. The focus question for the research is, "During critical incidents[1] where interns are working to address learning needs of diverse students, how does the field instructor support three interns who are learning to work responsively to meet these needs?"

The supervisor is in the position to help intern teachers develop conceptions of diversity that are simultaneously responsive to the actual classroom contexts in which they find themselves learning to teach and the range of classrooms and schools in which

---

[1] Critical incidents will be defined and discussed in more detail in later chapters. Briefly, critical incidents are "those occurrences that let us see with new eyes some aspect of what we do" (Newman, 1990, p. 17). For each case in this study, a critical incident related to aspects of classroom diversity will be identified and explored.

they find themselves over the course of their careers. There is a need to consider how to support preservice teachers in learning to teach all students effectively (Ladson-Billings, 1999) in a wide range of field placement contexts, helping them to identify and respond to the range of diversity that is present in almost every classroom and school (Grant & Zozakiewicz, 1995). Research has found that collaborating teachers are more hesitant to discuss and explore critical issues with their interns in meaningful ways (Hawkey, 1997; Ladson-Billings, 1999). They may lack the knowledge of how to engage these topics or not realize that it is appropriate or necessary to do so to support their intern's learning. Because supervisors are charged with the responsibility to bridge theory and practice with and for their interns, it is a natural place to explore some of these critical issues that both exist in and extend beyond the immediate experience and urgency of the field placement classroom.

In sum, the changing demographics of the student population and the stable demographics of our teacher candidates provide the potential and great need for exploring the intersection of both of these populations through the lens of field instruction practices designed to help intern teachers learn more about how to work effectively with the wide range of students present in the classroom.

The Significance of this Study

As argued above, it is important to consider what and how interns are learning about issues of student diversity when spending a year in a suburban elementary school that is described by outsiders as "not diverse." This is a particularly timely point to engage in this study because the school where the three interns teach was recently redistricted to reflect a broader range of diverse characteristics in the student body. This

school, in prior years, had not appeared to interns to be a diverse setting. However, with recent redistricting practices, the current student body has more diversity in race and socioeconomic status than in prior years. This makes it an ideal location to explore the idea that greater.diversity is present than is visible to the naked eye if interns will learn how to identify it and work with students in responsive ways. The close look I will take at field instruction in this context will provide a view of supervision rarely found in the literature. This study looks carefully at the interactions between field instructor and intern, exploring how I construct my field instruction practice in response to their learning needs as well as their students and classroom context. Through this, I will reveal the challenges and complexities of field instruction work.

The remaining chapters are organized as follows. Chapter two discusses selected pieces of research, theory and advocacy that represent conceptions of field instruction and intern learning. It also provides a close look at my personal approaches to field instruction practice and provides the research base for my social constructivist stance towards my practice. Chapter three takes a closer look at the methodology and participants in this study. Chapters four through six are case studies on the field instruction interactions I had about issues of classroom diversity with the three interns in this study. Chapter seven is a cross-case analysis that explores what can be learned about interns' learning on student diversity as well as field instruction practices that are responsive to diversity. Chapter eight, the final chapter, looks closely at social constructivism as a stance for field instruction practice and considers the resulting implications for field instruction as well as future research possibilities.

Chapter 2

A SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST FRAMEWORK FOR FIELD INSTRUCTION PRACTICE

Oldfather and West (1999) write, *"Social constructivism is not a method.* Rather, it is a view of learning that provides a theoretical base for making decisions about pedagogy and curriculum" (p. 91; italics in original). This statement points out the fact that social constructivism is a learning theory but also a stance that is used to guide decisions about teaching practice. Field instruction is a teaching practice that is situated in the interaction between only two people. In order to understand the relevance of social constructivism as a framework for this study, I provide an analysis of the meanings of social constructivist teaching and learning as well as some key issues to consider when using this as a research framework. This section also identifies some of the areas of social constructivism that need further research. Building on this information and the practical considerations of our program, I explain my social constructivist approach to field instruction practice in this context. To understand how social constructivism works as an approach to field instruction practice, I will also consider relevant literature on the needs of interns as learners, the history of and research on supervision, and the internship program and practice of field instruction at Michigan State University. These descriptions help to define the knowledge base that I draw upon to construct my field instruction practice.

Social Constructivism

Social constructivism is a process by which knowledge is jointly created between people through dialogue about shared goals (Brophy, 2002; Resnick, Levine & Teasley 1991). By sharing ideas and exploring how others look at a situation, one's

10

understanding of a process/concept/experience is enriched through a broader range of perspectives (Brooks & Brooks, 2001). In teacher education field experiences, field instructors have the opportunity to use the interns' learning experiences and relationships as a site for dialogue that has the potential to help interns socially construct knowledge about teaching. This experience supports the novice teacher by simultaneously recognizing the value and contributions they bring to the conversation (Smith, 2003) while providing access to the thoughts, experiences, and knowledge of the more experienced mentor (Bruner, 1996; Vygotsky, 1978). Because this is a type of constructivism, the individual's conceptions and internalized knowledge also matter. A social constructivist model forefronts an opportunity to work collaboratively with others as a necessary first step to individual meaning making. Newman (1990) writes:

> One of my current beliefs is that learning is a collaborative enterprise. People don't learn…in isolation. They learn by being members of a learning community. While we each construct an individual interpretation of a particular situation, our understanding is shaped by contact with other people's perceptions of what's gone on. Our interpretation will hold until we become aware of a discrepancy either through some direct personal experience or from something we've heard or read elsewhere and discuss it anew. (p. 8)

This description demonstrates the importance of the connection between a community to help individuals learn and the practice of individual construction of knowledge. According to Furlong (2000), dialogue with others is necessary for learning to teach and can be accomplished by allowing interns the opportunity to express their teaching ideas and beliefs (see also Freeman, 1991 and Rust, 1999). While we might each walk away with a different interpretation of what happened or what was learned in an interaction with others (Brophy, 2002), it is unlikely that anyone would have as rich or complex an experience without collaboration. Providing this collaborative opportunity and learning

11

from it are two different things. The following two sections consider the distinction between the learning theory and teaching stance of social constructivism.

Social constructivism as a learning theory. Social constructivism is an extension of constructivism where learners create knowledge instead of simply receiving it (Brooks & Brooks, 2001; Fosnot, 1989, 1995; Sfard, 1998). Social constructivism builds on the notion of the mental activity of learners and developing one's own understanding. Recent work questions the view that social and individual cognition can be studied separately, arguing that the social context is integral and not simply the background for individual cognition (Resnick et al., 1991; Richardson, 1997; Solomon, 1998). Social constructivism acknowledges the cultural role that others play in helping one to develop one's ideas through conversation, collaborative activity, etc. (Bereiter, 1994; Phillips, 1995; Resnick, 1987; Windschitl, 2002). This cultural role highlights the relationship that exists between learners and their contexts as well as the influence that others have in an individual's learning process. As a learning theory, researchers and theorists agree on several central defining features of social constructivism. According to Wells (2002), talk is the "foundation of a social constructivist approach to education" (p. 2) (see also Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1996; Resnick, 1987). Wells goes on to describe a series of ideas about social constructivist learning theory on which the authors in an edited volume, *Social Constructivist Teaching: Affordances and Constraints* (Brophy, 2002), would agree. This list of ideas includes consensus on the social nature of knowing and coming to know as well as agreement that "knowledge is constructed by individuals through an active relating of new information to their personal experience and their current frameworks for making sense of that experience" (p. 2). As a learning theory, the

primary goal of social constructivism is to "stimulate thinking in learners that results in

meaningful learning, deep understanding, and transfer to real-world contexts" (Brophy,

2002, p. xii; see also Oldfather & West, 1999).

Social constructivist learning highlights the importance of dialogue with others as

the first place that someone learns. This is the act during which knowledge is created

over time and through reflection on personal understanding of the interaction. Learners

move knowledge from the interpsychological plane to the intrapsychological plane as

they make sense of their interactions and prepare for the next event (Vygotsky, 1978,

1986). Nuthall (2002) places responsibility for making this transition from social

cognition to individual knowledge on the student as well as the teacher, "The student role

is not just to give answers but to express genuine beliefs or make serious claims and to

support them with evidence or reasons" (p. 48). Doolittle describes the social

construction of knowledge:

> Knowledge can not simply be transmitted from teacher to student or individual to
> individual; rather, knowledge is built up through the synthesis of social
> experiences. That is, knowledge is constructed in response to social interactions
> through social negotiation, discourse, reflection and explanation – all active
> processes. (Doolittle, 2001, p. 510)

While language use is a crucial component of social constructivism, the quality of the

dialogue also matters. This is what makes social constructivism a process that has the

potential to support student learning in a directed and valuable way. It is not enough to

simply engage in conversation:

> It is imperative to stress that dialogue does not imply simple discussing and
> telling, but rather, includes the analysis of ideas, the synthesis of verbal sources,
> the evaluation of the intersection of multiple sources, and reflective explanation of
> one's own thoughts and understandings. (Doolittle, 2001, p. 512)

Intern actions in the classroom then demonstrate the degree to which aspects of the

conversation were internalized during and after the shared dialogue. The more

experienced mentor plays a significant role in helping the intern mediate the social and

internal planes of meaning so as to make rich connections. Activity in the classroom (or

learning contexts) can be used as a measure of the success of the conversation through

reflection on why aspects did or did not play out in the classroom. It is important to

recognize that the conversation was not a failure if the intern or student is able to explain,

based on their understanding of the dialogue (Wells, 2002), why they chose not to engage

in a certain activity or practice.

As we explore issues of dialogue, the role of the field instructor as the more

experienced other becomes relevant as a member of the conversation. As one who

provides assistance to the intern in learning through this experience, the issues of

teaching – how, when, to what end – begin to emerge.

Social constructivist teaching. This section examines social constructivist

teaching practices in the classroom and includes consideration of how this perspective

informs the research needed on field instruction as one form of social constructivist

teaching. The section after this will consider the specifics of my social constructivist

teaching approach to field instruction practice.

Social constructivist learning theories imply that a novice learns from interaction

and engagement with a more experienced mentor. How that mentor, or teacher, chooses

to engage her practice has direct influence on the types of learning opportunities available

to a learner in a social constructivist environment. "Social constructivism is primarily a

theory of learning rather than a theory of teaching, so educators who identify themselves

as social constructivist can and do advocate a range of teaching approaches" (Brophy, 2002, p. ix). Wells (2002) documents that there is disagreement about "what such a theory might look like in practice and indeed, whether it is appropriate to talk about social constructivist teaching at all" (p. 3; see also Nuthall, 2002). As the Oldfather et al. (1999) quote which opens the chapter claims, a social constructivist approach to teaching does not emphasize a particular method or model of teaching. Rather, a social constructivist teaching stance places emphasis on pedagogical and instructional decision-making that is suited to the context and the students (see also Nuthalll, 2002; Wells, 2002). Here I will make the argument that there is an existing potential base for social constructivist teaching. Further, I believe that there is worthwhile work to be done on defining and characterizing a social constructivist teaching stance, particularly as it supports learning to provide instruction that is responsive to student diversity in the classroom.

Duckworth (1996) describes how she wants students to have the opportunity to develop their own frameworks for knowledge but that the teacher's role is also to broaden and deepen the scope of ideas that the student may not have thought about. In this case, teaching is providing access to the assistance necessary for students to reach goals that they have set or taken ownership of for their learning (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Wells, 2002). One example of this approach to access is Tharp and Gallimore's (1988) description of assisted performance, "Assisted performance defines what a child can do with help, with the support of the environment, of others, and of the self" (p. 30). Tharp and Gallimore believe that teaching is assisted performance and that this support is a more deeply conceptualized version of the early notions of scaffolding that helps learners

progress through the zone of proximal development (ZPD) (Vygotsky, 1986). The assisted performance that Tharp and Gallimore advocate relies on several actions that the teacher uses to help students move from a heavy reliance on the support of others to the development of an independent and well-developed practice on the part of the learner. This structure decreases the involvement and the responsibility of the teacher over time as the learner is increasingly able to manage to perform successfully without support. This kind of teaching is based on social constructivist work that values the contributions of the individual learner while recognizing the importance of collaborative support necessary for learning to occur.

The challenge for the social constructivist teacher, according to Wells (2002), is to manage the two levels of teaching that exist in the classroom. The first level addresses the learning needs and curriculum goals of the entire class. The second level focuses on the individual student's learning needs and the teacher must simultaneously attend to the class as a whole and the individual students within that classroom. For this reason, Wells says that social constructivist teaching can not be a method because these levels require that teachers make pedagogical decisions on the basis of the learning needs of particular students in the class. Because of this, social constructivist teaching is more appropriately thought of as a stance, not a method. However, also because of this reason, social constructivism recognizes and values the importance of the individual learner in the teaching and learning process. For issues of classroom and student diversity, this awareness of and responsiveness to the needs of the individual learner is a critical stance for teacher candidates to develop. Perhaps experiencing social constructivist field instruction practices would allow a teacher candidate to begin to develop the kinds of

attitudes and learning experiences that we want to see in classrooms through the modeling that would occur. This is something that we need to learn more about.

Further research needs to be done on several aspects of social constructivist teaching, particularly in teacher education. At this point, researchers have been inconsistent in attempts to connect social constructivist teaching practices with measurable outcomes in student learning (Brophy, 2002; O'Connor, 1998) and more research has been done on social constructivist learning than teaching. Brophy also argues that we are missing research on the "conditional knowledge" of social constructivist teaching including when and how to best use these approaches to consider how to support student learning. He writes:

> ...social constructivists tend to put forth their particular model as if it applied universally, without saying much if anything about when it would or would not be used or how it might need to be adjusted to different types of student, different subject matter, different learning activities, and so on. (p. xvi)

This study attempts to address some of these adjustments by developing research that focuses on intern learners, issues of student diversity and field instruction practices. Much of the literature on social constructivist learning and teaching is focused on the experiences of students in public school classrooms, often considering the students and their experiences as a class (Brophy, 2002; see, for example, Englert & Dunsmore, 2002; Roth, 2002; VanSledright & James, 2002). The bulk of this work has been with children and not with adults. Teacher education provides an arena that gives research access to adults that extends our knowledge base on how social constructivist practices change or remain the same as the students shift from children to adults. Field instruction provides one specific practice to be studied as an example of social constructivist teaching in teacher education.

Compared to other aspects of teacher education, field instruction is a practice conducted on a one to one level. The current prevailing belief is that social constructivist teaching practices are more successful when students are learning in small groups (Brophy, 2002; Englert & Dunsmore, 2002; Nuthall, 2002). Research is needed that allows us to explore how social constructivist practices work in a one on one relationship between a student and a teacher. Because of the heavy emphasis on talk as a centerpiece of social constructivist learning, field instruction practices offer a closer look at the interaction between teacher educator and teacher candidate. There is work on social constructivist teaching approaches such as guided assistance and scaffolding (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Vygotsky, 1986) that indicates a connection to student learning, there is little work on this area as related to the focus on work with teacher candidates.

The work done in teacher education focuses more on constructivist teaching (not social constructivist) in education courses or in the expert/novice relationship between student teacher and collaborating teacher (Feiman-Nemser & Beasley, 1997; Fosnot, 1989; Loughran & Russell, 1997; Richardson, 1997; Smith, 2003). There is a need to consider more carefully the role of social constructivism in teacher education practices, particularly with interns, as a part of the constructivist research in teacher education preparation. We have yet to learn how knowledge is used in situations when the novice teacher has a real world need to know how to do something in order to teach elementary students in a public school classroom. It is also worth considering whether social constructivist practices are better suited to learners who are succeeding or struggling with their learning experience. Does the relative ease with which the learner engages the material or experience influence the success of social constructivist teaching practices?

This study allows us to take a closer look at how interns learn (or don't) from the use of social constructivist field instruction practices and when it may or may not be suitable to use these approaches. The following section identifies the social constructivist activities of my field instruction practice in order to make explicit how I conceptualize this work. While I have acknowledged that there is not one set of activities that comprise a social constructivist stance, I will use the term 'social constructivist practices' as a means of communicating those practices that I engage in with my interns to indicate those activities that I think are appropriate based on my social constructivist stance towards field instruction practice.

Key aspects of social constructivist field instruction practice. It is necessary to understand the connection between social constructivism and field instruction practice. Newman (1990) writes:

> In effect, our beliefs about learning and teaching are largely tacit. We operate a good deal of the time from an intuitive sense of what is going on without actively reflecting on what our intentions might be and what our actions could be saying to students. Unfortunately, this means that much of the time we have little contact with what students are actually learning from our instructional activities. In order to understand what students are learning, we first have to make our theories explicit and open to scrutiny. (p. 18)

Here I will make my theories about my social constructivist stance for field instruction practice explicit, drawing on the previous review of social constructivist teaching and learning. Wells (2002) writes, "...from a social constructivist perspective, effective pedagogy requires a framework of general principles within which decision making can be emergent and strategic in each specific situation" (p. 33). This section serves to outline some of these general principles of a social constructivist field instruction practice. Careful attention to intern learning needs and the structure of our internship

program will follow this description. More detail about aspects of this practice description will be provided through those lenses.

Brophy (2002) claims that social constructivist teaching approaches are best suited for learning situations where learners (interns) need to construct "knowledge networks" (p. xvi) and when learners (interns) need to develop processes and skills that rely on synthesis and application of knowledge. Wells recognizes the relevance of action in addition to the collaborative nature of social constructivist dialogues:

> While it is in dialogue with others that the significance of activities is made explicit, questioned and clarified, this does not in any way diminish the importance of action itself, as a site for putting understanding to use and for testing conjectures, hypotheses and problem solutions. (Wells, 2002, p. 7)

As a field instructor, one of my responsibilities is to help interns bridge theory and practice. To do so, I need to see interns' efforts in practice to implement the approaches and activities we discuss as well as the efforts to implement ideas learned about previously in the intern's coursework.

At the same time, one of the complexities of social constructivist practice is to balance the needs and interests of the learner with the assumptions that I hold as a field instructor about the importance of various theories and practices in education. A consistent tension in social constructivist practice focuses on the tendency to work from knowledge bases that may be considered "right" and to ensure that learners do not simply internalize all that is said without reflection or thought, ultimately mimicking the attitudes and approaches of the collaborating teacher. We do have professional standards as a program to which we hold interns accountable. However, in the broader field of teacher education, "There is not an agreed upon body of knowledge or practice for teaching towards which interns' learning should be directed" (Smith, 2003, p. 35). This

lack of agreement has the potential to create conflict between the way I conceptualize knowing and teaching as a field instructor as outlined in the program standards and the intentions and beliefs of the teacher candidates with whom I work. The challenge becomes to provide field instruction appropriate to the intern's learning needs even if the intern and I are not initially in the same place or addressing the same learning goals. Issues of power and status may come into play with a focus on dialogue and learning opportunities that highlight the differences in our knowledge and experiences (Richardson, 1997). Below, I describe the components that comprise my social constructivist field instruction philosophy and practices. In doing so, I will identify relevant questions that I have about the effectiveness of this approach to field instruction practices.

My social constructivist field instruction stance. Nuthall (2002) writes, "...the teacher [field instructor] uses the language of critical and reflective thinking, models reasoning by thinking out loud, and challenges the students [interns] with ideas they have not thought of" (p. 52). All of these are aspects of practice that I feel are critical for field instructors and I have embedded these ideas in the five features of my social constructivist approach to field instruction, particularly as I strive to engage interns in learning about and responding to aspects of student diversity in the elementary school classroom. These five include: (1) attention to interns' learning needs; (2) support for interns' efforts to learn; (3) recognition of the teaching context's influence; (4) exploration of outside contexts; (5) mutual respect demonstrated through conversation and action. I will describe each of these ideas below and make further connections to each idea in the discussion of the university's program and field instruction practices.

Attention to interns' learning needs reflects my social constructivist belief that all learners need to be met where they are in the learning process and supported in ways that make the most sense for them as individual learners. Brophy (2002) argues that we need to be attentive to the learning needs of the individuals in the classroom and Wells (2002) says that we must consider the dual levels of teaching; one of these focuses on the individual learner (the other level is that of the class as a group) (see also Oldfather & West, 1999). The social constructivist approach to field instruction leaves the decisions about when and how to progress in learning up to the pair, technically freeing up decisions about how best to work together to the individual intern's needs. However, the context and the students also matter because the intern is not learning to teach in an inauthentic setting. So the question becomes, what are the best ways to identify and respond to the learning needs of the intern that simultaneously support interns and recognize the needs of the context? For example, how do you decide to support teacher candidates in their efforts to meet the language needs of an English language learner while recognizing that there is relatively little local knowledge in the school for how to do this? While the collaborating teacher plays a role in field instruction experiences, this study focuses on the work done by the dyad of the field instructor and intern. As such, it is possible to look carefully at social constructivist teaching through the way that I have conceptualized my field instruction practice.

While working to meet interns' individual learning needs, it is also necessary to maintain a stance that recognizes and validates novices' attempts to learn to teach. As a field instructor, I strive to support the intern to reflect on ideas, and suggest a range of options for action, etc. I try not to overwhelm the interns' initiative and ideas with my

own; rather, I strive to work collaboratively to support novices' making sense of the ideas

that they bring to the interactions we have together. For example, instead of telling the

intern who is struggling to figure out how to meet English language learning needs

exactly what to do, I might offer a range of options and then follow the intern's lead in

selecting among these options for action. Interns' ideas must be honored and supported

to foster an environment of risk taking, something that is necessary to do when trying to

learn as much as possible about teaching. However, the question still exists, how do you

honor intern efforts while ensuring the learning rights and needs of their elementary

students?

Given these concerns about the students in the intern's placement classroom, it is

critical to recognize the influence of the teaching context on the knowledge needed and

created by both the intern and the field instructor. How interns define and understand

their context can influence how they meet student needs (Oldfather & West, 1999). It is

important to support the interns' efforts to meet the particular challenges faced in their

context. When practice is taken on in this way, the relevance and importance of

conversation becomes salient. When discussing the context in meaningful ways, it is

necessary to consider the influence of the context on the meanings that one makes during

dialogue:

> Language in social constructivism, however, does not serve to 'transmit'
> knowledge between individuals but, serves as a stimulus to negotiation, action,
> and knowledge construction. Language provides an avenue for both confusion, as
> when a statement made by another does not coincide with one's or society's
> understanding, and comprehension, as when a dialogue results in an individual
> testing meanings through social exchange. (Doolittle, 2001, p. 512)

This example of the influence of language and the negotiation of meaning in dialogue

emphasizes the influence of views that each person brings to the conversation and the

potential for confusion and comprehension in this process. Recognizing the influence

and features of the intern's learning context can facilitate reduced confusion in socially

constructed situations. For example, understanding that an intern assumes that all

children have the necessary support and supplies at home to complete a project is vital for

me to know so that I can help the intern to challenge this assumption in order to meet the

needs of a lower socioeconomic student who does not have computer access outside of

school. The question for the field instructor becomes how to push this understanding of

student needs by focusing on the salient features of the context during conversation. For

issues of student diversity, it is necessary to understand the intern's learning context in

order to provide effective support and sense-making in work together as field instructor

and intern.

When it comes to helping interns make sense of their teaching experiences, I find

it useful and necessary to encourage them to explore the possibilities outside of their

immediate context. This is true both in terms of considering varying theories for why a

teacher or student might do something as well as alternative approaches to the instruction

and learning opportunities in the classroom. One strategy for this is to share examples

from my own personal experiences and professional knowledge as an elementary

classroom teacher. Working together to make sense of what has gone on in the interns'

teaching experiences and discussing examples of things that have or have not gone well

in my own teaching practice provides real models of events in practice. This also helps

interns to think about teaching outside of their field placement context, which I believe is

a responsibility of the field instructor. I want to push interns to consider approaches to

teaching beyond their experiences in their internship classroom. In some ways, this is

representative of Schon's (1987) conception of the coach as one who has built up a "repertoire of examples, images, understanding and actions" (p. 66) that can serve as a source of ideas when faced with a unique learning situation. However, it is necessary to consider how to best share these examples without sending the implicit message that I expect to see them do what I did. The goal is to help them reflect on and consider the appropriateness of a range of ideas for use with their particular students in their particular context.

Together, the four previous components comprise and are based on the fifth proposition of my field instruction practice. Recognizing individual learning needs, supporting interns' efforts to make sense of their learning by providing conversation on a collegial level and recognizing the challenges of the interns' context are all processes with the potential to build relationships and respect. While certainly not a guaranteed process, structuring work together in a way that values all that the intern brings to the learning situation creates a context where engaging conversations and risk-taking feel safer and the possibilities of the learning to teach process are open-ended. However, issues of power and status do have the potential to reduce the positive effects of this type of approach. It is critical that one is conscious of these issues and attuned to potential situations where the power or status of either member has the potential to undermine the relationship. Richardson (1997) writes that this forces us to reconsider how we relate if we choose to work this way, "Thinking of learning as a sociocultural process and teaching with conscious moral intent would require our rethinking the nature of the communities within and outside the school, as well as radically altering power relationships" (p. 11). To ask interns to engage with students in responsive ways and

meet their learning needs, it is necessary to utilize an approach to field instruction that

supports and models this experience. Though I believe that this is done through social

constructivist field instruction practices, the question remains open to determine the

successfulness of this approach from other perspectives.

My Field Instruction Practice: Specific Moves I Make

Given the social constructivist stance that I take towards field instruction practice,

I described five key principles that I try to use in my practice. In the context of these

principles, I alluded to some specific moves I might take as a field instructor. Just as a

teacher has pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1986, 1987) as a piece of her

practice, I also have pedagogical content knowledge on which I act to meet the needs of

my learners as well as the complexity of the content in learning to teach. Pedagogical

content knowledge is the intersection of content knowledge, knowledge of pedagogy and

knowledge of learners in order to tailor instruction to meet the specific needs of learners

and the subject matter knowledge that is to be taught. My pedagogical knowledge is

founded on a social constructivist stance. This stance includes knowledge about interns as

learners described later in the chapter. That knowledge intersects with content

knowledge about teaching elementary school (and in this particular study, content

knowledge of how to teach diverse student populations in the elementary classroom). As

a field instructor, I use the pedagogical content knowledge I have to design field

instruction practices that support interns' learning about the process of becoming an

elementary school teacher who is responsive to student learning needs. The connections

between these various knowledge bases inform how I use a social constructivist practice

to support interns' efforts to learn to teach.

As practitioners, "They [interns] frame problems and shape situations to match their professional understanding and methods, they construct situations suited to the roles they frame, and they shape the very practice worlds in which they live out their professional lives" (Schon, 1987, p. 42). As a field instructor with a social constructivist stance, I have a range of moves available to me to help interns do this in responsive and productive ways. All of these moves are based in conversation with interns. With an understanding of the program and internship experience, I describe here a series of specific moves that I utilize in taking my social constructivist philosophy from theory to practice. These moves include reflection, modeling talk and generating choices, sharing personal teaching experiences that can inform interns' dilemmas, and focused efforts to support interns' own development of instructional practices and beliefs through extensive questioning.

A significant portion of my work with interns is centered on reflection about the experiences they are having as they learn to teach. Schon (1987) describes reflection on and in action as a learning process where novices begin to develop practices that allow them to consider how to make sense of their experiences.[2] Reflection on action is the first step where one reflects on what happened and hypothesizes about why in order to improve future practice. Reflection in action is a process where one reflects on and makes choices about next steps while engaged in action. Through conversation, both casual chats and formal debriefing conferences, I strive to support intern reflection on a range of issues. I use reflection on several levels to explore various aspects of the classroom – reflection on the lessons I've observed, reflections on what they are thinking

---

[2] Schon's ideas of reflection in and on action as well as naming and framing will be used for analysis purposes in the case studies presented in later chapters.

about their own development as teachers, and reflection on the students in their classrooms and their learning. Of particular importance to me is reflection on the learners and their progress in the classroom. How interns conceptualize the ways that they think about their students as well as about their strengths and weaknesses in the classroom says a great deal about the sense they are making of the challenges of working with a wide range of diverse learning needs in the classroom. I strive to know the students in the interns' classrooms (as many as possible) and to use my observations of them during time in the classroom to help the intern reflect on what is and is not working for a particular student in a particular type of learning situation. Ideally, during the internship year, interns would make progress towards reflection in action as the most responsive way to work with their students' diverse learning needs.

While focused on reflection, the way that I choose to talk with interns about students and their experiences, learning needs, background, etc. provides a model for interns on how to talk about students in responsive and supportive ways. Modeling how to think and talk about students is something that I feel is critical in a socially constructed approach to field instruction practice. Doing this allows me to demonstrate the respect for their ideas which mirrors how I want them to demonstrate respect towards students. If I truly advocate a learning theory premised on dialogue and conversation, then I also need to provide the necessary support for learning how to talk about potentially sensitive issues or topics in ways that respect students. Part of this is modeling what Fosnot (1995) describes:

> I can not understand in the same way as another human who has had different experiences, but with language, with stories, with metaphors and models, we can listen to and probe one another's understanding, thereby negotiating 'taken-as-shared' meanings. (p. 26)

This also provides practice for conversations with future parents and administrators about the children in their class and challenges interns to learn to make their thinking public in understandable ways.

To model how I would do this and to provide access to content that they might not have, I also share my own practices and experiences with interns as a former elementary classroom teacher. Doing so reflects the fact that while I have more classroom experience than they do, I still consider myself a learner and still consider the experiences that I have had in the classroom as a critical part of my role as a teacher educator. Doing so also provides a point of reference for interns and the potential that exists for responsive practices that they may not see in their own placement classroom. Part of this role is to also help interns develop and follow through on reasonable goals for their own teaching and learning. Helping them to see beyond the immediacy of the current drama in the field classroom is an essential aspect of fostering their understandings of the larger practice of teaching and of meeting individual students' diverse learning needs.

The final group of moves varies on the need of the intern and the practicalities of the situation we are trying to address. Asking a lot of questions for clarification as well as for probing and helping them think about and reflect on their practice fosters an inquisitive and reflective approach to teaching and learning. Based on the success of this interaction with interns, it may be possible to help them to see their own way to an action to take. If not, another approach that I use is to propose options for action – especially when asked for early on; later, once a more open relationship exists, I offer them more freely (without being asked). However, I want to make it clear that I rarely propose these as the only options available for action and often present them as open-ended ideas that

need to be developed to fit the students and the needs of the intern's particular classroom context. Each of these moves will be described in more detail as they come into play in the case studies of my field instruction interactions with three interns.

Summary. Taking a social constructivist approach to field instruction practice is more complicated than entering the classroom and telling interns what to do and how I want to see it done. Wells (2002) discusses this complexity, "For teachers who see learning as a lifelong endeavor – for themselves as much as for the students they teach – the challenge presented by the decision to organize their teaching according to social constructivist principles is both demanding and rewarding" (p. 36). While I feel that I provide a supportive foundation for learning to teach by using social constructivist practices, the challenges of a social constructivist stance towards field instruction practice impact both field instructor and interns. Field instructors need to be able to respond quickly to the direction of conversation, highlighting important elements for interns and anticipating the flow of conversation in educative directions (Brophy, 2002). For interns, social constructivist teaching practices require learners to take significant risks and to engage deeply and actively in the conversation (Brophy, 2002). Brophy argues that the literature and research on social constructivist teaching practices is focused primarily on trying to argue that teachers should use these methods all of the time instead of considering the relative trade-offs in individual situations and learning opportunities of using (or not using) social constructivist teaching approaches. Oldfather & West (1999) recognize the importance of the setting and context in socially constructing this meaning:

> The best interest of our students is served if we attend not only to the social construction of meaning, but also to the taking of a critical stance toward that meaning. We are not just socially constructing any meaning; we are socially

constructing particular meanings in particular times and places, within particular
sociopolitical contexts. (p. 84)

This study will consider the effectiveness and limitations of social constructivist
approaches to field instruction practices through careful analysis of three intern-field
instructor relationships.

Interns as Learners: Learning About and Planning for Their Students

Now that I have reviewed the literature on social constructivist learning and
teaching as well as my own field instruction stance premised on social constructivist
beliefs, it is necessary to consider the broad characteristics and the contexts of learners
with whom I work. This section lays out the knowledge base that I use to inform my
field instruction practice as well as the specific context in which I work. Michigan State
University's teacher candidates participate in a year-long internship program after
completion of their regular four year undergraduate degree. During this fifth year, interns
are assigned to one classroom placement (from August through April) where they work
with their collaborating teacher and field instructor to learn to teach. They are
simultaneously enrolled in four graduate level courses across the school year, which are
designed to support their developing teaching practices.

One of the first issues to be addressed in considering the research that already
exists to support, question, or extend this study is that which focuses on interns as
learners as they continue their growth in the process of learning to teach through their
field placement. Ball and McDiarmid (1987) define teacher learning as the "attention to
changes in the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that may occur through teacher
education" (cited in NCRTE, 1988). All three of these aspects are key to understanding
teacher learning and can change individually as well as collectively over time.

There is a mixed body of literature on the changes that student teachers do or do

not go through over the course of their student teaching experiences (Nettle, 1998;

Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1985). Reviews of the research have shown that teacher

candidates who are progressive and idealistic during their teacher education programs

often become increasingly conservative as they move through student teaching and the

first years of their careers (Veenman, 1984). Further, they begin to take on

characteristics more like their collaborating teachers if/when they do make these changes

(Gomez, 1994; Nettle, 1998). However, Zeichner and Tabachnick (1985) found that this

was not an automatic given and that the opportunity exists to maintain some control and

personal drive as a beginning teacher, often reflecting the positive learning of powerful

student teaching experiences. This alerts us to a disagreement in the existing research;

we need more attention to the distinctions between the knowledge that student teachers

have and their tendencies to enact their knowledge from student teaching experiences.

We also need to know more about the influence of the school and community context on

shaping what interns do, come to know and believe about work with diverse student

populations. Research must be done to determine how to support student teachers in

developing the knowledge, skills, and dispositions in learning to teach in ways that

benefit all the potential students that they may work with during their career.

Part of determining how interns learn to teach is to consider the various

understandings of teacher knowledge. The field of research on teacher knowledge in

general is quite broad and varied. When describing the teacher knowledge and where it

came from, teachers claim that experience is a strong determiner in what and how they

learn to teach (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985). And yet researchers argue,

"Classroom experience alone, whether past or present, can not justify what teachers do, nor teach teachers to think about their work" (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985, p. 61). Differing perspectives have been proposed for the decisions made and the practices that teachers engage in during the instructional process.

Shulman's (1986, 1987) conceptual framework of teacher knowledge helps to explain the framework of knowledge that I use to understand intern learning. In a description of the knowledge base for teaching, Shulman names a range of areas that teachers must know about to inform their professional knowledge base. These include (at a minimum): content knowledge, general pedagogical knowledge, curriculum knowledge, knowledge of learners, knowledge of educational contexts, and knowledge of educational purposes. Shulman (1986, 1987) goes on to describe in detail his conception of pedagogical content knowledge as a blend of content knowledge, knowledge of learners and knowledge of pedagogy. Not only does a teacher have to know the subject matter, she needs to know her learners and how to best support the interaction between the subject matter and the students to encourage learning. This intersection is arguably one of the more challenging aspects for interns who are learning to teach. Wilson, Shulman, and Richert (1987) propose a model of pedagogical reasoning that highlights the interactive and iterative nature of teachers' knowledge with the following steps (though there is actually no one starting point in the model): instruction – evaluation – reflection – new comprehension – comprehension – transformation (which includes critical interpretation, representation, adaptation, tailoring). The cycle continues unabated as the transformation process informs the next instructional act.

This framework is generic in its approach to the students without paying explicit attention to who they are and what they bring to the learning experience other than to say that you need to know your learners. It lacks any sort of specific direction in suggesting how to support beginners in learning how to teach diverse student populations. As a framework, it does demonstrate the complexity of teaching. However, additional attention needs to be paid to the role of the K-12 learners in how teachers make sense of their contexts and design instructional activities that support the learning needs of all students in the classroom. With the increasing diversity of the public school classroom, we can no longer afford to represent a teacher's knowledge without considering how she/he takes particular students into consideration in instructional planning and/or teaching.

There has been little research on the nature of learning to teach in student teaching (Slick, 1997) with little attention also paid to the knowledge of culturally diverse learners (Grant, 1997). Interns need to know their students as learners in order to respect and respond to their diverse needs. This leads naturally to the question of how they come to know this information and part of the learning process is learning how to gather this information about their students. Ultimately, the interns need to learn how to respond to this information pedagogically and make effective instructional decisions that respect and support their learners. Each of these topics will be taken up in this section of the literature review in order to set the stage for what needs to be considered during the interactions with the field instructor that occur as a part of the internship experience.

Knowing students in particular ways. In order to design instruction for students that is responsive to their learning needs, interns must know their students in ways that

inform their understanding of students' backgrounds and the influence of students'

culture, language, ability and/or socioeconomic status on their learning needs. The first

significant step that must be addressed in helping interns to know students in particular

ways is dealing with the existing beliefs that teacher candidates bring with them to their

teacher preparation program. Teacher candidates possess beliefs about students, the ways

that students learn, who students are on the basis of their backgrounds, and so on. These

beliefs become particularly evident and influential when the "rubber hits the road" and

they must begin to design and implement instruction for real children in real classrooms.

There is a great deal of literature on the strength of interns' beliefs as they enter

teacher education as well as throughout their teacher preparation programs (Colville-Hall,

MacDonald & Smolen, 1995; Joram & Gabriele, 1998; Marxen & Rudney, 1999; Mason,

1997; Richardson, 1996; Wideen, Mayer-Smith, & Moon, 1998). Richardson (1996)

found that it was more successful to promote change in both beliefs and practices than on

either one alone and that conversations that supported the interns' opportunity to think

through their beliefs and practices as well as to experiment with new ideas was

supportive of this change. This speaks to the potential of the dialogic nature of social

constructivist field instruction practices to support interns' learning about their students

as well as their personal beliefs about work with diverse student populations. Because

social constructivism relies so heavily on the dialogic nature of learning, and because the

learning situation around issues of diversity is so heavily based on personal beliefs, this

opportunity to talk through situations is critical. Being able to explore their ideas in

conversation with another will support an intern in hearing about and receiving feedback

on their ideas in order to make meaning about what they mean and know in regards to diverse student populations.

Additionally, in their review of studies on learning to teach, Wideen et al. (1998) found that short term interventions had much less success in influencing the preservice teachers' beliefs, with greater success found with interventions that occurred over a year or more (the length of the Michigan State internship program). Beach and Pearson (1998) found that as student teachers "became more aware of the complexity of teaching, they were more likely to interrogate their own perceptions and personal theories of teaching, self-interrogation that stemmed from a heightened sense of the need to change" (p. 345). This provides some hope that there is the possibility to make some changes in beliefs in the course of the year that we work with our intern candidates.

Beginning teachers consider the complexity of working with a range of individual differences among students to be one of the most difficult challenges of the early stage of their career (Stansbury & Zimmerman, 2002; Veenman, 1984). Beach and Pearson (1998) found that student teachers attributed 57% of the tension and conflict in their experiences to the students and that this increased to 64% during the first year of teaching. Teacher interns claim that the point of their student teaching experience is all about the students (Wideen, Mayer-Smith, & Moon 1998) which provides the perfect opportunity to help them think broadly about their students' learning needs and design appropriate instruction that reflects their students. Students come with a range of learning needs and issues that must be addressed to teach responsively. This can include linguistic, racial/ethnic, socioeconomic, and ability issues that must be considered for

effective learning experiences. Interns need to know about their students in all of these ways.

Feiman-Nemser (2003) writes of the need for induction programs to do more than simply provide emotional support because beginning teachers ask questions about a wide range of issues. These questions include many about how to best meet the diverse learning needs of their students (see also Feiman-Nemser, 2000; Renard, 2003; Veenman, 1984). This ties back to Shulman's (1987) conception of knowledge of learners as a critical part of the knowledge base for teachers. One of Feiman-Nemser's recommendations is to have preservice teachers learn about students' learning needs and cultural backgrounds during their first years of teaching because schools have not historically been set up for novice or expert teacher learning around these topics. New teachers have to learn to teach in a particular context (Feiman-Nemser, 2000, 2003). Their knowledge must become contextualized to the students and school in which they work. While we obviously do not have a crystal ball to discern and anticipate the specific setting where each preservice teacher will end up teaching, we can make efforts to support their learning about the range of needs, situations, and issues they may face as they move from their preservice field settings to teaching positions. Research, such as this study, that explores how this can help interns in learning to teach is needed to better inform our practices and understandings of how to support their learning to teach processes.

Knowing how to come to know students. In establishing that interns need to know their students in particular ways in order to effectively meet their learning needs, the problem arises of how to help them come to know their students in these ways. The

challenges of learning to teach in ways that are responsive to all students' learning needs are nested and complex. Three issues must be considered here: addressing the preexisting beliefs of interns about students, the readiness of interns to address students' needs, and the possibilities for ways to come to know students.

Calderhead & Robson (1991) question where student teachers' knowledge comes from. Lortie (1975) found that prior experiences as students in classrooms were strong influences on teachers' understandings of teaching and learning. This complicates our notion of teaching and learning to teach if interns' experiences as students and as interns are all in classrooms and schools with relatively little diversity as perceived by the interns. This may serve to reinforce the existing beliefs that they brought with them to teacher preparation. During their years as students, particularly in elementary school, teacher candidates are never aware of all that each student brings to the classroom that must be addressed by the teacher in order to learn effectively. A teacher's instructional actions and decisions are not explicit and transparent for students.

Calderhead and Robson (1991) found that student teachers had strong, preexisting mental images that they used to solve problems and propose actions in the classroom. Student teachers' images were inflexible in their minds and they had difficulty taking the actual context and the real students of their student teaching classrooms into account and reconciling them with their preexisting images which were guiding their actions. This presents a challenge that must be addressed in helping interns to take into consideration the actual students they are attempting to teach and the learning needs they possess. As a relative outsider, the university supervisor is in the position of helping them to consider

their students and ask probing questions that guide reconsideration (or new consideration) of the students as learners.

Fuller and Brown (1975, cited in Boydell, 1986) described a three level approach to the concerns faced during student teaching and suggest that these be taken on in order as one learns to teach. Student teachers begin the student teaching process most concerned about themselves and their ability to successfully survive the experience. As they progress in the process of learning to teach, the third level of the concerns relates to students once the novice has moved outside of him/herself and the immediate need to teach and survive. This is where the intern will be able to change focus and spend more time learning about the students and their learning needs, providing knowledge of learners that can inform their instructional design and implementation. The time and course work to increase knowledge provided in the internship allows one to move to the third level of focusing on students and less on themselves while still in a supportive environment with a collaborating teacher, university supervisor and course instructors available to guide and suggest strategies for responsive instruction.

Ladson-Billings (1995) makes some recommendations for strategies that help teachers come to know their diverse students at the same time that they engage in meaningful instruction (knowing how to respond to their students pedagogically - see section below). She advocates that parents, family members and community members are invited in to help explore and represent the students' cultures outside of school. This provides the teacher with additional knowledge about the lives of students and suggests connections that can be made between the students' experiences and approaches for how to respond to these students instructionally. Additionally, she suggests that developing a

fluid relationship where students and teachers are simultaneously students and teachers for and of each other allows teachers greater insight into their learners and how to best support their learning. This is just one example of how a teacher might respond to the diversity present in their classroom.

Knowing how to respond to this information pedagogically. Wideen et al. (1998) argued that attitudinal change is possible for intern teachers and will result in changes in teaching practice. Further, their suggested support for this is embedded in the design of this study. I have strived to maintain constant and significant support for the process of change, working with others and maintaining a systematic message over time (such as emphasizing a focus on meeting the learning needs of all students) as a field instructor. Learning how to respond pedagogically to the learning needs of their students involves a range of processes from reasoning pedagogically, to implementing effective lessons, and responding to the broader societal issues that affect their students.

Interns need to learn to reason their way through instructional decisions and actions that are responsive to their students. Key to this reasoning process is the act of contemplating and planning for students' learning needs. Wilson, Shulman and Richert (1987) propose two steps in the model of pedagogical reasoning that would support interns in designing and implementing instruction that is responsive to the needs of their learners. They describe the processes of adaptation and tailoring during the transformation part of the pedagogical reasoning cycle in ways that support learners. Adaptation involves "fitting the transformation [of materials and lessons] to the characteristics of students in general" (p. 120) including features such as ability, gender, etc. Tailoring "refers to adapting the material to the specific students in one class rather

than to the student population in general" (p. 120). Together these two processes allow intern teachers to look at their students in both general and specific ways in order to design instruction that meets their learning needs. Simply applying a lesson without consideration of the students is an ineffective approach to instructional design and use. However, one limitation of this framework is its inattention to specific issues of diversity among learners because of its more generic nature. This notion of pedagogical content knowledge is the focus of the intern teacher knowledge explored through field instruction practices in this study.

"Good will must be accompanied by pedagogical knowledge and skills as well as the courage to dismantle the status quo" (Gay, 2000, p. 13). Finding ways to engage the elementary students beyond the classroom and their own immediate needs is an effective way to challenge the status quo and help students to develop socially active and responsive approaches to the world around them (Ladson-Billings, 1995). Some of this responsibility falls on the shoulders of the supervisor in supporting interns in developing these pedagogical responses, "During the internship supervisors can fashion questions that encourage student teachers to consider an ever wider range of factors that explain how their instructional events proceed" (Ellwein, Graue & Comfort, 1990, p. 13). For example, questions like those that ask an intern to consider how the physical placement of the desk of an English Language Learner in the classroom can help an intern to begin to explore why the child might choose to disengage from instruction. This final step provides the reflection and transformation that Wilson, Shulman and Richert (1987) find necessary in the continuing development of responsive instruction.

these

We m

earn

reali

today

Impor

the st

In way

Studen

Field

Exper

Prepa

Prepar

role in

Biolog

Mechan

Experi

Urban

A poem from the Talmud (cited in Lee & Smagorinsky, 2000, p. 122) sums up these aspects of the learning necessary for interns in one succinct way:

"To look is one thing.
To see what you look at is another.
To understand what you see is a third.
To learn from what you understand is still something else.
But to act on what you learn is
All that really matters."

We must do more to help interns make effective decisions about how to act on what they learn about students. Fraser (1997) writes, "While no teacher can understand all of the reality of any other culture, much less the many different cultures represented in some of today's classrooms, every teacher can develop a series of critical skills and perhaps most important, attitudes of curiosity and respect, which will foster a sense of engagement, for the students and the teacher" (p. viii). The challenge is to use field instruction practices in ways that encourage teacher candidates to develop this kind of responsive approach to students' backgrounds and learning needs.

Field Instruction as an Educationally Supportive Practice

Field instruction during the year-long internship at MSU is a version of supervision that overcomes many of the typical constraints that commonly exist in other programs. Field instruction, as a practice defined by an elementary teacher education preparation team serving schools in a 40 mile radius, is the act of playing "a key support role in helping the intern develop standards-based practices in planning, teaching and assessment, and in becoming a fully participating member of the teaching profession" (Michigan State Teacher Preparation Team Two, 2003). While not explicitly advocating a particular stance or approach to field instruction practice (i.e. not everyone is required to have a social constructivist stance towards his/her practice as a field instructor), I

interpret the "key support role" as one that allows me to engage in a social constructivist

approach to field instruction while these broad guidelines inform the practice I try to

develop as a field instructor. As a former Michigan State University field instructor

describing her practice, Denyer (1997) writes:

> The word 'instructor' is key because we see our role as just that – a person who
> will engage in instruction in the field, a person who will teach our teacher
> candidates about teaching, a person who will learn from teaching. We do not see
> ourselves primarily as supervisors who observe and evaluate the actions of
> teacher candidates, pointing out what needs to be changed and offering
> suggestions on how to make those changes, although that is part of our role. We
> are there to help our teacher candidates think carefully about their own practice
> and find ways to improve it. We are there to provide a series of scaffolded
> learning experiences as teacher candidates engage in the complex task of learning
> to teach. We do this in a variety of ways that might include asking questions,
> modeling, instructing, role playing, choosing those strategies carefully in order to
> support the growth and development of our teacher candidates. (p. 39)

This quote describes the purpose of the role of the field instructor in more

complex ways than a traditional model of supervision would likely be defined. The

structure allows for embedded assistance and assessment over a long period of time,

which allows interns to become more comfortable with the practices of field instruction

because there are multiple opportunities for success and struggle in learning to teach and

working together. Additionally, efforts such as renaming the supervisory position and

calling it field instructor at Michigan State, remove the obvious emphasis from the

supervisory capacities and responsibilities of the position and open doors to more

instructional and assistive practices in working with interns. As such, this study focuses

on the assistance aspect of learning to teach. In many fundamental ways, Michigan State

University's vision of supervision for preservice teacher candidates is a far cry from

practices described in much of the research on traditional supervision accompanying

student teaching. The field instruction practice at MSU highlights additional time for

supp...

and wa...

intenti...

typical...

vision...

to help...

section...

how M...

spen...

Freema...

been se...

educati...

additi...

school...

and stu...

controv...

By de...

be inter...

is more...

share...

most fie...

support, small cohorts for each field instructor, guided practice in learning to supervise, and weekly field instructor meetings to support and guide field-based practices. It is the intention of the university to try and move our practice beyond something that is the typical supervisory role. However, because this more traditional model is the primary vision of supervision that exists in the literature, this will be explored here in some detail to help locate field instruction in the broader supervision literature. The following section will look closely at both the existing literature as well as my understanding of how MSU's conception compares and contrasts with the other ideas out there.

History of supervision research. The bulk of research on the roles of the field supervisor is outdated and does not address the responsibilities of the supervisor (Enz, Freeman, and Wallin, 1996; Slick, 1997). Historically, student teacher supervision has been seen as a low status, peripheral occupation within colleges and programs of teacher education commonly completed by adjunct faculty or graduate students (Slick, 1998a). Additionally, the supervisor is commonly seen as an outsider interfering in the public school classroom and serving only an evaluative role in the relationship with cooperating and student teachers (Slick, 1998a). Research attention was paid to the conflicting and controversial issues of assistance versus assessment in the context of supervision (Boydell, 1986). At MSU, the field instructor is seen as one who is closely involved in the intern's experiences in learning to teach. Further, it is desired that the field instructor is more than an evaluator – she also serves as an instructor who is valued in helping the intern learn to teach. The program is similar, however, to the existing research in that most field instruction is done by graduate students and adjunct personnel. Yet, Michigan

State does much to help them define a well-conceived practice as a field instructor instead of simply hiring and sending them out. This support is described below.

In 1979, Bowman wrote a short piece for the *Journal of Teacher Education* advocating the end of student teaching supervision provided through and from the university as a result of limited outcomes, drains on resources, and little involvement from university faculty. Instead, Bowman argued that all supervision should come from the schools and collaborating teachers. Although not the only person to claim such a stance in the literature of the 1970's, this piece seemed to rejuvenate interest in research around supervision. Research conducted in the 1980's found that the university supervisor does play an important and relevant role in the student teaching experience, but most of these findings paid little attention to how the supervisor helped the novice in actually learning to teach (e.g. Zimpher, DeVoss and Nott, 1980). Again, conflicting results were found where studies also questioned the impact on the student teacher. Boydell (1986) believes that the supervisor is isolated intellectually and that survival techniques are undertaken to protect the relationships in the triad. She goes on to write:

> ...there is no guarantee that a supervisor with unlimited time, great sensitivity to students' concerns, and immense pedagogical expertise would be able to raise the intellectual level of supervision appreciably, given the need for traditional types of assessment and the apprenticeship approach to teaching practice with its brief and transient relationships between triad members. (p. 118)

Michigan State attempts to provide a range of supports to field instructors in engaging in their role as a meaningful member of the triad. Weekly meetings are held with all field instructors on a team, the program staff, and the faculty leader for the team. These meetings serve as a place for communication about details as well as a place for problem solving, strategies for working with interns, and opportunities to talk with the graduate

level course instructors about what is going on out in the schools. Additionally, for graduate students learning about this new role, a doctoral level course on supervision is provided for first-time field instructors that serves as an educational support for developing a new and complex practice. This is a much more integrated model of field instruction than is likely found in many more traditional models of student teaching supervision. There is a consistent effort to focus on balancing the time spent on assistance and assessment appropriately with the bulk of the time spent on assistance. Also, at Michigan State, the field instructor is supposed to support both the intern and the collaborating teacher and bears a responsibility in assisting both parties in this complex model of learning to teach.

More research has been done on the interpersonal relationship aspects of the supervisor/collaborating teacher/student teacher triad and on focusing specifically on labeling what the supervisor does, with much less attention paid to the impact of the actual activities in which a supervisor engages or the complexity of the role (Slick, 1997, 1998b). Models of clinical supervision presented as specific actions to follow have dominated the field instead of approaches that are seen as "a set of ideas from which a variety of actions could be generated" (Feiman-Nemser, 2001, p. 19). Richardson-Koehler (1988) suggests that the university supervisor is in the unique position to raise the discourse of feedback provided to interns. As one who is somewhat removed from the immediacy of the classroom situation, the opportunity exists to enter into the relationship in ways that allow the field instructor to challenge the status quo and to help to connect the work of the field with the work of the university classroom as the field instructor is someone who has one foot in each camp.

practi

1985

superv

critica

simply

instruc

listen

grow, a

accept

knowle

teach

have th

what co

what is

In writ

sense o

acting

suggest

because

support

means

A number of classification systems for supervision have been created, both on the practice as a whole and on specific aspects of this activity structure. Zeichner and Liston (1985) found four different types of discourse used between interns and university supervisors during post-observation conferences: factual, prudential, justificatory, and critical. Justificatory and critical stances allow the interns to continue to grow beyond simply what happened to their decision-making processes and rationales for their instructional actions. Grant and Zozakiewicz (1995) advocate for a supervisor who will "listen and support their [student teachers'] work, while challenging students to think, grow, and act as multicultural educators. As with children in schools, supervisors need to accept and get to know each student teacher and their cultural background, educational knowledge, and unique experiences" (p. 271-272). MSU encourages a high level of feedback and a long-term investment in the well-being of the intern with the idea that we have the time to really push on our interns' thinking and learning and help them to see what could be – not just what is – as a teacher.

Hawkey (1997) writes, "It is not clear whether the student teachers are learning what is intended from their interactions with different personnel" (p. 326). She goes on to write that there is little understanding of how student teachers "integrate" and make sense of the various perspectives they are given – particularly if they are receiving differing information from the various personnel. Zimpher, DeVoss and Nott (1980) suggest that because the university supervisors are relative outsiders in the triad simply because of the limited time spent with the student teacher, they are in the exact position supportive of the opportunity to be more analytical and constructively critical in helping interns learn to teach. In their research, the university supervisor became a motivating

presence in the learning process for the intern. Richardson (1996) found that teachers were more likely to generate alternative practices when faced with dilemmas while teaching (as opposed to isolated study of teaching). This would suggest that support for generating these alternative practices would benefit interns as they are engaged in their experiences. Michigan State is making attempts to move in these directions by emphasizing work with diverse student populations and working to help interns foster attitudes and practices that are responsive to student learning needs in lessons outside of the university classroom context. However, at this time we need more research to understand the consequences of these moves. Clearly it is necessary to see how much the field instructor becomes a source of learning for the interns and how this is supported or negated by the learning that comes from the collaborating teacher.

The learning process as seen by the field instructor. This redefinition of supervision to emphasize the various roles played by the field instructor makes it possible to consider other alternatives and perspectives that are engaged by the field instructor in helping interns learn to teach. This model sets the stage for exploring the ways that the field instructor can use a social constructivist stance to engage interns in learning to work responsively with all students in their classrooms.

Various researchers and research participants have described the role of the supervisor in helping interns learn in different ways. Stone (1987, cited in Slick, 1998a) argued that supervision should involve theoretical work in pedagogy and that "students and supervisors jointly explore teaching analytically and experimentally" (p. 77). Slick (1998a) argued that no one has yet explored this work of "sharing-of-professional-insights" (p. 831) between supervisors and student teachers and is an area ripe for

cons

teach

who

and

deve

colla

hive

of inv

expre

teach

instr

that p

intro

the ro

activ

no si

differ

who a

oncl

Progra

ares

anage

consideration. Rust (1988) acknowledged that supervisors' "tacitly held images of 'good teaching' appear to influence the work of preservice supervisors" (p. 57). A supervisor who participated in Slick's (1997) research study reported that her role was to "initiate and establish a positive, caring relationship that fostered the student teacher's growth and development professionally" (p. 716) while also being responsive to the needs of the collaborating teacher. Enz, Freeman and Wallin (1996) found three roles played by the university supervisor – mentor, professional resource and interpreter. The mentor role is of most interest here and was defined as "actions a university supervisor might take to express support, encouragement, instructional guidance, and feedback to the student teacher" (p. 137).

In this study, the attention paid to the instructional guidance piece of the field instructor's role as a mentor is particularly salient. Cohn (1981) found in her research that part of the supervisor's role was to "stimulate relationships between previously introduced ideas and the specific situation at hand" (p. 28) which shows the potential of the role to help interns see connections between their university learning and the activities and experiences of the field placement. The student teaching field experience is not simply a place to apply ideas already learned but to continue the learning process in a different context than the university classroom. The supervisor is, in effect, a teacher who asks "probing questions to encourage students to see relationships and draw conclusions" (Cohn, 1981, p. 28). In a study of mentoring practices in an induction program, Feiman-Nemser (2001) found that a mentor for beginning teachers looked carefully for "openings," places where the mentor could support the new teacher to engage in productive conversations about a range of topics important to all new teachers

while

teache

learn -

thems

suppor

implem

the lea

necess

teachin

this con

mentor

1996)

was unj

superv

opportu

Chapter

2

been in

teach. I

and vari

His worl

fied term

while trying to balance his/her knowledge of teaching with that of concern to the new teacher. There is an intersecting relationship in the process of helping intern teachers learn – they must be supported emotionally and feel a level of trust in order to open themselves to new ideas, critique and reflection with others. All of these emotional supports are necessary to engage in the actual processes of learning to create and implement effective instruction for students – a complex task that is the ultimate focus of the learning to teach process. Thus, it is my intention to provide the emotional support necessary in order to free the interns to take the risks to support their own learning and teaching practices.

The role of the field instructor in engaging this process of intern learning. Given this conceptualization of learning, I see the role of the field instructor as one type of mentoring that can occur in this context of social construction. Enz, Freeman, and Wallin (1996) found that the act of observing student teacher lessons and providing feedback was universally seen as the most important activity engaged in by the university supervisor. In this study, that process will be used as the central focus of the learning opportunities as I work with interns to help them meet all students' learning needs. Chapter three includes more detailed discussion of the research design.

Zahorik (1988) conducted a piece of research specifically focused on the observing and conferencing aspects of the university supervisor's role in learning to teach. This research determined that there are types of supervisors, types of supervision, and various goals and styles that supervisors used in their work with student teachers. His work included a group of 10 supervisors (six faculty, three graduate students and one fixed term employee) with varying feelings of success and degrees of commitment to

their

least

for t

teach

respe

for ev

prese

shoul

makin

safe a

variati

to clas

and de

superv

though

that em

seful i

with th

respons

E

teaching

described

Nondirec

their role as a supervisor (the full professors found this role least enjoyable and felt the least success in the role). Zahorik determined that there were three styles and three goals for the work that supervisors engaged in, influencing the experiences that the student teachers had in learning to teach. These three styles were behavior prescriptive (supervisors who told student teachers what to do in specific areas and what not to do – for example, classroom management), idea interpretation (this supervisory style involves presenting the supervisor's ideas to the student teacher on what classrooms and schools should be like), and the person support supervisor (one who focused on teacher decision making and thinking for themselves by providing an environment in which this was a safe activity). There were subset variations in each of these styles capturing more subtle variations in approach. However, the main message of this study was to begin to attempt to classify some of the various approaches that supervisors used during the observations and debriefing conferences they held. In attempting to locate myself and my approach to supervision, I struggled to find the "best fit" in the ideas Zahorik proposed. Initially I thought these categories may be a useful starting point to uncover patterns and themes that emerged in my own practice. At the end, I found Zahorik's questions to be more useful in informing the focus of this study – including how flexible supervisors might be with their use of different approaches, how these decisions are made, and what sort of response interns and collaborating teachers have towards these approaches.

Rust (1988) focused on how supervisors communicated their knowledge about teaching to the teacher candidates that they were working with in the schools. She described a common practice used by supervisors in their responses to interns, "nondirective strategies such as open-ended questions to guide thinking, challenging,

perc
p. 6
foun
conc
indir
inste
back
fail
teach
weak

exam
the no
Glick
super
interp
did m
direct
invig
silen
simil
role

perception checking, and focusing the students' attention on the classroom environment" (p. 60). Additionally, Hoover, O'Shea, and Carroll (1988) present a chart (originally found in Blumberg, 1980) that describes four different supervisory styles. My current conception of my own field instruction practice fits best with style C – low direct, high indirect: "The supervisor's behavior is rarely direct (telling, criticizing, and so forth); instead he (or she) puts a lot of emphasis on asking questions, listening, and reflecting back the teacher's ideas and feelings" (p. 27). By choosing to enact this stance towards field instruction, I feel that it validates the attempts and efforts of the intern in learning to teach and opens the lines of communication that free interns to take risks, expose areas of weakness and develop a learning attitude (as opposed to a performing attitude).

There is also a body of literature on supervision more generally defined (see for example, Costa & Gamoran, 1994; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002). This work explores the notion of supervision for practicing teachers and those who supervise them. Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, (1995) advocate a developmental approach to supervision that requires supervisors to have developed three bases – knowledge, interpersonal skills and technical skills. They write of a supervisory belief continuum that moves from nondirective moves through a collaborative approach and finally to directive approaches (of which there are two types – directive informational which provides choices to make and directive control where the supervisor lays a clear plan for action). Glickman et al. provide a series of behaviors that are spread across this continuum of supervisory approaches. Moving from the nondirective to the directive end of the continuum, these include: listening, clarifying, encouraging, reflecting, presenting,

problem solving (this is where collaborative stance is listed), negotiating, directing, standardizing, and reinforcing (p. 113-114).

These observable or identifiable behaviors provide an appropriate starting place for interrogating the field instruction practice as a form of supervision that is responsive to student learning needs. From a social constructivist approach, it would seem likely that most action would occur at the nondirective/collaborative end of the continuum because a social constructivist stance values the contributions made by the teacher candidate, following their lead for the shared work together. The nondirective end of the continuum provides the most room for the active involvement and voice of the teacher candidate. While these behaviors may align with the learning needs of practicing teachers, the learning needs of novice teacher candidates are such that nondirective (which also might be considered social constructivist) behaviors may not fully meet the learning needs of each and every intern. Because Glickman et al. intended for this to be a developmental continuum, in this study I investigate where my practices with interns fit (or not) on the continuum. While I see this continuum as limited for use with novice teachers in the way that the categories are organized, I chose to use this material as a richer source of supervisory behaviors than many of those written for student teaching supervision. Glickman et al.'s work is better suited to a program that allows for extension and development across time, something we need to support exploration of supervision in our year-long program. I used this framework to analyze the types of activities appropriate for teacher candidates guided by my social constructivist stance throughout each of the three case studies described in chapters four, five, and six. This

frame

study

includ

Cohn

connec

explici

interns

someth

learning

the inter

in the cl

and an i

ext. to b

is happe

beginnin

the novic

strengthe

they have

framework also will be revisited in the third chapter on the analysis of the data in this study.

Feiman-Nemser (2001) describes the process of educative mentoring as one that includes the following actions from mentors:

> They interact with novices in ways that foster an inquiring stance. They cultivate skills and habits that enable novices to learn in and from their practice. They use their knowledge and expertise to assess the direction novices are heading and to create opportunities and conditions that support meaningful teacher learning in the service of student learning. (p. 18)

Cohn and Gellman (1988) described a process called "situational teaching" that connected the context of the field setting to the supportive actions of the supervisor – explicit connections were made between course learning and field experiences to help interns see the relationship between their learning and their practices. This is surely something I strive towards – helping interns see the relationships that exist between their learning and their teaching. Featherstone (1992) suggests that an outsider can challenge the interpretations and propose different ways of looking at situations the novice is facing in the classroom. I think that the university supervisor is in the position to be an outside and an insider. She has some in depth knowledge of the context, the intern as a learner, etc. to be of valuable use in providing those alternate interpretations and visions of what is happening with students. Featherstone further proposes that down the road as beginning teachers without this kind of support, "a problem may become educational if the novice is able to connect it in some useful way to past experience" (p. 14), strengthening the importance of working through these complex issues with interns while they have the support necessary to guide them.

ways t

shifts

would

instruc

for soc

in the

engage

opport

practic

The Inn

literatu

social c

specific

teaching

period (

year-lon

experien

challeng

gradually

and learn

The previous discussion represents my current stance on learning to teach and the ways that I intend to approach this work with interns. Certainly, there are changes and shifts made in this approach as warranted by individual needs of the interns but this would well represent the overall approach I commonly take in engaging in field instruction practices. Either way, this is representative of the strategies I think are needed for social constructivism – supporting interns in making meaning of what they see and do in the classroom while simultaneously learning and making meaning for myself as I engage in these interactions with the interns and their students. This study provides an opportunity me to examine my own conceptions and enactment of field instruction practices more deeply, perhaps leading to revisions of both.

The Internship Structure and Connections to New Teacher Induction

The previous section discussed Michigan State's program in the context of the literature on supervision and my ideas about how to use this information to inform my social constructivist field instruction stance. This section gives additional detail on the specifics of the internship structure and program.

There is quite a bit of literature that refers to the constraints of the student teaching situation and the challenges of helping someone learn to teach in such a short period of time (Richardson-Koehler, 1988; Wideen, Mayer-Smith & Moon, 1998). The year-long internship structure used at Michigan State University to provide the experience necessary to certify teacher candidates offers advantages in supporting the challenging process of learning to teach. The internship is structured in seven phases that gradually increase the involvement of the intern in the classroom activities of teaching and learning. During the fall semester, with the collaborating teacher, the intern designs

and i

corre

enrol

and m

cours

practi

teachi

teachi

instru

observ

with b

support

amoun

helping

the teac

and dev

Elemen

to atten

for each

opportu

challeng

instruct

and implements one unit of instruction in science and one in social studies that correspond to and are supported by the Master's level coursework in which they are enrolled. During the spring semester, the interns take Master's level courses in literacy and mathematics as they increase their involvement in the classroom. These courses and course instructors provide additional support for the development of interns' teaching practices and philosophies. During February and March, they are engaged in lead teaching which is a period of time for which they bear primary responsibility for the teaching and learning in the classroom. Throughout all of this, the role of the field instructor is to support the intern's development of teaching practices through classroom observations and debriefing conferences, weekly seminars, and one-on-one involvement with both the intern and the collaborating teacher.

Two potentially beneficial features of the internship are extended time and the support of additional professional learning in multiple contexts. Interns have a greater amount of time to develop and practice their instructional strategies and beliefs about helping children to learn. Collaborating teachers have a longer period of time to scaffold the teaching process into meaningful segments allowing for greater feelings of success and development of self-confidence in interns' feelings about themselves as teachers. Elementary students benefit because interns are there long enough that they are obligated to attempt to design and implement the most valuable educational learning experiences for each student over a sustained period of time. Field instructors have the time and opportunity to develop trusting relationships that provide a foundation for truly challenging conversations about students, teaching and learning. At Michigan State, field instructors are also typically given a load of only six interns; this is significantly less than

the larg

week t

with a

the yea

provide

work is

theories

enrolled

and exter

interplay

opportuni

interns (a

Th

before ass

who are m

week stud

developme

teacher, an

ternship

student tea

repared fo

the larger supervision loads at other places. Michigan State also supports a ten hour per week time commitment to this practice which is an extensive amount of time to work with a small cohort of six students. Not only are we committed to intensive time across the year, interns are given extensive support on a weekly basis.

Additionally, weekly seminars for all interns in a group led by the field instructor provide further opportunities for professional learning to occur. A common focus of this work is to connect the experiences of the internship classroom to the broader ideas and theories of interns' previous and current university coursework. Since all interns are enrolled in four Master's level courses across the internship year, it is possible to support and extend their field-based learning with current learning in the classroom. This interplay between coursework and seminar experiences can serve to extend the learning opportunities that interns have as well as provide additional support for helping the interns (and the field instructor) to address the challenges that they face.

This additional time spent learning to teach in and of the classroom as interns before assuming a formal teaching position has the potential to create beginning teachers who are more prepared their first year than those candidates that complete shorter 10-15 week student teaching experiences. Berliner (1987) described a progression of teacher development that moved from novice to beginner, to competent teacher, on to proficient teacher, and finally to expert teacher. It is feasible to argue that interns leave the internship experience much closer to well started beginners than their peers in traditional student teaching programs who are more like novices (Hawkey, 1997). In order to be prepared for the rigorous early years of teaching, interns must develop the capacity to

conn

conn

durin

once

classr

studen

made

oppor

the star

things

providi

as the n

both the

inductio

face) pro

Summary

C

and respo

modified

Instructio

Boydell.

Presented

connect classroom experience with formal knowledge and to then learn from these connections.

This is something that Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann (1985) find critical to learn during preservice preparation because it is not a quality typically supported or developed once on the job. Given that the additional time of the internship year is spent in the same classroom, affording interns the opportunity to work in the same context with the same students and collaborating teacher over the course of the year, additional emphasis can be made on the advanced status that interns have as beginning teachers. They have had the opportunity to watch and work with students and collaborating teachers from August at the start of the school year through the end of April. Renard (2003) writes that the "things new teachers find most problematic are the things that come with time," (p. 63) providing further support for the investment in time during the internship program as well as the need for additional study as they struggle with actual educational issues. As such, both the student teacher literature (as a source of information about novices) and the induction literature (as a source of information about early challenges beginning teachers face) provide information necessary to consider in this study.

Summary

Given the description of how interns learn to make decisions that are reflective of and responsive to the students in their classrooms, it seems appropriate to engage in a modified model of this reflective and responsive process when working in field instruction learning opportunities. Teacher education is not ideologically neutral (Boydell, 1986), necessitating a careful look at the messages and perspectives that are presented in the course of working closely with interns. All of the roles described above

for th

ways

work

field

novic

collab

suppo

approa

teachin

the "lig

studen

concep

activiti

so on.

decision

ion of

to explo

During

conclusi

to re

developm

for the supervisor entail learning to work collaboratively with another person in multiple *ways* to support learning. The conception of field instruction in this study is that the *work* of supporting another's learning in a novel context (new to both the intern and the *field* instructor because of the new blend of students each year) is an act of helping *novices* socially construct an understanding of the students, the expectations of the *collabo*rating teacher and the school as well as district, and ultimately, a process of *support*ing the intern through conversation, reflection, and questioning. "A constructivist *approach* requires that teacher candidates build, or restructure, their knowledge about *teaching* so that it makes sense to them. Exposing their attitudes, values, and beliefs to *the light* of critical inquiry builds teachers who have a sense of learning—and how *students* learn" (Pankratius, 1997, p. 76).

Pushing the edge of this more cognitive definition of constructivism, into a *conception* of social constructivism, the intern is simultaneously engaged in similar *activities* with the collaborating teacher, the other interns in the school, the students, and *so on.* Interaction with all of these people informs how the intern makes instructional *decisions* as well as larger professional decisions, such as where to seek a job and what *sort of* relationships to have with colleagues and teaching peers. The goal of this study is *to explore* the role of a social constructivist approach to field instruction practice in *supporting* interns as they learn to teach all students in an intern's classroom. In *conclusion,* "Social constructivism stretches us to think beyond narrow, curricular goals *and to* read toward broad purposes of learning such as students' self-knowledge, *development* of identities, and belief that they can make a different in the world."

(Oldfather & West, 1999). This stance pushes us forward to consider the realm of

possibilities in field instruction practices for teacher education.

with

the le

inten

learn

chose

maint

allow

experi

that all

social

constru

choice

Current

questior

for this

In each

interactic

interactio

foster gr

Chapter 3

STUDYING FIELD INSTRUCTION PRACTICE: RESEARCH METHODS AND DESIGN

This is a qualitative study, designed as case studies of my field instructor work with three interns. Specifically, it followed the growth of three interns over the course of the lead teaching portion of the spring semester of the internship year and documented intensive field instruction practices designed to support interns' learning to meet the learning needs of diverse student populations. A case study approach to the research was chosen because case studies allow for an in-depth look at a phenomenon while maintaining a focus on the characteristics of real-world events (Yin, 1994). Case studies allow us to explore the "how" and "why" of situations with careful attention to experiences in context. Case studies are also used to make analytic generalizations, ones that allow us to use case studies to consider the data as it relates to theory – in this case, social constructivist learning and teaching theory (Yin, 1994). Because social constructivist theory was the framework of this practice, case study research is a logical choice to use as a lens to consider these field instruction/intern interactions (Yin, 1994).

A critical incident (Newman, 1990) is defined as those actions, experiences, or moments in the act of learning to teach diverse students that appear to raise significant questions, challenges or new ideas in the process of the intern's teaching experiences. For this study, critical incidents were identified for each intern's experiences in learning to teach diverse student populations. For David, the critical incident focused on the interactions we had around an English Language Learner in his classroom. For Jane, our interactions focused on the issues of ability in her classroom as a result of the school's cluster grouping policy that put all special education and gifted education students in the

sam

work

back

descr

with

to the

highl

learni

the st

to sup

questi

The su

those

contex

the col

school

larger

practic

same classroom at each grade level. For Elizabeth, the critical incident focused on our work together to help her learn to support Sam, a student from a lower socioeconomic background in a predominantly upper middle class student group. In this chapter, I will describe how these critical incidents served as the center of the analysis of my interaction with these interns. Identifying a critical incident and then focusing on the data pertaining to these experiences provides a focused, careful look at the interactions we had together, highlighting the specific moves that each of us made in supporting the intern's efforts in learning to teach. The following sections detail the specific research questions that frame the study, and data sources and analysis strategies used to develop the cases.

METHODOLOGY

Research Questions

The primary focus of this study is on the use of field instruction practices intended to support interns' learning to teach diverse student populations. The overarching question is:

> During critical incidents where interns are working to address learning needs of diverse students, how does the field instructor support three interns who are learning to teach responsively to meet these needs?

The subsidiary research questions are divided into three areas – those focused on interns, those focused on the field instructor/instruction, and those that provide information on the context in which this research study is taking place. Context is defined as the school site, the collaborating teachers' stances towards diverse learners in the classroom, and the school as well as classroom demographics. These three areas are critical to inform the larger question of the study given the interactions among participants, setting and p.. ·ore specifically, the sub-questions include:

Questions Focused on the Interns

These questions focus on interns' understandings of diversity along several dimensions.

Interns' broad understanding of diversity:

1. How do the interns define diversity (e.g. socioeconomic, ability, linguistic, culture/race) and how does this definition change over time during the spring semester?

Interns' understanding of their students as diverse learners as evidenced through the critical incidents:

2. How do interns discuss the needs of selected individual students in the classroom? How do they interpret these students' needs and to what extent and how are they able to provide evidence of working with these needs in the classroom?

Interns' understanding of their context:

3. How do interns broadly perceive their collaborating teacher's stance towards diversity and the ways in which they enact this in the classroom? How do they compare or contrast this to their own views on diversity in the classroom? How do the interns act on their perceptions of the collaborating teacher's views in these critical incidents?

Questions Focused on the Field Instructor/Instruction

The following questions focus both on the specifics of my field instruction action as well as the theory that underlies these actions.

Instruction:

1. What did I do to support interns in learning to assess their students' learning needs?
2. What did I do that involved supporting interns in developing instruction that is responsive to the diverse characteristics of their learners?
3. How did they respond to me and to these interactions? How did I respond or follow up?

Theory:

4. Why did I choose to do what I did in helping the interns?

Con

6

Teach

Scho

Teach

descri

statem

observa

docume

conduct

5.   How did the theories of social constructivism influence what I did? What other theories or guiding principles influenced my thinking?

Context:

6.   What interaction did I have with interns' ideas that related to new demographic shifts in the school's populations? What interaction did I have around ideas that were related directly to the collaborating teacher's beliefs about responding to diversity in the classroom?

Questions Focused on the Context

The following questions explore the role of the school and the collaborating

teachers on the context.

School:
1.   How did the context of the school – in terms of student diversity – change this year as a result of the redistricting that occurred over the summer? Which aspects of the context do interns pay attention to?
2.   How does this change in the context provide increased opportunities/needs for interns to respond to the nature of diversity in the classroom?

Teachers:
3.   How do the collaborating teachers respond to this change in their context?
4.   How do collaborating teachers' views shape/influence/constrain what interns believe they can and/or should do in teaching responsively to diversity in the classroom?

Study Design

This section considers the responsibilities that I have as a field instructor and then

describes the context and participants in this study. This section also explains the data

sources and provides examples of what was gathered.

Field Instruction Support

As a field instructor at Michigan State, my duties consisted of regular classroom

observations of each intern with post-observation conferences (at least five formally

documented for each intern in my cohort during each semester) and a weekly seminar

conducted with all interns in the school. The seminar is designed to address

prog

scho

desi

supp

colla

throu

to en

activ

proce

infor

that v

expla

requi

of da

varie

instru

oppor

cours

Study

Schoo

Comm

At ea

programmatic issues as well as professional issues of teaching, learning, and working in a school community. I also provided support in lesson and unit development as needed or desired by the intern, support for resume and portfolio development, and one on one support in whatever additional ways were needed. Additionally, I provided support to the collaborating teachers (CTs) in their mentoring practices both informally and formally through monthly collaborating teacher meetings with all CTs in the school. The goal was to embed most aspects of this study into the practices that mirror the regular day to day activities of one field instructor and thus provided data that are situated in the context and process as it naturally occurs. This design was intentional in order to use the outcomes to inform actual future practices of field instructors instead of creating unusual conditions that would be far beyond the scope of regular practices with interns. Nevertheless, I will explain below some data collection activities (interviews, student interviews) that did require spending additional time with the interns. Field instruction provides a wide range of data sources and "the case study's unique strength is its ability to deal with a full variety of evidence" (Yin, 1994, p. 8). Case studies for each intern's work with the field instructor have been created that illustrate how the field instruction practices provided opportunities for the interns to learn to work with diverse student populations over the course of the lead teaching period.

School and District Context

The selected school, Lancaster Elementary (pseudonym),[3] was chosen for this study because of my existing relationship with the interns as their field instructor. The school is located in a middle to upper-middle class neighborhood in a suburban community that serves primarily a middle class professional population. According to

---

[3] All names, including interns, collaborating teachers, elementary students and the school, are pseudonyms.

Stan

enro

educ

200

summ

and s

move

comm

of the

of 355

disadv

compo

African

Evalua

release

student

a numb

zone fro

resulted

Principal

concerne

Standard and Poor's School Evaluation Website, the school district (with total student enrollment of 4,208) has an economically disadvantaged population of 5.6%, a special education population of 9.7%, a MEAP passing rate of 80.1%, and high graduation rates (2002 data).

The demographic make-up of Lancaster Elementary shifted somewhat over the summer preceding the 2003-2004 school year as a result of an elementary school closure and subsequent redistricting of school boundaries within the district. No children were moved out of Lancaster Elementary, but the school received a low income housing community in the redistricting process which introduced greater diversity to the make-up of the student body. During the 2002 school year, Lancaster Elementary's student body of 355 made it the largest elementary school in the district with an economically disadvantaged population of 1.9% (below the district average of 5.6%). The racial/ethnic composition of the school was as follows: Asian/Pacific Islander: 8.2%; Hispanic: 2.8%; African American: 1.7%; and White: 87.3% (2002 data from Standard and Poor's School Evaluation Services). Data for the 2003-2004 school year has not yet been publicly released but informal conversation with the principal informed me that at least 30 new students were picked up directly from the redistricting process. Additionally, there were a number of students in the three focus classes who moved to the school's attendance zone from other locales.

Although some may see the changes in the school's demographic make-up that resulted from this redistricting as relatively minor, informal conversations with the principal and collaborating teachers indicated that teachers in the building were concerned and challenged by this change in their student population. Further, this shift in

population and teacher attitude reinforced the importance of helping the interns to learn to teach in ways that meet all students' learning needs effectively given that they will not necessarily be teaching in a context similar to this for their entire careers.

Participants

The participants for this study included three interns as well as their collaborating teachers at Lancaster Elementary.

The Interns and Collaborating Teachers

Several criteria were used to select interns and collaborating teachers to participate in this study. I sought interns who were (a) placed in a range of grades from primary to upper elementary; (b) at different levels of success in learning to teach at the time of the study but also willing to seek feedback to improve their teaching; (c) placed with collaborating teachers who had worked with me before and were comfortable with my presence in the classroom; and (d) in classrooms that had a range of issues related to diversity in the student population.

Three interns agreed to participate in this study, covering a range of grades (1st, 4th, and 5th) and consisted of two females, Elizabeth (1st grade) and Jane (5th grade), and one male, David (4th grade). They varied in their "success" during initial stages of the internship ranging from one intern who was consistently exceeding program expectations (Elizabeth), to a more 'typical' hard worker who was doing a solid job (Jane), to an intern who struggled to get started but was beginning to show real progress by the end of the first semester (David). This range of ability in learning to teach was an important factor to incorporate into this study to consider how the overall readiness of the intern impacts the nature of the work done in helping interns to learn to teach effectively for a diverse

range of student learning needs. Additionally, all three of these interns consistently sought out feedback and support from me in ways that made it natural to embed this additional aspect into our work together over the course of the study. Although this might indicate a tendency not present to such a degree in all interns, it seemed necessary to select interns possessing this trait in order to explore the full potential of field instruction practices more effectively.

All three interns were placed in classrooms where I had established relationships with their collaborating teachers that preceded this particular internship year. One teacher, Rebecca, was in her third year of working with me and the other two, Amanda and Catherine, were in their second year of working with me. These extended working relationships gave me additional insight into their approaches and attitudes as well as making them more comfortable with my regular presence in their classrooms. All three teacher/intern pairs had strong and supportive working relationships, which means that my role as a field instructor continued with an emphasis on the instructor aspect without requiring a strong mediator role that would redirect the focus of my time with the intern (or with the teacher) from working on practice to dealing with issues such as communication or personality conflicts. At the time of the study, Catherine had taught for 8 years (4th grade), Amanda had taught for 16 years (1st grade) and Rebecca had taught for 18 years (5th grade). Each teacher had a variety of mentoring experiences with both interns and student teachers under more traditional models of teacher education.

The Elementary Students

Informal demographic data about the classroom populations of the three interns indicated that there was a range of issues to address in each classroom in learning to teach

diverse populations effectively. More detailed descriptions of each classroom make-up will be provided within the context of the relevant intern's case study chapter. Documentation of my own perceptions of the students' learning needs took place in my field notes. My perceptions informed how I responded to the perceived learners in each classroom through the observations and conversations with the interns. The interns were each dealing with the range of issues that I've raised as critical to meeting the learning needs of diverse students in a classroom setting. Variances of ability (both special education and gifted education), language, socioeconomic status, and race/culture were present in all three classrooms.

Classroom Context

David

David's classroom of 23 students included seven identified gifted students who received periodic pullout services from the gifted resource teacher. The classroom also included four students identified with special education needs who also received pullout resource services as well as two students who received support from the reading teacher. Two children in the class were identified with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder and one of these children with ADHD also qualified for services relating to his learning disability in writing and his emotional impairment label as well as depression. The classroom also benefited from the presence of students from several cultural backgrounds including one African-American student, one Venezuelan student (an English Language Learner), two Asian students and one student from India.

Jane

This classroom of 24 students included one autistic student, one student with Downs Syndrome who participated in specialties and select classroom experiences, four students

with learning disabilities, one student with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder and one student with Attention Deficit Disorder. Four students received services from the gifted resource teacher. The classroom also benefited from the presence of students from several cultural backgrounds, including one student from the Middle East and one student of Puerto Rican heritage.

Elizabeth

The classroom of 25 students included a wide range of student learning needs including six children reading below grade level who met with the reading specialist and one student involved in the math at-risk program. One child, diagnosed with ADHD, worked with the math resource teacher, the special education resource staff, and the social worker. One child in the classroom exhibiting autistic-like characteristics received additional classroom support from the teachers. One student with mental impairment had a classroom paraprofessional and worked with the special education resource staff, the occupational therapist, the social worker, and the speech therapist. One student with cerebral palsy worked with the occupational and physical therapist. Additionally, three students received differentiated curriculum for their gifted learning needs. The classroom also benefited from the presence of students from several cultural backgrounds including two Asian students and one Indian student.

Below is a table that summarizes the diverse characteristics of each classroom. While it may not seem to be especially diverse, the range of diverse learners in each classroom is extensive and would challenge even an experienced teacher. It should also be noted that a school-based policy put in place the summer before the data collection on this study resulted in the cluster grouping of all gifted and special education students in the same regular

education classroom at each grade level. By chance, all three of the study classrooms were the selected classroom for the cluster group at their grade level.

Intern:	Race/culture	Language	Ability	Socioeconomic Status
David (23 students in 4th grade)	1 African-American student; 1 Venezuelan student; 2 Asian students; 1 Indian student	1 novice ELL student; 3 students who need language support in writing	7 gifted students; 4 students with special education needs & resource support; 2 students who saw reading teacher; 2 children with ADHD (one of whom has a written language disability and emotional impairment)	All students considered middle class by teacher and intern
Jane (24 students in 5th grade)	1 student from Middle East; 1 student of Puerto Rican heritage	Middle Eastern student has language processing disability; Puerto Rican student has autism	1 autistic student; 1 student with Downs Syndrome; 4 students with learning disabilities, 1 student with ADHD; 1 with ADD; 4 gifted students	1 student considered to be of low SES and 2 students considered to be lower middle class SES
Elizabeth (25 students in 1st grade)	2 Asian students; 1 Indian student	1 Asian student in her second year; other students needed writing support	6 students reading below grade level worked with reading teacher; 1 student with math at-risk services; 1 child with ADHD; 1 child with suspected Asperger's Syndrome; 1 student with mental impairment; 1 student with cerebral palsy; 3 gifted students	2 students considered to be of lower SES by teacher and intern

Table 1: Diverse learners in each intern's classroom

Data Sources

The data sources for this study were varied and designed to address the range of questions covered. All data sources provided information that could be used to support

the identification of the critical incident and the larger issues of an intern's attitudes and beliefs around that critical incident. The following is a description of each data source and purpose as well as the frequency and timing of the data collection for each source.

Interviews

Winter interviews. Winter interviews for both interns and collaborating teachers were conducted by another graduate student in order to protect the rights of the interns since I served in a supervisory and evaluative capacity for them during this portion of the data collection. All interview tapes and transcripts were held by my advisor until the end of the semester and the submission of my final reports on each of the interns. (See Appendix A for questions used in winter interviews with interns and collaborating teachers.)

Interns: These interviews inform several of my research questions. The winter interviews determined a baseline for each intern's conception of diversity and could be used as the "starting place" for each intern in looking at changes over the course of the spring semester. Questions were asked that explored how they conceptualized diversity (e.g. When I use the term "diversity" in relation to your classroom, what comes to mind for you? What issues have you faced in your classroom?) Winter interviews also served as a baseline for how they thought about various students in their classrooms and how they were able to describe their learning needs. This also served as a place for interns to begin to conceptualize their understanding of their collaborating teacher's practices and how that influenced what they felt able to do in the classroom to meet their students' learning needs (asking them to think about how their collaborating teacher and field instructor have helped them to learn about these issues). The interns' perceptions of the

changed context as a result of school redistricting could be apparent here and provided another baseline look at their classroom context for teaching and learning to teach.

Collaborating teachers: The winter interviews of collaborating teachers done by another graduate student served as a way to understand the classroom context and determined the collaborating teacher's experiences with a demographically altered student population in comparison to past years of teaching experience (e.g. How does your class this year compare to classes you've had in the past few years? Describe this year's class. Who are your learners? Have there been changes in your typical class make-up as a result of the redistricting from closing another elementary school?). This informed their interactions with their interns and their students and thus, was an important element to include in these interviews. Questions in the winter interviews were also designed to determine the collaborating teacher's conception of diversity in the classroom in order to determine whether a collaborating teacher's stance may have influenced the beliefs and/or practices of an intern (e.g. When I use the term "diversity" in relation to your classroom, what comes to mind for you? What issues have you faced in your classroom?).

Spring interviews. I conducted the spring interviews so that I could probe particular areas of interest and utilize my knowledge of the classroom context and the students each intern worked with over the course of the school year. These interviews were conducted after the submission of all final reports that I prepared for each intern. Therefore, there was no longer a formal supervisory or evaluative relationship at the time of the interview. (See Appendix B for interview questions used in spring interviews with interns and collaborating teachers.)

Interns: Spring interviews served as an opportunity to revisit the interns' conceptions of diversity. This allowed me to make comparisons against what they had discussed in their winter interviews. The spring interviews were also an opportunity to probe ideas that arose out of the data from the focus on critical incidents in each intern's classroom over the course of the semester. These questions focused on the development of interns' ideas about selected students with specific learning needs related to diversity. I also asked questions about the effectiveness of various field instruction practices that may have provided some insight into the role of the field instructor in helping interns to learn to work effectively with a range of diverse students (e.g. What else could a field instructor do in this role that would help interns in learning to teach all children?). Additionally, during the spring interviews a question was asked about the development of each intern's portfolio (see data source below) because this provided an opportunity to ask about their representation of their understanding of student diversity and whether that was a salient feature of their portfolio.

Collaborating teachers: The spring interviews were a place to talk with the collaborating teachers about their perceptions of their intern's growth over the course of the lead teaching period and their responsiveness towards the learning needs of all their students. Additionally, this served as a time to reconsider the diverse learning needs of students in their classroom and how their interns needed to grow to continue to meet a range of needs (e.g. Did you sense a change in your intern's approaches, challenges, etc. over the course of lead teaching? How do you feel that your intern has changed over the course of the semester in their ability to meet the needs of all of your students over time?). Questions here focused on the intern's ability to meet students' learning needs by

the end of their lead teaching period. I also asked questions that worked to try to identify

the chosen critical incident for each intern from the CT's perspective (e.g. From your

perspective, what one moment, experience, etc. in the semester was the biggest "aha"

moment for your intern this year? What stood out to you about the intern's learning to

work on teaching practices this year? Particular issues, students, etc.). I also asked

questions about their perceptions of the role and the approach of the field instructor to

determine how well they felt that my practices worked for their interns' learning (e.g.

What else could a field instructor do in this role that would help interns in learning to

teach all students?).

Student interviews. At the end of the year, I interviewed each of the three interns

with a focus specifically on their students as learners. I asked the interns to talk with me

about each of their students and describe them along a range of dimensions (academic,

social, any specific learning needs, etc). Interns were prompted to:

> Talk me through your class list and tell me a little bit about each student. Start
> with some descriptive words about each child as a learner as well as anything else
> you think I should know. Pretend that we haven't been talking about these
> children on and off all year – some we've discussed a lot and some I don't know
> very much about. (student interview protocol)

These interviews served as a place to confirm or disconfirm my perceptions about how

each intern viewed the specific students in their class. It also served as a final

conversation to discuss each student's specific learning needs from the intern's

perspective. In this instance, I asked several questions that also tied together some loose

threads about interns' perceptions of how to best use assessment and accommodation for

supporting students' learning needs.

Classroom Observations and Debriefing Conferences

Classroom observations and the debriefing conferences held after each observation were a significant source of data in this study. Observations and debriefing conferences provided a place to discuss and document an intern's experiences in learning to meet the learning needs of specific children in the classroom. This provided access to the specific practices that each intern used in teaching to meet these needs.

Classroom observations. Videotaped classroom observations took place over the second half of the lead teaching period, beginning at the end of February and continuing through the end of March. This is the time period of interns taking primary responsibility for the students and for all activities in the classroom ranging from instruction to management to parent communication. Classroom observations were scheduled in collaboration with the intern in order to see a range of content areas and activities. Observations lasted anywhere from 25 minutes to an hour. There is data on five observations each of David and Jane and nine observations of Elizabeth (who invited me in for additional observations beyond the normal requirement of five). Elizabeth's observations were shorter because her students were in first grade. The classroom observations provided the data on whether and to what extent interns were actively engaging in complex visions of diversity (focusing on more than one aspect of diversity when engaging in instruction with the students) in the classroom and how they go about working to meet their students' learning needs. This was usually noted in reference to attempts during lessons to meet needs as they focused on particular children in the context of the activity in class. Additionally, this informed my understanding of how interns saw their students and what they did to respond to this vision (the evidence of

their attempts to meet their needs). These observations took place across a range of subject areas and topics to ensure that the relevance of different student characteristics came into play (e.g. a student may need special assistance in math due to a learning disability but do very well in language arts). Classroom observations were videotaped to serve as a record of what occurred during the lesson and field notes were taken during the observation and served as a point of conversation during the subsequent debriefing conversation. Classroom observations also served as a place where data was collected on students who appeared to have a significant impact on the intern's learning to teach (those students who repeatedly appeared in conversations with the interns and collaborating teachers). This student focus helped to center attention on the specific students who ultimately were featured in critical incidents in the learning and teaching process of each intern.

Debriefing conferences. Debriefing conferences were audiotaped and provided the opportunity to connect interns' teaching to their talk about their teaching. This served as the place to probe their ideas and actions and look for connections between what they thought they did during a lesson and why they believed that they did so. Additionally, this served as a place to help them reflect on how a certain strategy or approach worked and to push their thinking on different ways to develop their instruction to be reflective of the learning needs of all their students. I anticipated that debriefing conferences would also be a place where context would reappear – how the students or the collaborating teacher supported or constrained interns' efforts to learn to teach in this responsive way and how the interns responded to those supports or constraints.

The video and audio tapes of classroom observations and debriefing conferences, in addition to the artifacts collected through observations in fall semester documented normal parts of my field instruction practice. They served as sources of data that allowed me to revisit my own practices with the interns and discern patterns in my responses, approaches, etc. to develop some ideas about effective or ineffective use of field instruction practices.

Intern Lesson Plans from Classroom Observations

Lesson plans served as artifacts of the intended and attempted practices of interns as they planned, taught, and assessed through their instructional cycle, documenting the types of adaptations they were making for the various learners in their classrooms. Interns were expected to plan for adaptations and accommodations along a range of areas (social, academic, linguistic). Lesson plans were collected from each intern at least one day before the observed lesson so that I could have time to read through it and generate any questions I may have had for the intern before or after they taught the lesson (a normal field instruction practice they expected from me). Lesson plans served as documentation of the intern's intentions for the activity as the lesson and acted as a source of data for questions and ideas discussed during the debriefing conference as well as a source of confirmation or disconfirmation during the data analysis process.

Portfolios

Portfolios created both throughout and at the end of the year serve as a source of evidence of the intern's ability as a teacher to impact student learning. Our teacher preparation team has defined this approach to the portfolio as a programmatic expectation of the internship experience while recognizing that interns may also have additional uses

ior

dem

dev

natu

prac

hat

hro

resp

port

TF

resp

their

conv

care

ccu

sen

adju

mog

dien

clas

sen

adju

for the portfolio. It is not a scrapbook of the year but rather a document that demonstrates professional approaches to teaching and learning. Because the portfolio development process is supported through the work of the field instructor, this served as a natural place to ascertain the intern's ability to develop, document and explain teaching practices that are responsive to diverse students' learning needs. Field notes were kept that documented the work done together to support interns' portfolio development throughout the spring semester. Ideally, if the interns developed practices that were responsive to student diversity and began to take these commitments seriously, the portfolio would provide evidence of these commitments.

TE 502 Seminar

Weekly seminars, facilitated by me as a regular practice of my field instructor responsibilities, were held with all seven interns in the building as a means of supporting their learning experiences in the school context where they were learning to teach. Our conversations in seminar reflected issues in this study as interns were engaged in close, careful work with students during the lead teaching period. Access to conversations that occur as a part of seminar supported an understanding of happenings in the school context as seen by the three focus interns. Comments made in seminars provided additional insight that reflected an intern's understanding of their students and issues around meeting the diverse needs of an individual student. For example, Jane would often share stories of her experiences working with the gifted cluster of students in her classroom. Field notes were written about relevant conversations that occurred at seminars after the meetings concluded. Conversations were considered relevant if they addressed aspects of diversity or mention of students in the three focus interns'

classroom

seminars.

lear so th

since my

aterns. E

conversa

Field inv

F

dengages

from the

convers

informa

ad. For

with El

context

impress

interns

place g

Soudi

Schod

Proje

Field p

classrooms. For example, Elizabeth spoke regularly about her work with Sam during our seminars. I would document these comments when they arose. Field notes were taken later so that it did not become a distraction to the larger group or the flow of the meeting since my obligations in this context were to work with and across a larger population of interns. Because not all interns in the school were participants in the study, seminar conversations were not audiotaped.

Field Instruction Field Notes

Field notes were collected throughout the semester to document the practices that I engaged in as the field instructor in working with the interns. These notes were distinct from the notes taken during classroom observations. These included notes on seminar conversations that related to the study, conversations around portfolio development, informal conversations with collaborating teachers and interns on study-related issues, etc. For example, in my field notes from January 14, I documented a conversation I had with Elizabeth about some of her goals to meet her students' varied learning needs in the context of writer's workshop. These notes served as an important place to document impressions of the collaborating teacher's influence on the practices and beliefs of the interns that were expressed in informal conversations. Additionally, the notes served as a place to document ongoing initial ideas and thoughts about the direction of the study.

Student-specific Field Notes

In addition to broader issues of field instruction practice and the happenings at school documented in the field instruction field notes, student-specific field notes provided a more focused look at the specific interactions with and about children in the field placement classrooms for each intern. These field notes ultimately served as a

significant source of evidence about the critical incidents in each intern's classroom as documented through specific students. However, during data collection, critical incidents were not identified so as to not limit the possibilities that may surface during the semester. Regardless of the data source, every time a student was mentioned, I documented the conversation and context of this material. Field notes were kept that detailed specific events with children in the classroom documenting the student's involvement, the intern's activity and response and any thoughts that I had upon reflection on the intern's teaching and interaction with the child. I documented ideas that I needed to follow up on as well as questions I had about specific students and the interns' interactions with these students. For example, on March 2, I noted in my field notes on Elizabeth's students:

> I'm wondering what sense Elizabeth is making of the Sam's behavioral issues in the classroom in ways that challenge or confirm her understanding of kids of lower socioeconomic backgrounds as well as what it questions it asks of her understanding for how children benefit from grade repetition. I'll continue to monitor this situation and think about how the situation might continue to influence her when it comes to Sam. (March 2, student specific field notes)

These notes included observations of the student and intern interaction during an observation (formal or informal visit to the classroom), any conversation that I had with an intern focused on a specific child, as well as occasional conversations I had with collaborating teachers about specific children in the classroom. These field notes served as data about how an intern worked with and talked about specific children in the classroom and how they talked about issues related to diversity.

Data Analysis

Initially, each case was analyzed independently. Data analysis began by reading through field instruction field notes and student-specific field notes with a focus on the

overarching research question while attending to each individual intern. Using the sub-questions as a guide, broad categories were identified in the data focusing on intern conceptions of diversity, contextual influences/elements, perceptions of field instruction practice, student-specific interactions, and the intern as a learner. These categories were revised and adapted by working with interview transcripts to seek confirming and disconfirming evidence from the participants in the study about their perceptions of these issues. As I moved through the cases, these categories were refined and the features of each were more specific. I revisited the first case as new ideas were presented in the second or third case to ensure that the categories encompassed relevant data from all cases. Ultimately, the categories were refined to consider certain elements described in the following statements.

Intern conceptions of diversity included comments they made about their understandings of diversity from places such as their coursework experiences. For example, Jane told me several times about what she had learned about cultural diversity through her TE 250 course as well as her senior-year field placement at a highly diverse local elementary school. Contextual influences/elements included comments that made reference to the recent redistricting, the population of students at the school, and interns' perceptions of the parents and school community. David asked me repeatedly to talk with him about the situation of the redistricting and to hypothesize with him about the influence this was having on the teachers. As well, all three interns commented on the significant presence of the parents in the day to day lives of the classrooms in this school. Comments related to field instruction practice were either of two possibilities. The first included comments made in reference to what I did to help interns in some way. For

example, Jane commented on the value of the debriefing conferences after the observations I did of her teaching. The second aspect included any references to our activity together or specific moves that I noted I made in response to my perceptions of their needs. Here this included things like finding resources to share to support Jane in her efforts to differentiate her math instruction or noting that I needed to check in with Elizabeth about her stress levels after a difficult week in her classroom with Sam. Student-specific interactions focused on any mention in the field notes of comments or interactions around specific students in each field placement classroom. The final category included any references made by the intern or others to the intern as a learner. This included comments related to how an intern perceived his/her own learning needs or any reflection on their experiences as one who is learning to teach. For example, David commented that he was a learner who needed to see things modeled before he could try them for himself.

The same broad categories were used with the data focusing on collaborating teachers as well and as categories were refined, the data was reread to ensure that all aspects were considered. The only significant change focused on the fact that the collaborating teacher was talking more about the intern than about herself in relation to some categories (so in the case of the interns' learning needs, they were speaking on their perceptions of the intern as a learner as opposed to talking about themselves). For each case, I engaged in a cyclical process of analyzing and writing about the data. This included writing analytic memos about each of the findings under the coding categories for each intern and each collaborating teacher. Memos on each category were compared and refined by looking carefully at the overlap between the ideas reflected in each. For

example, after writing a memo on David's understandings of diversity, this information

was compared with the memo on Catherine's (his collaborating teacher) perception of

diversity looking for signs of influence and/or overlap between the two. Memos were

revised to document the new understandings I had as a result of the comparison with the

additional data source.

A second layer of analysis was then done that allowed me to document more

carefully the data related to each intern's critical incident in learning to teach diverse

student populations. Critical incidents were identified by looking carefully across all

pieces of data to determine prevailing ideas and areas of intense focus in our work. By

looking at the data, it was possible to identify those topics on which we spent the

majority of our time working together. Memos were written about each of these critical

incidents for each of the interns in a case by case approach. This included information

from a variety of the categories of the data about a particular student. The critical

incidents became an analysis tool. This process allowed me to use the broader

understanding of the data developed above to explore more carefully the specific critical

incident that influenced the intern's experiences in learning to teach diverse student

populations. Analysis was done of classroom observation field notes and debriefing

conferences transcripts to trace the specific elements of work focused on the critical

incident described in each case study (in this instance, a focus on the data pertaining to

interactions around a specific student in each intern's classroom). For example, David's

critical incident memos included references to Lucia, the English Language Learner who

had a critical influence on his learning to teach, as well as data on our interactions around

her, contextual elements that influence his experiences (such as his collaborating

teacher's approach to helping him with this challenge), and so on. These memos documented relevant data, possible theories about my findings and implications across cases that might be pursued as well as questions I had about my findings. In David's case, I questioned my interpretation of his actions with and towards Lucia in relationship to other diverse students in the classroom (e.g. Did David do anything to support Mary or Ashok's more advanced English language learning needs?) To write these memos, data was culled from each of the memos from the earlier stage of the data analysis and resorted and reorganized to focus on the work and experiences of both the field instructor and the intern as related to the critical incident identified in each case.

In order to seek confirming or disconfirming evidence, portfolios and lesson plans for the classroom observations served as data that could confirm or challenge the findings related to interns' claims about their performances and teaching beliefs. For example, Jane's portfolio was full of references to her beliefs about and approaches to differentiated instruction, a significant element of her challenge in meeting the learning needs in her classroom. David's inquiry project also served as a source of data that could serve this purpose because his project was focused on teaching ESL students (which was also the focus of the critical incident in his case). Jane and Elizabeth's inquiry projects are not included as sources of data because they did not relate directly to the critical incidents identified in their classrooms.

This set of final memos on the critical incidents ultimately led to the outline of the chapter for each intern's case study. To consider carefully the field instruction practices that were evident in each case, attention was also paid to Glickman et al.'s (1995) supervisory behavior continuum to question and challenge my perceptions of my social

constructivist practices during the analysis phase. Glickman et al.'s continuum provides a comparative point to interrogate the social constructivist nature of my practices as well as to serve as one way to identify the specific behaviors I engaged in with each intern. For example, I was able to use these ideas to name the practices I was engaging in with David (such as *suggesting* options for action) and identify when I moved from my social constructivist stance as a result of what was going on during our interactions around his work with Lucia, his English Language Learner. Schon's (1987) work on naming and framing problems as well as reflection in and on action were used to guide the analysis from a theoretical perspective. Schon's work highlights how practitioners learn their practice and looked at the interactions between mentor (field instructor) and novice (intern). For example, I was able to use this framework to identify areas when David and I were succeeding at or failing to name and agree on the problem that he was attempting to address in the classroom with Lucia. For both Schon and Glickman et al.'s frameworks, analysis was done that compared my perspectives of the data with their theories to determine places of overlap and places where my data seemed to move away from their descriptions. This analysis served to connect my work to the research of the field and helped to identify broader themes in the study.

After working on each step of the data analysis process on a case by case basis, cross-case analysis was done to identify broader themes and issues of field instruction practice that existed across the experiences of the three interns (such as how to provide support from a social constructivist perspective that also met intern learning needs). For example, I strived to look across all three cases to identify patterns and activities in my

own practice that served to be effective without limitations to the context of a specific classroom.

Study Limitations

There are several potential limitations in this study that could influence the findings. Some might argue that case study research provides a limited look into a small set of cases about a phenomenon. Yin (1994) argues that a small number of cases is not particularly a drawback to the research method of case studies because the purpose of the method is served by a careful look at the setting in context-rich ways. In this case, I feel that the trade off is worth it in order to take a deeper look at the specific situations of the interaction between interns and field instructor. This study provides a more comprehensive look at the specific activities and interactions between field instructor and intern (particularly around issues of student diversity) than is currently available in the research literature of the field.

Additionally, the research setting influences the outcome of the study. In this case, I chose interns who I felt would be supportive of the research effort in their classrooms and who would benefit from the additional time and energy spent working with them. I also chose classrooms where I had positive, standing relationships with the collaborating teachers who would tolerate the additional presence in their classroom and could appreciate the dual role I would play as field instructor and researcher. What I did not anticipate was the influence of the school's new cluster grouping policy for gifted and special education students[4] on the experiences in each of the three study classrooms. All three of the study classrooms were the site of the cluster, meaning that both special education and gifted students were placed in the same classroom. It is possible that this

---

[4] This policy will be explained in more detail in Jane's case study.

new policy influenced the emphasis on certain aspects of diversity as it was represented in their classroom. I will explore this issue and potential study limitations more carefully in Jane's case study on issues of students' academic learning needs in the classroom.

In this study, one potential limitation is that I was both an insider to the experience, acting as the field instructor, as well as the researcher of this study. As a teacher researcher, I feel a commitment to my students as well as to my research goals. There were times in this study where the research took a back seat to the field instruction (teaching) practice. For instance, there were several times in each case when my research interest in how interns were learning to work with and make sense of diversity took a back seat to more immediate concerns in the classroom context. In Elizabeth's classroom, an emergency arose with a student requiring Elizabeth to interrupt a debriefing conference until later in the day so that she could support her collaborating teacher in managing the classroom and the student's situation. Also in Elizabeth's classroom, a video taped observation was cancelled and rescheduled in order to support the parent's need to video tape a student who was being tested for seizure-type activities. In this case, I did a regular field instruction observation of the lesson without using my video camera. Although tangentially all issues are related to meeting students' learning needs in classroom situations, moments did arise when I felt a need to worry less about my personal questions of interest to focus on the needs of the intern and to place my role as a typical field instructor above my situation as a researching field instructor.

While this inside role might seem a limitation to some in terms of the conflict between researcher and teacher, I also feel strongly that I could not have completed the quality of study from a more removed position. Field instruction is a complex task

focused on the needs of those who are learning to teach. Because the relationships are key to understanding the ebb and flow of the practice, I would not have been able to gain access to the degree of knowledge and experience by studying another's field instruction practice. Studying my own practice also supported the interns by not intruding on the relationships of another field instructor and her interns. I would not have had the degree of access in another field instructor's experiences and the day to day nuances of the job and relationships with interns. Given this, I feel that the benefits of studying my own practice outweighed the costs of trying to be both researcher and teacher at the same time.

To that end, I attempted to make strides to improve the rigor of the study in order to avoid bias about my own feelings and perceptions of what was going on. During data collection, I had another graduate student conduct the fall interviews with both interns and collaborating teachers to bring another perspective into the mix and to protect the interns' rights as research subjects. I also conducted interviews about the students in each intern's classroom to make sure that my perspectives were or were not accurate about the sense I was making of what each intern thought about various students. I took a variety of measures during the analysis process to ensure that the data was reflecting what I was seeing, limiting my own biases from taking center stage. During analysis, I sought to corroborate my perspective by comparing intern and collaborating teacher perspectives of what was going on in the classroom. I also sought outside perspectives in the reading of various memos and data sets by colleagues (both those with a great deal of experience with field instruction and those with relatively little knowledge of the practice) to ensure that my personal experiences and relationships with each intern were not clouding my judgment about their critical incidents or about the process of learning to teach.

Chapter four presents the first case study of an intern and his critical incident of working with Lucia, an English Language Learner. David's experiences in learning teach are described as we work together to support his efforts to meet the needs of a newly arrived English Language Learner during his spring lead teaching period.

Chapter 4

FIELD INSTRUCTION SUPOPRT FOR DAVID: NAMING AND FRAMING THE CHALLENGES OF TEACHING AN ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNER

David's collaborating teacher, Catherine, and I considered him to be an intern who competently completed the internship experience. He learned a great deal about teaching, effectively utilized quality instructional practices and exhibited the ability to deal with many of the challenges of teaching. During the fall semester of the internship, David struggled to step into the teacher role, feeling more comfortable as a friend to his students. As the semester progressed, David developed appropriate relationships with his students and placed himself in the teacher's role, learning to effectively manage the classroom. It took David longer than the other interns in this study to make the switch from focusing on himself as he learned to assume the teacher's role to an emphasis on the students and their place in the classroom. In the spring, Catherine offered a great deal of praise for the growth David demonstrated across the year and was quite proud of the teacher he was by the end of the internship:

> I think one word is growth. I mean you know I was a little shaky at the beginning of the year, thinking 'ahh!' And I'm so, so pleased to see how far he's come. So that's it in a nutshell. I'm really happy with where he's at now (spring, p. 1).

David took a position teaching third grade in a community an hour from Lancaster Elementary for the year after the internship.

However, this story highlights a different aspect of his learning process and is an example of how he struggled to bridge the gap between the cultural/language needs of his students when those aspects directly influenced or impacted his instruction. Lucia's arrival in January was an event that fundamentally altered David's experiences in

learning to teach, challenging him in multiple ways. David's work with Lucia, his new

English Language Learner, serves as an example of a critical incident in learning to teach

that took place during his internship experience. Newman defines a critical incident as

"those occurrences that let us see with new eyes some aspect of what we do" (Newman,

1990, p. 17). For David, working with Lucia complicated his understandings about

teaching *all* students and my notions of field instruction practice. Her arrival set up a

series of interactions between David and myself about Lucia's learning needs, serving as

a focus for my work as David's field instructor. In this chapter, I focus on how he

reflected on her as a student and a member of the classroom as well as my field instructor

responses during our experience together.

Lucia's arrival was an incident that I consider "critical" because it affected the

remainder of David's internship and serves as the foundation for this semester-long story.

The chapter is structured around a key theme that emerged from my analysis of David's

experiences with Lucia and my attempts to support his learning. Naming and framing a

problem (Schon, 1987) is a key skill that teacher candidates must develop. Schon argues

that the problems practitioners face are not "well-formed structures" but rather issues that

require one to "choose and name the things he will notice" (p. 4). In order to work on the

challenging aspects of teaching practice, novice teachers must learn to name and frame

any particular problem that needs addressing in order to propose action to manage the

problem. David's experiences and approaches with Lucia, as well as my responses and

approaches to working with David, reveal the challenges that we faced as field instructor

and intern that occurred across three phases of the internship: (1) communicating about

and naming the problem that we were addressing, (2) developing and implementing

curricular and instructional actions to manage the problem, and (3) maintaining a common focus across the semester on the goals and identity of the problem. I divide the story into three phases because my analysis showed that there were three critical shifts in mentoring moves that I took as a field instructor in my work with David. As his field instructor, I'm a central part of the story of naming and framing David's work with Lucia. Examining my moves helps us see how our interaction did or did not move his teaching and learning forward.

The Story of Our Interactions

Phase One: Negotiating the Naming of the Problem

The first phase of the interaction focuses on our negotiation about the naming of the problem. How were we identifying and defining David's goals in working with Lucia? Schon (1987) suggests, "Through complementary acts of naming and framing, the practitioner selects things for attention and organizes them, guided by an appreciation of the situation that gives it coherence and sets a direction for action" (p. 4). Exploring our work together to achieve this goal is the primary focus of this section.

The secondary storyline addresses how I approached my mentoring practices to support David's attempts to understand and name the problem. I explore my practice of nondirective (Glickman et al., 1995) actions as a field instruction practice that respected and responded to David's learning needs and attempts at learning to teach. This was done while also recognizing my own instructional goal that I wanted David to figure out how to support Lucia as an English Language Learner and to make a plan to address her learning needs. I will argue that from my perspective, David and I ultimately appeared to agree on learning approaches for Lucia that included a focus on both Spanish and English

Language Learning during Book Club instruction. I will show that this process of naming and framing took time and involved a range of conversations focused on David's learning needs as well as Lucia's.

Phase one covers January and early February, a period of the internship program when interns are heavily involved in university coursework (two days a week in January) and focused primarily on preparing materials for their eight week lead teaching period in February and March. During this time, interns typically have less responsibility for teaching in the internship classroom because of their erratic schedules and tight university coursework deadlines.

Lucia's arrival. On my second day back as a field instructor at Lancaster Elementary after the winter holidays, David informed me that he had a new student in his classroom who had arrived the week before. Her name was Lucia and she had come to the United States from Venezuela after spending a year in Spain. Lucia spoke only Spanish and David was working hard to make sure he sat with her and utilized his three years of high school Spanish instruction to translate the activities of the classroom. Of central focus on this day in mid-January were his attempts to translate what the Junior Achievement guest instructor was doing with the fourth grade children on the economics of various types of resources.[5] Translating all of this into Spanish was a challenge for David but he was commenting that she was "quite bright" and was "raising interesting distinctions" with him as they discussed the material. He then proceeded to show me several examples of what he was doing to help her with the workbook that went with the Junior Achievement lessons.

---

[5] Junior Achievement is a program provided by parents or members of the school area community who come to public school classrooms and engage children in a series of 4-6 lessons about business and economics.

David commented that he and his CT, Catherine, did not just want her to be sitting there all the time but were not sure what to do with her when she spoke little to no English and only received English as a Second Language (ESL) services once a week from a teacher whose primary language knowledge was in Korean (FI field notes, p. 17). This early comment from David sparked my hope that aggressive efforts would be made to adapt instruction to meet Lucia's language learning needs as well as capitalize on David's interest in her presence in the classroom.

David acknowledged that it would be a challenge for him to figure out how to instruct Lucia in meaningful ways. Lucia's arrival was the critical incident that introduced our joint process of naming and framing ways that he might support her learning. This first step at acknowledging the challenge seemed like evidence that David was starting to explore how to name the problem. As the semester progressed and our conversations continued, David's attitudes towards and thoughts about Lucia as a student became more evident. Three main contexts served to center and focus the majority of our conversations about Lucia and David's attempts to learn to work with an English language learner in the fourth grade. The first two included aspects of the curriculum related to literacy instruction and science instruction. The third was David's university coursework requirement to complete an inquiry project. The first portion of phase one provided evidence that David was intrigued by Lucia's needs and showed an interest in supporting her as a learner while expressing some uncertainty about what approaches might work best. As a field instructor, this led me to take the nondirective stance of exploring together his options for Lucia and her English learning needs. While Glickman et al. (1995) might consider this to be more of a collaborative stance, because I asserted

no control, power or limitations over his decisions for Lucia at this time I believe this to be a nondirective approach when used with a novice teacher (who still may need some ideas about the possibilities available for instruction). At this point, we were both continuing to try and figure out what the problem was and how we could best name and frame the problem.

Making choices for a focus. Schon (1987) writes that one must "choose and name the things he will notice" (p. 4). This section explores how David went through this process of choosing and naming with my support. One of the early areas where David's concern about Lucia as an English Language Learner started to manifest itself connected to the inquiry project he was required to complete for his graduate level course on reflection and inquiry (a course that also maintained an emphasis on advanced literacy methods). His struggle with making choices about what to notice influenced the focus of his inquiry project. It also highlights how much confusion he ultimately held over how best to work with Lucia in the classroom, especially during January and the earliest portion of this phase. However, it also reflects my early sense that there was something going on here that would ultimately support his attempts to work with Lucia. I was choosing to focus on Lucia's needs and his sense of curiosity and range of ideas that he had for ways he could support her learning during his science unit (focusing on this as his inquiry project). David was choosing to focus on his coursework assignment with Lucia as a means to an end in completing that goal. This reflects the power of the period of the internship in that his primary focus was to consider his own needs as a student.

David emailed me at the beginning of February to ask me to meet with him and discuss his options for topics for his inquiry project, knowing that a proposal for his

project was soon due to his instructor. He was frustrated that he did not really know what he was trying to do and wanted to talk through his ideas. Initially, David had chosen to focus on the notion of conceptual change during science instruction and how this is expressed through illustrations; but it quickly became clear to him that his greater need in terms of his own learning was to focus on ways to support his English language learner. I encouraged him to make the switch in topic because I was not convinced he had any ideas for how to follow through on his science idea. It also seemed clear that this might encourage a regular focus on and attention to Lucia's learning needs. He was interested in this idea and it was easy to make suggestions for him in terms of what he was doing to initially support her and how he might further this in terms of a project (such as specific attention to how to support an ELL in a fourth grade classroom, how to develop literacy activities for a single student in the context of 4th grade literacy instruction, etc.).

I was able to use my role as a field instructor in this instance to encourage him to use an existing course activity as one means of achieving my instructional goal for him that he learn to teach Lucia English. Although the general flow of my practice in this phase was to suggest options and support his ideas and choices (a nondirective stance), here I did choose to exert some power as the field instructor. I opted to more overtly encourage a particular choice for his inquiry project so as to support Lucia's learning needs, feeling a conscious responsibility for her learning as well. This appeared to me to be a solid first step in Schon's (1987) process of helping David to select a focus and through that focus, name the problem as needing to meet Lucia's learning needs.

When David told me he could not think of a narrow question about Lucia and English language learning, I recommended he focus on specific strategies that he could

use to help her in a specific content area. Over the course of our conversation, we narrowed the focus to science because of his initial interest in this topic as a part of his inquiry project. He thought this would also give him some time to think through how this might work because it would allow him to delay starting his inquiry until he taught the unit at the end of February or beginning of March. This would give him more time to consider his approaches before beginning to collect data. I suggested he find some readings as soon as possible that would support him in considering these ideas and help him think through what he wanted to plan to incorporate in his lessons (this search for and use of relevant literature is a required component of the inquiry project). Specifically, I suggested to him that he think about different ways that he could support Lucia's science learning as well as her language learning.

I suggested that the first step in doing so would be to find out her knowledge of the science content he planned to cover (both in English and in Spanish because of his reasonable fluency in Spanish). At this stage, I was the one who suggested all aspects of the English language learning component of the inquiry project. David took a back seat on this aspect and focused more on the science component. We discussed how this pre-assessment would allow him to design activities that would support his efforts to help her. He suggested that activities like drawing pictures, having conversations on tape, listening to tapes, using a website he found that translates, etc. would all be helpful for the learning process. I was pleased to see that he had a range of learning strategies in mind and was heartened to believe that he could come up with a variety of approaches that would be responsive to her English language learning needs. At this point, David

stepped up and began to form a direction for action in order to manage the problem of how best to meet Lucia's ELL needs.

By the end of this conversation, I thought we had really centered on a focus for how he might handle this inquiry project. I felt that I had helped him to see the importance of considering Lucia's English Language Learning needs as a part of this project and that this focus on science instruction would carry over to the larger problem we had identified in helping Lucia learn English. My way of helping him address the ELL issues was to provide support through our conversation and affirmation for his ideas about how to incorporate her needs into his instruction. This was a nondirective approach to supporting a novice teacher. But, he described himself as a "monkey-see, monkey-do" learner and stated that he really needed some guidance in doing this type of work (student-specific field notes, Feb 3). Reflecting back on this, I recognize that the type of help given likely did not achieve his more concrete desire to have something modeled for him before he tried it himself. It seems as though David might have preferred a directive approach to this process (which I find to be problematic given that this was *his* course assignment to develop and engage in classroom inquiry). However, we had made progress in deciding how to name the problem as needing to support Lucia in learning English in the context of science instruction.

Yet, after this extended conversation about ways to incorporate his interests in the science aspect of the inquiry project with the need he felt to focus on Lucia's English language learning needs, he came back to school the next day having shifted his likely focus. David mentioned that he might narrow his inquiry project focus to how he was supporting Lucia during literacy instruction in his classroom which would be utilizing the

99

Book Club instructional model during his lead teaching period. David initiated this second conversation about his inquiry project with me when I came across him in the teacher's lounge during lunch. He wanted to know what sorts of ideas I could give him on what he should do with Lucia during Book Club. He thought maybe he should include this in his inquiry project but he seemed really confused and acknowledged that for the purposes of the course, it was becoming an unnecessarily large project. I suggested that he focus on Lucia's work in science to follow his interest and not complicate this by also including Book Club for the inquiry project.

At this time I thought we were sticking with the original plan to focus on Lucia's ELL needs during science instruction. This conversation introduced a period of waffling back and forth between the two curricular contexts (science and literacy) that highlighted his semester-long uncertainty with how to develop and scaffold Lucia's English language skills – particularly in literacy instruction (FI field notes, p. 20 and p. 22). By introducing Book Club to the conversation, David was beginning to recognize that this focus on Lucia's English language learning was the problem he needed to choose and frame in ways that helped him to meet her needs. The following section highlights evidence that we were struggling to negotiate and name the problem of Lucia's English Language Learning needs (and ultimately, to maintain a focus on one identified problem across the semester) when the attention shifted to the challenge of including Lucia in Book Club instruction.

Becoming more focused on literacy instruction. The following description focuses more closely on the specifics of our joint exploration about how David thought he might be able to structure or adapt Book Club literacy instruction to incorporate

Lucia's needs into the model. Book Club is an instructional model that has students reading authentic literature, engaging in whole class conversation and analysis of the book while also fostering student-led group discussion and personal response (Pardo, 2002). David and I were still struggling to come to some sort of agreement about his goals and purposes for Lucia during instructional times and we began to focus specifically on literacy instruction as the central piece of the problem.

Apparently, he had spoken to [the school's reading specialist] about whether she had access to any Spanish versions of the Mildred Taylor books that he planned to use with the rest of the class during Book Club. While she did not have those, she gave David several other translated sets of books (one English and one Spanish of each of two different titles – *The Mouse and the Motorcycle* [Cleary, 1990] and *The Ghost in the Attic*). David later claimed during his inquiry project presentation that he "collaborated with the reading specialist. She was really helpful" (inquiry project presentation notes, p.1). However, he was not sure how to use these texts in his instruction because he recognized that these were not at all similar to the texts read by the other students.

David wanted Lucia to have opportunities to read in Spanish because he realized that she was a capable student from his Spanish conversations with her. David's initial idea was that she read the Spanish chapter first and then read the English so that he could provide opportunities to both languages. However, the book he chose for her was one far beyond where she was as a reader for the English component of the structure. He thought he might also be able to adapt some of the Book Club written activities for her to do in the support of reading these other texts. I expressed my concern that Lucia would miss out on some of the social support that she might need (e.g. assistance making sense of

some aspect of the reading or the written activity she was to complete) because no one else would be reading that book at the same time. He did find a Spanish translation of *Roll of Thunder, Hear My Cry* (one of the books in the Mildred Taylor series that he had not planned on having the class read; Taylor, 1991) on the web and wondered whether that would be enough to support her in a Book Club group if he had other children read this text. We tossed this idea around but since he had not originally planned that any of the other students would be reading this book it became clear that maybe this was not really a solution for how to include Lucia.

My attempts as a field instructor up to this point were to support his developing independence as a teacher and to explore the ideas with him that he generated about how he might meet Lucia's learning needs. He would describe an idea and I would play through the choices, issues and consequences of that idea. For example, when deciding whether or not to use *Roll of Thunder, Hear My Cry* as a book club text, I helped him to consider whether this fit with his original goals for the rest of the class by asking questions about his approach to Book Club, his instructional ideas, and the needs of other students in the classroom (student-specific field notes, Feb 4). My attempts to support his novice efforts at planning and adapting instruction for her needs met my own instructional goal of helping him pursue a plan to meet Lucia's English Language Learning needs but also validated my own nondirective, stance to field instruction by allowing him to socially construct ideas about how to teach.

That said, we entered a debate about his real purposes for Lucia during literacy time. Talking him through his rationale by asking whether his main point was to have her reading the content of the Taylor books (and thus finding a way for her to do that in

Spanish) or learning English at a functional level, he came to the conclusion that, in this context, the English was more important and so that precluded the necessity of forcing her to fit into a Book Club book. At the end of the semester, David commented during his inquiry project presentation, "There's no way she knows enough English to participate in our Book Club" (inquiry project presentation notes, p. 1).

Instead, he thought maybe he would use different strategies to support her reading in English. One idea that he had was to have her read *The Mouse and the Motorcycle* in Spanish to give her some age appropriate content to focus on but then I encouraged him to have her draw and write about it in English with some specific activities that were at a more basic level (he called them "more like K-1 activities") in English (e.g. working with words, creating visual dictionaries, using English to label key characters and responses to the Spanish book, etc.). This seemed to be the final conclusion that he came to for how he would handle this unit....for the moment (student-specific field notes, Feb 4). Reflecting back on this, I do not believe that David understood the purpose of the dual approach of learning in Spanish and English. Although I recognized this to be an educationally valued practice for ELL students (Harper and deJong, 2004; Villegas and Lucas, 2002), I do not believe that David realized this from a theoretical perspective. Perhaps as a result of my nondirective approach to my work with him during this phase, I failed to recognize that he did not share this knowledge with me. Instead, I assumed that because he was the one who originally proposed this idea for Lucia's literacy instruction, he was aware of the rationale for doing so as well as the necessary supports she would need to engage in this model.

At this point in the process, I felt that we had come to a conclusion about what he intended to do to support her learning and that we had successfully named and framed the problem as his desire to have her learn English. As David later described during his inquiry project presentation, the main goal was to "get her to learn English as fast as she can" (FI field notes, April 21). We had named the problem and also began to frame some ideas about how he would work with this issue in the classroom and in his coursework, beginning to set "directions for action" (Schon, 1987, p. 4). I also felt that I had respected his learning process, giving him the time he needed to come to his own conclusions and to explore and consider a range of options that he felt were viable. And yet I also felt I provided the kind of support that allowed him to make meaning for himself while still coming to a reasonable conclusion that showed he recognized his responsibility for the learning needs of all the students now present in his classroom.

Phase Two: Managing the Problem

The analysis moves to phase two because it appeared we'd come to the conclusion that David's primary instructional goal in working with Lucia was that she focus on learning English. I was now focused on how to support David in addressing Lucia's learning of English while also trying to implement Book Club instruction with everyone else in the class. He was beginning to explore different ways to make this possible and hypothesize about what he could do in this context to work through this. Over the course of this phase, my field instruction practices moved from nondirective approaches to directive approaches where I told him what I would like to see him do to support Lucia in learning English. I will document that shift in approach and analyze why I thought it was necessary to move from a more open, nondirective stance to a

directive approach to field instruction practices. I will argue that David's struggle with the complexities of literacy instruction complicated his ability to maintain a focus on Lucia's language learning needs as the problem we'd identified as our goal in phase one. Phase two covered the early portion of lead teaching (February into early March) when David was taking on increasing responsibility for classroom instruction and all aspects of running the classroom (e.g. organizing parent volunteers, writing weekly newsletters, etc.).

David, Lucia and Book Club. In mid-February, students completed the 4th grade Michigan Educational Assessment Program and then began to learn the Book Club instructional format with much scaffolding provided for each piece of the model. It was the first time David had ever worked with the lesson format. He hadn't seen it modeled in the classroom because they used the Reader's Workshop (Fountas & Pinnell, 2001) instructional format during the fall semester when his CT was responsible for the majority of the literacy instruction. He did participate in the model in his senior literacy methods course as a student as well as debriefing and analyzing the model as a future teacher. On February 19, David began his first Book Club discussion lesson. As the lesson was beginning and he was getting organized, David came up to ask me what he should do about Lucia during Book Club. He wrote on his lesson plan for Book Club that day that she would read the Spanish version of *A Ghost in the Attic*, then the same section in the English copy of the book and do the same type of Book Club written response activities as the rest of the class was doing in English while she did them in Spanish (this included activities such as prediction, summary, etc). David later said during the inquiry project presentation that he wanted her to make text to text connections reading

paragraph by paragraph between the English and Spanish versions of *The Ghost in the Attic* (inquiry project presentation notes, p. 1). This was a very limited use of English and seemed to provide little instructional value for Lucia if she was reading in Spanish first and writing in Spanish for her response. At the point at which he asked me, there was no time to make changes before he needed to begin his lesson. He decided to try his plan and see what happened. This is just one example of a time where David asked for assistance in deciding what to do with Lucia at the zero hour before a lesson was to begin. This is also an example of where his instructional plans did not match what it was that David and I had previously framed as a logical response to his problem of helping Lucia learn English.

During the lesson Lucia was busy at her own table away from all the other students, appeared to be on task and to have produced a noticeable amount of text on her summary page (student-specific field notes, Feb 19). Overall, he later reported that he was reasonably satisfied with the way the Book Club lesson went because he had never tried anything like it before but was not convinced that it was anywhere close to where it has the potential to be once he became more comfortable with the Book Club format. He had little to say specifically about Lucia's experiences with the lesson. He seemed satisfied that she was on task and engaged with a piece of literature during this time period.

While trying to validate David's early attempts to try a new instructional model for the rest of the children in the classroom, I expressed my concern that he do something more to engage Lucia in learning English if this was his primary goal during this time. I suggested to him again that he might revisit a range of ideas I had made earlier for how

he could utilize the Spanish novel with English writing and response activities (e.g. engaging Lucia in writing activities such as creating visual representations of characters in the book and using English to identify and describe these characters). Because this was the first day of Book Club, I still held out hope that he would restructure his approach to Lucia's work during this time. He seemed to recognize that his plan might not be solid since he asked for help before the lesson. My stance continued to be to suggest and guide at this stage. However, I was now conscious of the fact that he had done something for Lucia's literacy instruction that was not in line with my earlier understandings of what he had in mind for her learning. I considered this to be something I needed to keep in mind as I worked with him during future Book Club lessons.

This was early evidence that David and I held different expectations for how he would manage the problem. Our versions of the solution were varied in terms of the amount of attention to English. His attempt to manage the problem relied on her Spanish language knowledge (and to some extent his) without tackling the more complex issue of her English language learning in meaningful ways. I was still trying to validate him and support him in meeting his goals of having her read in Spanish while developing her English through word and language activities related to her reading. This was an attempt to seek balance between his need to learn as an intern and my need to help him understand how to work with an English Language Learner. This tension continued to build, leading to a shift in my field instruction practices as it became clear that Lucia was not benefiting in ways that I had hoped.

Bringing another voice into the conversation: David's literacy instructor. His literacy methods course instructor, Laura Pardo, was in the building visiting another intern's classroom one morning and she stopped in to talk with David about some aspects of his literacy unit. I encouraged him to ask her for advice on Book Club methods and strategies because she was a member of the original design team for the Book Club instructional model. I also encouraged David to ask her for suggestions and ideas about how he might support Lucia's English language learning while he had her engaged in Book Club instruction (FI field notes, p. 27). I hoped that this would reaffirm what I was suggesting to David because he would hear it from another person, and one who I knew he respected for her knowledge of literacy instruction. When Laura was meeting with David while the rest of the school as at an assembly, I came in to check and they were discussing Book Club. I asked him if he had asked her about Lucia, he had not done so and I got him to do so while I was still there. Laura didn't think it made much sense to have her doing the English reading portion of such a complex task in the way that he had structured the back and forth nature of the work with *The Ghost in the Attic*. If David wanted her to be reading in Spanish, Laura was encouraging him to have Lucia use English to make word books, cut up magazines for pictures, draw and label responses to key vocabulary in the Spanish book, etc. This would allow her to engage in the level of reading she could do in Spanish but would also have her engage in learning to utilize English to express herself. This suggestion from Laura was similar to the types of basic work in written English that I was encouraging in our earlier conversations (student-specific field notes, Feb 19).

Additional observations would show that he never took advantage of the suggestions provided by Laura or reaffirmed by me as valuable ways to begin to engage Lucia in learning English while still recognizing her ability to do more complex work in Spanish. This is the point at which it became clear to me that we were not managing this problem in the same way and that I disagreed with how he was handling this situation. I felt that I could no longer allow him to continue on like this without making any changes to his format and began to shift my approach to field instruction from suggesting and collaboratively working together to make meaning (a nondirective approach) to more of a directive approach where I was more specific about telling him what I expected to see him to do support Lucia. I feel that I have a dual obligation as a field instructor – to support interns in learning to teach but to also work in the best interests of their students. This was a place where my concern for David's student required that I shift my approaches in working with David in the hopes that it might better support Lucia.

Continued resistance/disagreement. During March, David engaged in the bulk of his lead teaching and had more consistent opportunities to utilize the Book Club model during his literacy instruction now that state mandated testing, school breaks and snow days were over. When I made an observation on March 8th of David's Book Club lesson on *Mississippi Bridge* (Taylor, 1992), I questioned in my field notes what Lucia was doing while the children were in groups having conversations about the book because I observed her working on something that looked like worksheets (March 8 observation notes). The following conversation occurred during the debriefing conference about this lesson. We discussed Lucia's role in Book Club instruction and how that does or does not support her English language learning opportunities.

> David: …this is what I've been doing, Alisa, with Lucia during Book Club. I might have already told you this but she has an ESL packet that [guesses at name of ESL teacher] whatever her name is, the ESL lady put together. And so I've been either having her work on that to help with her English or whatever.
>
> **Alisa: …So you dropped the *Ghost in the Attic* in the thing?**
>
> David: No, I just rotate.
>
> **Alisa: Oh, okay.**
>
> David: So one day will be that, one day will be read and respond in the packet [for Book Club].
>
> **Alisa: In Spanish?**
>
> David: Yeah, in certain ones. Well, I don't know if she's catching on or not, but she's [whispers something about her attitude], but I thought I could kind of…
>
> **Alisa: So you think she's getting wise to the fact that you don't know the Spanish?**
>
> David: She probably just realized that I'm not a good speaker. So I'm not sure whether I should just have her write it in English.
>
> **Alisa: I don't think she has the written English to do it.**
>
> David: Yeah, but I don't have the Spanish to decode it.

This conversation makes it clear that he was not using literacy time to help her learn English aside from the days when he had her work with her packet or worksheets provided by the ESL teacher.[6] While he may have engaged in English language instruction during content area periods to the service of the content area material, this was the only time out of his day that was designed to specifically support English language learning during literacy instruction. He also recognized that it was no longer entirely feasible to engage in this method that he devised for her to do the work for Book Club.

> **Alisa: But if you want to go back to those ideas Laura was throwing out of creating word books of words that were in the book or illustrations of key moments in the text that she then tries to label with English terms like girl and**
>
> David: Ghost.
>
> **Alisa: Yeah, yeah. That I think would probably be**
>
> David: Something simple.
>
> **Alisa: Yeah, yeah.**
>
> David: Okay
>
> **Alisa: She still has a text to base it on**

---

[6] Researchers have argued that "the literacy curriculum for ESL students should include more authentic, meaningful reading rather than less" (Li and Zhang, 2004, p. 97).

David: No, I agree, I just was so excited; I was hoping I could do the actual Book Club format. I don't have the Spanish that goes with that book

Alisa: And she's not, she's got to be learning English so it's going to be whatever it takes

David: Yeah

Alisa: Reading the book in Spanish and doing a basic activity with it in English would be a nice variation from doing a workbook packet

David: Right

Alisa: For ESL purposes

David: Right

Alisa: So I think it's still great to have her read the Spanish book because it does engage her brain in a different way, but you're just going to have to ask her to start doing some English things with it.

David: Okay. (March 8 debriefing conference)

It is evident in this conversation that David was still struggling with how to support Lucia through her adapted Book Club work and hadn't yet hit on what it takes to have this work for her. Although David expressed continued interest in and support of cultural diversity in the classroom, his actions did not match his talk. Yet, his desire to have her continue to use her native language is one of the strategies valued by experts in English language learning and culturally responsive teaching practices because continued learning in the native language does much to support transfer of skills between languages as well as demonstrating respect for the native languages and backgrounds of children (Harper and deJong, 2004; Villegas and Lucas, 2002). During his inquiry project presentation, David commented, "I wanted her also to...the whole conceptual...how is she doing as a reader in Spanish" (inquiry project presentation notes, p. 1). This raises the question of whether or not he knew that this was the culturally responsive thing to do or something that he felt comfortable with in this situation because Lucia's first language was Spanish and he could speak it to some degree.

My attempts to meet him halfway and validate some of his instructional decisions (having her read the book in Spanish) did not seem to support him in exploring other

ways to use English in this format. He was still trying to achieve something that was starting to appear to him to be beyond the scope of reason for instruction when he could not support her Spanish writing. This would suggest that he would have to alter the activity to support her English writing needs and yet he made no reference to initial attempts to do that when he realized that she seemed to know that his Spanish was not that good. At the same time, it's clear that he had not taken many of the suggestions made by Laura or myself for how to support her work in English. Although David said "okay" to my requests that he do some English work with the novel, additional observations provided no evidence that he had followed through on this request.

There are two possibilities here. One is that David never really understood the problem as helping Lucia learn the English language, which is how I'd framed it. His version of the naming and framing of the problem was substantially different from mine in some way. The second possibility is that while he understood the problem as helping Lucia learning the English language (like I did) – and perhaps even understood the solution (to some degree) as something that required intensive work during literacy instruction, he could not clearly see how to implement this in a way that would help him manage Lucia's specific learning needs as one piece of his larger classroom context. While David was able to effectively differentiate his Book Club instruction in ways that allowed a child reading at the first grade level to participate in Book Club with his grade level peers, he was not able to do this for Lucia.

It became apparent that my attempts to get him to engage Lucia in more work with English were not effective. Clearly, we were not approaching the management of this problem – Lucia's English Language Learning needs – in the same way, to the

detriment of the student. Schon (1987) argues that our backgrounds influence how we frame problems. My assumption that we were coming from the same perspective as educators – a desire to help Lucia learn English in order to succeed in the American public schools – was clearly not enough of a common ground to assume that we had agreed on the problem as well as the solution that would help us to manage this problem. While I can hypothesize that if asked, David would agree with me on the problem, my sense now is that David did not possess the knowledge or the skills as a novice teacher to effectively implement a solution that involved extensive support for Lucia's language learning. Although I had shifted to a directive approach where I was telling him what to do and working to be more explicit with my expectations, my field instruction practices still failed to have the input that I would like to have seen in helping him to adapt and improve his instruction. In the next phase, the focus of our conversation and work together shifted because of comments that David started to make which highlighted some of his thoughts about Lucia's behavior and attitude that concerned me.

Phase Three: Redefining the Problem as a Field Instructor

Phase three began when it all started to appear to fall apart in terms of our progress with David's work on Lucia's ELL needs. Increased attention and time for Lucia from the ESL teacher provided by the district seemed to shift David's focus from Lucia's ELL needs during literacy instruction. He put the responsibility more on the shoulders of the ESL teacher.[7] Additionally, during this phase, David increasingly commented on Lucia's behavior and attitude as a student in ways that concerned me as a field instructor. My stance moved from direct guidance on what he might do to support

---

[7] A lack of communication and awareness of what the other is doing to support an ELL student is common between ESL and classroom teachers (Li and Zhang, 2004).

Lucia during literacy instruction to redefining my instruction to focus on David's

responses to her behavior and comments on her attitude. By offering him opportunities

to reflect on what was going on in the classroom as well as letting him know how his

ideas were coming across, my instructional goal was to deal with these responses in ways

that made him more aware of the connection between his actions as a teacher and her

behavioral responses and attitude as a student in his classroom. Phase three covered the

last portion of lead teaching as David began to complete his instructional units and began

to phase out of primary responsibility for the classroom and the students. During this

phase, interns also began to work on portfolios, prepare for interviews and reflect on the

year's experiences.

Focusing on behavior and attitude. During a debriefing conference in March, we

revisited Lucia's behavior during the mini-lesson that the whole class was having about

characters and point of view in *Mississippi Bridge* before engaging in Book Club group

work. It appeared to me during the observation that she might have been reading a

Spanish version of a book from the Goosebumps series for children. He seemed to lack a

solution or even ideas for how he might address the challenge of having her doing her

own work while the rest of the class was engaged in something else. Our discussion of

her behavior was an initial indication of a shift towards David's focus on her behavior

and less on his instruction or her learning.

> **Alisa: Hey, what was Lucia doing during the discussion?**
> David: I don't know.
> **Alisa: She was reading this**.
> David: Actually I did see that.
> **Alisa: Spanish Goosebumps.**
> David: That's so hard, Alisa, I don't know what to do.
> **Alisa: Well, I just wondered about having her go ahead and get started on
> her own Book Club stuff. She's not listening to and getting into the**

discussion, which she really can't because what does she know about the point of view of these characters? [Since she's not reading the same book as the rest of the class] Going ahead and saying it's Book Club time, get started.
David: Get started while we're discussing
Alisa: Yeah, yeah. Because then she'd have a half hour instead of 15 minutes.
David: Yeah, it's kind of, yeah and sometimes I think about that. Other times she fits in, you know? It's like she's normal. (March 8 debriefing conference)

This conversation illuminates some of David's challenges in working with his own understanding of reasonable expectations for Lucia when he comments that sometimes she fits in and sometimes she doesn't meet the typical expectations for the classroom. He commented that he did not "know what to do." At the time, I took this to mean that he did not know how to handle her behavior and encourage her responsibility for working independently. I responded accordingly and focused on how he needed to direct her activity in ways that supported on task behavior. Reflecting back on this through analysis, David may actually have been acknowledging his uncertainty about the larger issues of educating an English Language Learner. His ambivalence and confusion seems apparent when he says, "Other times she fits in, you know? It's like she's normal." I view this use of the word normal as problematic because it alerts us to an inability to manage the problem in the same way as I had understood it. He had not reconciled himself to her specific needs or the idea that it was his responsibility to ensure the necessary accommodations were available to support her as a learner in the classroom.

This demonstrates one of two possibilities. The first is that that he did not successfully step into the role of being Lucia's teacher and seemed to want her to conform to the norms of the classroom without recognizing how that may or may not be possible for her during different periods of the instructional day. The second is that he realized that this was his role but was unable to enact this role in ways that positively

impacted the situation. While it is typical of novice teachers to teach to the group, without recognizing individual learning needs, I had hoped that he would tackle this additional challenge because of his earlier enthusiasm about Lucia's presence. His attitude towards her left me worried that he continued to make little progress in his work with her when it challenged his plans or methods for the rest of the students. It also indicated that perhaps his more positive responses towards her and comments about her were masking some underlying attitudes towards English Language Learners in the classroom (Allington and Walmsley, 1995; Harper and deJong, 2004; Li and Zhang, 2004).

Leaving the focus on literacy instruction behind. During a March 23 debriefing conference about a science lesson I had observed, David alluded to Lucia's continued challenges in learning English and the support from home as well as the increased ESL services she would be getting because a new teacher would be taking over Lucia's support. David seemed relieved that she would be receiving additional services and from a teacher that he perceived to be more interested in Lucia and more engaged in helping her to learn. This further supports the idea that David was disassociating himself from the problem as I'd understood it to be defined earlier, that he needed to learn to help Lucia with learning English as a part of his literacy instruction in the classroom. In this case, he was able to hand over the problem to someone else who he viewed as being responsible for teaching Lucia English and remove the feeling of responsibility from his own shoulders. David also failed to recognize the potential of the ESL teacher as a resource for his own learning about how to support Lucia in the regular classroom.

> David: Yeah, we were talking with her mom and dad that her attitude, even at home in trying to learn English is not, not so hot but it's getting better.

116

Alisa: Did you have her conference yesterday?
David: Yeah. It was we were thinking that, you guys moved me away from Venezuela, I don't want to learn the language, I want to go back to Venezuela.
Alisa: Oh she does?
David: So, I'm getting a little tired of this game. [...] Even the ESL teacher, do you know [new ESL teacher], she's an Asian lady? [...] I just know that [new ESL teacher's] still going to work with Lucia and do good stuff and she actually wants to come twice a week.
Alisa: And how often does she go to her?
David: To [former ESL teacher]? Just, every Friday and so now she's going to get, instead of one hour a week she'll get two hours a week. [...] Which is very awesome. (March 23 debriefing conference)

This conversation included the second reference that David made to the fact that he now questioned Lucia's attitude and implied a connection between her attitude and her classroom performance. Earlier, he questioned her attitude in response to whether she was getting wise to the fact that his Spanish was not as good as he had hoped it would be to get through the year together. At this point, he questioned her willingness to try and her desire to learn as well as his increasing frustration with "this game." It also appeared that he was choosing to not engage her in situations that he felt would force a confrontation by requiring her to do something he thought she didn't want to do. By April, in the final interview with me, David described Lucia as "a sweet girl, but a little conniving" (spring interview, p. 15). This instance of suggesting that she was unwilling to try and implicating her desire to learn, by accusing her of playing a game with him, seemed to me to be a case of blaming the victim. This was where his inability to see and implement a solution that would help him to manage his work with her in the classroom could be attributed to her attitude and less about his uncertainty or confusion about what might work best. By washing his hands of responsibility for her because the new ESL teacher would pull her from the classroom more often (and for more time), he was able to remove himself from the equation. He made no mention of his own responsibility to

work with her or to build on whatever the ESL teacher was doing with her during their time together. David commented during his inquiry project presentation at the end of the semester that they had Lucia making extensive use of the work provided by the ESL teacher, "For academic work, she was doing those oral language packets 50% or more of the time" (inquiry project presentation notes, p. 1).

Enforcing expectations for Lucia. On March 25, I observed another Book Club lesson in David's classroom. During the first few minutes of the lesson, Lucia was not in the room. She eventually returned. I assumed during the observation that she was at an ESL class because the majority of her work with the ESL teacher was occurring during classroom literacy instruction times. The following conversation occurred during our debriefing conference and highlights David's lack of awareness about what Lucia did when returning to the room.

> **Alisa: Where was Lucia?**
> David: Uh, ESL....Did I tell you she gets that twice a week now? Tuesday and Thursday which we said yeah, go for it.
> **Alisa: And then was she working on her ESL while you were doing science?**
> David: Yes. Oh, I don't know.
> **Alisa: Because she was sitting over there looking like she was doing her own thing and I just wondered**
> David: I didn't notice. (March 25 debriefing conference)

When Lucia returned from her ESL instruction, she went to the classroom library and stood there touching many of the books. Eventually she stopped doing this and went behind David's desk and was hanging out back there spinning in his desk chair. David came up to her after she has been there a few minutes to ask her to get started on her ESL work. Lucia left to retrieve a folder but eventually returned to sit with the folder and do her work at David's desk (March 25 observation field notes). Perhaps he was too focused on what he was doing during this time to notice Lucia's return, but it seemed to me that

he also did not notice a number of distracting behaviors that she engaged in upon her return that would have been more likely to draw his attention. I questioned whether it was really possible to ignore all that she was doing or whether it was simply easier to let her entertain herself while he was in the throes of something else with the rest of the students.[8] This concerned me because of the possible underlying implications of his attitude towards her.

David had not succeeded in consistently implementing the earlier recommendations I made about ensuring that she was quickly focused and on task with her learning activities. Because we had discussed this previously, I had hoped to see that he was attentive to how his reactions as a teacher influenced her as a learner and that he'd need to see that she was engaged and on task with the lesson at hand. My directive behavior did not change but the focus of my concerns moved. Here I had shifted my field instruction towards his attitudes and approaches with her in a management sense because these communicated some powerful, often unspoken messages about her place in the classroom and his responsibility towards her as her teacher. Holding her to the same expectations for work and behavior as the other students was one significant area that he was beginning to struggle with as she became more comfortable and he had to work harder to balance this. I began to push hard on issues related to Lucia in all conversations that we had about what was going on in his classroom regardless of topic or focus, instead choosing to consistently ask him about what she was doing, how it was going from his perspective, etc. This identified a shift in my focus on the problem as well. I was no longer focusing as heavily on her English language learning needs and instead

---

[8] Li and Zhang (2004) found a similar pattern for an ELL student when there were no appropriate instructional materials available to help the teacher direct the student's learning.

focusing on all aspects of her involvement in the classroom as well as his response to them – and to her as a member of his class for whom he bore responsibility.

It is important to note that Lucia was expected at all times to participate in the content area instruction that was going on in the classroom, especially David's science unit on plate tectonics that was occurring at this time. While novice teachers are often unable to focus on the actions of individuals in the classroom while focusing on their instruction and teaching to the whole group, David was successful in having all other students besides Lucia complete their Book Club work and transition to their science lesson. The following conversation indicates how unaware David was of what she was doing during some science instruction that was held immediately after the Book Club lesson. He did not help her make the transition between the two lessons and redirect her to participating with the rest of the class as is expected of her during science lessons.

Alisa: But I was just thinking that you might want to make sure when you change topics that Lucia knows you're changing topics too.
David: See, and ugh [makes frustrated sounds]
Alisa: Something that just says we're doing science now and during science you participate.
David: Okay.
Alisa: Or some clue
David: I'll be honest with you. In previous science lessons, I've had that before, I've said okay switch and she understands that. She knows not to do work [...] What do I do?
Alisa: Take it away from her [referring to other things she's trying to do during lessons instead of paying attention and participating].
David: Yeah.
Alisa: I mean treat her the same way you would treat everyone else.
David: She's so sweet.
Alisa: When a lesson is going on that you want her to participate in...
David: I know.
Alisa: She does it.
David: She's just going to try to get away with it every time.
Alisa: I mean you can't
David: It's just hard. [...] She can, and I know she can pick, she will be picking up bit by bit little things of English even when I'm talking about science. She can

pick up little parts of that so...I think that's a good idea I just...it's tough you know? Especially when you have a sweet girl, cute, never would hurt anybody, you know, stop! Listen to science, you know?[9]

Alisa: But you've thought that about some of the others at the beginning of the year and you got over that real fast. I mean when you think about it in terms of [...] your own learning curve. (March 25 debriefing conference)

Later in the lesson, as they were copying some study guide information from the

overhead, David went to Lucia and told her to move so that she could see the overhead

screen in order to copy the material that was up there (March 25 observation field notes).

It should be noted that Lucia was assigned to sit in an area of the classroom that often put

her behind the teacher as David or Catherine moved forward from the front-center part of

the room to talk with other children and was somewhat in a corner of the classroom

seating area.

> **Alisa: I appreciated the fact that you moved Lucia. I thought that was a good move. To make her make that...**
> David: Yeah, her attitude, we're starting to notice that more.
> **Alisa: I couldn't tell from what she said to you, but I got the sense that she didn't want to move.**
> David: No.
> **Alisa: Was she working on the sheet (for the science lesson)? [...] Before you moved her?**
> David: Nope. (March 25 science lesson debriefing conference)

While he considered her to be a "sweet" individual, he also seemed to consider

her to be somewhat manipulative as a student. He seemed inclined to cut her some slack

in behavior and meeting her responsibilities based on her English language learning

status and did not seem willing to be the one who pushed hard and said, as the teacher,

what needed to happen. He again mentioned her attitude and he referred to her resistance

to do as asked as demonstrated through her attitude. However, he also structured the

---

[9] Earlier in the year, David struggled with his teacher role and the issue of being "friends" with his students. Throughout the year, David continued to speak regularly about his students in endearing terms like sweet, kind, etc. regardless of gender. I interpret this comment as a general reference to his impression of the student and not evidence of any bias on his part for or against students in the classroom.

classroom, and in this case - her seat assignment, to support an attitude of disengagement and disassociation with the classroom and learning activities. Her position in the classroom allowed her to disengage and to 'hide' from his line of sight by doing nothing other than staying seated and attempting to not draw attention to herself. He enabled her resistance to participating in what was going on as well as creating structures for helping her to avoid. It appears that his behavior was contributing to the situation that he found so exasperating as he expressed earlier as well as implicitly endorsing her behaviors that were ones he considered manipulative.

Perhaps this also contributed to her behavior during Book Club. Because she was not expected to participate in the same activities as the rest of the class, it was likely to feel easier to try and get out of something that she was not interested in doing in another area of the curriculum. At the time, it felt to me as though he was enabling her to have a bad attitude, to choose not to participate in things that she found less than interesting because he was unwilling to confront her behavior that he did not like and do something about it that would force the confrontation with a student who was "sweet." I redirected my field instruction practices towards getting David to enforce the same expectations and practices that he expected of all students when it came to issues of behavior and participation in content area work. On reflection, it may be that he was simply confused about what to do to make this situation work. In this case, he was willing to settle for the fact that she was quiet and was not disturbing the learning of the rest of the class.

Phase three of the lead teaching period became a period where David and I appeared to no longer be communicating about the same things. In this case, I shifted my field instruction practice to meet what I thought David was doing and where I felt like he

was going with some of his comments about Lucia's behavior and attitude in the classroom. I continued to be directive in my approach but shifted the focus of my comments. No longer were we negotiating a problem about how to best meet her English Language Learning needs in the classroom. It felt to me as though we had taken a major step backwards and were dealing with more fundamental issues related to helping David accept and accommodate her presence in his classroom. My attention shifted over this period to focus more on how he was helping her in the classroom, how he was including her in activities and what behaviors of his were contributing to her attitude and behavior. Shifting the focus to his role as a teacher and leader of the classroom moved us away from Lucia's English Language Learning needs, effectively renaming the problem from my perspective and taking us back to square one. The terrain of our problem had more assumed pitfalls and implicit gaps than either of us realized from the start of the naming and framing.

Mixed Successes

While the bulk of this story documents a challenging situation that did not ultimately come to the desired conclusion that I held for David's learning to teach, there were moments of success. For several possible reasons, David's science instruction better supported Lucia's learning than most other aspects of the daily curriculum and learning environment. As described during his inquiry project, David recognized the value of using visuals in the classroom and was aware of instructional benefits that came from doing this in support of Lucia's language learning needs (Echevarria et al, 2004; Harper and deJong, 2004). In science, this seemed to be easy for David because it was something that he already felt he needed to do to make the complex concepts of plate

tectonics concrete and visible for all of his students. One distinct possibility is that Lucia simply benefited from that which he already thought he ought to do.

From early in the year, David seemed to have a better grasp on science instruction and showed more interest in figuring out how to work with conceptually difficult teaching models and strategies. Once he got a good start on this in the fall, there was extensive motivation on his part to engage his students in high quality science instruction. While a number of the examples shared above document inattention to her behavior during science instruction, David also was aware of her participation in many science activities, commenting that "during our group experiments she was always participating" (inquiry project presentation notes, p. 1). He was able to connect her participation to exactly those activities which he felt would be beneficial visual representations to support her learning.

On March 30, David showed me Lucia's science test for the recently completed unit on plate tectonics. He was very proud of how well she had done and made sure to tell me so. He was showing me the short answer parts of the test in particular and was interested in showing me how each of her English answers, while choppy and incomplete, were accurate representations of the knowledge of the unit. When describing the success he felt that he and Lucia had with this test, David said:

> I know with Lucia, when we did her science assessment, I never answered a question for her, like give her the answer, but I would sit and try to say, okay this is what this word means. You know? Plate tectonics, no, I didn't even do that because that was a big concept she needed to do. But um, you know the word vibrate, okay this means shaking the table. You know I changed it with her a little bit but [not much]. (student interview, p. 8)

The next day, David again sought me out for the purposes of showing me her test and talked with me again about how pleased he was with how she'd done on it. He went to

great lengths to document for me how her English answers connected directly to specific scientific ideas he'd taught (field instruction field notes, p. 40).

While this was a story of some success for David, it was still an area where my impact was limited. Although I felt that I had provided extensive support to David in his first science unit in the fall, discussing ideas for pre-assessments, unit activities and experiments, Lucia was not present in the school at that time and so was not a part of our efforts to support David in this instance. However, in the spring unit on plate tectonics David commented that he had not pre-assessed her knowledge:

> Yeah, and [...] I wonder [...] if I should get Catherine to teach a lesson and audiotape a discussion with her [Lucia] and try to find out where she's at because I've been doing all these hands-on things but maybe it's like, maybe she's, maybe I'm the Charlie Brown teacher to her, "Waa, waa, waa." [laughter] Not knowing. (debriefing conference, March 25, p. 9)

Early in the semester, while discussing his inquiry project, I encouraged him to engage her in two pre-assessments to find out what she knew about plate tectonics. One would be in Spanish to see what she might have already learned on this topic. The second would be in English to see if she recognized any of the vocabulary or primary concepts of the unit (student-specific field notes, Feb 3). This approach supported his earlier interest in using her Spanish to support her English learning (Harper and deJong, 2004; Villegas and Lucas, 2002). However, this period of the semester was also when I utilized a nondirective approach to field instruction. My ideas were presented as options in a range of possibilities, not mandates for action. This comment indicated that he either did not take the earlier advice given about finding out exactly what Lucia did/did not understand about the scientific concepts he planned to teach prior to instruction of the unit or was not monitoring her learning as the unit continued to progress. Without the pre-assessment

knowledge, it was difficult to help him figure out how much of the learning growth that occurred in the unit was due to his instruction and how much was related more to her ability to understand more English about a topic she already grasped. My field instruction practices felt limited in this instance, even though he was proud of the overall work that she did in the unit, because I was unable to help him see how it mattered that he find out what she was capable of as an English Language Learner before going continuing this far into instruction. Given what I learned about David, I recognize now that my field instruction stance of social constructivism may have complicated matters.

Never did David offer up any of Lucia's work in Book Club or other areas of literacy instruction as examples of her work or his instructional successes. In literacy, David expressed more concern over the curriculum, the instructional models, and the day to day reality of how to help students learn.

A Final Look at David's Talk about Lucia

Two final pieces of data document some of David's perspectives on Lucia and his talk about having an English Language Learner in his classroom. The final period of the internship focused on the development of the professional portfolio and the inquiry project as a completion of the graduate level coursework taken during the internship. His talk in both of these places was mostly positive when he was removed from the reality of his day-to-day work with Lucia.

In his portfolio, David documented his experiences with Lucia in the area of math. There was no mention of explicit attention to her English Language needs in the areas of literacy, neither reading nor writing. David wrote of his work with Lucia, "Because I can understand some Spanish, I modify my English Language Learner

student's tasks so that I know if she understands the main concepts in our math unit. By using illustrations, both text and student-made, she was able to communicate her ideas to me with minimal language barriers." Here his primary example relied on how he used visuals to create learning opportunities, an effective strategy for English Language Learners to bridge the gap to content area work. The same is true of what he claimed in his inquiry project presentation for what he successfully did in science. However, there was not any other reference beyond use of visuals to concrete approaches to English Language instruction during the remainder of his portfolio or included in his inquiry project presentation.

On the 21st of April, I attended David's inquiry presentation with a group of his classmates and had the opportunity to hear him reflect on his experiences with working Lucia across the semester. He chose to focus on *Teaching an ESL Student* across the curriculum instead of in only one content area. I compiled notes on his presentation as he gave it and did not audiotape this presentation because we had not agreed on my doing so prior to the experience. David reflected back on his early thoughts about Lucia's arrival into his classroom. He said he remembered thinking, "Oh boy what are we going to do?" when Lucia showed up. David described Lucia to his audience saying that she had "a good attitude, good humor" and that she "wanted to fit in so that's a good sign." Nowhere did he mention his impression that she played games or that she was somewhat conniving or manipulative in the classroom. The surface level of his discussion of teaching an English Language Learner in the classroom made it appear as though he thought he was expected to provide a glossy, successful image of the ELL process at

work, perhaps to please his instructor. Yet, he never got to the point of synthesizing his successes into a meaningful, reflective teaching practice.

By the end of the semester, David said he realized that when it came to working with English Language Learners in the classroom, "You can still do, you can still do it. You just have to fit it into your plans. Like in science, I just went visual, lots of pictures and activities." Even at the end of the semester, David failed to use the inquiry project presentation and paper requirement as an opportunity to get inside the problem and explore possible solutions to having an English Language Learner in the classroom.

The Complexity of the Case

David faced similar challenges of meeting several other students' learning needs in the classroom, though none that were as complex as Lucia's story. Because Lucia did not come until January, there is no fall semester data commenting on the challenges David faced working with ELL in the classroom that matches the complexity of this example. However, there was reference in the field instruction field notes about two students in the classroom who have different home languages. Catherine and David had begun to realize that Mary [Chinese] had more difficulty with written language than they had perceived. They came to this conclusion because they met Mary's mother and discovered that she spoke very little English. They determined that they needed to do more to support Mary in English language use in the classroom and shared this concern with me. They also commented that they were beginning to identify similar issues of written English language use for Ashok [Indian] and that they would need to accommodate these needs (Harper and deJong, 2004). This conversation occurred in early November as Catherine and David were preparing for parent teacher conferences

and documenting notes on the students (field instruction field notes, Nov 3, p. 10). After this time, there was no more mention made to me of specific efforts taken to support Mary and/or Ashok's newly identified needs in the English language. This description of two other incidences helps to identify a pattern of a tendency to deal minimally with English language learning issues if the child is otherwise thriving in the classroom.

The real question here is, "Why did this not go better?" How come we were unable as intern and field instructor to communicate effectively about an important problem and work together to implement a solution to help David manage Lucia's English Language Learning needs in the classroom? This section explores why a social constructivist stance towards field instruction both did and did not work out well here, considering what opportunities it offered David and what limitations it imposed on our work together as well as his learning. This revisits issues of Schon's (1987) notions of naming and framing as well as the needs of individual teacher candidates as learners in the process of learning to teach. Schon recognizes that, "Often, situations are problematic in several ways at once" (p. 6). In this case, there are several tensions in the larger context of helping David learn to teach through the use of field instruction practices. This section discusses David's needs as a learner, and the resulting matches and mismatches between his needs and my field instruction practices. This discussion continues the exploration of how we were unable to successfully name and frame the problem for our work together. Implications for field instruction practice in helping interns to learn to work with English Language Learners in the classroom are considered.

David as a Learner

Just as children in public schools have specific learning needs, so too do adults.

In this case, David was fairly cognizant of his learning needs and expressed these at

various times over the internship year. When talking about the way he and his CT

interacted, David came up with the following description of himself as a learner and how

Catherine had worked with that:

> "It seems like towards the beginning of the year it was just strictly [...] - I kind of
> talked to her about this - I felt like I wanted to, for as long as I could, just stay in
> the corner and soak up everything. But, she's like... I have a good analogy. I
> told her I don't know how to swim so let me get some waders on, some floaties.
> And she was good at that. Just like a parent who is trying to get their kid to not be
> afraid of the water, eventually you have to take them in. And she kind of did that
> and she was always right there. In case she knew that I wasn't comfortable with
> something she was always right there to step in. And now it is at the point where
> I can do, if I want to ever do a lesson, feel free, or "David, how 'bout you take on
> this newspaper?" Okay. I think I can do it now. (Fall interview, p. 8)

Yet in the spring, David acknowledged this approach to his learning to teach and

recognized the value of Catherine pushing him to take more responsibility and try more

activities in the classroom throughout the year:

> You know I was dilly dallying around the bush. I told Catherine so much about
> don't throw me in the pool; I don't know how to swim. She did pretty good
> through September and when it got more to October it was okay, you've got to do
> it. [laughs] And it was fine; it was good, I'm glad she did. (spring interview, p. 3-
> 4)

He recognized that he needed the push to go ahead and try new things and explore this as

a part of the field-based experiences of learning to teach.

David described himself as a "monkey-see, monkey-do" kind of learner who

needed to see activities and teaching approaches modeled for him before he attempted

them for himself (student-specific notes, Feb 3). Both Catherine and David described

him as someone who wanted to talk a lot about what he was seeing and experiencing in

the classroom to support his understanding of what was going on with his learners (Fall

interviews with Catherine and David). Catherine and I discussed his need for structured,

guided learning during the spring interview as an aspect of this approach to learning:

> **Alisa: Because he strikes me as someone who without that structure, because**
> **he was constantly asking you for structure, if you weren't giving him**
> **structure for whatever reason, he would come ask and me how do I figure**
> **this out? How do I make this fit?**
> Catherine: Yeah, yeah I think he needs those boundaries. He's got great
> questioning. He's a good wonderer, but we, he just needs to make sure he's
> steered on the right course. That's why I hope next year, [...] I hope he's
> somewhere where he'll have mentors who will do that for him because he can be
> an awesome teacher. He really can be (spring, p. 3).

This section explores how David's needs as a learner intersected with challenges

of teaching Lucia, the university coursework and internship program expectations,

Catherine's (his collaborating teacher) approach to literacy instruction, and Catherine's

and my responses to these learning needs. The potential causes for David's uncertainties

over literacy instruction – and in particular for an English Language Learner – reside in

several areas and correlates to his learning needs in multiple ways.

Coursework and program expectations. There are several aspects of the

university's teacher preparation program structure that relate to this issue. In the fall,

science and social studies content areas receive intensive attention as the focus of the

university coursework for the semester. David was required to plan and teach units in

both areas as a part of this coursework and received instructor support to do so during this

time period. David's exposure to formal literacy instruction during this period was more

limited, although there was a literacy practicum that he was expected to complete as a

step towards preparation for spring coursework in literacy and increased teaching

responsibilities. This practicum required that he complete a series of activities in the

classroom that were structured to scaffold his exposure to and awareness of literacy issues, materials and practices in his classroom. Although David engaged in some limited teaching opportunities in the area of literacy during the fall semester, his comfort level with this was simply not as high during spring lead teaching as it was in science.

The timeline of this study overlapped the interns' increasing responsibility for all aspects of the teaching experience, a period referred to as lead teaching. During the spring semester, the interns have the opportunity to teach all content areas at the same time, take on the additional tasks of the classroom (such as weekly newsletters and parent communication), and maintain this responsibility for a period of eight weeks. For field instructors, this time is also a period of increased expectations, searching through classroom observations and formal as well as informal conversations for evidence that interns are able to successfully manage this responsibility for teaching and classroom policies. For collaborating teachers, including Catherine, this is a time of pulling back and allowing the intern to take the increased responsibility for the classroom, including primary interaction with students and all instruction.

The challenge for David was that Lucia showed up at the beginning of the spring semester when expectations were increasing and his responsibility for aspects of the classroom increased. Because the other students in the classroom who were English Language Learners were not novice speakers, this was not something that David had seen Catherine addressing during the first portion of the school year. In some ways for David, the timing of this situation was unfortunate. Because of the type of learner that David claimed to be, the timing of this situation complicated his ability to learn in the ways that he felt were most successful for him. Since lead teaching was moving into high gear and

Catherine was pulling back and providing increased responsibility for David, he did not have the opportunity to see Catherine model how she would accommodate the needs of an English Language Learner in the regular classroom activities and instruction.

His classroom context. David's collaborating teacher chose to use the instructional model of Reader's Workshop during the fall semester and Book Club as the instructional model during the spring semester. While this approach to literacy in the fourth grade gave David an opportunity to explore two different instructional models, his exposure to Book Club in this particular classroom with these particular children was nonexistent at the time he began attempting to implement it himself. While David had experience with Book Club as a student during his senior year methods course in literacy, this did not seem to carry over to his practices and understanding of the model in this particular fourth grade classroom or provide insight into how students might respond to Book Club. He struggled with the reality of implementing this instructional model with a range of diverse learning needs present in the classroom and varied student reading levels that went from first grade to tenth grade. David recognized this struggle that he faced and was able to connect some of this tension to his sense of himself as a learner:

> **Alisa: Looking back on it, is there something you wish had happened in the fall that didn't happen but now that you've had the spring you wish you'd know?**
> David: Yeah, I can see how book club is supposed to work. You already know me as a learner. I like to see how things are done. [...]I don't know how much they took out from book club, I don't know, Alisa. (spring interview, p. 4).

He seemed to use this as a rationale for why it might not have gone as well as he would have liked; that lack of understanding of what he was trying to create interfered with his ability to really pull off a great unit. And yet, he admitted that he was able to do this in science without any modeling of the science lessons or units. Perhaps this was due to the

133

fact that he was able to see other science units and that fundamentally, only the content was different this time and not the instructional approach. Later, he went on to comment that he could have done more with Book Club to make it challenging and "a bit more fun" for his gifted students but acknowledges, "But that's kind of learning, I was learning with them, you know?" (spring interview, p. 8). He seemed to recognize that he could have done more once completing his experience with the model and acknowledged that he was still learning about what he was doing. Yet, interestingly and perhaps unsurprisingly by this point in the year, he never made mention of Lucia as a challenge for him that complicated the implementation of Book Club or that pushed his understanding of how to best engage in literacy instruction in a way that helped (or did not) an ELL student in the classroom.

Reflecting back on the spring semester, Catherine recognized how David's learning needs influenced his teaching experiences with Book Club.

> Catherine: David has to see it, he has to see it and the whole book club to him was just overwhelming even though it goes step by step in the book.
> **Alisa: He couldn't visualize it?**
> Catherine: He could not, same thing with mini-society. Until he saw the video he just couldn't conceptualize it at all. So, I think, I think she [Laura Pardo] really helped him. She gave him video from the early 90's, [...] just him able to see that was helpful. So and you just with your observation and your redirection, I think the thing that probably helped him most from what I did was the handholding, taking him through it, lots of dialogue. We had lots more dialogue than Kay and I ever had. I thought Kay and I talked a lot, but no, and he initiated a lot of it.
> **Alisa: I think that once he figured out, back in October and November that we were trying to help him, we weren't going to shoot him down**
> Catherine: Yep, yep.
> **Alisa: It's been constant ever since.** (spring interview, p. 4)

While I had hoped that this would be enough modeling and exposure to help him make the leap to a new instructional model, it was clearly not enough to support his use of this strategy at the same time that he was learning to support Lucia's ELL needs.

As a learner, David expressed a need to experience things in certain ways in order to master them for himself. However, the structure of the program and the classroom colluded to make this a more difficult proposition. As a field instructor, my role also placed practical limitations on my ability to serve in this role for him. The next section explores how David's learning needs both did and did not match the approaches I took as a field instructor in my work of helping him learn to teach.

How Catherine and I supported him (or didn't) as a learner. Catherine and I reflected at the end of the year on how we addressed the challenges of helping David learn to teach Lucia. Recognizing that Lucia arrived as lead teaching was fast approaching, Catherine and I discussed how this did not work for David as a learner who felt that he needed to see everything modeled for him to be able to learn how to do it. This segment of text from the spring interview, refers to the strategies we used to help him try to work with her in literacy:

> **Alisa: So you weren't modeling for him this is how I've incorporated her**
> Catherine: Exactly right.
> **Alisa: And now that I think about it, maybe we're back that. I didn't step in and say let me make you a book [for her to use for English language learning].**
> Catherine: Let me show you how to do it.
> **Alisa: Let me talk with her and show you.**
> Catherine: Yeah, I didn't do that either.
> **Alisa: And whether that was some of his hesitancy. I thought if I could push Laura to say it and she did, she jumped right in and said exactly what I wanted her to say**
> Catherine: But that didn't do it for him. She didn't show him.
> **Alisa: Hmm…maybe that's my, that's my thought.** (spring interview, p. 12-13)
> […]
> Catherine: I wasn't giving him direct instruction either at that point but you were
> **Alisa: Well, I know and that's why I**
> Catherine: But he had no idea…the telling, the telling was over his head. (spring interview, p. 21-22)

135

This conversation began to illuminate our attempts to connect why David may not have engaged in certain strategies with the type of learner that he perceived himself to be and what he claimed to need to explore a new idea. Because Lucia showed up when David was beginning his lead teaching (most of January was a wash-out because of the MEAP and Lucia did not participate in the MEAP) and Catherine was phasing out of modeling nearly so much of the instruction before David attempted it on his own, he did not see as much explicit attention from Catherine for how to work with Lucia. She left this challenge up to him because it coincided with his increased responsibility for instruction and for the students. Reflecting back, this may have been unfair or a mistake to assume that he could step up and engage in approaches or strategies that he had not seen, knowing that he relied on this support to facilitate his own learning process. At the same time, in my role as field instructor, I did not feel that I could take the leap and step in to model this for him without it being intrusive to him and to his students.

Although I paid repeated attention to what he was doing with Lucia during each lesson I observed, without explicit modeling of instruction it did not seem to carry over to his plans or his comfort in altering the curriculum to support her in new and untried (and thus un-modeled) ways. However, Catherine did comment on how he was able to transfer from co-teaching the mini-society together with her to working independently on his science unit because she felt less qualified to support him in science and I was unable to spontaneously provide many ideas, having never taught plate tectonics. This highlighted that our attempts in literacy to suggest strategies and approaches had not worked, leading to direct instruction as a strategy for helping him learn, which we determined was still unsuccessful.

The question that still exists, however, is why he was able to make the transition from teaching social studies to developing his own science unit with relatively little support and a great outcome for most students, but could not do the same with very specific suggestions (and even directions) from me and from his literacy instructor to support Lucia's English language learning in the classroom. Does this connect to a confusion over diversity issues and his hesitancy to explore something as complex as English language learning? Was he simply overwhelmed at the thought of one more challenge while trying to create and implement instruction for all of the other students and their learning needs that he already felt obligated to maintain? Was he focused more on hoping that Lucia would pick up English from her peers and less worried about her content learning (though this would be challenged by his interest and support of her work during his science unit)? Was all of this somehow compounded by the fact that he chose learning to work with ELL students in the classroom (and specifically in science) as his inquiry project for the year? Did his confusion over the project seep over into his work with Lucia by mere association between her as the 'topic' of his project and his frustration with the assignment? All of these questions pose reasonable hypotheses for some of the challenges that David faced in making meaning and sense of what was going on around him as he learned. One possibility that I can continue to explore is how our work together as intern and field instructor did or did not support him.

Upon analysis, one of the primary problems that David and I faced was our inability to name and manage the same problem over time and work together to maintain that referent point as a source for solution. My attempts to work with David to make meaning together seemed to mask the lack of agreement that we had on the actual

problem that we were addressing. I took something different from the conversation than

he did. Our conversation continued to explore some of the difficulties that David still had

as a learner, talking about his teaching experiences and how he represented them to

people who were not familiar with his learning context, his students or his collaborating

teacher.

> Catherine: His thinking has, his wondering about teaching, and his thought
> process you know, oh gosh, I think, the questions he's asking of his instruction, of
> our kids, that's really...it's very good, it's very good.
> **Alisa: But he can't turn that around yet.**
> Catherine: Yeah.
> **Alisa: And talk about it in professional language with somebody who doesn't
> know him or what was going on or can sit there and say 'oh you mean...' and
> pull the pieces out for him.**
> Catherine: Yeah, because we can.
> **Alisa: We're still doing a lot of naming.**
> Catherine: Yeah. (spring interview, p. 7).

As the conversation continued, there was discussion of how this naming played out and

how he was engaging in practices without realizing the connection to the theory or term

that he was already familiar with. This gap served to slow his growth as a teacher and

was something that had to continually be provided through other people to help him see

what it was he was actually doing. Perhaps one thing that both Catherine and I should

have realized earlier was David's need for us to explicitly name the practices we were

engaging in and help him to see and learn to identify the connections between the day to

day routines and activities and the more formal theories and structures of which they

were exemplars. Although Catherine and I both felt like we were doing a great deal of

talking with him about what he was seeing, doing and learning, it may be that we did not

use enough 'educational jargon' to help him see how some of what he was doing was

directly connected to the language and activities of the profession in ways that made it

possible for him to name for himself what it was that he felt he was doing to help his learners.

We may not have also provided him with enough theory and rationale for *why* we wanted him to take certain approaches to Lucia's English Language Learning. As a field instructor, this is a lesson that I took from my work with David to apply in future situations. While this could be evidence of a larger contextual issue about David as a learner, it also reminds me of the need to be explicit about the knowledge that field instructors and collaborating teachers share with interns during the process of learning to teach. By engaging him in conversation and knowledge exploration at a child-specific level, our mentoring practices may have masked some of our attempts to help him learn to work with Lucia. The final section pulls together a range of these issues and concerns as related to field instruction practices with implications for potential changes and improvements in practices that would support interns' work with English Language Learners.

Implications for Field Instruction Practices

What do we learn about a social constructivist take on field instruction that directly connects to work with diversity – specifically when working with English Language Learners in the classroom? In this instance, a social constructivist stance towards field instruction practices where the intern and the field instructor work together to collaboratively create meaning and action about teaching and learning was somewhat unsuccessful. On the English Language Learning front, there is the sense that this was largely unsuccessful but when it came to respecting and valuing the contributions of the

intern in the process of learning to teach, there was room for David's voice and perspective in the interactions.

From a social constructivist perspective, there is evidence that there needs to be a careful balancing act between the approaches of the field instructor and the needs of the learner. Early on, David's expressed interests and curiosity about how he would learn to work with an English Language Learner influenced my decisions to allow him to explore his own ideas and understandings of how to best support Lucia's needs. My emphasis was on working with David to make sense of what he was thinking and wondering without pushing my own agenda at the cost of his voice or knowledge. This seemed to work because I understood us to ultimately come to a common conclusion about what needed to happen during the second phase of the lead teaching period as we moved together into managing his problem of working with Lucia.

Even though David and I were negotiating about best ways to work with Lucia during phase one and I was providing suggestions and ideas during the early portions of phase two, it became clear that this type of approach to field instruction no longer impacted what David was doing. As David's teacher, my approaches to constructing knowledge required too much discovery learning on his part. Phase two became a process of shifting my field instruction approaches from suggesting and negotiating to telling David what I'd like to see him do to support Lucia. Although I was more comfortable with a stance that allowed David and myself to be mostly even players in the process, it became clear that I needed to switch to meet the needs of my learner, as any teacher should do when original approaches are not working. For example, for the purposes of his work with Lucia, my approaches to mentoring and supporting David

could have shifted to include mini-lessons on the theories of appropriate instruction for English Language Learning. However, there were still many ways and other areas in which I could maintain my preferred social constructivist stance that made it possible to incorporate and respect David's ideas about teaching practice. Like all good methods of teaching and learning, stances taken towards field instruction should not be seen as limited, one way roads to an end. Flexibility and creativity in redesigning mentoring moves to best meet the needs of the learner can often be necessary steps in field instruction practices that meet the needs of those learning to teach. If we are to see evidence of teacher candidates working to meet the needs of all learners in their classrooms, then we must be willing as university supervisors to make those accommodations for our learners as well.

However, there are programmatic and logistical limitations to this process as there are for many aspects of teaching and learning. When it comes to meeting David's learning needs, there as some aspects of field instruction that did not match. My inability to model the instruction at the level that David would clearly have desired is one fundamental issue of field instruction practice that is complicated by the practicalities of the job. Time limitations make it impossible to spend the amount of time in each intern's classroom that may be necessary to engage in the level of the mentoring that is necessary. Because this is a collaborative job with the support of classroom teachers as mentors in the process, it is necessary to share this burden, to communicate about interns' learning needs, and to devise strategies that support the intern from all perspectives. With aspects of diversity in the mix, this may be complicated by personal views and attitudes towards

diverse student populations, but is a task worth tackling when it serves the best interests of the elementary students as well as the interns' futures as teachers.

Additionally, one of the things that would have served David's learning needs well, from his perspective, would be extensive modeling of teaching practices. While Catherine provided extensive modeling in the fall semester of various teaching practices and instructional models, without a beginning English Language Learner in the classroom during the fall semester, David did not see this modeled. As I mentioned above, my role as a field instructor does not provide me with the same type of access to the students or control over the curriculum or instructional models in a classroom to step in and provide the degree of modeling that David would have liked. Because Lucia arrived during the lead teaching period, there was little opportunity for me to model how David might work with her in the classroom in a formal sense.

How this might be addressed or modified is of interest to future field instruction practices. One strategy is to encourage that the collaborating teacher step in and model appropriate practices, temporarily suspending the more typical progression of the internship. The value of the modeling in this case would likely far outweigh the temporary inconvenience of restructuring the lead teaching period to make this accommodation. Co-teaching is a practice that is encouraged and endorsed by our teacher preparation program and would also serve as an approach to teaching and learning in the field classroom. It would support an intern's opportunity to learn from the collaborating teacher's knowledge while still participating in the larger acts of teaching. This is an instance where field instructors could step in and provide the leadership, the

encouragement and the 'permission' to stray from the model to the benefit of all involved.

Meeting learning needs of interns is a critical point taken from this story of David's work with Lucia. All involved asked David to work hard to meet the needs of Lucia in his classroom. We owed him the same respect and support. We met that challenge with mixed success. In affirming ways, the social constructivist stance for field instruction supported David's sense of self as a teacher and his desire to learn and to engage in conversation about his teaching practices. In other ways, my practices – and the practical limitations imposed on the larger practice of field instruction – failed to meet David's learning needs as he approached the challenge of teaching an English Language Learner. The next case explores an example of my field instruction work with an intern centered on the experiences of teaching a wide range of ability needs in the same fifth grade classroom.

Chapter 5

SUPPORTING JANE'S EXPLORATION OF LEARNING ABILITY

This chapter presents the case of my interactions with Jane, a fifth grade intern. Jane was a quiet person who was well-matched with regard to both the instructional approaches and personal teaching style of her collaborating teacher, Rebecca. Rebecca commented that "because she's quiet like me and we both try to be patient (laughs), I think we worked well together" (spring interview, p. 1). The two of them bonded quickly and Rebecca commented at the end of the year that Jane was definitely "one of my top [interns]. I think she found a nice balance" (spring interview, p. 17).

Jane's internship placement was in a classroom where the teacher was dealing with the complex challenge of working with a wide range of student learning abilities, serving all identified gifted and the majority of identified special education students in the same fifth grade classroom. During her fall interview, Jane described her class:

> My classroom is very interesting. It's very diverse academically. We have very high achievers, way above fifth grade level, and we have some that are way below. And that is one of the biggest challenges right now, tailoring all that. (Jane's fall interview, p. 2)

Jane was required to deal effectively with a range of adults who shared responsibility for the education of these students (including the gifted teacher, the resource personnel, and a paraprofessional who was in the classroom all day). I will show that the school's new student grouping practice was a critical incident (Newman, 1990) that had an extensive impact on Jane's experiences, requiring her to rethink her teaching practices to accommodate these learning needs. The grouping practice forced her to identify what she knew and could do to meet these needs while also recognizing that she had areas in which she needed to grow. Jane was a strong intern who rose to the challenge of this task and

144

faced head on the complexities of the school's new policies in developing her teaching practices. Jane also had a strong relationship with Rebecca as co-learners because Rebecca was in her first year of teaching fifth grade (she moved up after quite a few years in third grade). As such, both were exploring new territory and were able to support each other in the new experiences they were having together.

Two primary components of a social constructivist stance towards field instruction practice served to support Jane's learning needs in this context. Fostering conversations that supported active reflection on her teaching experiences pushed her continued growth as a teacher. Additionally, sharing professional and personal knowledge and resources about my own teaching experiences in a fully inclusive school system supported her attempts to try new instructional approaches. Like David's case, my work with Jane centered on her experiences of learning to work with children in her class. However, unlike David's case where we focused primarily on one student, this chapter explores our work together around a number of the children in her classroom because of the focus on issues of academic ability and the range of students present in her classroom.

My role in her experiences of learning to teach was more subtle than those present in David's case. In Glickman et al.'s (1995) terminology, this is a strong case of nondirective supervision where my primary role was to help Jane make sense of her own understanding of what was happening in her teaching and her classroom and then to help her consider her options for action. For Jane, social constructivist approaches to field instruction supported her learning and growth in effective ways.

As in David's case, analysis of my work with Jane explored how we framed the problem (Schon, 1987) that she faced of managing this range of ability levels in the classroom. Rebecca had framed the problem in similar ways and was supportive of the structures that Jane was using to manage this problem. Her relative newness to fifth grade (if not to other aspects of teaching and the school) provided a context for them to learn together about how to work with the children. My expertise in full inclusion classrooms allowed me to play an expert role in helping Jane navigate this challenge. Jane's case demonstrates an instance of working successfully together as intern, field instructor and collaborating teacher to frame and manage a problem in ways that were comfortable and productive for all involved. This raises the question of whether or not issues in the classroom were overlooked because of our common emphasis and tackling of this problem. The lack of tension and dissonance in our naming and framing will be explored at the end of the chapter to problematize our approach to our work together.

This case explores: (1) the influence of the school context and student placement policies on learning experiences of a novice teacher candidate; (2) the types of support necessary from a field instructor for Jane to learn to teach in this context; and (3) the implications that this type of classroom setting has on the work of the field instructor.

The School Context and Placement Policy

As described earlier, Lancaster Elementary serves a primarily upper middle class family population of students. A significant number of parents are professionals with higher education degrees, including a range of doctors, lawyers and professors. Many of these families can afford for one parent to stay home and focus on child-rearing. The

level of parent involvement in the school is quite high and the parents have considerably high expectations for their children as well as for the teachers and staff of Lancaster. There is particular concern in this school building about challenging the children and meeting higher level academic learning needs, particularly for those children who are identified gifted by the time they enter the upper grades. At the same time, as is true in any school, there are students with a range of special education learning needs that require attention and support.

Lancaster Elementary implemented an approach to grouping children during the year of this study (2003-2004) that essentially reorganized their traditional approaches to student placement. During that year, Lancaster cluster grouped all of the children who received gifted education services in the same classroom at each grade level. Jane's classroom was where these students were placed in the fifth grade. Jane and Rebecca also had the majority of students who qualified for special education services and all of those special education students identified with more "severe" needs (fall interview with Rebecca, p. 2). Effectively, Rebecca and Jane's classroom contained all but a few fifth grade students who received additional support from outside personnel. Their classroom of 24 students included twelve students who received special services. One was an autistic student (who had fulltime support from a paraprofessional in the classroom), one student with Downs Syndrome participated in specialties and select classroom experiences (such as field trips), four students with learning disabilities, one student had Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) and one student had Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD). Four students received services from the gifted resource teacher, particularly in the area of mathematics instruction.

Nationally, efforts have been made in recent years to support classrooms that are inclusive of all students with a reduced number of special placements for special or gifted education. Inclusive classrooms strive to include all children in the regular education environment and to then provide any necessary academic, social or emotional accommodations in that context, thus increasing the inherent diversity of student needs in the typical classroom (Bullough, 1995). While Lancaster Elementary did not try to implement a truly inclusive system, this step of concentrated grouping children across all academic populations into one classroom did move them towards aspects of this model. Children who received special services at Lancaster Elementary did still leave the regular classroom for those periods of time (e.g. to go to speech therapy, reading resource help, gifted education services). However, there were significant chunks of time where all children were present in the regular classroom requiring curricular accommodations and social support.

For a novice teacher, and even for a significant number of experienced teachers, this range of student learning needs presents a noticeable instructional challenge in the classroom. For Jane, the range present in her classroom intensified aspects of the process of learning to teach. Adapting and differentiating the curriculum and instruction of the classroom is not a simple task to undertake. The restructured approach to grouping children was a more challenging context than most interns would face during an internship. The unintended social consequences of the grouping practice and how Jane worked to manage these social tensions in the classroom learning community while simultaneously meeting learning needs was her primary focus. This is the critical incident in her experience of learning to teaching because it became the focus of her work

regardless of whatever other ideas she had as she entered the classroom. This experience overwhelmed the classroom and mandated her attention. As described below, Jane and I framed this problem (Schon, 1987) in similar ways and worked collaboratively to support her attempts to manage this problem in effective ways. This case explores the ways that I used my field instruction practices to support Jane's efforts to meet her students' learning needs.

The Complexity of Social versus Academic Learning Needs

Jane recognized the challenge of intertwined social and academic learning needs and realized that both were necessary goals for her teaching practice. Based on this understanding, she created her internship portfolio around the theme of community and collaboration in learning. At the end of the year, Jane wrote in her portfolio:

> Within this community structure, it is equally important to provide individually differentiated instruction. Each child enters a classroom with interests, a personality and a learning style that is unique. It is my job to not only provide a supportive community for students to learn in, but also ensure that the individual needs of each student are being met. (Jane's portfolio)

This statement acknowledged her dual, and sometimes conflicting, goals to meet the social and academic needs of her students by simultaneously creating a classroom community of learners and meeting individual needs. Jane and Rebecca worked with their students at the beginning of the year to develop a classroom constitution where all students participated in the design of classroom rules, beliefs and practices such as classroom jobs and responsibilities. Jane used a variety of instructional approaches and management strategies to balance the learning needs of the individual students with the social pressures that arise when this range of ability is present in a group of fifth graders. By the time students enter the fifth grade, most are becoming increasingly aware of their

149

own academic needs as well as those of their classroom peers. For example, during one classroom observation, I observed attempts by one child to point out the struggles that the autistic child was having with an activity in the classroom. While working in groups to learn about mixtures and solutions in science, the child pointed out something that the autistic student did wrong, calling to his peers, "Look at him! Look at him! He did something wrong" (March 2 debriefing conference, p. 1). In this community, relatively few children move in or out across the elementary years and so most of these children had years of knowledge about each other, both in and out of school. Jane utilized three approaches to meeting both of these needs: (1) differentiated instructional strategies, (2) instructional methods that allowed students to participate in less public ways, and (3) varied grouping approaches to meet both social and academic needs.

As Jane's field instructor, I helped her to explore strategies and reflect on their effectiveness in meeting her students' needs as well as providing her with resources to implement some of these practices in her classroom. We framed this problem (Schon, 1987) in common terms and both were on board with how she might manage this problem throughout her spring lead teaching period. The approaches that she used to address this concern were ones that I felt comfortable with and knowledgeable about in order to support her efforts for her students. This section will explore how we worked together on her practice in these ways after first exploring Jane's understanding of the cluster grouping policy as well as the influence of the gifted population on her classroom practices and experiences.

Jane's Early Understandings of the Influence of the Cluster Grouping Policy

As a field instructor, I try to use the weekly seminars that I hold with all the interns in my cohort group as a place to discuss the school context (particularly early in the year) and as a place to provide instruction on topics that are of use as interns learn to teach. In this context, I worked on teaching students more about the principles and practices of differentiated instruction. During a seminar in September, we were discussing the new cluster grouping policy and the impact that this was having on the interns' classrooms. We discussed issues of social stigma for students that came with additional adult help through special education (Hutchinson & Martin, 1999). Students often feel exposed when they require additional, regular adult assistance to complete the normal academic tasks of the classroom. Interns were especially concerned about the effects of this in the regular classroom on students' relationships with other children. I shared an experience that I had with several students in my fourth grade classroom who resisted the necessary support of the paraprofessional and how we tackled this challenge in an inclusive classroom by having the paraprofessional work with all students in basic ways (i.e. classroom management) so as to remove the extreme association of the paraprofessional as someone who worked *only* with certain children in the classroom. Jane was the first to latch onto this idea and acknowledged it as an existing concern in her classroom, and asked about how to handle this (field instruction field notes, p. 4).

For me, this early conversation was an opportunity to engage Jane in discussion about the impact of the grouping policy on how the social relationships between students were or were not functioning productively in her classroom. This conversation served as an initial attempt to work with Jane to begin to frame collaboratively the problem that she

151

felt she faced in her classroom. By exploring her thinking on the issue, I was able to develop an understanding of her early thinking on the topic as she experienced it in the context of her classroom. Jane described how one of the special education students in her classroom was resistant to the help that was publicly provided by the classroom aide. This child would turn from the aide, Alice, as she attempted to help him with his work (field instruction field notes, p. 4). Jane questioned me during seminar about how she was supposed to respect the child's desire to protect his public relationship with others at the same time that she ensured he was receiving the help he needed to learn. This early interaction in September began a year's focus on the needs of her learners and the issues of providing ability versus social support in the classroom. While we interacted around this topic throughout the year, Jane's attention to and interest in ways to support the individual learning needs in the classroom only grew. We used this interest and concern as a common frame to the problem and were able to consider how to best work with this tension in the classroom.

The driving force: the gifted boys. The social versus academic issue was of particular concern to Jane because of the cluster group of gifted students in her classroom. There were four identified gifted boys who were a dominant presence in the class. They were confident and assertive in ways that influenced the social dynamic for all students. Mike, Tim, Josh and Jake were all students who received gifted education services in math and their abilities were also far beyond the typical fifth grade student in other areas of the curriculum, particularly in reading and science. There were several instances early in the year that challenged Jane and Rebecca to work hard to create a classroom community. Three of these four boys were described as students who would

"complain about everything," interrupt and blurt when others were trying to talk during discussion, and put down the ideas of others (student interview, p. 4-5). Jane felt that these boys really needed to develop some social skills even while they had the chance to work at academically gifted levels (field instruction field notes, p. 12). This was a stance that I strongly supported through my work with her as she grappled with ways to maintain a focus on this concern and manage the complexity of this problem in daily instruction.

Jane and Rebecca were particularly worried about these behaviors because of the impact they were having on their peers. Rebecca commented that the drawback to this policy was that the teachers in the grade below and the principal who were responsible for designing the class groups "knew who they were academically but they hadn't thought about the strong personalities and putting them together" (spring interview, p. 12). At the end of the year, Rebecca described the challenge that she and Jane felt that they faced with this group of boys at the beginning of the year:

> Rebecca: Yeah, that [social influence and attitude] was an issue and I think we kind of worked through a lot of that in the beginning. Having them understand that because they were wizards at math and science that there might be other kids with strengths in other areas and maybe this is something you need to work on. They still try to convince you that they know everything they need to know in the fifth grade and for sixth grade, through seventh grade at least (laughs), that's what I've been told.
> **Alisa: So attitudinal more so in that context than actual ability?**
> Rebecca: Right. [...] And like you said, they catch on quickly. But then, putting it in writing, for all except one of them, is more difficult. Writing is their area they need to work on. (Rebecca's spring interview, p. 4)

As an experienced teacher, Rebecca recognized that these students had much to offer but also lacked knowledge and development of writing skills that could be a focus for much of their work during the year.

The gifted students had a clear impact on their peers as in one instance when several students told me that they did not need to check their work or participate in the discussion because they were working with the smart boys as their partners for the activity and could rely on the boys to do the work and be correct (field instruction field notes, p. 12). The presence of these students had a direct relationship to the instructional decisions that Jane made and the focus we took on our work together, which are described below.

Differentiated Instruction Practices

During several seminars in October, we were working with a set of materials (readings, handouts, specific strategy models, etc.) about differentiated instruction (field instruction field notes, p. 7-8). Differentiated instruction is one current educational movement designed to support this challenge to balance equity and equality in the regular classroom. Tomlinson et al. (1997) define differentiated instruction as an attempt to provide a range of academic activities within one lesson or activity to meet the learning needs of a range of students. They advocate an approach that has teachers differentiate the lesson in one (or more) of three ways: through the content, the process or the product of the learning. Learning in these ways changes the appearance of student work to increasing variability in what or how children might be learning. Inclusive classrooms raise issues of managing equity versus equality because all children do not need the same educational supports or experiences (Hutchinson & Martin, 1999). Hutchinson and Martin described equity as treating students fairly, which is not necessarily engaging in the same approaches or strategies for everyone as they learn. Jane felt that this distinction was one that had the potential to cause social issues for her students because

of her early experiences with the presence of four gifted, dominant boys in her classroom and their impact on their classmates (field instruction field notes, p. 8). In several instances early in the year, these four boys consistently demonstrated their own knowledge at the same time that they put down the contributions of many of their peers.

Adaptations to meet the needs of individual learners would serve as a place where equity could become an issue in the eyes of students and parents. This provides a challenge to the intern teacher who is struggling simply to develop one lesson plan, let alone the necessary adaptations to meet a range of student learning needs. However, this is one important lesson that intern teachers need to learn in order to effectively meet the needs of all students in the classroom – meeting individual needs is a support for learning for all students rather than a detriment to the group. Jane was aware of this need early in the year as a result of the school's placement practices. The challenge for Jane was to help her students see and understand this distinction as a necessary support for their learning while simultaneously learning to teach in this way. The challenge for me as Jane's field instructor was to support her efforts in learning to teach this way, a complex task for a beginning teacher to undertake while also successfully completing the other requirements of the internship.

Jane utilized differentiated instruction as a means to an end to help her ensure that all of her students were given the opportunity to learn in ways and at levels that were appropriate for their individual needs. She recognized that differentiation was something that made it possible to meet students' needs "without some people feeling like they're ahead or they're the smart kids" (Jane fall interview, p. 4). Tomlinson et al. (1997) found that preservice teachers were receptive to and interested in utilizing differentiated

instructional practices to meet the needs of a wide range of learners when attending a workshop on differentiated instruction. However, once in the classroom attempting to implement their new beliefs and ideas, they struggled to practice what they believed. Tomlinson et al. recommended that teacher candidates have the opportunity to see more examples of differentiated instruction in the classroom as well as opportunities to discuss their own beliefs and attempted practices in order to improve their ability to provide differentiated instructional practices for their students. My role as Jane's field instructor was to provide as much of these discussions and support as possible.

For Jane, the necessary classroom-based support was in place because Rebecca was also interested in implementing these strategies as a way of dealing with the range of needs in the classroom. Because Jane was in a teaming situation in fifth grade, she also had the mentoring support of the other two fifth grade teachers. In particular, the math teacher was actively engaged in supporting Jane's efforts at differentiated instruction.[10] All of us were framing the problem that Jane faced in complementary ways, bringing our own experiences and perspectives to the situation in order to enhance Jane's knowledge and strategies. Differentiated instruction was something that I had extensive experience with as a former fourth grade teacher in a fully inclusive school system that required the use of differentiated instruction to meet students' needs. As a field instructor, I was able to use these experiences to support Jane's efforts in the classroom. I also shared with Jane a series of resources that I had which could support her work with a wide population of students in the math classroom (for example, a set of real world problem solving activities that build off computational knowledge) (field instruction field notes, p. 7).

---

[10] Jane's CT, Rebecca, taught social studies to all three fifth grade classes while the other two teachers each taught the math and science to all three classes. Each teacher was responsible for teaching language arts (reading and writing) to her own homeroom classroom.

Both of these facets of my practice supported Jane's efforts to manage the problem successfully in her classroom. Because we had a common frame in place with agreement on the appropriate strategies that Jane might use, our work together to manage this problem was particularly successful.

Differentiated instruction on fractions. As an example of Jane's work with differentiated instruction, I will explore the impact of a math menu approach to a unit on fractions that Jane taught during her spring lead teaching. Jane initially pursued a differentiated approach to her math instruction to meet the range of needs in the classroom, including the gifted boys. She commented repeatedly that the "range of the children's knowledge was influencing her thinking" about what she needed to address in her instruction and how she was going to go about doing so (student-specific field notes, p. 12). After Jane had started work on her planning, decisions beyond Jane's scope or involvement were made about the program for the gifted boys. The parents of the gifted boys arranged for them to work several times a week with the gifted resource teacher for the elementary schools in the district. On the days that they were not working with the resource teacher, they had computation packets of activities provided by the resource teacher that they were to work on in the hallway on their own.[11] Jane, however, felt that the use of a differentiated math menu was still an appropriate approach to deal with the needs of everyone else still participating in the classroom curriculum (field instruction field notes, p. 23).

---

[11] The parents requested that the packets be focused on computation and not on higher level or critical thinking skills in the area of math. It was the opinion of all the teachers involved that this played to their strengths but ignored areas of mathematical thinking and concepts that the children needed to work on. For a variety of reasons, the parents' wishes on this topic prevailed.

As she was preparing to teach this curriculum unit during spring lead teaching, we talked at length about how she might go through this process of differentiated learning with her students. When I was teaching fourth grade, I utilized an individualized, contract-based differentiated instructional approach in math. Jane was already interested in using a similar approach with her students so it was possible to use this common interest/experience as one mechanism for helping Jane manage her problem. I was able to share these experiences with Jane and help her think about the pros and cons of her approach as well as how she might group different kids (both socially and academically) to support each other when working together (student-specific field notes, p. 1). During a debriefing conference about an unrelated lesson, we began to talk about her plans for this unit. Jane commented:

> ...we did the pre-assessment yesterday and I looked at them last night. Some know how to convert fractions to percents and you know, the other way around, and some knew how to write in lowest terms and add and subtract, and some didn't even know how to look at a problem that said, "Two out of five students were wearing glasses, what fraction is that?" So it's like ahhh! (March 2 debriefing conference, p. 3)

Jane and I went on to discuss her plans for this unit and the variety of ideas she had for how best to work with her students' learning needs in this context and with this particular content. By sharing with her my own various experiences as a classroom teacher working with fractions in math and differentiated instruction, I was able to provide her with examples of things that did and did not work in my personal experiences as a teacher. Using these ideas, I was able to support Jane's work on differentiated instruction in specific, example-rich ways that allowed us to talk through concrete issues and move from our more theoretical discussions about differentiation to the immediate needs of her

fifth grade classroom. This is one example of our joint, focused management of the

challenge of varied learners.

Conversing with Jane and providing feedback on her ideas as well as helping her

to play out her options in a given situation seemed to be enough to get her to take action

on her practice. Unlike David, Jane did not need specific directives about what I wanted

to see her do to make effective decisions about her practice. She was able to learn from

examples shared from my classroom and then imagine what differentiated instruction

would look like and implement it in her own classroom. Perhaps this is because we had

framed the problem in similar ways and the solutions seemed more logical and useful to

Jane in order to support her efforts to manage the problem. Jane and I discussed her

plans for the fraction unit. We talked about several of her ideas for how best to support

student learning about complex content for fifth graders such as fractions and percentages

and how to convert one to the other. Jane had a variety of ideas that we played with

involving a series of jigsaw activities where students would work in groups to

demonstrate fractional versions of percentages from 0%-100%, based on their prior

knowledge of the concept.

> Jane: ...so we'll have one person from each group in a group talking about what
> they're doing, showing products, you know and then all their stuff is going to be
> together on a bulletin board...0-100% across the top and different ways their
> group is coming up with to represent the different percents.
> **Alisa: So they're all creating products around that idea?**
> Jane: Right, so they're seeing that they're all working on the same thing, just
> some are more challenging than others. (March 2 debriefing conference, p.
> 4)

Jane was active and engaged in our conversation, sharing her ideas and taking the lead on

exploring what might work best in her classroom and for this particular unit of

instruction.

I also alerted her to the need to ensure that she addressed the social issues of working on diverse tasks in the classroom and encouraged her to consider whether or not she "needed to have a group discussion about how you're respectful of your peers' learning so that somebody does not say 'mine's harder' or 'that's so easy, I can't believe that you have to spend a week working on that'" (March 2 debriefing conference, p. 5). Jane commented later in the conversation that she felt that the students would be relatively unaware of the distinctions in difficulty between the tasks because she wanted to ensure that they would be of equal interest (i.e. the tasks were not distinguishable in traditional ways where the high ability students would be doing something engaging while the rest of the class worked on worksheets).

With suggestions and guidance from the math teacher and me, Jane worked hard to develop a series of activities that were interesting and stimulating regardless of conceptual difficulty. However, it's also important to point out that she had access to modeling and support as she worked on this fractions unit with the fifth grade math teacher. In David's case, he had relatively little involvement in the process of learning to teach Lucia from his collaborating teacher (although she did not obstruct his efforts to work with her). And yet, Jane's more noticeable tendency towards reflection was evident in the comments made by Rebecca (who was her CT but not the teacher she worked with on the math unit) about conversations they had where Jane discussed differentiation in math:

> I think she's really liked the math and the way that they organized and I think she kind of helped to spearhead that, breaking up into ability based kind of groups for math. And I think she has shared with me, that she finds it easier to be able tot each that way, to be able to break them up like that. She says that math is a way it can easily be done. And I don't know if she expected that because I don't know if math was her area. (Rebecca's spring interview, p. 7)

As she reflected on the early success in this unit, Jane and I talked about how well the students were responding to the activities and the materials. Jane was delighted with their "involvement, focus, and enthusiasm" during math each day and how well she felt it was going for everyone (student-specific field notes, p. 11-12). Additionally, we discussed the experiences of several specific students, one of whom particularly worried her at the beginning of the unit based on his performance on the pre-assessment. Jane described Paul as a student who struggled with math content and often lost his focus and direction during activities. He also did not have any confidence in his own math abilities. In the context of this unit, we discussed what was working for him about the differentiated approach. Jane thought that he was successful because he had the opportunity to access the content at a level that was appropriate for him. She also noted the value of the structure of working in small groups or on independent activities that removed much of the social pressure of working with the entire class and also allowed him to focus on his own work. Jane was able to reflect on how this supported him and consider ways to move this type of structure into other aspects of her instruction in order to better serve his learning needs. By using our field instruction time and relationship, I was able to engage her in reflective conversation about this experience. Jane was pushed to explore the rationales behind her successes, further informing her understanding of the processes and outcomes of differentiated instruction.

After I had observed her teaching a lesson in this differentiated unit, Jane reflected on her experiences with differentiated instruction, particularly in math. She believed that she had been able to use effective strategies to meet her students' learning

needs and was encouraged by the way it had played out in the classroom, convincing her

that she would willingly try it again:

> **Alisa: I think this math stuff is cool.**
> Jane: Me too, and it gave me a big thing to talk about at this interview [mock interviews held on campus], the differentiation. I could say we're doing this thing right now and I have pictures to show what we're doing and it's a really good way to say, I think, working with different levels.
> **Alisa: Well, and I think...**
> Jane: I think it's helping. I like that they each have tasks on their levels. When you do a whole class, especially with this unit some are way up here and some are way down here. I don't like to see people sitting there bored because they're like we're doing this again but then I'm looking at others and they're sitting there blank. (March 24 debriefing conference, p. 4)

Later in our discussion, I asked Jane to consider whether this was a practice she would

carry over into her own classroom:

> **Alisa: Would you do this on your own?**
> Jane: Yeah, and I think I don't know that the first time it would be hard, but since we're doing it now and working together to see how it can be set up, I think I would be comfortable setting it up now that I have an idea how to do it. Do you know what I mean? I think it would be hard to initially do but since we're doing it now and I have an idea, it'd be easier to and I think yeah, I would. (March 24 debriefing conference, p. 6)

This comment demonstrates the importance of the support that Jane received in learning

how to develop and implement a new instructional model in her classroom. I was able to

help her through reflection opportunities to talk about her experiences both before and

after teaching as well as sharing appropriate resources for the unit. In addition, Jane was

able to succeed because she was able to try this in a supportive environment where her

teachers were focused on the same goals.

At the end of the unit, Jane commented that she was very pleased with students'

performance on the final assessment that focused on the common concepts taught across

the unit. Given the wide range of knowledge that students demonstrated on the pre-

assessment, Jane had been concerned about the final outcome and felt strongly that her use of differentiated instruction helped all children learn something from the unit (field instruction field notes, p. 41). In reflecting on this unit at the end of the year interview, Jane talked about the success of this strategy in helping her to meet the diverse learning needs of the students in her classroom, "There's no question in my mind that each of them were given the challenges and support that they needed there" (Jane's spring interview, p. 4). Jane was able to assess her learners in a variety of ways that documented the knowledge they developed during this unit. All children did well on the final unit "test" that Jane was asked to design and implement. Only two children did not get a B or better on the test and both of those children improved noticeably in comparison to their pre-assessment performance (and were also special education students).

As a learner, Jane herself was able to see how and what her students gained from this type of instruction and could see the usefulness more generally as a strategy for instruction. She recognized her own growth as a teacher who was able to work more effectively to meet this range of academic learning needs. Early in the year, she felt that she "didn't really know how to meet them [their learning needs] and didn't really have any ideas" but that by the end of the year she was "more confident and able to take a risk and try it" (Jane's spring interview, p. 5). By late March, she was also able to start thinking outside the immediacy of her internship classroom to her own future as a responsible teacher. Yet, she did comment on the support and mentoring from her two teachers and me that was part of her ability to think through and experience something that was new and challenging for her as a beginning teacher. Jane recognized the value of having her colleagues and teaching partners on the same page in helping her to

implement her instructional and social goals for students. As a field instructor, I played a role in this process, helping her to negotiate her way through the problem, naming the issue and developing effective methods for implementing approaches for managing the problem. While Jane was able to work with differentiated instruction as an approach to her classroom needs, she also recognized that other things needed to be done to support her students as learners in a complex social environment.

Methods for Student Participation

Jane worked hard to ensure that all students in the classroom felt valued and safe. For some children, the academic range of their peers intimidated them or influenced their ability and/or desire to contribute in ways that were socially accepted and respected. Jane worked hard with Rebecca at the beginning of the year to develop a classroom learning community where all students were respected and were taught to honor each other's contributions. Yet, she also realized the need to do more than this to help some of her struggling or more reserved learners to step forward and participate in the conversations and activities of the classroom. At the end of the first semester, Jane commented:

> I think that I think about it a lot. One of my strengths is that I continually think about it and change things and I'm not just stuck in one pattern. If it's not working, we'll do something else. I guess being open to that and being willing to think about those things. I think that I'm very available for them whenever they need help. If they have comments or they just need to share, I think that I'm open for that. (Jane's fall interview, p. 4)

In February, Jane reflected with me during a debriefing conference after an observation of a Book Club lesson that she needed to do more to get all students involved in the whole class discussions like those that they had during this lesson (field instruction field notes, p. 28). I expressed my concern during this time that she had very few students participating in the whole class discussion (only about five students regularly

164

participated during this time). Jane's immediate response was to say that she was glad I

had brought that up because she'd been thinking about it over the last week and was

struggling to decide on the best ways to call on students who were not volunteering to

participate. Again, this serves as evidence that we were framing Jane's classroom

problem in similar ways and focusing in on similar material as we both worked to support

her efforts for students. We discussed the situation and the relevant options at length as

well as the impact of this on the social dynamics of the classroom (student-specific field

notes, p. 6-7). While Jane realized the importance of engaging children in whole class

discussions, she also realized that there were other areas of instruction in which she could

encourage students to participate besides those focused on whole class activities and

discussion.

Jane worked to ensure that students had a variety of methods available to them for

participation in the classroom that complemented different strengths and skills. Rebecca

talked early in the year about the steps they had taken to help develop this context:

> We've talked about how everybody in the class has strengths that are no less
> than mine and all the different things people can be good at and raise your hand if
> you do good at everything. Of course there are some who raise their hand and
> then the kids say, "No, you're not" and told them to put their hands down.
> (Rebecca, fall interview, p. 4)

This attempt by the other students in the class to convince their gifted peers that they

weren't great at everything demonstrates the social tension at play in the classroom. Jane

strove to create learning opportunities that gave students access to the content of the

curriculum with no limits on how far they could go with the materials. Below I describe

some examples in social studies and literacy.

Revolutionary War centers. The Revolutionary War centers associated with Jane's social studies unit allowed students to explore materials and concepts from the time period in a structure that promoted personal reflection and response. Students were asked to make observations and hypotheses about the materials in each center and to explore the materials in ways that engaged all their senses. The centers included activities like tasting cookies from the time period, examining photographs of uniforms from the British and American militaries, listening to music from the time period, etc. Jane's content goal for these centers was to enrich the students' understanding of the time period in which the war took place and to provide more access to the day to day life of colonial citizens. While I provided resources on teaching this unit (because I had also taught the American Revolution in social studies), my role was to help her think about how she was going to structure the experience to include everyone. The instructional format of centers shifted the students' focus from what others in the classroom were doing to the materials provided and minimized the sizes of the groups in which students were working. Paul, the student described in the math fractions unit as one who struggled with content and had difficulty participating, was an active participant in these centers because the pace and group size both allowed him to get more involved in the activities of his group (March 2 debriefing conference, p. 1-2).

At the end of the rotation through each center, Jane called the entire class together and had them discuss their observations. This discussion was supported by the fact that the centers elicited open-ended responses, not a yes/no or worksheet type of approach that would have limited conversational ideas and opportunities. Jane said:

> Jane: I did it that way for kind of two reasons because one, I wanted the discussion piece to be there and if I used open-ended things then they're not going

to be...I don't want there to be a right or wrong answer, to be observing and analyzing.

Alisa: Right, and that opens it up for all your kids...everyone can contribute.

Jane: More people were participating, too. (March 2 debriefing conference, p. 1-2)

Of particular note was Paul's participation in the whole class discussion after the centers. As Jane commented, "When he does participate, I try to make sure that I call on him so I don't pass over those opportunities" (March 2 debriefing conference, p. 1-2). This blend of methods provided a variety of ways for students to participate and created a safe place to explore ideas in a small, supportive group before talking and working together as a whole class. I was able to help Jane debrief how these activities supported specific students like Paul as well as offering her another approach for considering how to meet both social and academic learning needs in the classroom. We were in agreement about the value this variety provided for students in terms of being able to participate in the curriculum in ways that were more comfortable for them, and scaffolding their efforts to work in the social environment of the larger class community.

Narrative writing. Jane also provided students with activities that allowed for individual strengths and personal preferences to play out in their work. Each student was asked to create a narrative children's book that they would read to their first grade buddy in their partnership classroom at school. In the context of this activity, Jane described how she supported individuals by giving them free reign with the topic and design of their book and helped them to explore their personal interests. She also tailored her expectations of the students to meet their individual learning needs (i.e. in terms of minimum length and complexity of the elements included in the story). Jane reflected

back on the experience during her spring interview, describing different components of

the activity and the outcomes:

> Jane: We did tell them, your area of challenge, push yourself, and not all did and I don't expect all of them to, but a lot of them did and I saw, you know I can think of a few like Ryan who would be a one who would, when he started writing, even at the beginning of this semester, not into it. He wrote a chapter book because it was about computers, something he was interested in and just took off with it. So, I think by providing that choice of topic, it kind of let them, internally it got them interested.
> **Alisa: Did you vary the requirements at all in terms of, you talk about how you must have these certain elements and these pieces, did that vary at all based on ability?**
> Jane: Not the pieces, but maybe the extent to which they were created. For someone to write one or two sentences on the page at one level and that might be okay and that's a big success; where for someone else it might be that you're really not owning up to what I know that you can do.
> **Alisa: So the pieces were there for everybody but how they were implemented or how accountable they were held to...**
> Jane: Kind of depended on where they were at. (Jane's spring interview, p. 4)

In my observations of their work on these stories, each student was actively engaged in

the construction of their story and illustrations and seemed very proud of the story they

had each chosen to tell. Many students went out of their way to tell me about the story

they had written and quite a few volunteered how they came up with their topic,

connecting it to their personal interests or to their perceptions of the interests of their first

grade buddy. By talking with the students, I was able to gain insight into the events and

activities of Jane's classroom as well as her learners' understanding about what was

occurring in their writing. This knowledge helped me to support Jane's efforts to meet

her students' learning needs by understanding more clearly the necessary steps to manage

the problem as we had framed it. Understanding the learners who are the focus of our

work together is an important aspect of working together to frame and manage problems.

While this information did not ultimately solve the challenges we faced in David's case,

in neither case would it have been possible to have this level or quality of conversation without knowledge of the learners in the intern's classroom.

Jane's reflection about both of these experiences showed that she understood the purpose and the value of these activities in ways that supported the goals she had for the students. Her understanding of her learners was evident as she was able to express how she felt that these activities supported the specific students she had worried about (such as Paul) who were not participating in class activities. I was able to use this reflective approach to her practice to support her attempts to work with her students' needs in socially constructed ways, sharing my thoughts and ideas about what she might do to meet their needs but ultimately leaving the choices and decision-making up to her. Our common framing and managing of the problem (Schon, 1987) allowed us to work together in this way. Because of this, my social constructivist approach to field instruction practice supported Jane's efforts in this instance.

Additional approaches. Jane also planned a range of activities that highlighted different student strengths so that as many children as possible had a chance to shine in the classroom and in front of their peers. Although she did this in less formal ways such as directing public praise towards children who normally might not be seen as those who excel, she also provided activities that played on different learning strengths. Jane planned dramatic activities in her social studies unit on the Revolutionary War, including a four act play/skit done as reader's theater to cover the content of the Boston Tea Party. I observed this activity and it went reasonably well; Jane was satisfied with her students' effort and particularly commented on two children who rarely speak up in class and the contributions they made to the play. These two girls were able to take artistic

responsibility for the minimal sets used and series of props and all students recognized the contributions they made to the success of the class efforts (field instruction field notes, p. 26). Jane recognized that this experience highlighted different learning skills and reflected on the value that this activity had for playing up different strengths.

Finally, Jane recognized the value of knowing her learners and being able to respond to the individual in individual settings. For example, Alexander, a student who had attention issues (but was not formally diagnosed as ADHD) needed opportunities to work independently. Jane commented:

> You know, I just notice how Alexander does so much better when he has an individual task than a group task. If you give him, "You need to do this [on your own]," it's light years better and when he's not being disruptive it seems to help everyone else too. (March 24 debriefing conference, p. 7)

Alexander was a student who was discussed in our spring three way conference as someone with whom Jane had to work very hard to learn to be patient and to work with effectively.[12] Jane valued the support she received from the teachers and myself in working through her ideas and strategies for working with Alexander in effective ways that did not compromise the learning of other students. She simultaneously valued the contributions, sometimes unusual, that Alexander made to lessons. Over time, Jane felt that her options and approaches improved as she learned more about Alexander's specific needs and also felt more freedom to take control of his learning and accommodate instruction as needed (for example, pulling him from a group activity to work alone when it seemed to best suit him). Encouraging her to veer from her plan for Alexander when it was appropriate for his learning was something that I did over time to help her step into

---

[12] Formal three way conferences were held several times during the year for each intern, collaborating teacher and field instructor. The spring meeting served as a time for the mid-semester assessment of the intern candidate's progress in the classroom.

her responsibility and role as the teacher of the individual children in this classroom. This kind of reinforcement for her attempts to take ownership of her students and their needs was something that Jane could use as she struggled with the complexity of the classroom environment.

In a number of other instances, Jane reflected on how her knowledge of the learners supported her in making instructional decisions about how best to structure student participation to meet academic and/or social learning needs. For example, in talking with her about a science lesson, Jane and I discussed her rationale for when she chose to turn questions back on students and encouraged them to answer them for themselves as opposed to doing all the work on her own. Jane reflected that her knowledge of learners was what made it possible for her to decide when to do this and when to choose to ask the entire class in order to protect the social persona of each student:

> Kids like Josh I know I can do that and he won't feel embarrassed or he'll go with what he thinks. There are some people that I would probably tend to ask the whole class, "What do you guys think?" because I know they would feel on the spot and uncomfortable with that. (March 24 debriefing conference, p. 11)

Jane understood that students had different experiences and different social responses to the challenge of education in a public setting. She was conscious of these needs and considerate of students' feelings and perspectives as she engaged them in learning opportunities. Her reflection on this experience allowed her to talk intelligently about why she chose to do what she did and it was thoughtful and purposeful. Her variety of student participation methods reflected an understanding of her learners as both individuals and members of the larger classroom community with both academic and social needs. By supporting her efforts at reflection, sharing pedagogical and practical

ideas with her and using these approaches to help her manage the problem in her classroom (Schon, 1987), I was able to play a role in Jane's development of socially and academically appropriate teaching practices.

Varied Grouping Practices

In addition to meeting the individual learning needs of students by finding ways for them to participate without intimidation, Jane also utilized varied grouping strategies to help her manage this social element during instruction. Jane recognized that students had different abilities to offer, "I really see how they all have different strengths and so [I am] kind of thinking about how can we use all those different strengths in the classroom?" (Jane's fall interview, p. 3). Children in elementary school are commonly placed in ability groups for reading and math that reinforce racial and social class differences with the emphasis in differences between groups changing even more dramatically over the years (Grant and Sleeter, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 1999). Grant and Sleeter write further, "Special education often constitutes a track below the lower track for students whom the regular program is unable to accommodate, whereas gifted programs offer the socially advantaged children the best instruction" (p. 4).

One approach to counteract this tendency to place students in ability groups that are rigid and based on standardized testing performance has been the movement towards differentiated instruction. There are multiple ways that students can be grouped for activities and instruction and the goal is to keep this fluid with changes in groups as needed to support the goals of the instruction (Grant and Sleeter, 2003). Jane was able to understand the importance of grouping in ways that were flexible and varied across time

and activity. Rebecca reflected at the end of the year on the influence that the gifted boys

had on the grouping practices in the classroom:

> Rebecca: One of the issues we had early in the year, when we grouped by ability, and those four, three of them had a terrible time and so that's one of the reasons we had to balance, break them up, because they just came into the class, not only did they want to have this opinion of themselves, but when they got into the group together, they all wanted control. So that became a real issue.
> **Alisa: Jane said that often the first thing was to put those boys into four groups and then she goes from there and keeps figuring that out because she said they're just so controversial with each other and they won't work together; but when you put them into different groups, they're very kind and helpful.**
> Rebecca: Yeah, and that's real progress since the beginning of the year, because at the beginning, even working in any group, they wanted control. That's where we had discussions about different strengths and recognizing, you know, because none of them are artists either, so and you need an artist in your group.
> (Rebecca's spring interview, p. 6-7).

Jane was also a strong advocate of making sure that she provided varied grouping

experiences across the year; sometimes she used homogeneous groups and sometimes

heterogeneous (student-specific field notes, p. 1). Each time she structured groups, she

thought carefully about the role of the work required by each member of the group and

the social dynamic of the group she was creating.

Differentiated instruction is one way to accomplish variation in when and how

students are grouped because the flexibility in group membership across time is a key

feature of its instructional design (Tomlinson et al., 1997). However, Jane was also able

to see beyond this approach and utilize grouping practices across her entire curriculum

even when she was not focusing on uses of differentiated instruction. For example, she

was able to used varied structures to group students in science, a subject area where she

did not attempt the challenge of differentiation. Her commitment to this aspect of her

instruction greatly enhanced her ability to succeed with both the social and academic

learning needs of her students. Jane wrote in her portfolio:

> Providing opportunities for students to work and learn alongside peers is
> extremely important. Through discussing, problem solving, experimenting and
> questioning together, students grow not only academically, but socially as well.
> (Jane's portfolio)

She recognized the social and academic value of grouping her students in ways that

provided opportunities to learn together. Below are several examples for how Jane

worked with this approach in her classroom.

WebQuest. The students participated in a group-based WebQuest (Dodge, 2001)

on both British and American spies of the American Revolution during their social

studies and computer lab time during the spring lead teaching period.[13] This is one of the

most powerful examples of Jane's efforts to vary her grouping practices to support both

the academic and social growth of her students' learning needs. In this case, because I

taught the Revolutionary War as a part of my elementary social studies curriculum and

was also using WebQuest materials with the university social studies methods course I

was teaching, I was able to provide significant support and resources for Jane in

determining the logistics of the project as well as support quality reflection on her

experiences with this activity.

For the WebQuest activity, students worked in groups of three where each student

had a role to play in his/her group (map maker, writer of the coded spy letter, and

strategizer for the logistics of the battleground information). Jane and I had a series of

conversations about how to structure the groups for this activity once it became apparent

---

[13] A WebQuest (Dodge, 2001) is a tool that allows students to access the World Wide Web through a structured task where students commonly work in groups to learn about a topic through pre-selected websites and scaffolded use of technology.

that they would need different strengths in each group. Did she play to the strengths that students had to offer? Did she challenge any of the students by placing them in a role that might be something that they would find more complex but that she felt they could do? We went through the series of options that she had and brainstormed the pros and cons of the different approaches, but ultimately, I felt that as the field instructor, the decision was hers to make (Glickman et al., 1995). Jane was able to use the support of our work together to select among her options for how best to manage this problem in her classroom. She was able to successfully make the transition from our brainstorming experiences to the implementation of solutions that we both deemed appropriate (this is something that David was unable to do). During our debriefing conference on March 5, Jane went through the logistics of the group membership with me, describing the final decisions she had made about how to best group the students:

> **Alisa: How did you decide who got what job?**
> Jane: I tried to look at what I know about them and what they seemed to enjoy. Like I know Alex enjoys puzzles and he makes up his own language so I knew he'd love making a code because that's totally his thing.
> **Alisa: Uh-huh.**
> Jane: I know Sasha and Samantha love to draw and so I thought they'd be really good at making a map.
> **Alisa: Yeah, Sasha's map is really quite detailed.**
> Jane: Yeah, I'm trying to think of others...like if it didn't strike me that they'd really like a puzzle type thing or a map then I tried to make them a strategist type person. Like Tim, I know he's really good thinking at through things so I thought he'd be really good for that. Obviously not everyone can fit something but I got most of them somewhere I think they'd be...
> **Alisa: So the goal this time was to support instead of extend?**
> Jane: Yeah, because it was something new. My goal was more to, we're trying this so it's probably easiest to try it the first time if you're in a role you're comfortable with.
> **[...]**
> **Alisa: No one seemed too stressed, no one was freaking out over it or anything.**
> Jane: No, and I think three is a good number to do in a group.

Alisa: Uh-huh. And if you can keep it from being two that get along really well and one who, if you can keep it from being a weird triad.

Jane: And so after I picked, first I picked here are going to be my map people and my code people and then I kind of paired them based on who I know works well together...

Alisa: So role first and then by group instead of grouping them and then trying to assign the roles, oh that makes sense.

Jane: Uh-huh. And then also I wanted people of varying abilities because I wanted them to be able to work together because...and then sometimes, well, when I know when you put the higher end people together some of those boys get angry at each other because they all have their own way and they're very uncompromising when they're together but when they're with other people they do well. The same with the lower end, I'm afraid if I put them all together then...

Alisa: It's too difficult?

Jane: It wouldn't get done or it would be too hard, yeah. (March 5 debriefing conference, p. 2-3)

Jane clearly had a complex mental map of the decisions she made about how best to group students to complete the WebQuest activity. She took into consideration a wide range of factors and structured her groups to best support her instructional goals as well as their academic and social needs. In reflecting on how the lessons were going, Jane described her classroom as functioning well and highly engaged in the activity:

Jane: Yeah, this is the most engaged I've seen them, the most percent of kids engaged on one thing.

Alisa: ...every single person I asked was like, "Oh yeah, this was awesome."

Jane: But they all are, every time I look around, every single person is doing their job. [...] all the questions I would hear are "Maybe I should do this" or "Let's see this together." You know, asking each other and "No, no this is what it is." You know? (March 5 debriefing conference)

Jane's appreciation for their enthusiasm is backed up by her efforts in advance of the instruction to develop successfully functioning groups and she was able to play that out in the classroom. The time we spent together prior to the implementation supported these efforts and encouraged her confidence in her approach. Her multifaceted approach to determining group membership was worth the time, thought and effort as demonstrated by their language as she described it used in their groups.

Book Club. During Book Club, Jane also faced the challenge of figuring out how to design supportive groups of mixed abilities since all children were reading the same novel on the Revolutionary War, *The Fighting Ground* (Avi, 1987). She was concerned that it would be obviously easier for some and more difficult for others. Jane prioritized group membership for this instructional period "based on who can and can't work together" (March 2 debriefing conference, p. 6). She acknowledged that it seemed to be more by default that she ended up with groups of mixed ability, primarily because she often strove to separate the four gifted boys when she could to reduce the amount of time they spent working only with each other. Jane expressed concern that the students were unable to work in these groups independently, despite their experiences with Book Club in fourth grade (field instruction field notes, p. 24-25) and that she was unsure how best to implement this model. I believe that our common framing of the problem Jane faced, and our other work together to successfully manage this problem, made Jane feel more comfortable in exploring her uncertainties about Book Club with me.

I played a significant role in helping her to identify the concerns that she felt were present in the structure and to consider how what she was trying to do (or not do) conflicted with the model of Book Club, as well as encouraging her to seek assistance from Laura Pardo, her literacy instructor (and an original participant in the development of the Book Club instructional model). This was a case where I was able to support Jane in working through something that she was dissatisfied with in her classroom. In this case, I provided support as she navigated a new instructional model, worked with students who already struggled to cooperate in groups, and also provided the kind of

guidance during reflection that reaffirmed her attempts to move beyond her own comfort level in trying something complex with her students.

Jane was frustrated with their misbehavior in the several groups that she was trying to oversee. Rebecca had taken one group out of the room and a parent had pulled another group into the hallway to work with them; Jane was trying to oversee the remaining groups in the room on her own. Jane and I spoke repeatedly about her options for simultaneously supporting their group work and the components of the instructional model of Book Club. I suggested to her that she think about how she was facilitating the groups and what her role as an adult might be in the group. She was doing a lot of directing the conversation and I suggested to her that perhaps they needed more help in learning to talk and listen with less attention to the actual content of the talk. I encouraged her to believe that they could be taught to do this part on their own with less emphasis from her (field instruction field notes, p. 24-25). Ultimately, with support from Laura and myself, Jane was able to guide the groups to learn to talk effectively together and work across ability levels (student-specific field notes, p. 9). Her satisfaction with this instructional model and activity increased noticeably. At the end of the process, Jane was able to see this value in this kind of discussion:

> I think that by having the open structure of discussion and not as much having a right or wrong, but observing and then talking about it and then pulling those, not correct but more accurate things out of it, it kind of lets everybody participate, not critical. (Jane's spring interview, p. 4-5)

While not an entirely positive example of effective grouping (there was at least one student who had to be moved to the group monitored by Rebecca so as to receive constant supervision), this description documents Jane's commitment to help students work effectively in groups and her desire to do whatever she needed to do to make it

work. This included her willingness to acknowledge publicly when she was struggling to implement an approach in the classroom and uncertain about her own knowledge and ability to do so. This experience demonstrated an openness in our relationship and willingness to work with me to manage the solution that was most appropriate for this aspect of her problem. Jane was committed to supporting her students in group activities and to varying her grouping practices in order to meet both academic and social needs in the classroom. As her field instructor, I was committed to letting her try things out and then reflect on how they went, while providing necessary guidance and encouragement to take these risks in her learning.

Final Outcomes of these Efforts

By the end of the year, Jane was pleased with the students' growth and reflected on how each of the four gifted boys had learned something about themselves as learners and also developed a deeper respect (or at least patience) for their classmates' ideas and involvement in learning. All four of these boys learned to contain themselves in ways that supported the efforts of their classmates in the book club discussion among many other settings for working together. At the end of the year, Jane commented:

> Jane: When I think of the gifted boys, when I think of Mike and how much he's grown, he's just not a problem. When I think of Tim, I mentioned to you earlier, he's come a long way, he's really not a behavior problem, doesn't intimidate people anymore. Josh keeps to himself but is still convinced he knows everything. Jake is a big mouth.
> **Alisa: Jake has always been more verbal about it.**
> Jane: Yeah, he always has been but it's significantly less than it was at the beginning of the year. (Jane's spring interview, p. 9-10)

Rebecca reflected on their mutual satisfaction with the progress she and Jane made:

> She and I had a talk just the beginning of this week about how far we've gone especially with that top group and their attitudes and everything and how they've really, really changed and I don't know if it was an aha but just a real pride in

what we've done together with this particular group that at the beginning of the year we thought, we're never gonna like these guys. So it was just kind of a sparkle in her eye; you could tell she felt really good about how far we'd come with them. I don't know if you'd call that an aha but just…kind of the whole idea of working with these guys and I think they're happy, I mean a couple of the parents complained at conferences; a couple of the others said that they loved coming to school which is great. We didn't know if we'd ever get there with them. (spring interview, p. 9)

While managing the learning and social demands of the wide range of needs in the classroom was a challenge for Jane, so too was managing the social dimensions of the classroom. It is evident that all three of these broad strategies (differentiated instruction, methods for student participation, and varied grouping procedures) that Jane engaged in with her instruction overlap and influence each other. This case creates a reasonably positive picture overall of Jane's success in managing the social and academic challenges of this classroom. Many of her endeavors exceeded the expectations we have of novice teachers in the early days of their teaching experiences. Jane was able to engage in the complexities of designing and organizing differentiated instruction and successfully working to balance her own needs as a learner in the teaching process with the issues of social and academic growth for her students. In the long run, both Jane and Rebecca were happy with the outcomes and progress they had made during the school year. As her field instructor, I was also pleased with the progress that Jane made in balancing this complex tension in her classroom.

Field Instruction Support for Working with Academic Ability Issues

Jane reflected more on her learners and their needs, both academic and social, than she did on her own learning needs as a teacher candidate. Instead of a focus on how she explored her own development, she considered her teaching practices and instruction in direct relationship to her students' specific learning needs. Jane reflected continually

on her learners and regularly shared how their needs influenced her practice. Compared to David, Jane had a much more developed sense of the need to know the learner in order to engage in responsive instructional practices. At the end of the year, Jane reflected that:

> What I found helpful this year was knowing where their strengths are and where their needs are because by knowing those things you can more individually plan or on the fly decide who's gonna need what. If you don't, then it's kind of like guesswork so…that's what I'd most like to know. I don't know that you can immediately know it. It'll take some time but…. (student interview, p. 7)

However, as a learner herself, Jane did strive to take advantage of the resources around her including people and materials. During the fall interview, Rebecca was asked about Jane as a learner and she discussed how Jane was someone who would go ahead and seek the resources that were available to her in order to be active in her knowledge as well as "com[ing] back with ideas from Alisa. I just see her eager to learn" (Rebecca's fall interview, p. 2). Rebecca also commented that as a field instructor, I served as a resource for Jane on issues of classroom diversity. When it comes to the role and activities of the field instructor, both Jane and Rebecca valued the curricular and instructional ideas that I was able to provide as Jane worked with this challenge of an academically diverse classroom. I believe that these resources served a purpose beyond providing Jane with specific materials and strategies to use in her instruction. The sharing of resources led to theoretically and conceptually rich conversations about Jane's experiences in her planning, teaching, and working with her learners. Being a field instructor is not simply about providing 'stuff' to interns but rather to use that material as an entry into a conversation about rationales, purposes and goals for learners. I believe that I served as a catalyst for Jane's critical thinking and constant reflection on her practice. One way that I started those conversations was by sharing my personal resources and experiences as a

lens for talking about the broader issues of teaching practice. Because Jane and I framed the situation in her classroom in similar ways, our work together flowed naturally out of that understanding.

From early in the year, Jane seemed to be able to take information from our seminar lessons on differentiation and issues of ability in the classroom and transfer these experiences to her particular classroom. Our work together on the framed problem supported her efforts to move from theory to practice in the classroom. Jane recognized the intentional planning of seminar topics to meet the needs of the interns and the salient issues in the context of Lancaster Elementary, "Looking at the needs of the whole, like for seminars and being able to pick that out and decide what those are going to be about based on what issues seem to be [critical] or problems" (Jane's spring interview, p. 11). She did this in a way that speaks to the potential of seminar as a place for theoretical conversation about issues of practice. This is also in direct contrast to the experiences that Tomlinson et al. (1997) found in their research on student teachers' use of differentiated instruction in their classrooms after participating in professional development where student teacher struggled to implement their new ideas. I hypothesize that this is due to the continued support she had in implementing these ideas in the classroom from her collaborating teacher and grade level colleagues (as they switched classes for teaming purposes) as well as from me.

I also believe that this may be due to the additional support that I was able to provide her because of my personal experiences and professional knowledge base in differentiated instruction. I was able to sit with her and help her to reflect on what did or did not work, building off our common knowledge shared during seminar as well as the

182

additional knowledge of differentiated instruction developed through personal experience that I brought to the situation. Rebecca reflected on this during the fall interview, describing the support I had provided to Jane:

> I think they [Alisa and Jane] talked about working with our challenging group and things they could do. Alisa shared some math activities and she comes in and questions what she did and Jane thinks about it. She gives her things to think about. (Rebecca's fall interview, p. 4)

Because all of the issues between academic and social needs were intimately connected (i.e. how she chose to instruct her students had an impact on their social relationships and how they related had an impact on how she designed instruction), we were able to use our time together to reflect on how she might better structure these learning opportunities to meet both sets of needs. I do not believe that these shared experiences were necessary to support Jane's efforts (I was able to do similar things with her in science when she was teaching a topic I was unfamiliar with), but I do believe that it enhanced the exchange of ideas in ways that pushed her farther faster because I was able to bring my own prior knowledge to the situation. Perhaps at times, this also compromised the learning because I made assumptions about the commonality of our knowledge and interest instead of feeling a need to stop and probe more deeply as I might have in areas where I was less certain of the terrain. Since Jane and I were both interested in these issues, those such as the language learning needs of certain children (who were not recent immigrants but spoke another language at home) were not prominent in our work together.

Jane most valued my classroom observations of her teaching as a critical component of field instruction practice that helped her to deal with the complexity of the academic and social needs present in her classroom. She felt that these observations and subsequent debriefing conferences where we had the opportunity to discuss her

classroom experiences were "most helpful in my own reflecting of where I should go next" (Jane's spring interview, p. 11). As a field instructor, these observational opportunities provided me with the chance to understand how best to support Jane's needs by coming to better understand her students for myself. Part of my role was to point out to her the social workings that were going on while she was teaching. All teachers fail to notice some of the activity of students during instruction; beginners tend to be particularly susceptible to this trend because of their intense focus on the sequence and flow of their instruction. As Jane's field instructor, I was able to observe and document patterns that she might be unaware of but interested in knowing about so as to improve relationships and learning. For example, recall the situation described earlier in this chapter of the student who was attempting to draw other students' attention to the mistakes of the autistic student. My knowledge of her students fostered our work together and backed up the value of the suggestions I was making because I was able to show her who might benefit from a specific move or help her play out what might happen for a certain student as the result of a particular course of action.

Observation allowed me to provide the degree of support needed for Jane to reflect on her practice and make sense of her learning about what was working and what was not during instruction. Jane described this process as "open-ended" (particularly when helping her think through her planning of activities) and "guiding" when helping her to consider how something might or did play out in the classroom (Jane's spring interview, p. 12). I see this as well connected to my own sense of my practice as social constructivist, where we worked together to help her develop her learning about teaching with respect for her novice ideas, but also opportunities to use my more expert

knowledge about teaching to support her development of new knowledge about practice.

I believe that it takes a great deal of skill as a field instructor to find the place where the

appropriate balance of guidance and support is located for an individual intern. Just like

children, each intern learner is unique and for Jane we were successful in finding a

balance that both she and I were comfortable with as supportive for her learning.

Jane was also able to use our experiences and conversation together to help her

see how a discussion of one idea might influence her practice in another way. Jane

understood the relationship between the ideas we discussed and how I considered what

she was doing in the classroom with the reflection that we both engaged in on her

practice. Jane described this process to the research assistant who conducted the fall

interview:

> Jane: When I'm planning, I'll share, well I'm thinking about this, or this is what
> I'm doing and I have some ideas and she'll [Alisa] go, "Oh I know this really
> good idea, too." and she'll help me. It won't be, I don't ever feel like I have to
> use it, but I could take it and develop it or change it. She has lots of resources
> and ideas for planning, too.
> **Interviewer: So she's not only accessible, but she's approachable and she
> seems to give you a lot of options that you can make your own.**
> Jane: And what feedback when she observes is very constructive. She might say,
> "Well, did you think about this, or how could you do this instead of 'you should
> have done this." It's very positive. I don't ever feel like I did a bad job. Just
> here's something you might think to make it better. (Jane's fall interview, p. 5)

This type of comment is typical of other comments made by Jane about the kinds of

support that she found helpful and the role that I played as a field instructor in her process

of learning to teach. These kinds of activities lend themselves well to a social

constructivist stance towards field instruction practice. Jane indicates that she felt in

control of the decisions to be made and that she felt respected in our interactions because

at no time was she pushed to do something a certain way or directed to do something

differently. From Glickman et al.'s continuum (1995), this is clearly a series of nondirective behaviors on my part – providing Jane with reflection, listening, and supporting her decision making. Suggestions about her choices and options for designing curriculum and instructional practices are something that I also offered. Like David's case, this is not considered nondirective behaviors on the supervisory belief continuum; however, for novice teachers, I believe this to be a necessary step in helping teacher candidates to understand and comprehend their options for action so that they can make useful and informed decisions.

<div align="center">Implications for Field Instruction Practices</div>

Jane's case provides an opportunity to consider implications of practice for field instructors working with interns in inclusive or mixed-ability classrooms. In particular, the relative newness of this structure for the collaborating teacher allowed me as a field instructor to find access to opportunities to support Jane's growth in concert with Rebecca. In this school setting, Jane and Rebecca also had a great deal of freedom to have flexible goals for a range of students. This is very different than the working conditions in schools under intensive scrutiny and pressure of No Child Left Behind and grant programs such as Reading First. Lancaster Elementary was a place where teachers are afforded the freedom to make the instructional and curricular decisions that they deem most appropriate for meeting a range of learning needs.

Jane's case describes the importance of the field instructor knowing individual students in the classroom. While this case does not focus as closely on one student like David's case or Elizabeth's (to be described in the next chapter), there were several clusters of students in Jane's class that were necessary to understand in order to support

Jane's efforts to learn to teach. With a focus on the social and academic learning needs of students, it was helpful as Jane's field instructor to be able to talk intelligently about individual children and how an idea we were exploring might play out for them. Without the individual knowledge of the students, it would be much more difficult to tailor the support to meet the specifics of Jane's context and to ensure that she was paying careful attention to the needs of each of her students. Typically, this level of knowledge about students is not something that the field instructor develops since visits to classrooms are infrequent and sporadic; however, this has the potential to strengthen the role and contributions of the field instructor to an intern's learning process. This is an area for continued research and findings from this case demonstrate the value of knowledge about a wide range of students in the classroom.

Seminar conversations provided Jane with access to the theoretical knowledge she needed about differentiated instruction to make the move to her classroom instruction. For Jane, there was explicit carryover between the seminar and the activities of her classroom that she was able to make sense of and utilize in meaningful ways. This was also material that I was able to build off of in order to support her learning about differentiation and academic diversity. This demonstrates the potential of seminars for the dissemination of knowledge about any variety of topics related to diversity if there is the space and need to follow up on it in the regular day to day life of the classroom.

Additionally, Jane's story is primarily one of success due to the support and involvement of her collaborating teacher and grade level colleagues as well as her own drive and motivation to learn as much as possible about effective teaching. This case documents what is possible when the field instructor and the classroom teacher(s) are on

the same page in terms of the priority and focus of the intern's learning in the classroom. This also demonstrates what is possible in a less constrained class and school environment. While this focus on issues of academic diversity was certainly not my only goal for Jane, because I was able to support both Jane and Rebecca in this endeavor our progress was more significant than in cases where the CT and field instructor are on different pages as to the priorities of the teacher candidate's time in the internship classroom.

Working with Jane highlights the importance of conversation and guidance in reflection. It also highlights the value of sharing personal teaching experiences to support an intern's ability to make sense of the opportunities and challenges present in the classroom. Using my personal, practical knowledge as well as theoretical understanding of the complexities of inclusion and differentiation helped me to communicate with Jane about a range of classroom issues and practices. Because I had deep, conceptual knowledge of the subject, I was able to question, probe, challenge etc.

Part of this accomplishment is likely due to the fact that Jane and I had a common frame for the problem she faced in her classroom. The bulk of this case documents how we were able to work together to successfully manage this problem in the context of her classroom. Jane and I were both satisfied with the direction of her work at the time and experienced little to no dissonance or tension in our work together around this issue. Rebecca's investment and involvement in this frame further supported our work together even when we were not in her presence. Jane recognized that Rebecca was on the same page with her and was comfortable with the ideas we were discussing and Jane was sharing with her. Rebecca supported Jane's implementation of the ideas we discussed

and Jane's decisions about how to best work through this in the classroom. This positive decision may, on reflection, hide a number of issues that we overlooked in our work together.

My comfort level with this classroom caused me to jump wholeheartedly on the issue as something I could tackle to support Jane's growth as a teacher. Someone with less knowledge on this particular topic might not have been able to support her in the same way, but may have been more observant of things that I overlooked when Jane and I were able to work together to frame and manage the problem successfully of social and academic issues. Other issues worthy of my attention as a field instructor may have been places where I could have also served to push Jane's thinking about her classroom practices. However, because we felt a common interest and approach for some issues that were particularly salient in the context this year, perhaps I focused too narrowly on the work that we were doing on meeting this need. While I believe that this was time well spent in that it benefited Jane's thinking about her teaching and her students, it did take time away from other issues that could have been explored and obscure areas where I could have the role of challenging her beliefs and practices. I could have forced her to confront her beliefs about additional types of diversity in the classroom beyond academic differences. Our teacher preparation program advocates that our interns develop a broader conception of diversity than any one feature. As field instructors, we must come to understand our own biases and preferences and explore how these may hide tensions that are present in the classroom. Because I was able to work so closely with Jane and Rebecca on something that I valued as a former classroom teacher, I played off my own

strengths to the possible disservice of Jane's learning needs in other areas of the process of learning to teach.

Early in the year, Jane described the diversity in her classroom as "mostly academic diversity. I don't see a lot of racial/ethnic, that kind of diversity, but very diverse academically and what their academic needs are" (Jane's fall interview, p. 3). She did not focus on other aspects of diversity in her classroom as critical features of the student learning needs present in that context. In Jane's classroom, all students from culturally diverse backgrounds were also identified as special education students (though there were also White children identified with special education needs). This cultural diversity, and attention to their learning needs beyond ability, was subsumed by attention to other aspects of them as learners. Jane did not seem to see the connection between a student's cultural background and learning needs or experiences. She seemed to think of multicultural work as an add-on to the curriculum as it already existed (Banks, 1991, 1994). At the end of the year, Jane commented in her spring interview that she considered cultural diversity to be much easier to handle than ability learning needs:

> Jane: It [cultural diversity] doesn't frighten me at all, but I don't think that...I guess when I think of diversity, academic diversity seems a bigger concern to me than what background children come from. I know there's differences in backgrounds but I also feel like I can learn about those things and that's more adapting a style than, okay, you don't get this, what am I going to do? You know?
> Alisa: **So regardless of the other aspects the academic issues would be the ones that would still concern you next year?**
> Jane: Yeah, I think so.
> Alisa: **No matter where you get a job?**
> Jane: Yeah, I think it's easier, I mean, personal opinion, but I think it's easier to pull different cultural pieces into your curriculum and you know, talk to parents and talk to other people about what's going in your life, just like you would to someone here except maybe you would be gaining knowledge about their background instead of finding out more about someone very similar to yourself. So I don't really feel like there's anything you could do to prepare. And I really

feel like the teacher preparation program hits diversity hard in many ways up to this point so it's not really a concern. We talked about it in multiple classes, and especially, like I took CEP 240 and that's the whole focus of the class.

[...]

Alisa: What do you think you still need to learn about in order to be effective with all your students?

I feel like I'm never going to stop learning so that's a hard question. I think mostly it comes from knowing the individual students. I know my students well enough now to know this person is going to need this help and they're going to need me, [name of student] to sit down and read the directions with him and take that five minutes afterwards, or this person needs to listen to a book on tape because reading it they don't comprehend it, [student]'s that way, needs to hear it. She understands it, and gets it and knows it, you know what I mean?

Alisa: Right.

Jane: So I think the biggest thing is just learning about individual students. I don't know there's anything at this point that education could...I feel like I've been educated so much I kind of just need to go out there and try it and adapt and change and then as I go on, I'll probably pull in other things to read. (Jane's spring interview, p. 15)

While Jane appears comfortable and confident in her ability to handle other aspects of

diversity and the challenges that they might present, her attention to academic learning

needs at the cost of all other aspects of diversity this year underscores a series of

assumptions that were not explored in the internship context about what may be possible

in other contexts. As well, this is an example of the oversight that I described above

where our frames as field instructor and intern were so in tune with each other that we

lacked dissonance in our relationship that might have caused me to look beyond what was

working well and probe areas of growth and development for Jane. Although Jane

expressed comfort with issues such as cultural diversity, it seems as though she

underestimated the complexity of connecting learning needs with culturally responsive

teaching practices. Instead of probing this and working with Jane to challenge these

assumptions, I focused on the common frame we had for working with academic/social

issues in the classroom. While this was a valuable use of time and energy, it assumed

191

that there were not other issues to be explored. Obviously, hindsight gives me greater insight into this gap in our work together. Because the challenge of working with academic/social issues was a predominate focus of both Jane and Rebecca, it seemed to take center stage naturally. When asked to reflect on what else could have been done to help her with issues of classroom diversity, Jane felt that there was little that a field instructor could do but did attempt to brainstorm some ideas.

Among several other strategies already in place within the teacher preparation program's field placement structure (for example, ensuring variety in context across the junior and senior year field placement settings) Jane did suggest the value of some sort of "mini-professional development" between interns in different field settings to help them learn more about the variety of diversity present in the public schools. However, this does not address the oversight of the diversity that *was actually* present in her classroom at Lancaster Elementary. Rebecca described the diversity of Lancaster Elementary:

> The ability, the range of ability, and we do have different culture, there's Paul, they speak a different language at home. I know people do say that, that we're not diverse. We are, we're just diverse in a different way. So I guess they need to be able to communicate what differences there are. Just because we're not a lot of different colors, that there are differences that we have to work with. (Rebecca's spring interview, p. 16)

Rebecca goes on to suggest that one thing a field instructor could do to help interns see the diversity would be to specifically "come right out and label" it (Rebecca's spring interview, p. 16). While Jane did not feel that there was much the field instructor could do in this context to support deeper understanding of the facets of diversity (Jane's spring interview, p. 15), this does not excuse the responsibility to pursue this agenda in ways that move students beyond this kind of mindset at the end of the year. Although I made attempts to do so in other contexts (such as seminar), in retrospect, it is clear that there

was not enough done to help Jane make sense of this in her classroom. Because our frames for the challenge she felt she faced became the primary focus of our work together, other aspects of practice around classroom diversity did not receive due attention.

The next chapter, and final case, explores the experiences that Elizabeth and I had around her work with Sam, a first grader from a lower socioeconomic background who struggled in all aspects of daily classroom life at Lancaster Elementary.

Chapter 6

HELPING ELIZABETH TO SET APPROPRIATE GOALS FOR STUDENTS AND HERSELF RELATED TO SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND TEACHER LEARNING

Elizabeth was an intern with a strong sense of herself as a teacher and a vision for who she felt she would become across the course of the internship year. As a child development major who had prior student teaching experience as a part of that program, Elizabeth arrived in Amanda's first grade classroom at Lancaster Elementary with a significant desire to learn as much about first grade as fast as she could. Elizabeth felt that her prior experience prepared her well for the challenges of the internship year and the complexities of planning and implementing instruction. Amanda and Elizabeth's class was filled with 25 active and often challenging first graders who pushed the learning curve for both teachers. Both Amanda and I were impressed with Elizabeth's quickly developed understanding of her students' learning needs and her wide range of ideas for how she might address these in the context of the classroom. At the end of the year, Amanda described her sense of Elizabeth's strengths:

> I think one of her biggest strengths is her questioning, her continual questioning of her own practice. Questioning what's put before her, not in a negative way, in a positive way. Well, how can I make this appropriate for the kids? What's the best way to do this? I think that's definitely one of her strengths. (Amanda's spring interview, p. 1)

Elizabeth consistently questioned all aspects of her teaching experience. She was able to use this approach to learning and her own natural curiosity about teaching as means of developing strong relationships with Amanda as well as myself as her field instructor. Although a strong teacher candidate who excelled from early on in the internship, Elizabeth had a tendency to set goals for herself as a learner and future teacher that were

beyond the scope of reason for what could be accomplished during the year. In December, Elizabeth commented about Amanda, "I just want to be at the same level that she's at. And if I leave in April being at the same level that she's at, then I'll feel like I'm prepared to teach because she has so much experience behind her" (Elizabeth's fall interview, p. 3). Elizabeth did not seem to recognize that this was simply not doable. Elizabeth failed to recognize the complexity of mastering competency in a field of teaching and underestimated the challenge she faced in trying to become an expert in her practice (Berliner, 1992). At the time of the internship, Amanda was in her 16th year of teaching either first or second grade and was working part time on her Master's degree in literacy (an area in which Elizabeth particularly wanted to be as competent as Amanda). These high expectations for herself would serve as a significant challenge for Elizabeth during the internship year.

In the context of this approach to her own developing practice, Elizabeth came face to face with a student, Sam, who would challenge many of her preconceived notions about the teaching philosophies advocated in her child development program. Sam also challenged her in management and behavior and forced her to confront her own assumptions about what first graders at Lancaster Elementary are "supposed" to be like and how to support a range of students in the classroom. The critical incident (Newman, 1990) in Elizabeth's process of learning to teach centered on Sam, a student new to Lancaster Elementary who was of a lower socioeconomic background and the only child in the classroom in this economic situation throughout the majority of the school year.[14] Sam had little parental support and many academic and behavioral issues that appeared

---

[14] While Sam's enrollment at Lancaster Elementary was not a direct result of the redistricting, the complex economic story of Sam's arrival at Lancaster will be described later in this chapter. One other child from a lower socioeconomic background came to the class for a portion of the spring semester.

out of the norm compared to the classroom in which he found himself. Elizabeth's experiences with Sam provided a context for us to explore broad conceptions of diversity and the influences of socioeconomic status on students in the classroom. The events took place within a district that continues to struggle with redistricting issues and teachers continue to learn to address the consequences of such policies.

This case explores my work with Elizabeth as she learned to address Sam's needs. Elizabeth confronted the challenge of how to support a student from a lower socioeconomic background in a context that assumes the presence of a certain amount or type of parental involvement, resources and motivation for both students and families. Data analysis revealed that our interactions were noticeably centered on Elizabeth's experiences in working with Sam in her internship classroom. Sam appeared in 2/3 of all conversations, debriefing conferences and classroom observation field notes. Early on, I provided support and guidance for how Elizabeth might meet Sam's needs in the classroom. As the internship year continued, I shifted gears in response to Elizabeth's unusually high expectations for herself and worked to help her set more reasonable goals for her own learning as well as for her satisfaction with the accomplishments Sam made over time. As David's case revealed, I pushed him to work on his practice because of my concerns about instruction for Lucia's English Language Learning needs. In Elizabeth's case, my pushing as a field instructor centered more on helping her to set reasonable, achievable goals rather than on her instruction for Sam (which was well-conceived and demonstrated worthwhile attempts to support his needs). In fact, my work with Elizabeth focused more on redirecting her growth by helping her to have a more realistic view of what's possible to accomplish during the internship year.

con:
soci
cen
she
al..
acc
fra
ex
fra
in
Eli
of

stu
cla
inst
(4)
tea

is nec
Eleme

Both social constructivist practices and Glickman et al.'s continuum will be considered as a part of the field instruction issues present in this case. I will show how social constructivist approaches to field instruction practice supported Elizabeth to a certain extent because of her curiosity and interest in learning to become the best teacher she could be. However, a modified version of a more directive approach (Glickman et al., 1995) had to be taken to help her to see her own progress and recognize her own accomplishments as a novice teacher. I will also take a careful look at how constructs of framing (Schon, 1987) fit into this case. In comparison to the two previous cases, my experiences with Elizabeth provide a lens into a situation that demonstrates how we framed the pedagogical problem of Elizabeth's work with Sam in similar ways. Yet, later in the year, my focus for my field instruction began to shift more towards how Elizabeth's management of this problem for herself complicated her own understanding of her progress in learning to teach.

This chapter explores (1) issues of redistricting and the influence this has on students and teachers; (2) Elizabeth's experiences with Sam and issues of SES in the classroom and school context as well as her high expectations for herself; (3) the field instruction support that was necessary to help Elizabeth learn to teach all students; and (4) the implications of this case for field instruction practices with highly motivated teacher candidates.

Redistricting and the Influences on School and Community

Before delving into the specifics of how Elizabeth responded to Sam's situation, it is necessary to consider the larger changes that were beginning to take place at Lancaster Elementary as the district began to experience the outcomes of redistricting. This case

first explores the issues of redistricting and the impact that this had on Lancaster Elementary and the teachers. I then explain how Sam came to attend Lancaster Elementary for the first time as a first grader.

A School with Changing Demographics

The greater suburban community in which Lancaster Elementary is located is primarily middle class. However, there are small pockets of lower socioeconomic housing in the form of trailer parks and government subsidized apartments. Prior to the year of this study, Lancaster Elementary served a population of middle to upper-middle class professionals with significant homes and property. There was one set of apartments as a part of the school's community but all other housing consisted of single-family homes and a few condominiums. The redistricting of the school system after closing an elementary school at the end of the 2002-2003 school year resulted in some demographic shifts at Lancaster Elementary. No children left Lancaster Elementary or any other existing schools during the redistricting process – the children (and teachers) from the closed school were simply parceled out to several elementary schools in the district. The school boundaries now included some of the lower socioeconomic housing that is in the district. For the teachers, this change resulted in conversation, confusion, and uncertainty as particular assumptions about the student population no longer held. For example, a number of the teachers expressed concern over whether children would be able to complete at home projects or homework assignments at the level of quality typically expected at this school.

Historically, the district level of school governance has varied in power and responsibility (Tyack, 2002). In the days of small, local school districts minority and

lower economic populations did not benefit from the same types of relationship and support as white, economically strong populations (Tyack, 2002). The voices of lower socioeconomic populations were not heard or supported and efforts were not made to develop inclusive governance systems at the district level to ensure the equality of all populations. Arguably, Sam's family and their larger community could be seen as representative of these voices. Today, there is great variety in the structure and size of school districts with varying resources, student populations, and expertise (Tyack, 2002).

The redistricting of school attendance zones was commonplace during the 1950's and 1960's as a result of the baby boom (Hyland, 1989). Hyland explained, however, that during times of lean enrollment, redistricting continues to occur as pockets of growth develop, neighborhoods 'grow up' and no longer possess large numbers of school-age children, and school districts lose students resulting in closed buildings. This is precisely what occurred in this school district in the summer prior to the year of this study. Additionally, this trend in the district is continuing as this dissertation is being written. The district is now considering initiatives for 2005-2006 to either close schools, shift school populations to develop fewer buildings through reorganizational efforts such as creating K-2 and 3-5 buildings, or to maintain the status quo in number of schools but redistrict again to shift student numbers in an effort to equalize class size. This process has challenged many of the teachers in the district who feel that they will retire early rather than make another school move and has introduced uncertainty into the future of all teachers and students.

Consider, for example, that during the redistricting process in Springfield, Ohio, Rieger, as chair of the redistricting committee, (1994) found that "the redistricting

options had uncovered deep-seated resentments, negative perceptions, and class divisions within the district" (p. 37). Informal anecdotal evidence at Lancaster Elementary has not uncovered "deep-seated resentments" towards the new students; however, there has been close scrutiny by teachers and parents of currently enrolled students of the children, their families, and concerns over their abilities to provide the 'necessary resources' for success at this school.

Both Amanda and Elizabeth were aware of these trends and conscious of Sam's needs when he appeared in their classroom during the second week of school (for whatever reason, Sam did not come to school during the first week of classes).[15] (March 24 debriefing conference, p. 5-6). Redistricting, even in its most minor form, has the power to alter the ways that teachers think about teaching, learning and their students. Wilmore (1995) argues that the attitudes of the teachers are the most critical aspect in a successful redistricting experience and that positive attitudes and the belief that the teachers expect every student to succeed and take the responsibility to help them learn is the appropriate response to changes in student population. In the context of Lancaster Elementary, issues of income and socioeconomic status are the focus of the influx of this new student population (see also Rieger, 1995). Sam represented the beginning of this trend of a new student population that is becoming more prevalent in the district schools and at Lancaster Elementary in particular.

Sam's History and Coming to Lancaster Elementary

Increasingly, our society is becoming more economically diversified with greater populations of children in poverty or in the upper-middle to upper class while the size of

---

[15] No one seems to know where Sam was during the first week of school (which was three days long) and this was indicative of the lack of communication that the parents had with the school and teachers.

the working class and the middle class is shrinking (Ramsey, 1998). Socioeconomic or

class status is a variable of diversity in student population that is often ignored or

imbedded in larger issues of inequality in schooling. Race is often conflated with

socioeconomic status, ignoring the significant and important populations of rural, low

income white children whose characteristics differ from their teachers just like

differences in racial and ethnic minority children. Sam represented this population of

poor white children (although Sam did not come from a rural district when he enrolled in

Lancaster Elementary). Like race, socioeconomic status is often salient only to those

who differ from the norm with less attention paid to affluence by those who need not

worry about it (Ramsey, 1998). Attention needs to be specifically paid to how teachers

address and accommodate socioeconomic diversity in the classroom.

Lancaster Elementary, as Amanda described it, is:

> Very easy in some regards and very difficult in others. Very supportive parental
> group. Very supportive. But at the same time then, also very picky. And very
> demanding so it kind of keeps you on your toes and of course, you have probably
> middle to upper class economic status here" (Amanda's fall interview, p. 3).

Recognizing this, Sam did not fit the standard family or student description of the

population at Lancaster Elementary. Sam's parents were not involved in his education in

the traditional sense; Amanda and Elizabeth had difficulty across the entire year in

getting them to come to conferences, return paperwork or phone calls, and attend special

meetings to talk about Sam's learning needs. Initially, the only knowledge of Sam's

outside life was that he had previously attended and repeated Kindergarten in a

neighboring urban school district and was already seven at the beginning of first grade

(field instruction field notes, p. 2). It was understood that Sam and his family had moved

into his grandmother's home in the lower income area that had been redistricted to attend

Lancaster Elementary. Later in the year, it was determined that Sam's family was actually living out of district, had not followed the procedures for requesting School of Choice enrollment at Lancaster, and was using his grandmother's mailing address in order to attend this school while his parents drove him into school each day. The parents were often very late picking him up, which was what prompted the careful look at where he was living and what his family life was like outside of school (student-specific field notes, p. 24-26). Elizabeth and Amanda were frustrated by this lack of honesty from the family and felt that they were struggling to educate Sam without outside support or consideration for their efforts to help him learn. No one was ever given an explanation for the family's desire to have him attend Lancaster Elementary instead of attending school in his home district. Although perhaps it is one indication that they did care about his education.

The next section explores how Elizabeth and I worked together to support her efforts to educate Sam in this first grade classroom and how she made sense of his particular learning needs and familial situation. In this context, I explore my work in helping her to develop reasonable goals for her own practice and for Sam.

Helping Elizabeth Learn to Work with Sam

Elizabeth faced a number of challenges in learning to support Sam's learning needs in the classroom. As a beginner, Elizabeth was well prepared for the rigors of the internship and was an intern who could be relied on to push and challenge herself to design the best possible instruction for her students. The students in Elizabeth's class were not the easiest to work with. As a result of some staffing changes in first grade for that school year, there seemed to be an attempt on the part of the administration to load

up Amanda's class with the students that the Kindergarten teachers and principal were most concerned about academically (either high or low) or felt needed a consistent presence for behavioral reasons.[16] Amanda described her class make-up during her fall interview:

> Well, it is a very active class. Behaviors are challenging. This is the biggest class I've ever had. [...] And three more children [compared to last year] added to the pot makes a really big difference. [...] There were a lot of needy children emotionally, needy children, which has been different from the three years prior to that in this school district where there was a more laid back, even keel class. [...] Kids coming in that could barely read, and then children that are coming in that are fluent readers and the same with math and with writing. Behavior is the biggest issue, I think. (Amanda's fall interview, p. 4)

Adding Sam to this situation seemed to tip the balance in some ways. His presence in this classroom after the first week caused both Amanda and Elizabeth to question how much more they could handle and effectively address. During the second week of school, Amanda commented to me on his arrival and hypothesized that this was going to be a difficult year (field instruction field notes, p. 2).

After several weeks with Sam, Elizabeth and Amanda came to the realization that they faced quite a challenge in figuring out how to support Sam in this classroom, both academically and socially. Sam's performance (in both behavior and academics) was not up to the level of the majority of his peers. No other children in the class needed both academic and behavioral support to fit the norms of the classroom to the extent that Sam demonstrated. For example, two other children who presented a behavioral challenge were learning at a typical first grade level. Another child with special education needs

---

[16] Lancaster had only two first grades during this school year and the second classroom was staffed by two teachers who were job sharing and both new to the school, causing concern that there might not be the kind of behavioral or academic support necessary in the second classroom. As a result, Amanda's class was heavily loaded with all children who were behavioral or academic issues (both gifted and special education). Sam was assigned to this classroom without any real awareness of the way that these issues would play out over the course of the year and placed here to address class size concerns.

was one of the most compliant and agreeable children in the classroom. The initial thought expressed by a number of specialty teachers (art, music, and physical education) and others in and out of the classroom setting was that Sam must have special education needs. While I was aware of the challenge Sam was presenting through my own observations in the classroom (both formally and casually), Elizabeth's and Amanda's response to Sam caught my attention.

Elizabeth reported to me on a conversation that she and Amanda had about Sam and his performance in the classroom where they both took a step back from the situation to question what was going on. Their initial response was to assume that Sam might have special education needs but then considered whether Sam had ever had the opportunity to learn some of the things that other students in the classroom had already mastered (field instruction field notes, p. 2). For example, all but one other student in the classroom had already demonstrated proficiency with numbers up to thirty. They discussed whether he'd had the outside support and guidance to have many of the experiences that other students had already had by first grade. For instance, children in this school have typically traveled out of state and sometimes out of the country by first grade, are taken many places for educational fun (such as museums), learn to interact socially with peers through numerous extracurricular activities, and have extensive experiences with reading and school-type learning activities in the home. Elizabeth and Amanda assumed that Sam did not have these experiences.

Based on this experience and conversations with Amanda and myself, Elizabeth concluded that one simply could not assume to know what was going in the classroom based on past school location or home location and that she (as an intern teacher) could

not also assume that Lancaster Elementary's population and student make-up was typical.

Elizabeth also recognized that Sam was having issues adjusting to the classroom and was not socially accepted by his peers or succeeding in making his way into the classroom learning community. By the end of her conversation with me, Elizabeth explained that she did not think it was fair for her to make assumptions about what Sam should be able to do based on his membership in this classroom, nor could she or should she make assumptions about his outside life or experiences based on her knowledge of his family or his prior school district. Given that, Elizabeth resolved to think carefully and thoughtfully about how she could support Sam in the classroom.

Lareau (1987, 2000) researched the ways that parents' social class contributed to students' successes in school. Parents from the working class do not have access to the same social resources as parents in the middle class who support their students in school in fundamentally different ways. Culturally, these families have a different approach to education than the middle class population from which most teachers come and on which many schools function. Lareau's work indicates that social class is a variable that affects school experiences for students and must be considered by teachers as they work to meet students' learning needs. As a field instructor, I was delighted to see that Elizabeth was beginning to question the assumptions she made about students and that she also needed to stop, slow down, and question what Sam might need based on her knowledge of him as a learner in this context. Social class and ability grouping are often conflated with lower income children placed in lower tracked classes or groups (Nieto, 1999). Elizabeth's efforts to step back and reassess demonstrated that she hesitated to simply step into this trap. This conversation served to cement an ongoing dialogue Elizabeth and I had about

Sam and her academic and behavioral work with him across the entire internship year. This conversation also served as an opportunity for us to work collaboratively to name and frame (Schon, 1987) the challenges that Elizabeth faced in working with Sam. From a subsequent set of conversations, Elizabeth and I were able to develop a foundational understanding of what she thought about the situation with Sam and work to manage this problem across the year.

The following sections explore how I supported Elizabeth's efforts to manage the problem as she strove to build Sam's relationships with his peers and her attempts to reconcile her child development beliefs to the reality of this particular first grade classroom and Sam. Throughout these sections, I will also pay attention to how Elizabeth and I worked together in order to learn to set more reasonable goals for herself as well as for Sam.

Supporting Sam Socially and Academically

Sam had difficulty making friends and working successfully on group projects with the other students in the class, particularly the other boys. Elizabeth felt there was a connection between Sam's difficulty in social situations and his experiences outside of school. At the end of the year, Elizabeth reflected on Sam's social needs:

> Socially he still struggles, he's...I mean friendship wise, touching his classmates, he still has issues...but part of that comes from...I feel like he has a lack of emotional support at home because his is one that needs that hug, that encouragement more than anyone else in this room. Socially he still has so many issues with other kids. (Elizabeth's student interview, p. 1)

Elizabeth strove to make something work for Sam, recognizing that he had few connections with the other students outside of school and had difficulty playing with them in appropriate ways on the playground. She also recognized that he needed support

206

in working with peers on group projects and concerned herself with determining who Sam would work with and how to provide support to Sam as well as the other children to make this a successful experience. This section will explore how Elizabeth and I interacted around activities in the classroom where the intersection of Sam's behavioral and academic needs influenced Elizabeth's experience in learning to teach, and instances of parental involvement and community issues that complicated attempts to support Sam's social growth with his classmates.

Intersecting Behavioral and Academic Needs

When Sam lacked opportunities to interact with his peers and his teachers were busy with other things, Sam would often choose to 'entertain' himself in ways that were socially inappropriate and behaviorally unacceptable. For example, one day Sam decided to walk on top of the tables where students sat as a means of getting around the room (student-specific field notes, p. 24-26).[17] This became a distraction to all children in the class, a number of whom quickly announced Sam's behavior to each other and to the teachers, effectively redirecting all activity in the classroom. While the children were displeased with this behavior, they also engaged in a number of conversations about Sam and his constant misbehavior for attention. On another occasion, I observed a child at Sam's table engaging his tablemates in a discussion of Sam's constant misbehavior by noting that Sam had fewer stickers for positive behavior on his self-control chart than any other child at the table (March 8 classroom observation field notes, p. 1).

---

[17] Half of the tables for students' work areas in this classroom had no legs and sat only a foot off the floor. Children sitting at these tables did not sit in chairs but instead on the carpeted floor. Their low height was tempting to Sam as a surface on which to sit and walk. On this particular occasion, he gave in to that temptation.

One of Sam's most common attempts to get others' attention was to mess with their materials and supplies for learning (student-specific field notes, p. 9-10). I witnessed this repeatedly throughout the year as Sam struggled to find ways to engage his peers in interactions with him. As a member of the classroom community, I was able to use my personal experiences of seeing Sam and his peers in action to support Elizabeth's attempts to manage this problem. This section includes several examples of how I supported Elizabeth as she worked with Sam to support his academic and social needs in the environment of his first grade class. First I will provide examples related to Sam's academic needs in an environment that he found socially challenging. The second section focuses on how Sam interacted with his peers during learning times.

Supporting Sam's academic needs in a social context. Elizabeth worked hard to support Sam's academic needs in the structure of the classroom. Elizabeth and Amanda used reader's and writer's workshop approaches for literacy instruction (Calkins, 1994; Miller, 2002).[18] Sam had difficulty with the open nature of these times and the structure challenged Elizabeth to manage both academic and social needs at the same time. I will describe several experiences that Elizabeth had with Sam during these times as well as explain how I used my field instruction practices to help Elizabeth think through these challenges.

During an observation of writer's workshop, Sam had to be redirected a number of times because he was following another child around the room threatening to write on him with markers. Both Elizabeth and the classroom aide spoke to him about this

---

[18] Reader's and writer's workshop approaches are based on the premise that all children need opportunities to read and write at their own functional level. Each instructional model begins with a mini-lesson on a relevant skill or strategy followed by time for children to read or write, ending with opportunities to share their experiences.

behavior. Elizabeth later came to work one on one with him and he continued to try to

get another classmate's attention by trying to write on him with the marker as well.

Elizabeth was ultimately frustrated with his consistent focus on his classmates instead of

on his own work during writer's workshop (March 23 classroom observation field notes,

p. 1). When talking about this at the during the debriefing conference, Elizabeth

commented,

> ...if he doesn't even feel like he can do it, it's like an outburst, he's just all over
> the room and into everybody's....you know what I mean? Messing with people
> and I've not quite figured it out because even when I feel like it might be a little
> bit below what he can do, I just think he doesn't want to sit down and focus and
> so right away thinks he can't. (March 23 debriefing conference, p. 1)

Elizabeth was particularly frustrated with this lesson because she had structured writer's

workshop in a way that allowed Sam to participate even though his writing skills were

significantly below grade level. She allowed Sam to draw his stories first and then work

with her to dictate the text and help sound out the words that he wanted to use. I worked

repeatedly with Elizabeth on recognizing that this was a complex structure for Sam to

undertake and that she needed to understand that this type of work was very difficult for

him. Her expectations for what he should be able to do during this time were out of line

with his academic readiness.

Elizabeth was upset numerous times during writer's workshop and reader's

workshop, commenting that she felt she wasn't sure she would "ever get [Sam] sorted out

and help him learn to focus and finish a task" (student-specific field notes, p. 9). As we

talked together, I was concerned that Elizabeth was overestimating what was possible

from Sam, particularly during the fall semester when he struggled to write anything more

than his name. I was also concerned that she was taking Sam's struggles as a sign of her

own inability as a teacher, rather than as something that she needed to consider and address as a part of learning to implement a new model. We spoke at length about how she needed to set reasonable goals for what Sam could accomplish during this time given that he was not yet writing or reading independently and reconsider what she could do to support him in an open-ended instructional model. For Sam, the more informal nature of these structures offered him the chance to get up and work his way around the room, chatting with classmates and finding ways to keep from sitting down to write or read his books (student-specific field notes, p. 4).

By helping Elizabeth to reflect on what it was about the instructional model that freed Sam to be off task, Elizabeth was able to reconsider how she structured this work to support his particular needs. Instead of sitting at a table with his classmates, during reading and writing times, Elizabeth chose to assign Sam a space away from his peers in the hopes that this would encourage him to focus on the task at hand instead of the presence of his classmates. During reader's workshop, Elizabeth also made sure to try to work with Sam each day on his reading, both to support his needs as a reader but also to ensure that others were able to read for a time without his behavior as a distraction (student-specific field notes, p. 4). These were attempts on Elizabeth's part that I supported in order to help her focus on more realistic expectations for what was reasonable to expect from Sam during reading and writing instruction.

In order to support Sam's learning as well as help Elizabeth with her management of the instructional model, I worked with Sam one-on-one during several writer's workshop drafting sessions and other writing activities. For instance, during one activity where students had to write letters to President Bush, I helped Sam to write his letter

a

c

c

li

tr

in

ar

m

sc

ro

a p

Wa

son

(field instruction field notes, p. 28). Taking on an instructional role made it possible for me to talk intelligently with Elizabeth about the experiences she had in supporting Sam's efforts to write when he struggled with the content and was quick to quit and return to trying to socialize with his classmates. This also gave me insight into what it was feasible to expect of him. With that kind of one on one attention, Sam was more willing to focus and bask in the one on one support that he received from an adult who reminded him to let his classmates work. Yet, it also provided me with the opportunity to learn in more detail about the struggles that Sam faced in getting work completed in a highly active first grade classroom. While this may not be typical field instruction practice for others, I found this type of work particularly valuable in building my knowledge base in order to help Elizabeth work with Sam.

Elizabeth was increasingly frustrated by Sam's behavior as time passed, feeling like it was becoming more and more out of control. Elizabeth recognized that in the transitions from Amanda taking primary responsibility for teaching to Elizabeth's increased teaching role, "We let those behaviors continue, and they had just increased and increased and increased" (Elizabeth's spring interview, p. 12-13). There were small moments of success where Sam and Elizabeth found ways for him to participate in the social interaction of the classroom community and follow the norms of the group. My role in this context was to help Elizabeth learn to appreciate these successful moments as a part of the outcomes of setting more reasonable goals for Sam. I was concerned that it was so difficult for her to recognize when Sam had had a good day or accomplished something that for him was a significant challenge.

During writer's workshop each day, Elizabeth's class had sharing time at the end of the session. Students had the opportunity to share their works in progress as well as published writing pieces. Most often, this was done in front of the class as a whole group activity. Sam never chose to share during this time; instead he removed himself from the group. However, in late March, Sam approached Elizabeth and asked for permission to share his story that day. While he had difficulty with the actual sharing (he couldn't read his own writing or what Elizabeth had transcribed for him), he did gamely repeat what Elizabeth whispered to him as she read over his shoulder. As importantly, his classmates were attentive and responsive to his efforts. For Sam and his classmates as well as Elizabeth, this was a significant moment in their year of work together (March 24 debriefing conference, p. 3). During the debriefing conference, I made a specific move to raise this incident as a part of our conversation. I wanted to make sure that Elizabeth recognized this as a sign of Sam's progress as well as ensure that she remembered this more positive experience with Sam in the chaos of a busy day in first grade. I felt that drawing attention to something like this event would help Elizabeth recognize that Sam was making progress and that she played a role in helping him get to that point. I also wanted her to understand this as a sign of her efforts to set and accept progress on more reasonable goals.

Elizabeth recognized that the classroom learning experiences had begun to move significantly past what Sam was able to do independently. His reading and writing skills were not developing at the pace of even the other struggling learners in the classroom. Just as things were coming to a head with issues of Sam's behavior as it escalated to a

higher level, Elizabeth identified a connection between these two aspects of classroom

life commenting:

> We have now surpassed, I feel like the behaviors are getting worse because we
> have surpassed what he is able to do in great leaps and bounds. He can't, it
> frustrates him. Right from this morning the bellwork I gave, it was the addition of
> 2+1, I mean it was not too hard for him and he claims, "I can't do this." And it's
> like he's defeated before he even tries. (March 5 debriefing conference, p. 1-2)

Realizing the complex interrelationship between behavior and academics was an

important step for Elizabeth in coming to grips with how she might best support Sam.

She said, "I did take a step back and think about how he must feel every day coming into

a classroom where he can't function" (March 5 debriefing conference, p. 1-2). She was

able to redesign activities but also her expectations for behavior in ways that were more

supportive of Sam's particular situation in the classroom. At the end of the year,

Elizabeth recognized that this was something that benefited them both:

> When he does good, like he did today, I mean the work he did today for Sam
> was…showed tons of growth. The fact that he sat down and actually followed the
> directions that I gave…compared to the beginning of the year. And that's what I
> have to keep telling myself throughout the year, that's been the biggest challenge.
> It's seeing that progress because sometimes it feels like he's not making any.
> (Elizabeth's student interview, p. 1-2)

Coming to this conclusion was a significant sign of the progress that Elizabeth and I

made together. Recognizing the importance of setting reasonable goals for learning and

then taking pride in the accomplishments that both she and Sam made was critical

progress for Elizabeth in learning to teach diverse learners. She was able to accept the

progress that he made and I considered this a sign of her progress in coming to

understand the complexity of educating Sam. By exploring with her the outcomes of

each of these situations as described above, I was able to help Elizabeth reflect on her

experiences in working with Sam and in this instance, his interactions with his peers.

While we never got Sam to the point of ideal relationships with his classmates, Elizabeth was able to learn about her options in helping a student to become socially more appropriate in his relationships with classmates.

At the end of lead teaching in March, Elizabeth and I proudly reflected on a session of writer's workshop where Sam was able to sit independently and work carefully for the first twenty minutes without bothering anyone in the classroom. I was able to help her recognize this by bringing it to her attention during our debriefing conference so that she could see that she and Sam really were making progress on their work together. Again, this was a place where I wanted to call specific attention to what Sam could do during instruction as evidence that Elizabeth was learning to work with his needs in effective ways. For all involved, this was a significant accomplishment because Sam's ability to work independently without bothering his classmates allowed Elizabeth to focus her work on the needs of all learners and not just on managing Sam (March 23 debriefing conference, p. 2). This was another sign of our progress that she needed to recognize in order to take pride in the accomplishments both she and Sam had in working together.

Supporting Sam's interactions with his peers. My role as a knowledgeable observer in the classroom allowed me to support Elizabeth's efforts to integrate Sam into the classroom. Sam struggled to work with his peers in socially appropriate ways. This was particularly difficult when they were expected to work together to complete a learning activity. By observing Elizabeth's attempts to support Sam and the variety of solutions she used to engage him but to also meet the needs of her other learners, I was able to help her process the approaches that worked and learn to set reasonable goals for

what she could expect of herself as well as of Sam. This section looks at several examples of how Elizabeth learned from her experiences of having Sam work with classmates and the role I played in that learning.

As someone who was less involved in implementing instruction, I could sit back and watch how Sam interacted with his peers during group activities. I was able then to use this information during debriefing conferences to help Elizabeth consider her options for action. This information was particularly helpful in challenging Elizabeth's high expectations for Sam by being able to present her with the reality of the situation she was addressing. During one lesson, I noticed an interaction between Sam and another student in the classroom and shared this information with her during our debriefing conference. Elizabeth began immediately to explore her options for how she might handle Sam's location in ways that did not distract his peers:

> **Alisa: I don't know but Sara's about had it with Sam.**
> Elizabeth: Oh is that why [they were fighting]?
> **Alisa: He did something and you moved him over to his other table and her comment when he left was something along the lines of, "I'm so tired of him, he's just so annoying."**
> Elizabeth: I'm thinking about constantly having him over the writing center.
> **Alisa: That could become his personal table there. That's what they did with the emotionally impaired student in David's class – he has his own table. He couldn't handle sitting with his peers so they gave him his own table.**
> Elizabeth: I think that the problem with [mentally impaired student] is that even though [classroom aide] is over there, Sam was even more distracting to [mentally impaired student] than I think any other child in this room.
> **Alisa: That worked out okay I thought with [classroom aide], she was close enough that she could get his attention by calling his name from where she was sitting by [mentally impaired student] versus if he's across the room and no one can get there.**
> Elizabeth: There's not enough corners in this room. [The principal] has said that we need to get a Velcro square or a carpet for him and we haven't yet but I'm curious as to how that will work.
> **Alisa: A kindergarten student has one. She [the intern] seems pleased with it because she was referring to it, he knows where he's supposed to be and it's easy to redirect him or if you need to, you move the square and then he**

215

goes to wherever the square is, so if you wanted to focus on having someone else up front and center, then you could move the square as opposed to tape on the carpet when you really are kind of containing an issue there. (March 4 debriefing conference, p. 3)

Thinking through the options that existed allowed us to play out some ways to help Sam focus as well as reduce the impact that his behavior had on his classmates. My role in this conversation was to help Elizabeth think about how best to manage the problem in the classroom, supporting Sam both academically and socially. I was concerned that Elizabeth's work with Sam supported his social needs at the same time that she recognized a responsibility to all other students. Our conversation allowed Elizabeth to consider what other interns had done to support children who needed some guidance in behavior but were also struggling socially. By sharing these examples with her, I was able to help Elizabeth see beyond the immediacy of her own classroom situation and explore options other than those that she had used or witnessed in her own classroom. I was also able to help her see how those other options demonstrated that another adult had similar challenges with children, that as a beginner Elizabeth was having experiences similar to those of her peers. While this conversation does not highlight Elizabeth's high expectations for herself, I felt that this understanding was particularly important because she expected herself to be competent with experiences she had not yet had. Her desire to become her CT by the end of the year also pushed me to help her see that she was not going to achieve that goal simply through completing the internship year. Recognizing that these were unrealistic goals in many ways made me focus my work on ensuring that she developed a more realistic understanding for how she might make progress in her teaching and learning.

Elizabeth often used group work situations in the content areas to help her students learn to work together while supporting each other as emergent readers and writers. In science, Elizabeth particularly enjoyed having students work together as partners to explore materials related to the unit of study. During a science unit on solids and liquids, Elizabeth put the students into pairs to sort a series of solid objects into those that were magnetic and those that were not. Elizabeth used the name sticks[19] in order to put the students into pairs at the end of a mini-lesson and set of directions for the activity they would do. Reflecting on this process during the debriefing conference, Elizabeth and I discussed how she inadvertently ended up with a pairing that was not a good idea and what she did to try and solve it in action:

> Elizabeth: Joe and Sam, a partnership? Yeah, I ended and did not, yeah that was not one that I thought out.
> **Alisa: You mean they were at the end?**
> Elizabeth: They were at the end, they were my leftovers. Well, because I kept saving – those are two that I save in the sense that I know that they need support and so when I was pairing them up, it was like, okay, I'm trying to pair this one with this one and I don't know what happened…[laughs] that was not a plan. And it was something, and then at the end I was like, oh, I can't move, I didn't want to say you go with them.
> **Alisa: To break up working partners?**
> Elizabeth: Yeah, so I figured that I would support them.
> **Alisa: And was one the strategies to stick them up here by themselves at the listening center?**
> Elizabeth: They were, they were sitting at the listening center. The only problem with the two of them is that both of them wanted the materials all the time and so they were the ones that were taking the trays, or other people's things from their trays so that they could have two nuts, you know, and they could have two paper clips and they could have two things that were magnetic in that the sense that they weren't so much concerned with the fact that it was magnetic, they were concerned with what they could construct out of the magnet. (March 25 debriefing conference, p. 1)

---

[19] Name sticks are a set of tongue depressors in a can with each student's name on one stick. Elizabeth and Amanda used these sticks to select students to call on at random or to quickly pair/group students.

Eli

tha

ma

to

ma

ove

how

had

notes

push

some

toget

I wa

wha

Acr

aca

A

A

wh

Elizabeth recognized that she had ended up in a situation for which she did not plan and that she did not find particularly successful because of the boys' inability to share the materials that they were to work with together as partners. She realized that her solution to the problem (placing them together but away from their peers) was not that helpful in managing the behavior but it did keep them from distracting their peers while they argued over the supplies. I knew, going into the debriefing conference, she was frustrated with how this had played out and the fact that these two had ended up together because she had said as much as she walked past me during the lesson (classroom observation field notes, March 25). As we continued to talk about this lesson, and especially this pairing, I pushed Elizabeth to consider what her options would be if she were to go back and do something like this again, realizing that it did not work to place these two students together because neither was able to take the lead on the academic piece of the activity. I wanted her to think carefully about why this did not work out as planned and consider what it would take to meet these needs without simply assuming she did it wrong. Across the course of our conversation, I was able to help Elizabeth recognize both the academic and social issues that she faced with Sam.

> **Alisa: If you were to go back and do it again, and you ended up with a Joe/Sam partnership, would you give them two trays of stuff?**
> Elizabeth: Yeah, that probably would have been. Sam...probably if I were to go back, I would let Sam work on his own because I think with a different partner, Joe probably could have worked out the problem of working cooperatively whereas Sam probably just needed to be in his own group, by himself, at the listening center where he could explore the materials and not be...but I even think that he would have been searching out for someone to say look how cool, you know...
> **Alisa: Right, he needed the social interaction that came with the exploring and then I wonder, too, he doesn't have anyone modeling for him what to do**
> Elizabeth: Uh-huh
> **Alisa: And in that instance, maybe Joe wasn't the right choice as someone who was prepared to model the appropriate use of this stuff**

Elizabeth: And to be on task, and yeah how to...

Alisa: But if he goes and sits by himself then it's just exploration, it's not following through on trying to figure out which solids are magnetic.

Elizabeth: But even with the just exploration, I think for him, with additional support, it would have been a better structure.

Alisa: With additional support?

Elizabeth: Meaning me, yeah, meaning like me going over there making sure, checking on him, you know, having him sort them into two different piles. Giving him maybe even extra time to explore materials and properties. If those trays are in here, he can not keep his hands out them. (March 25 debriefing conference, p. 2)

Figuring out how to support Sam when the situation was best served by working with classmates, while recognizing the difficulty of this, left Elizabeth searching for options for how to manage Sam's needs at the same time she supported everyone else. I was able to guide Elizabeth through the process of thinking about how to meet his additional needs and to explore what she considered to be her best options. Ultimately, she thought it would be best to provide adult support rather than relying on another student to be that primary support for Sam. I wanted her to recognize that she was facing a complex issue here and that this was something that could challenge any intern. I continued to remain concerned that she held herself to standards that did not allow her room to learn as a novice and so spent time working through this entire issue in order to support her understanding of other possibilities. This continued to be a constant tension for Elizabeth and Sam – how to pull him into the classroom community while respecting others' needs at the same time.

In another instance, Sam demonstrated the constant struggle he had with one student, Roger, who particularly craved his own space and consistent routines with predictable behavior from his classmates. During one classroom visit, Elizabeth asked for my guidance on what she might do with Sam (someone who has many

ac

sh

wo

ne

w

be

m

w

up

m

ar

E

c

C

s

e

o

t

r

i

accommodations listed for him on Elizabeth's typical lesson plan[20]). She recognized that she needed to make accommodations for him but was struggling with strategies that would support his social growth in a classroom where other children also had significant needs (student-specific field notes, p. 5-6). During the lesson I had just observed, Roger was getting upset that Sam had touched him (it appeared unintentional) and continued to be upset that Sam was staring at him after Elizabeth had asked Roger to scoot over and make room for Sam. Roger had a tendency to be easily upset by his peers and I talked with Elizabeth about the appropriateness of holding Sam singularly accountable for upsetting Roger with minor actions because it seemed like you could never tell what might set Roger off. Sam did not possess the social skill and ability to read the situation and the maturity to then work to avoid upsetting Roger. I wanted to make sure that Elizabeth understood this was asking a great deal of Sam and that she needed to consider carefully the degree to which she viewed this as a part of her larger situation with Sam.

We discussed a range of ideas for supporting Sam in learning to work with Roger. One solution that I recommended was that Elizabeth ensure that the two children were spaced out on the carpet and in whole group activities. During social group times, I encouraged her to work with both of them to learn to work together and tolerate each other (student-specific field notes, p. 5-6). Elizabeth immediately introduced some of these ideas into her next lesson, focusing carefully on where each child was during the mini-lesson. This tendency to reflect on experiences, select ideas for how to improve instructional activities and social relationships and then find ways to implement them into

---

[20] On the lesson plan form that interns use, there is a section for academic, social and linguistic accommodations for the lesson as well as the assessment of it. Elizabeth's plans continually included accommodations for Sam that included social and academic support. Elizabeth sought ways to provide him with support for working with his peers and in whole group settings as well as helping him with the academic tasks of a lesson (such as how to accommodate his reading needs in an activity).

her instruction was typical of Elizabeth's work with me. Although I maintained concerns about Elizabeth's expectations for herself and for Sam, she was always responsive to suggestions that were made to help her deal with classroom events. By supporting her with immediate feedback in the classroom as well as an opportunity to reflect, I was able to help Elizabeth address immediate concerns in her classroom and she was able to make immediate changes in her practice. This became one of the most effective approaches I had for helping her to manage her problem successfully with Sam. It also allowed me to remain true to my social constructivist stance towards field instruction practice by helping Elizabeth to learn and make sense of her own experiences rather than telling her what to do next. However, I did encourage her to work with both Roger and Sam, not simply to drop the issue without exploring the more complex solutions to the situation. I was able to help her see what I had observed and she was able to then "see with fresh eyes" her own reality and reconstruct her practice.

Elizabeth recognized during another conversation that Sam was a child who really wanted to be a part of the classroom community and that she needed to consider how her efforts to support him either included him in that community or further marginalized him from the group. One of the strategies commonly used for children who were struggling to behave when seated on the carpet for a whole class activity was to send them to sit in a chair at the back of the room (still facing the group). Sam often sat in a chair in the back of the room before a lesson was completed because he could not keep himself from physically touching or bothering his classmates. Elizabeth recognized that he wanted to be a part of the class and questioned this mechanism for redirecting his behavior because it removed from him from the intimacy of the group. She recognized that her own

a
t
u
l
v
w
p
in
or

eb
th

frustration with his constant misbehavior made it easier to remove him from the group. I wanted her to understand that simply removing Sam from the group did not solve the greater issue at hand and that her challenge was to manage to balance this tension for Sam. I recognized that this was a difficult situation to work through each day and I wanted Elizabeth to understand the complexity of this in ways that helped her be realistic about what she might accomplish.

She commented to me that he wanted to "be a part of the group so much that even when he's been asked to go sit in a chair, he scoots it up so close that ultimately he's in trouble again" (student-specific field notes, p. 9-10). We tried to explore other options for how she could balance this tension in ways that supported Sam's growth in multiple areas. Elizabeth asked whether it would be "wrong" to tell Sam that he has to stand at the group instead of removing him. When we discussed this and her rationale for it, she felt that it removed many of the things and people that he might fidget and play with but ultimately allowed him to continue to be physically a part of the group. Elizabeth did later try the standing approach to management and found mixed success for how it worked with Sam. While not an ideal solution, this is an example of how Elizabeth would continue to test ideas to find something that would work for both Sam and his peers. I was satisfied that she paid attention to his academic need to be involved in the instruction as well as his social needs and did not simply sacrifice one to benefit the other.

The struggle to include Sam in positive interactions was an ongoing one, one that ebbed and flowed each time Elizabeth tried to work harder to balance the complexity of the system in her classroom. Over time, and with support, she came to recognize that the

pieces were interrelated and would move back and forth between which she chose to prioritize, depending on Sam's behavior at the time, the activity she was attempting, and the experiences she was having with other children at that point. Working with her to help her think through the influence of her decisions, we managed her problem together (Schon, 1987) in ways that helped her slowly but surely move towards an idea of what might work for her in future teaching situations with Sam and with future students who have similar needs. She was able to use our work together to hypothesize about future action for the immediate future as well as for later years. By helping her to redirect her focus to more reasonable goals for Sam and for herself, she was able to see what was possible in the situation and not just where she was failing to meet her own expectations.

Influence of Parents and the Practices of the Upper-middle Class Community

One of the challenges present for interns at Lancaster Elementary is the supportive but vocal parent population. While the majority of parents at Lancaster know how to and will do anything necessary to support their students, this can sometimes overwhelm and challenge an intern who is still in the process of learning to teach, and wary of mistakes that might be made in public ways. For Sam, the parents of these other students were also a presence, even if he was not aware of the larger implications they had on his ability to socialize with his peers. Additionally, the cultural norms of the upper-middle class community conflicted with Sam's experiences. This mismatch had the potential to marginalize Sam as the one who did not fit the situation. Two examples of this mismatch in resources and material support forced Elizabeth to consider how she understood and supported or complicated Sam's social experiences in the classroom.

One particular example of this impacted how Elizabeth was thinking about the community and parents' response to a child who did not come from a background similar to their own. Sam and another child got into trouble on the playground during lunch recess one day when Sam responded to the other child's verbal attacks by punching him. When a child gets in trouble at recess, he or she receives a "wall notice" which documents the infraction and must be returned to school the next day signed by a parent. If a child does not return the wall notice signed, he stands along the wall during every recess until he returns the note. Elizabeth reported on a conversation that she had with the parent of the other child involved in this particular altercation with Sam. The parent came to Elizabeth (Amanda was out of the classroom for professional development that day) and asked whether Sam's wall notice was returned because "through the grapevine she's heard that his wall notices never come back." She wanted to know how it was handled when he failed to return his notice. Elizabeth attempted to downplay the issue by assuring the mother saying, "Well, honestly, there were a lot of consequences for a couple days after that." As she explained it to me later, "If his parents don't send back the wall notice, I'm not going to keep him in from recess for two weeks because his parents didn't send back the notice." She continued to explain this to the parent without getting into the specifics of another child's situation or consequences while the parent tried to pass her comments off as concern about "whether those parents are involved" (March 5 debriefing conference, p. 2).

Elizabeth did not like that this parent questioned the actions of another parent or family and was thrown by this encounter. I spoke with her not long after it happened that morning and expressed my concern that she let Amanda know as soon as possible.

Elizabeth and I talked at length about how this affected Sam and his relationships with his peers. In this instance, Elizabeth responded in ways that demonstrated care and concern for Sam's social welfare in the classroom. While the other child involved was often in trouble, his mother repeatedly explained to him (and to the teachers) that much of his misbehavior was not his problem or his fault. Elizabeth felt that the conversation she had with the mother was indicative of the way that the mother spoke to her son about Sam. While the mother's interest in the situation could be construed as genuine concern for Sam's well-being, Elizabeth felt that the tone of the conversation was intended to implicate Sam's parents as irresponsible and uninvolved rather than an attempt to look out for Sam or take responsibility for her own son's behavior. Elizabeth was also bothered by the mother's comment that she heard these things "through the grapevine," implying that Sam was a subject of conversation and speculation (which Elizabeth assumed was negative) throughout the community (student-specific field notes, p. 26-27). She commented that "everyone in the school knows about Sam" and she was "amazed at how quickly information gets around this school" (student-specific field notes, p. 26-27).

My role here was to help Elizabeth consider her options for action (talking with Amanda and the principal) as well as helping her to debrief her feelings about the situation and her understanding of the larger school community. While I do not condone the situation or the action of the parent, I wanted Elizabeth to realize that this was not an entirely unusual situation and that she needed to be prepared to handle these in her future years. Elizabeth's surprise at this, particularly that the word had gotten around among the parents, demonstrated that she had naïve conceptions for how the school community worked and the influence that this could have on students. Her assumptions for the way

225

the school experience would play out for each student demonstrated her initial oversimplification of the situation. How the parents spoke about Sam and his family said something about his ability to integrate himself into the social community of his peers. Elizabeth felt that this would complicate her efforts to support Sam in making friends if his peers were receiving other messages about him from home.

We spoke at length of the challenge that Elizabeth faced in this situation. Over the course of our conversation, Elizabeth recognized that the diversity of the classroom could be influenced by something like socioeconomic status and that this could have powerful, lasting effects on children who are marginalized as a result. We had previously discussed how Sam's family background was something that had to be taken into consideration in her planning and his learning. Elizabeth identified a mismatch between his experiences and those that were the norm in the school setting, realizing that he would need to learn some alternatives in order to succeed in the classroom and school community as traditionally structured (field instruction field notes, p. 15). I appreciated that Elizabeth was able to come to realize this complexity and began to understand that despite her surprise, there was a lot going on here that was not immediately obvious in the classroom.

The nuances of this conversation as well as of the experience she had with this parent reinforced that Elizabeth and I had framed the problem she was attempting to manage in similar ways. We were in agreement that the work she was trying to do with Sam should focus on helping him access the social community of the classroom as well as begin to make academic progress. At several points in the year, we had the opportunity to touch base through our conversations and reaffirm that we were on the

226

same page in terms of beliefs and approaches about the framing and naming of this problem. Each conversation or interaction served to reinforce our earlier negotiation of the problem as one that focused on Sam's complex needs as a socioeconomic minority in this classroom context. Each conversation further demonstrated that with time and attention, Elizabeth was coming to understand that this entire process of learning to teach a student with Sam's needs was more complex than she initially expected.

Another example from the school year documented Elizabeth's growing awareness that Sam did not fit the typical norms of the classroom. One tradition that existed in their class was to celebrate students' birthdays with a treat provided from home. Each child brought in his or her preferred snack for his or her birthday and the class then engaged in a routine that celebrated the child. As the snack was passed out by the birthday child, the class waited patiently at their seats practicing their manners as they said 'please' and 'thank you' as well as 'happy birthday.' After that, the birthday child stood at the front of the class with Amanda and Elizabeth where the entire class sang "Happy Birthday" with their own special ending to the song. The birthday child then got to take the first bite of the treat while the classmates waited patiently for him or her to begin.

On Sam's birthday, he was absent from school. When he returned the next day, he asked Elizabeth after lunch if she had a birthday snack for him to share with the class, which she did not. I was in the room during this conversation and she turned to me and commented on how sorry she was that he was the first child in the class to have nothing to share with his peers. At this point, it occurred to Elizabeth that their entire ritual for celebrating birthdays was centered around the treat that the child provided. She realized,

"We never even sang happy birthday to him!" This oversight caused her to focus on the assumptions that existed in the structure of the classroom that parents had the financial ability and awareness to provide a snack for 26 people (student-specific field notes, p. 9-10).

In the context of this conversation, I was able to share my personal approach to birthday snacks in a school where more than one child in the class would be unable to afford to bring in a snack. In my classroom, we celebrated all birthdays in each month (and a party for the summer months) at the end of the month with a low-key snack that I provided for the entire class. This eliminated competition about the quality of the treat as well as ensured that all children in the classroom were included in the celebration for their month without any attention to the fact that some children could not afford such a luxury. Elizabeth was curious about the specifics of this approach and this conversation afforded me with an opportunity to show her how she might prepare in advance to eliminate such situations, while respecting all children's right to belong.

I took advantage of this as teachable moment with Elizabeth to help her explore other options and to reflect on the reality of this situation as yet one more way Sam stood out from his peers in ways that directly related to the difference in their socioeconomic status. It bothered me that the possibility Sam would be unable to provide a snack for the class was not considered prior his birthday. While I don't hold Elizabeth personally accountable for that oversight, it did concern me that she was not aware of this given that so much of our work together focused on the specifics of his personal life and particular needs. In this instance, Amanda later offered to bring in a snack for him to share with his peers on another day because it was too late to change the structure of the birthday treat

program for the year. However, Elizabeth expressed a desire to take a more inclusive

approach in her own classroom in the future.

Intimately connected with the challenges of supporting Sam's social development

were the beliefs that Elizabeth held about how best to support young children and their

learning experiences. As a result of the experiences that she had in working with Sam,

Elizabeth reviewed several aspects of her child development beliefs. How we worked

together to help her reconcile her experiences with her previous beliefs about teaching

and learning is the subject of the next section.

The Demise of Child Development Beliefs

Elizabeth entered the internship year in possession of a solid base of knowledge

about child development beliefs and practices. As a result of her child development

student teaching experience in the Michigan State University child development lab,

Elizabeth had solidified her theoretical knowledge through practice in a very controlled

lab setting where student teachers are held to high standards and expectations for the

kinds of language teacher candidates used with students, and were carefully monitored

for how they spoke to students. Elizabeth's experiences in the lab school setting

informed her beliefs about developmentally appropriate practices, behavior management

and ways of speaking with young children. Elizabeth's beliefs were a common part of

our conversations as well as those she had with Amanda, particularly early in the year as

she asserted herself in the classroom and worked to become a partner in teaching with

Amanda. Over time, Sam challenged many of these beliefs and forced Elizabeth to

reconsider what she felt was possible in the quickly paced, sometimes chaotic first grade

classroom in which she interned. This section explores how I played a role in supporting

Elizabeth as she worked to reconsider her beliefs about management in light of her experiences with Sam and his particular learning needs. Specifically, I will look at how Elizabeth dealt with the challenge he presented for how she addressed children who were misbehaving in terms of the language and actions she used.

Saying No to Children and Removing Sam from Class

Elizabeth advocated a management approach that allowed her to explain and redirect children with minimal use of negative terms (such as 'no'). In her child development classes, Elizabeth learned approaches to management and behavior that required her to use 'I' messages. These messages redirected children by expressing her concern for the behavior in which they were engaged and naming a behavior that she would rather seem them demonstrate. For example, instead of saying 'no' to a child running down the hall, Elizabeth would say something like, "I am afraid that if you run down the hall, you might get hurt. Please walk."

Her vision of herself as a teacher was valid and built on a wide base of knowledge about child development. It stemmed from a desire to respect and support positive self-esteem in each of her students and yet was complicated to implement for a child with Sam's particular needs. Sam was not accustomed to behavioral boundaries and was also unaccustomed to having many opportunities to discuss his feelings and thoughts about each moment of misbehavior in the classroom. With Sam, Elizabeth discovered that this approach to management did not result in the changes in behavior that she hoped to see. This is an instance where Elizabeth's beliefs were not consistent with Sam's cultural experiences. This mismatch caused some frustration on her part as Sam was unable to meet her expectations from this perspective. I played a role in helping Elizabeth think

about whether or not this management technique was reasonable and thus, whether her expectations for Sam were also reasonable.

She determinedly continued to pursue this strategy for redirecting children throughout the fall semester. We spoke a number of times about how she needed to consider whether this was the most effective approach to managing a child's behavior, like Sam's, when he was physically active and potentially in danger of actually hurting one of his classmates in the process. For example, one day Sam was running up and down the hallway while the children were supposed to be putting on snow clothes for lunch recess. Elizabeth spoke to him about this behavior using her child development language, saying she was worried he would get hurt or hurt someone else if he continued to run. This had no effect. Elizabeth then told him to "Stop running!" This caught Sam's attention and caused him to focus on her (student-specific field notes, p. 24). Sam expected to be told when to stop doing something (this seemed to be the only time he responded to a request for him to change his behavior) and often seemed confused by the explanations he received for why he could not do something. Elizabeth was very frustrated that this did not seem to work in this situation because she had prior experiences that demonstrated to her that it could work. For example, Sam was asked to stop playing with the science manipulatives (March 25 observation notes). Elizabeth explained to him that they needed certain materials in certain places and Sam continued to play until he was simply told to stop. The explanation he received for why it was inappropriate for him to play with the materials meant very little to him. Rarely did these explanations result in Sam understanding what the problem was well enough to keep from repeating the offense.

Ultimately, there came a point in the year when both Amanda and Elizabeth had to physically restrain Sam during several activities in order to get him to stop what he was doing and comply with their requests for behavioral control. Elizabeth struggled with this experience and was very stressed by the need to send or take Sam to the office for a cooling down period. She was particularly aware of the social consequences this action was having on his relationships with his classmates. On one particular instance when I was in the classroom with her, Sam was refusing to stop building a tower out of the die they were using as manipulatives in math. After quite a few minutes of attempting to negotiate with Sam, then requiring that he stop, and taking away the manipulatives (which only resulted in him going across the room and taking them back out), Elizabeth removed Sam to the office for a cool down.[21] At this time, Elizabeth had parent volunteers in the classroom working with the students in small math groups and as she and Sam left the room, Joe commented, "There goes Sam to the office again!" This comment bothered Elizabeth greatly and as she returned to the classroom without Sam, she said to me that she wondered whether she should have just dropped it and let him play with the materials as a way of avoiding drawing attention to Sam's situation in front of parents in the classroom (student-specific field notes, p. 17-18).

Elizabeth was both internally conflicted about the use of such a management strategy and conscious of the impact that such a decision might have on Sam's social reputation by doing this in a public way. While she expressed frustration over his behavior, Elizabeth also understood that Sam needed help in figuring out what he could

---

[21] This was the plan that had been designed collaboratively by Amanda, Elizabeth and the principal in order to address some of their concerns about this behavior in the classroom. They recognized that Sam needed an opportunity to remove himself from the situation and regain control because his behavior was often dominating classroom time in ways that negatively impacted all learners.

do and what he could not do. I reaffirmed to her that her decision was reasonable for Sam given that he had been pushing it all day and this was the final straw. Being able to respond immediately to her concerns by being in the classroom while this situation played out was particularly valuable for supporting Elizabeth as she worked through the tension she felt in dealing with Sam's needs.

Elizabeth's child development beliefs were in direct contradiction to this approach of dealing with Sam's misbehavior. It took a long time before Elizabeth would step into the role of being the teacher who would ask Sam to leave the room or escort him to the office. Her personal conflict over the approach as well as her belief that such a response shouldn't be necessary if she was doing everything right made it difficult for her to do this. Elizabeth put the responsibility for getting to this point in management on her own shoulders, believing that she should single-handedly be able to deal with Sam without resorting to such measures. Only during lead teaching when it became clear that she needed to take on all roles of the primary teacher in the classroom did she step up and engage in this aspect of the program. The fact that Sam seemed to be more out of control at this time period pushed Elizabeth to begin to make this change in her management.

Elizabeth and I had an informal conversation one day where Elizabeth burst into tears, confessing that she felt she was "doing so badly with Sam" and how she didn't like the person she had become because the children weren't meeting her expectations (field instruction field notes, p. 32). This behavior was in line with my concerns that she was overcome with her own expectations of what she should be able to accomplish as a beginner with a very difficult set of children. Talking with me as well as with Amanda (who joined the conversation part way through), Elizabeth was able to recognize a

connection between her beliefs about management and the challenges she was facing

with Sam. She was afraid removing the explanation of why children needed to change

their behavior was to leave it so that "they walk out of the room at the end of the day

having all these negative [thoughts about school]" (March 4 debriefing conference, p. 6).

Elizabeth had difficulty giving up on this aspect of her beliefs even when she had notable

evidence that it was not working for her in her work with Sam. Amanda reflected at the

end of the year on the difficulty that Elizabeth had in accepting that this approach to

management wasn't going to work in every situation:

> Amanda: I'll just never forget the beginning of the year, maybe even before
> school started, she was asking questions about my philosophy and things like that
> and you know, coming from that child development background, and how you
> deal with that behavior. Well, if the rule is don't run down the hall then you stop
> and say, "Oh Joey I see that you are running down and the hall and blah, blah,
> blah…" And if nothing else, I think one of her big ahas, okay, here's a big aha,
> sometimes there's not time to do that whole big long spiel. Sometimes, you just
> have to look at a kid and say "STOP." It's okay to give that directive because
> sometimes one word is what you need for the situation. Yes, sometimes, you can
> sit down and reason with a child or talk with them. But you can't always do that,
> sometimes that's just "Stop". And I think that hurt her too, that hurt her feelings.
> You remember that day when she was upset because she said, "I'm too mean, I'm
> being the type of person I didn't think I was."
> **Alisa: Yeah, she was really upset.**
> Amanda: She was very upset but she wasn't bad. It was just one of those
> situations where she really had to step in and say, stop, that's it, no more.
> (Amanda's spring interview, p. 9-10)

This quote demonstrates how hard it was for Elizabeth to let go of her previous approach

to management. While Amanda acknowledged that both approaches had their place, she

also pointed out how difficult it was for Elizabeth to reconcile this change with her sense

of self as a teacher. I was concerned that even in the face of negative outcomes,

Elizabeth was not able to see how this might need to be adjusted for Sam, even if she

continued to work with this approach in other areas. While I recognized that it is never

pleasant to physically remove a child from any school or classroom activity, I do not believe that Elizabeth was easily willing to see how this would work for Sam in some ways. However, I do appreciate that she was interested in understanding the complexity of the situation.

In particular, Elizabeth was worried about the impact of this approach on Sam's social relationships. Occasionally other children in the classroom might be removed in order to get their behavior under control. However, it seemed, as Joe pointed out, that Sam was the one most commonly leaving the classroom. Elizabeth was conscious of the influence that her decisions to remove him might have on this aspect of his classroom life. However, she ultimately reconciled herself to the reality of this situation and accepted that, for the time being, this was the plan that was in place and that she would need to enforce the expectations for him that had been laid out by Amanda and the principal. Elizabeth commented, "I just need to follow through on what is in place to make it possible to get through the day" (field instruction field notes, p. 32). My role was to help her come to this conclusion and recognize that she needed to play a role in enforcing the goals and expectations that others with more authority held for Sam (student-specific field notes, p. 24-26).

Across the internship year, Elizabeth had the opportunity to confront a number of her child development beliefs head on and consider whether or not to hold onto them, adapt them, or drop them in favor of something new she learned at Lancaster. For the majority of situations, her child development beliefs were reasonably in line with what she experienced in Amanda's classroom (i.e. Reader's Workshop). In other instances, Elizabeth was able to push Amanda's thinking forward, enhancing the use of centers in

ways that reflected a more child-centered philosophy. Working with Sam forced her to recognize that all children did not respond in similar ways to the same approaches. She began to understand that the school system was based on white, middle class expectations for student and teachers and that not all children fit the mold in the same way. Elizabeth's approaches were more in line with the middle class school structure than Sam's experiences as a student. Early in the internship year, Elizabeth's attempts to hold onto these beliefs in the face of situations where it was evident it did not work concerned me. I worried that she was oversimplifying the situation with Sam and holding both of them to expectations that they could not meet in practice. However, this behavior changed over time with support and reflection from Amanda and me. Coming out of this situation, Elizabeth realized a need to differentiate her approaches to behavior based on her students' diverse needs just as much as she needed to consider these diverse needs in the design and development of instruction.

Conclusion

In reflection at the end of the semester, Elizabeth commented on her own understanding of how she came to the point where she finally let go of her desire to become the perfect teacher, recognizing that she had much to learn and that she was putting too much pressure both on herself and on Sam. During the spring interview, Elizabeth commented:

> Elizabeth: That's one of my weaknesses, either I think too much about it and I need to do more or I put too much pressure on myself and I just need to accept it.
> **Alisa: Set more reasonable goals?**
> Elizabeth: Yeah, yeah. (Elizabeth's spring interview, p. 3)

Later in the interview I asked Elizabeth to describe that 'aha moment' when she

understood that this was too much to handle without reassessing her goals and setting

more reasonable ones:

> Elizabeth: My aha moment probably came...and...I didn't, it wasn't in a good way though.
> **Alisa: Okay.**
> Elizabeth: When, with Sam, right in the middle of February when it was me in the middle of my lead teaching and I was having to remove him from the classroom. My aha moment came, "What am I doing wrong?" What am I...kind of like what we had talked about...what can I do to support this child as an individual because I wasn't feeling like I was effective. So in that sense, my aha moment came because I had to reflect on myself and say he needs more than what I can give him. Part of me had to set those reasonable goals and expectations but part of me was also thinking, okay, in my classroom how would I manage this, what support network would I have? And management wise, okay, I started pulling him and he had his own separate desk/table all the time. [...] I think what had happened is that I had let, not being in the lead, we had let those behaviors continued, and they had just increased and increased and increased.
> **Alisa: I do remember there feeling like a time when it seemed like his behaviors had just launched into the stratosphere.**
> Elizabeth: Yeah, and I guess the aha moment was thinking, "This child needs structure and we've given him no structure. We haven't been consistent within this classroom for a child who needs consistency." And so...
> **Alisa: And now we're throwing in a transition to a different teacher?**
> Elizabeth: And so my aha movement came thinking about, okay, in my own...not that, I pretty much felt ineffective with him and incapable of meeting his needs and that was something that I had to deal with too. But it also made me think about looking ahead to next fall when I go to my own classroom, what will the structure be for those kids who need structure? (Elizabeth's spring interview, p. 12-13)

In this discussion, Elizabeth reflected on the need to set reasonable goals for her learning

and for Sam's. She recognized that she couldn't be everything he needed and that she

was putting too much pressure on herself to do so when she commented that "I had to

reflect on myself and say he needs more than what I can give him" (Elizabeth's spring

interview, p. 12-13). She understood that there were a wide range of needs that he had

and that while she was obligated to work hard to meet them, she also needed to realize that she was unable to do everything for him.

One of the issues that I feel is particularly important in this conversation is that Elizabeth was able to see past the struggles of this year, understanding that she would and did learn from them and that she could take these messages forward into her future teaching experiences. She reflected on the questions she was asking herself as she brought the internship year to a close, the kinds of things she needed to consider as she implemented classroom rules, routines and support systems for her future groups of students.

Banks, Cookson and Gay (2001) write that social class "is one of the most important variables that mediate and influence behavior" (p. 197). It is also one of those factors that seem to make people of reasonable means uncomfortable to discuss because of the implication that merit is not actually the means to advancement (Nieto, 1999). All of this cannot serve as an excuse for ignoring the students' backgrounds and needs or making assumptions based on perceptions. Elizabeth struggled admirably to meet Sam's needs in the larger context of this first grade classroom full of peers who were not in line with his outside experiences or lifestyle. She recognized early on that his outside experiences might influence his classroom success and that she could not simply make judgments or assumptions about him and his experiences based on those of his peers. She also understood that she needed to set reasonable goals for her own learning and for Sam's so that she could celebrate the achievements of their progress both individually and together.

Field Instruction Support for Elizabeth

Field instruction support for Elizabeth focused on how to best support her in her efforts with Sam who consistently challenged her knowledge and practices in multiple ways. Working with her in this context, it was critical to develop a structure and support that allowed her to meet his needs but to also recognize that she needed to think about her own experiences as someone learning to teach and learning how to set reasonable and achievable goals in order to do so. With Elizabeth, opportunities for in-depth and thoughtful reflection were the most powerful ways to help her think about and refine her practice. These occurred through conversations about her experiences with Sam as well as more formal debriefing conferences which occurred after classroom observations. As an intern, Elizabeth did not hesitate to seek out conversation with me as her field instructor, and often moved quite quickly to conversations about deeper issues of teaching practice. I was able to use this natural entry into conversations and her willingness to engage in them regularly to force her to question whether or not her goals for herself and for Sam were appropriate in a given situation. At the end of the year, Elizabeth commented that the "emotional, being in the building, supportive piece" of field instruction practice was something that she valued immensely (Elizabeth's spring interview, p. 17). Elizabeth and Amanda also valued that I knew the children in their class very well and was able to use that information about students to give an immediacy and specificity to our work together. By spending time in the classroom on a more informal basis, talking with the students, participating in class activities, I was able to learn more about the children and use this information to support Elizabeth's needs.

At the end of the year, Amanda commented on the role I played in helping

Elizabeth come to know herself as a teacher. Amanda felt that our conversations together

as field instructor and intern played an important role in helping Elizabeth figure out who

she is and what she believes as a teacher:

> [Elizabeth] coming back and saying, "Well, Alisa and I talked about this..." and listening to some of the conversations, those are incredibly deep conversation that you have had with her and so...I think you really helped her to guide her thinking, not that you've told her what to think but you really helped her along her path of self-realization of who she is and what she believes as a teacher. (Amanda's spring interview, p. 11)

Amanda felt that these conversations were places where constructivist approaches to field

instruction practice came through in action:

> Amanda: You are definitely more the expert and she's more the novice but you really allowed her to take the lead in the conversations and this is my thinking, and you would just through your questioning and observations, I think have her come to her own realizations. Which to me I think is the true constructivist theory to teaching. Yeah, there's a goal in mind there, but helping them arrive there themselves with your support.
> **Alisa: We're going to get there together?**
> Amanda: We're going to get there together, I'm your support but I'm not going to tell you exactly how it has to look, like this. Does that make sense?
> **Alisa: Yeah.**
> Amanda: It's been awesome. (Amanda's spring interview, p. 12)

These conversations served as the primary place where I was able to use Elizabeth's

classroom teaching experiences to help her understand areas where she was succeeding

even if she was not giving herself credit for those accomplishments. Elizabeth

recognized the value of the questioning that I used to help her make sense of her learning

through these conversations. She valued that the "specific comments" and "observations

about why did I do that" made her reflect on her practice. She commented that over time

it made her "ask myself those same questions that you ask of me" (Elizabeth's spring

interview, p. 17). She was able to see how she had gradually internalized the process I

engaged her in during our conversations until she was able to use that as a tool to help her reflect on her own practice without my prompting. I consider this a sign of Elizabeth's progress in coming to set more reasonable goals for herself. By helping her to see that she had some control over how she responded to Sam's learning needs, I was able to help Elizabeth think about the appropriateness of her expectations. This is something that she could take with her into future years when she does not have mentoring that is as closely focused on her practice as someone who is learning to teach.

As Amanda commented, "I know that she valued the conversations that she had with you greatly" (Amanda's spring interview, p. 2) reflecting the power of these conversations from both perspectives. Elizabeth commented, "I feel like talking with you, I have a really good understanding of my growth over the course of the year" (Elizabeth's spring interview, p. 19). Both felt that the conversations we had together were places where we were able to work collaboratively with Elizabeth to come to an understanding of her experiences in the process of learning to teach. Elizabeth particularly appreciated the opportunities to talk in more informal ways:

> You being in my classroom, I think that I was fortunate in the fact that you were in my classroom a lot and so I got to talk to you in more than just the observation. I think those were what helped me because it was more informal and I felt that I was more able to talk to you about the general of what was going on, and you had a sense of my classroom and the kids in my classroom and so I was more able to talk to you about even what happened yesterday or the day before than what was happening right there and now. (Elizabeth's spring interview, p. 18-19)

These conversations allowed us to work together on the broader sense that Elizabeth was making of learning to teach as well as the bigger picture of her experiences with Sam. This helped us to move beyond those moments of complete frustration with Sam and with herself and think about the entirety of her experiences with Sam. This type of

conversation helped her as a learner who understood that she was focused on more than the internship year as well as my goals as a field instructor to help her see the appropriateness of her goals.

Elizabeth overestimated her ability to develop expertise during the internship year. As Berliner (1992) writes, "Expertise, it should be remembered, is a characteristics that is ordinarily developed only after lengthy experience" (p. 227). Elizabeth valued Amanda's expertise. She had the experience that Elizabeth wanted to have, desperately craving the knowledge that Amanda has amassed over sixteen years of teaching practice. Berliner acknowledges that teachers do not typically "hit their peak until they have at least five years of on-the-job experience" (p. 229). As Elizabeth's field instructor, it was my responsibility to help her restructure her expectations for herself to be more in line with what was realistically possible for a novice in the teaching profession. However, Berliner (1992) also writes of the quality of experts' behavior where they demonstrate a particularly noteworthy attention to knowing more about their students. Elizabeth was well on her way to developing this trend in behavior, thought and action for a novice. While she did recognize that she had strengths, she also needed to work on accepting her own natural limitations as one with relatively little experience in the profession. This kind of situation – where an intern is placing unrealistic pressure on him or herself – is something that may be more unusual in field instruction practice but noticeably important to recognize and address. An appropriate goal for field instruction is to help an intern learn to be proud of attempts to become "accomplished novices" (Bransford, Brown, & Coching, 1999, p. 36). They defined an accomplished novice as one who is "skilled in many areas and proud of their accomplishments, but they realize that what they know is

minuscule compared to all that is potentially knowable" (p. 36). Helping Elizabeth come to accept a goal focused this kind of role for herself as a person learning to teach was a particularly important element of our work together.

However, it was also important to know about what was going on in the classroom and to encourage Elizabeth's reflection on the specific experiences she was having at the lesson and unit level of instruction. I was able to use classroom observations and debriefing conferences to help Elizabeth reflect on how learning with Sam played out in the classroom. Even early in the year, Elizabeth had a sense for how she might think about our work together in ways that supported her as a learner and pushed her to think about what it is that she wants to accomplish:

> I think that I've been fortunate enough that my FI has been immensely supporting me. One strategy is that she uses as far as our observations go is that they're always positive comments and I can bring up a negative comment, or she'll say what about this, and I don't know sometimes not even that it's negative or she's trying to invoke me to think about some kind of different way or what could you have done here, but it's never a "well you did this and I think you should have done this" and so I think that's really helpful to me because it makes me first of all process it, second of it all, it's constructive criticism because it's not well you did this an I think you should have done it this way. I also think that she's given me the option to really go deeper and there's a lot of things I want to accomplish and I feel like I can sit down and talk with her and she always makes that time available for me [...] and I can sit with my FI and say what about this.
> (Elizabeth's fall interview, p. 6)

Elizabeth appreciated the way that I conducted observations, focusing on what it was that went well and providing her options for how to handle similar situations in the future. She also felt that it was supportive to have the constructive criticism because it provided her with a perspective on her teaching practice. Elizabeth also felt that it was the kind of support she needed to probe further into her own practice by talking one on one and pursuing different ideas for practice. For our work together with Sam, this was a

particularly important strategy because it required us to reconsider and reevaluate regularly the new ideas she was implementing as well as her own expectations for what might work. By having this type of focused, regular conversation based on practice, we were able to work together to manage Elizabeth's work with Sam in ways that respected him as a member of the classroom learning community.

Of particular importance to me in supporting Elizabeth was a desire to understand her students so that I was able to provide the kind of guidance that actually might be useful for her in working with Sam. As a field instructor, I can provide any intern with a range of possible answers and options for working with his or her students. However, realizing that interns are more likely to use a recommendation or set of ideas if they see a direct connection between their specific situation and the shared ideas, it seems increasingly important in a diverse classroom setting to be able to tailor and direct the advice in ways that seem most feasible for implementation in a *particular* case. Given that, Elizabeth appreciated my specific efforts to support her work with Sam by focusing much of our field instruction work together. Sam came up in over two thirds of all field notes (both student specific and field instruction field notes focused on work with Elizabeth) and classroom observations. I asked Elizabeth to consider whether there was anything else that a field instructor might be able to do in helping an intern learn to teach all children effectively. In response to this question, Elizabeth spoke of our work together with Sam:

> Elizabeth: I think just knowing the kids within each classroom that an intern is in.
> I truly think that's the most important thing because your knowledge of who my
> kids were helped me the most, seeing your insight to Sam in addition to mine,
> helped me the most in dealing with him. So in that sense...
> **Alisa: So it's being able to talk to you about the kids one on one?**
> Elizabeth: Yeah, and knowing them

Alisa: And having enough information that it feels like a valuable conversation to you

Elizabeth: That you know them too. And it's not just that you saw them on a specific day act out and you think, well, what behavior…why did they do this?

Alisa: Over time?

Elizabeth: Yeah, it's over time and you see that progression right along with me of you know, where he came in and even though it's been a struggle throughout the year he's had his highs and lows – where he is now. So now our conversations are totally different about him than about how they were in the fall.

Alisa: Oh yeah!

Elizabeth: You know what I mean? But in that sense, you've seen that change too. (Elizabeth's spring interview, p. 20)

Elizabeth saw that our work together was something that "helped her the most in dealing with him." I am particularly pleased that there was this sort of support available to her to work with him and I believe that this support was instrumental in helping her reframe her expectations for Sam as well as for herself.

<center>Implications for Field Instruction Practice</center>

Elizabeth's case demonstrates an interesting range of practices for field instruction in support of the learning of the more advanced teacher candidate. We can naively assume that those who are more capable, more organized and effective in instruction, and more reflective on his/her practice need less of our support in the process of learning to teach. Elizabeth's case demonstrates that field instruction is not just a necessary support for those interns who are struggling. In fact, working with Elizabeth, while rewarding on *many* levels, was often as challenging for me as work with other interns who were struggling more in the process of developing and implementing effective instruction. As a field instructor, Elizabeth pushed me to question my assumptions about how far an excelling intern can/should go during the internship and what kinds of support are necessary for someone who is thoughtful and reflective and yet incredibly hard on herself as a learner.

<center>245</center>

As far as issues of broader field instruction practice, I find that several overarching ideas are particularly salient from Elizabeth's case study. This case reiterates the importance of knowing and understanding the challenges that an intern faces in working with specific students who challenge the norm by knowing something about the students themselves. Sam provided Elizabeth with a range of challenges. Without understanding the complexity of Sam's outside life as well as his experiences in the classroom as the field instructor, I would have been unable to help Elizabeth understand the appropriateness of her goals for herself and for Sam. I would likely have assumed that they were reasonable, pushed her forward and expected her to succeed, wondering when she did not. Instead, I played a role where I was responsible for helping to rein Elizabeth in, forcing her to refocus and question her expectations.

This is not something that I had previously experienced with any other intern in the last few years of field instruction practice. While I have worked with interns who were exceeding the expectations of the program in the past, none had held themselves to such high standards of academic success for their students or felt such responsibility for the failures of individual children in the classroom. As a result, this was a new experience for me as well as for Amanda whose prior intern was not at the same level as Elizabeth. I worked with Elizabeth to help her take responsibility for her actions that supported Sam's successes and not simply for those that were unsuccessful. As field instructors, we must be careful to identify those interns who put undue pressure on themselves and help them to see the larger picture so that they do not repeat this process in the first few years of their own teaching career at the danger of leaving the profession or undermining their own efforts to achieve in the classroom. Districts and states are

placing enough pressure on teachers and schools to succeed; it is a disservice not to help teacher candidates see the complexity of this issue and help them learn to recognize those areas in which they are succeeding at making progress for individual learners.

As a social constructivist approach to field instruction practice, this case demonstrates that there are limits even when working with an excellent intern. Elizabeth's assumptions early in the year that she would be able to learn all that Amanda knew as a sixteen year veteran by the end of the year were unrealistic and alerted me to a possible trend that we would have to address across the year. I had to step in as a more experienced teacher to help her understand that she was overchallenging herself and use my role as more experienced other to help her to see that there were limits to what she would accomplish this year, even as I encouraged her to become the best teacher that she could be. For field instruction practice, this case suggests the careful and judicious use of reining in as one of our core field instruction practices. While not many interns may need to be encouraged to step back and slow down, in order to preserve the sanity and sense of self of some of our strongest teacher candidates, there may be places where this type of action on the part of the field instructor is ideal to support an intern. Helping her slow down, redefine her goals, reflect on her successes, and use that understanding to make her next instructional and professional decisions was something that increased Elizabeth's success across time. Although Amanda played this role for Elizabeth as well, her primary concern was focused on her first graders. As her field instructor with primary concern for Elizabeth, I was able to focus in more carefully on Elizabeth's tendency to push herself beyond reason and capability and step in to support her as I encouraged her

to stop and reflect on all that she had already successfully accomplished as Sam's teacher.

In locating my practice on Glickman et al.'s (1995) continuum, I focused primarily on the nondirective behaviors for our work together. We conversed, reflected and supported her decisions about effective practices for Sam. The one place where I veered from the nondirective approach was in forcing Elizabeth to recognize her attitudes and responses towards Sam's progress or lack thereof. Her increasing frustration with herself as she failed to help him make extensive progress was something that I focused on helping her address. This does not line up exactly with the purposes of the continuum because it focused more on Elizabeth as a learner and her sense of self as a teacher rather than on the specifics of classroom pedagogy. Although we did address regularly what her expectations for Sam were, I served more as one who allowed her to let herself step back and pushed her to recognize the progress that they were making rather than focusing only on the progress that still needed to be made. As a result, our work together, while socially constructed, contained a very specific goal on my part over time. Elizabeth oversimplified the challenge of becoming an expert in a cognitively complex field by minimizing the amount of time and knowledge that it takes to become an expert in a complex field (Spiro, Coulson, Feltovich, & Anderson, 1988). I worked to help her understand the complexity of the challenge she faced as a teacher who would continue to learn for a number of years (Berliner, 1992).

By framing and naming (Schon, 1987) this problem of Elizabeth's work with Sam in similar ways, I was able to support her efforts to engage him in appropriate pedagogy. She was able to do this and was responsive to his learning needs. However, she put a

great deal of pressure on herself each time he struggled with something in the classroom. Amanda herself did not hold all the answers for how to best meet Sam's needs and was learning to work with him alongside Elizabeth. Amanda was able to more effectively manage this tension for herself than Elizabeth was, understanding the complexity of the issues involved in greater detail and scope. She was able to accept this and work with her own uncertainties without stressing herself beyond belief as Elizabeth did who assumed that she must be everything for every child in the class. Because Elizabeth and I had named and framed the problem in common ways and I supported her approaches for how to best manage this problem, we were able to utilize a common focus on our work together around Sam. However, I was also able to see that how she had determined she must manage this problem was beyond the scope of her ability or the context of the classroom setting in which she found herself. Understanding this as her field instructor allowed me to tailor my work with her in ways that were simultaneously supportive of her efforts to educate Sam and my own to help her grow and reflect as a future teacher.

As a field instructor, I was able to bring in my experiences of working with students from a range of socioeconomic backgrounds in the same classroom as a means of helping her to think about the challenges that Sam faced both in and out of school because of the disparity between his family's income and that of the school and classroom community. Elizabeth valued these shared stories, commenting that she would "thrive off of" opportunities to hear about "other people's individual experiences and that's what I want to hear because that helps me more to construct my own idea and understanding than what a book or a text could" (Elizabeth's spring interview, p. 17). Working together to help Elizabeth make sense of her interactions with Sam through

conversation, reflection on practice and sharing of personal experiences, I was able to help Elizabeth better refine her approaches so that she could take pride in the accomplishments that both made across the year.

The final two chapters include a cross-case analysis of the three cases. The next chapter considers what we can learn about interns and their work towards culturally responsive teaching practices (Villegas & Lucas, 2002) with diverse student populations. The final chapter considers the implications of the three cases together for the work with social constructivism, Glickman et al.'s (1995) continuum, and Schon's concept of framing (1987). As well, the final chapter will provide a look at the broader field instruction implications of this study in addition to future research possibilities.

Chapter 7

WHAT DID WE LEARN ABOUT HOW NOVICE TEACHERS ADDRESS ISSUES OF STUDENT DIVERSITY?

About halfway through the fall semester of the 2004-2005 school year, and the analysis period of this dissertation, Rebecca commented to me in a mixture of surprise and frustration, "This sure isn't the school you started at [as a field instructor] four years ago!" Increasing classroom diversity and its attendant issues continue to slowly but steadily change the face of this suburban elementary school. As demonstrated through the case studies described in this research, the impact of diversity on teacher learning is significant. As such the field instructor must be a part of this learning process. This research was designed to explore the question, "During critical incidents where interns are working to address learning needs of diverse students, how does the field instructor support three interns who are learning to work responsively to meet these needs?" This chapter focuses on the cross-case considerations for helping interns learn to teach all students as a result of this work with David, Elizabeth and Jane.

Villegas and Lucas (2002) provide six criteria for culturally responsive teachers that are based on a goal of working toward social justice. These criteria act as a framework for teacher educators to utilize in a preparation program founded on principles of advocating for diversity, teachers as agents of school change and the construction of knowledge. I have used this framework in the cross-case analysis to explore how to structure intern learning experiences so that interns have the opportunity to work on issues of student diversity with support from more experienced others such as field instructors and collaborating teachers. Villegas and Lucas' criteria are centered on the notions that culturally responsive teachers are those who (1) "have sociocultural

251

consciousness; (2) have affirming views of students from diverse backgrounds; (3) have a sense that they are both responsible for and capable of bringing about educational change; (4) embrace constructivist views of teaching and learning; (5) are familiar with their students' prior knowledge and beliefs, derived from both personal and cultural experiences; (6) design instruction that builds on what students already know while stretching them beyond the familiar" (p. xiv). The first three criteria focus on attitudes and dispositions that culturally responsive teachers possess and the last three criteria are focused on the actual teaching and learning practices of culturally responsive teachers.

The following section looks at each of these criteria in light of the case studies of David, Jane and Elizabeth and considers the question of whether interns were able to use our work together to develop the kinds of stances and knowledge that reflect Villegas and Lucas' description of culturally responsive teachers. Given the emphasis in this study on teacher candidates' learning experiences in the field placement setting, I center my cross-case analysis on the ways that interns demonstrated or communicated attitudes and practices responsive to diverse student populations while engaged in teaching their students. This initial work builds a rich description of these three interns' progress towards culturally responsive teaching practices. I then use this foundation to consider what was possible across the three cases. I identify what seems to be reasonable expectations for teacher candidates' learning about student diversity in the classroom based on the continuum that Feiman-Nemser (2000, 2003) has designed for "strengthening and sustaining teaching" across the phases of a teaching career.

Teaching Practices Responsive to Student Diversity

Sociocultural Consciousness

Villegas and Lucas (2002) describe a teacher with sociocultural consciousness as one who "recognize[s] that the ways people perceive the world, interact with one another, and approach learning, among other things, are deeply influenced by such factors as race/ethnicity, social class, and language. This understanding enables teachers to cross the cultural boundaries that separate them from their students" (p. xiv). Further, they argue that teachers must be able to "understand that their students may see the world differently than they do and accept that worldviews are not universal" (p. 198) allowing them to recognize the unique experiences and contributions that each member of the learning relationship brings to the situation. Further, teachers who are socioculturally conscious recognize that differences in social positioning are powerful descriptions of who does or does not have access to status. For the interns in this study, the complexity of this idea was beginning to become apparent to different degrees. David, Jane and Elizabeth demonstrate that sociocultural consciousness, particularly across a range of factors, is a complex goal for teacher candidates.

Elizabeth seemed more able to acknowledge how social class impacted whether Sam did or did not fit into the cultural norms of her classroom. She acknowledged that perhaps the norms of the classroom complicated his interaction with his peers and the school culture. She seemed to understand that this was connected to the socioeconomic distinctions that existed in the classroom. She did not blame Sam for his background or imply that he needed to change who he was or his family background to conform to the classroom norms and expectations. Rather, she attempted to see the challenge of the

situation for what it was – complex, personal, and something that she needed to consider as she worked with Sam in this context. Elizabeth was particularly willing to acknowledge that her perspective on the world was not the only view allowed; understanding that Sam and his family may experience school and education (in particular) in ways that did not match her experiences as a member of the middle class. Elizabeth worked very hard to understand Sam and to try and consider his perspective when things in the class were not going as she hoped they would.

In addition to the story told of the critical incident focused on Sam, Elizabeth also had several conversations with me and with Amanda, her collaborating teacher, which suggested her understanding of student diversity recognized more than one factor. A student in Elizabeth's university courses spoke regularly of the challenges of cultural diversity in her urban field placement classroom. Elizabeth visited this teacher candidate in her classroom and returned to Lancaster speaking extensively of her own understanding of cultural diversity which reflected a complex notion of how best to meet the learning needs of the students while respecting the backgrounds of each child. However, Elizabeth never demonstrated these beliefs in practice in this context where she did have students from other cultural backgrounds in her classroom. This suggests that Elizabeth was beginning to work with the ideas at the theoretical level even if she was not yet ready or aware of the need to consider these issues in her own classroom practices.

In the quote that opened this section of the text, Villegas and Lucas (2002) do not list issues of diversity in academic ability as one of the factors that they encourage teachers to recognize as they develop sociocultural consciousness. I see this as an oversight in the richness of their framework. It is necessary to make sure that the range

of factors that are considered when teachers address diversity is broad. Currently, many teachers address issues of ability in the classroom but fail to understand and appreciate the interconnection of this with other aspects of student diversity. Doing so encourages a deep understanding of the rich complexity of diversity that truly challenges a beginning teacher. Our teacher preparation program does include this in our concept of diversity that we use to educate teacher candidates (Rosaen, 2003) and so I have included it here as an aspect of Jane's work to develop a rich understanding of students.

Jane understood that not all students learned as she did and that the instruction she designed needed to be responsive to a range of learning styles and specific needs. Jane recognized that the social nature of the classroom setting complicated issues of academic learning needs for her students and was particularly thoughtful about how to help her students succeed in both academics and social relationships. She understood that there was a connection here that influenced what her students took from their experiences in the classroom. Jane was able to appreciate the complexity of this aspect of student diversity on her classroom learning and teaching practices. In this case, Jane demonstrated a consciousness about her students that positively influenced the learning opportunities and supports she developed for students.

However, as the ending of Jane's chapter demonstrated, there were comments she made about aspects of cultural diversity that reflected a tendency to oversimplify and underestimate the challenges of working with learners from diverse cultural backgrounds in the classroom. Jane believed that cultural diversity would be easier to address than academic diversity and would not present too much of a challenge as long as she sought out advice about how to support students and made sure to talk to families about their

experiences. While both of these are appropriate strategies for learning about issues of cultural diversity in the classroom, Jane's casual response indicates a tendency to discount the complexity of this issue and the influence that cultural background can have on a student's learning experiences. This dichotomy between an intensive and thoughtful effort to meet academic learning needs and an oversimplification of the complexity of the influence of cultural diversity on learning experiences results in questioning the degree to which Jane has begun to develop sociocultural consciousness that embraced a range of factors. There is evidence of progress but also noticeable evidence of gaps in Jane's practice.

David struggled to demonstrate sociocultural consciousness in his work with Lucia, an English Language Learner. It appears that David failed to recognize the degree of complexity that her English Language needs had both for her as a learner in this new context and for his instructional practices. While I believe that David grasped that Lucia's ELL needs were something he had to consider, I don't feel that he was able to understand the degree to which this influenced every aspect of her learning and the sense she was making of the world around her. Early on in the semester, David demonstrated a curiosity in Lucia and her ELL needs that caused me to believe that he understood how complex it is to teach her. On reflection, it is evident now that I overestimated David's understanding of this issue. David did not succeed in crossing the cultural boundaries with Lucia when it came to instructional activities. It is my perception that David valued Lucia as a person but when her needs complicated his instruction, David began to build barriers to this work, instead focusing on her behavior as opposed to her learning needs.

Based on these cases, sociocultural consciousness appears to be a complex goal for teacher candidates to master across a range of factors. Sociocultural consciousness is an attitude often founded on years of prior beliefs and experiences. Teacher educators have found it very difficult to help students see the inequity in society (see for example: Cochran-Smith, 1991; Ladson-Billings, 1991). The three cases in this study serve to demonstrate this challenge with noticeable early understanding really present in only one intern. The transition from exploring and realigning beliefs to engaging in practices that acknowledge these beliefs is difficult for any teacher, let alone a novice. Villegas and Lucas (2002) describe sociocultural consciousness as an attitude on a continuum where teachers can be anywhere along the line from dysconsciousness to consciousness, likely somewhere in the middle. Elizabeth and Jane each demonstrated a great deal of awareness of student diversity on one domain. Elizabeth also recognized the potential influence of cultural diversity on learners while Jane underplayed the challenges that she would face as a teacher in making sense of instructional issues related to cultural diversity. David struggled to demonstrate sociocultural consciousness in his practice. Part of me is heartened to see that they were beginning to realize that these kinds of issues do influence their practice. However, the lack of the awareness about the degrees and complexity of student diversity continues to concern me. None of these interns has become fully conscious at this early stage in their professional teaching careers. Elizabeth's understanding of socioeconomic diversity and awareness of cultural diversity provide me with the most hope that she has begun to develop the sociocultural consciousness necessary to continue to learn in and from her practice with a diverse population of students. While sociocultural consciousness might well represent the

attitudes that our teacher preparation program hopes to foster in teacher candidates

through course and field placements, it is evident from this description that demonstrating

this in rich and varied ways is difficult for novice teachers to do in practice.

Affirming Views

A stance of affirming views about students' backgrounds and acceptance of

diversity as a teacher means that one recognizes the "resources for learning in all students

rather than viewing differences as a problem to be solved" (Villegas & Lucas, 2002, p.

xiv). This stance implies that the resources for learning are seen as a motivation for

developing responsive teaching practices; that teachers reach out to use their information

about students to support effective learning opportunities for students. Villegas and

Lucas (2002) place an affirming perspective at the opposite end of the continuum from a

deficit perspective towards students from culturally diverse backgrounds.

Jane was particularly focused on using what she knew about her students to create

an accepting and affirming classroom environment. Not only did she demonstrate an

appreciation for what her students needed as learners, she strove to create a classroom

learning community that expected students to treat each other in the same way. Jane

effectively used what she knew about her students to create instruction tailored to meet

their academic learning needs that also addressed their social relationships and status in

the classroom in ways that respected each student's individuality. While, as described

above, Jane did not recognize the complexity of meeting all learning needs across a range

of factors, she did work incredibly hard to make effective adaptations to her instruction to

address issues of student diversity related to ability.

Elizabeth also focused on using what she knew about Sam's background and experiences to support her efforts to meet his social and learning needs in the classroom. Elizabeth understood that the issues of social class and socioeconomic status influenced how Sam experienced the school setting and expectations of this first grade classroom. Elizabeth did not treat Sam as though these characteristics negatively impacted her work or practices as a teacher. She accepted them as a part of what he brought to the classroom and took these issues into consideration as she organized her instruction and worked to support Sam in making friends and learning to work with others. While there were moments when Elizabeth realized too late the intersection of socioeconomic status and classroom culture (e.g. the birthday treats issue), she also reflected thoughtfully on how she would handle a similar situation in the future.

David recognized early on that Lucia had a specific learning need as an English Language Learner. However, as he engaged in his lead teaching practices, he was unable to meet effectively those needs in ways that valued what Lucia had to bring to the learning situation. While there were times when he took great pride in her progress and efforts (such as her success on the science test on plate tectonics), he was not able to look at her ELL needs as a resource for learning. Rather, her needs became a point of frustration and inactivity for him, resulting in him beginning to blame her lack of involvement or success on behaviors she was demonstrating (such as avoidance of work). Villegas and Lucas (2002) see this as evidence of a deficit perspective response to student cultural diversity. Ultimately, David failed to view these learning needs as a resource for the classroom. Villegas and Lucas (2002) recommend that teacher educators need to help teacher candidates understand the "consequences of teacher attitude on student learning"

(p. 38). This became my goal with David after it was clear that the focus was no longer on her English Language Learning needs during instruction.

For beginners, Elizabeth and Jane both worked very hard to develop instructional practices that valued the contributions and abilities of their learners to the classroom community. David made efforts to meet the academic learning needs of the rest of his students but was unable to design and implement effective instruction that met the English Language Learning needs that Lucia brought to the classroom. One will notice here that Elizabeth and Jane, who had more developed sociocultural consciousness, were also more effective in utilizing affirming views of their students to design and implement instruction that was responsive to student learning needs. Villegas and Lucas (2002) acknowledge that teachers with sociocultural consciousness have an easier time developing and maintaining affirming views of their students. David struggled to understand the complexity of his students' sociocultural backgrounds and how this influenced his instruction, and similarly had trouble maintaining affirming views of Lucia's English Language Learning needs. Developing affirming views is certainly a stance that we advocate as a teacher preparation program and we work hard to help teacher candidates learn to view difference as a resource rather than a challenge to be overcome. With aspects of diversity, even when they did not acknowledge needs of certain populations, neither Elizabeth nor Jane demonstrated a deficit perspective. However, it's also fair to say that there is a difference between claiming to possess positive and inclusive attitudes and implementing a practice that reflects those attitudes. While I believe that all three of these interns claim to have open and reflective views of diversity, only Jane and Elizabeth were able to begin to design instruction that supported

the specific instances of work with diverse student needs that we explored through the critical incidents in their classrooms. Additionally, neither Jane nor Elizabeth was able to do this in ways that responded to all diverse learning needs in the classroom. Clearly both are still in the early stages of transferring knowledge and attitudes into practices.

Educational Change

In keeping with a social justice stance, Villegas and Lucas (2002) believe that culturally responsive teachers "have a sense that they are both responsible for and capable of bringing about educational change that will make schooling more responsive to students from diverse backgrounds" (p. xiv). They advocate teacher learning that helps teachers to see teaching as a "political and ethical activity" (p. 198) and believe that culturally responsive teachers identify themselves as agents of change in the process of making schools more responsive to issues of student diversity.

Villegas and Lucas' vision of educational change is more politically active than the work that I engaged in with my interns at Lancaster Elementary. At the time this was not part of my focus for our work together. My initial challenge was to get interns to even recognize and acknowledge the presence of student diversity in the classroom. Doing so would be a necessary precursor to understanding how social change might even be critical in the classroom or school. Additionally, as beginners I was uncertain about their ability to take this on in the midst of all the other parts of learning to teach. However, in their own way, Jane and Elizabeth pursued an agenda that supported the needs of students who might be considered outsiders – those who struggled with the academic demands of the school setting in Jane's case and Sam who was marginalized in this setting because of his socioeconomic status in Elizabeth's case. David is not an

intern who would be considered to be one who was focused on or advocating issues of educational change in the classroom. Villegas and Lucas (2002) recognize that "For beginning teachers, the challenges of learning how to teach are so great that they have little time or energy to think about trying to change things" (p. 56). I believe that, of the three interns in this study, Elizabeth did begin to see the edges of the complexity of this issue as she set high goals for herself and for Sam and then struggled to implement this level of work in the context of this particular classroom and school setting. She was able to see the differences between what Sam had access to and what her other students had access to and understood how the school setting privileged the knowledge and experiences of the other students. She began to try to make sense of this for herself as a teacher with many students in her future and engaged in conversation that allowed her to start to try to explore her options, both for Sam and in the future. Jane also began to work on developing an understanding of what her future students would need through her work with differentiated instruction, using this information to consider what might be possible for learners of all ability backgrounds. It is important for teacher candidates to begin developing rich conceptions of diversity that support efforts to change our educational system as soon as possible.

The three interns in this study demonstrate the challenge of helping interns to develop the sense of self as an educational change agent. While all three believed that they could be effective teachers in a general way, only two began to see that they might have some control in this situation. Elizabeth and Jane were able to attempt activities that would begin to challenge the true inequity of the system. As interns who are guests in another teacher's classroom, opportunities for creating change are somewhat limited.

Without the power or responsibility of formal employment, interns are limited to smaller potential and opportunities to enact change.

Villegas and Lucas recognize that this is complex and advocate a range of approaches that teacher educators can take to help prepare teachers to become change agents. However, given the setting in which these interns completed their internships, the need for change was less evident to them than it might be if they were expected to teach in an urban school that challenged their personal experiences as a student. This environment was familiar to them as former students and so seemed to meet their expectations about what school is and should be like for teachers and students. Only Elizabeth began to question what the context meant for a student who did not fit the typical demographics of the student population. This is a difficult issue to resolve. These interns learned high quality instructional practices, felt trusted as competent professionals and yet were in an environment that reinforced much of their beliefs about the structure and organization of schooling. When it comes to developing teachers who would take a personal responsibility to act as agents of change, little growth came from their experiences in this setting. However, it is reasonable to encourage teacher candidates to begin to identify what needs to be changed in our educational system. Helping novice teachers to develop views that recognize the inequities of our system is the first step to educating teachers to see themselves as possessing the potential to change the system.

Constructivist Teaching and Learning

Culturally responsive teachers engage in constructivist teaching and learning practices that understand that learners give new meaning to principles, ideas and knowledge through active construction of this knowledge (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). As

Villegas and Lucas write, "The overriding goal of the constructivist teacher is to help students build bridges between what they already know and believe about the topic at hand and the new ideas and experiences to which they are exposed" (p. 75). These principles of teaching and learning realize that individual students bring their own perspectives and understandings that must be considered as a part of the learning process. This stance recognizes the potential of diverse student characteristics to influence the teaching and learning process. However, Villegas and Lucas do not say much about the influence of cultural on this stance towards teaching and learning. Perhaps what is needed here is a social constructivist look at how teachers and students work together to construct knowledge, using their own backgrounds and experiences to influence practice.

All three interns in this study would claim that their teaching practices are founded on constructivist principles of teaching and learning. In fact, all three did so in their portfolio text (David, Jane and Elizabeth's portfolio text). However, for David there was again a distinction between the instruction and the philosophical claims that he made. While I did see David demonstrate some constructivist approaches to his science instruction on plate tectonics, I did not see him attempt to use these approaches specifically to meet Lucia's learning needs or include her in instruction that was designed to accomplish that as a conscious part of his teaching for the entire class. With Lucia, David reverted to activities that were designed to fill her time and keep her occupied while he worked on instruction with the rest of the class that she could not access at her current level of written or spoken English language skills.

Jane's work with her students was responsive to student needs and she demonstrated a number of learning experiences that reflected constructivist learning

264

opportunities. Jane was better able than David to implement instruction that capitalized on the various knowledge bases that her students brought to the learning process. Jane appreciated the various contributions her students could make and worked hard to design the curriculum in ways that accepted and utilized the contributions of students who were struggling with the content and curriculum. She was able to use what students knew to "build bridges" to the new content that she was striving to teach.

Elizabeth also demonstrated constructivist teaching and learning practices in her work with Sam. She worked very hard to find ways to build on what Sam knew about a subject and work from that point in designing her instruction or redirecting it in the context of teaching the lesson. During her lead teaching experiences in the spring semester, Elizabeth designed a series of activities in each subject area that allowed students to gain access to the content in their own ways.

It is reasonable to expect teacher candidates to begin to engage in constructivist teaching practices with the necessary support to help them take on this more complicated approach to instruction. Because they may have been students in classrooms with more traditional instructional practices, it likely will take extensive modeling through teacher education courses to help them understand constructivist principles for learning and the necessary types of instructional design. However, practicing this type of instruction can help interns begin to understand how each student differs in what knowledge and beliefs they bring to learning experiences. Our teacher preparation program focuses on work with subject matter throughout the senior and internship year courses with the intent that this foundation will allow interns to see the possibilities for designing constructivist practices. Jane and Elizabeth demonstrated that interns who are also aware of issues of

student diversity can utilize that information to design instruction that is more responsive to learning needs.

Students' Prior Knowledge and Beliefs and Responsive Instruction

There is an intimate connection among these last two components of culturally responsive teaching practices. Villegas and Lucas (2002) argue for constructivist teaching practices on the basis that a constructivist approach directly supports the orientation that teachers will need to understand students' prior knowledge and beliefs in order to design responsive instruction. Because understanding students' prior knowledge and beliefs is a necessary precondition to design responsive instruction, I will look at the cases for the last two of these criteria together. Villegas and Lucas (2002) argue that culturally responsive teachers understand what their students bring to the learning experience and are aware that this body of information stems from both personal and cultural experiences. Teachers must understand this information in order to help students build bridges from their background knowledge to the experiences that they want students to learn from in the classroom. They believe, "In a multicultural society, responsible educators continuously tailor instruction to individual children in particular cultural contexts" (Villegas & Lucas, 2002, p. 92). They describe culturally responsive teaching as a "profoundly adaptive and creative activity" (p. 92) that requires teachers to be able to transform their understanding of students into effective classroom practices. However, they also use this information to stretch their students beyond the familiar (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). One priority here is to teach in a way that makes the classroom culture inclusive of all students as well as ensuring that students are able to see varied perspectives themselves.

When Lucia initially arrived in David's class, he sought basic demographic information on her about where she was from and what her parents did that brought them to the United States. Early in the semester, David would try to use his ability to speak Spanish with Lucia to connect with her on a one to one level and would periodically engage her in conversations during instruction where she might share some language or cultural knowledge with her peers. David also worked for a short time in a modified Book Club model that had Lucia reading and writing in Spanish while everyone else was working on another book. However, that was the extent of awareness that David seemed to have about her prior knowledge and beliefs and was the only attempt he made to build on her linguistic resources in the classroom. It now seems likely that David did not know what to *do* with the information he gathered beyond recognizing that this was part of welcoming a new student to the classroom. When encouraged to pre-assess her knowledge on a topic (such as the science material on plate tectonics) in order to design instruction with her knowledge in mind, David never followed through on this. He did not use this opportunity to gain additional information about what she might already know or be able to represent (in Spanish or in English). Because of the communication barrier that they had, David's attempts were limited to a few conversations in Spanish that caused him to realize he was lacking the necessary language skills to understand or probe her conceptual knowledge simply by relying on his Spanish language skills. David did not succeed in building on her prior knowledge and experiences in a way that influenced his instructional design or allowed him to use that material in ways that supported his own attempts to figure out how to help her learn English.

Elizabeth had a decent understanding of Sam's prior knowledge and beliefs given that Sam often had a difficult time focusing on the activities at hand and demonstrating what he did, know or could do. Elizabeth was skilled at observing Sam and engaging him in one-on-one conversations that allowed her to begin to make sense of what Sam knew and could do from the first grade curriculum. With this knowledge, Elizabeth was able to accommodate her instruction to meet his particular learning needs. Elizabeth engaged in many of the activities that Villegas and Lucas (2002) describe as responsive instruction. She was able to help Sam learn to engage in activities with his classmates. She was able to work with his learning needs through using appropriate materials and varied approaches. Elizabeth also worked hard to make the classroom community inclusive of Sam, with some degree of mixed success, given the behavioral issues that were a part of this situation. However, Elizabeth made a good faith effort to engage in the appropriate kinds of support and practices that allowed Sam to contribute to the classroom and learn in fitting ways.

Jane also understood that her fifth graders had a great deal of information and prior experiences that she needed to understand in order to support their learning. She was skilled at using pre-assessments and post-assessments as well as observations of their performances, both in action and in artifacts, to determine her next steps in instruction. For Jane, her understanding of what her students could and could not do was critical for designing her instruction in ways that allowed her to meet the wide range of ability levels present in her classroom. Like Elizabeth, Jane was able to use a range of the teaching practices that are part of the recommended responsive instructional approaches advocated by Villegas and Lucas. Jane succeeded in using a variety of instructional activities to

help her students gain access to the knowledge in the most compatible ways through differentiated instruction in math, varied the materials to meet the particular needs of her students and was able to build on their interests and abilities in multiple subject areas to support the classroom community.

For Jane and Elizabeth, this process of designing responsive instruction stemmed from a more complete picture of the various components of culturally responsive practices as described by Villegas and Lucas (2002). These last two pieces of the framework are the culmination of the other ideals and practices that result in actual teaching practices designed to support student learning. While they were not proficient in each aspect of this process, Jane and Elizabeth were able to begin to bridge their beliefs and their practices in ways that supported the students who were the focus of the critical incidents explored in this study. David's learning is not as well developed in this area as his peers. Because he struggled early in the internship year with the challenges of stepping into the teacher's role, and because of the fact that Lucia arrived in January, he did not have the time and skill across the internship year to progress to the level that Jane and Elizabeth did during the internship year. However, having a goal for interns of developing culturally responsive teaching practices by the end of the internship year is not unfounded. With an understanding that all teacher candidates will be in different places with this goal at the end of the year, it is possible and worthwhile to use field instruction practices to support growth and development of responsive teaching practices in each intern.

This section considered in detail the outcomes of the three cases in terms of what they offer for our understanding of how teacher candidates begin to become culturally

aware and responsive teachers who attend to issues of student diversity both in attitudes and in practice. By looking at the actions and statements of these interns through the lens of Villegas and Lucas' framework, both gaps and elements of development are identified. This raises the question of what is actually reasonable to ask of teacher candidates as they complete their initial field experiences. The following section explores this question by considering the overlap between the work of these three interns on Villegas and Lucas' framework and the teaching career continuum.

<p style="text-align: center;">Comparing Interns' Growth to the Teaching Continuum</p>

Feiman-Nemser (2000, 2003) advocated an approach to teacher education that extended across the entire continuum of teaching experience. In the early years of preservice teacher education, Feiman-Nemser argued for attention to issues of student diversity, given that currently there is little structure in place to support this kind of learning during the practicing teacher stage. She described the task of learning about students' cultural backgrounds as a critical piece of preservice teacher preparation given that there is a "need to cultivate the tools and dispositions to learn about students, their families and communities, and to build on this knowledge in teaching and learning" (Feiman-Nemser, 2000, p. 10). Given the analysis of the interns as culturally responsive teachers, it is possible to use Feiman-Nemser's continuum to consider what is reasonable for our expectations of interns. This helps us to answer the question, "What progress on issues of student diversity is realistic or feasible for interns at this stage in their learning process?"

Villegas & Lucas' (2002) descriptors of culturally responsive teachers provide some insight into the components of practice and attitude that can support the

<p style="text-align: center;">270</p>

development of teachers who are responsive to student diversity. Villegas and Lucas describe what we would like to see in all teachers, not just those who are moving through teacher preparation programs or beginning in the classroom. Feiman-Nemser (2000) asserts that preservice teacher candidates need to learn about students' cultural backgrounds, while during the induction years, teachers need to learn about the larger community of their teaching context and take what they learn about students to implement effective instructional practices. The year-long internship program in place at Michigan State University affords interns the opportunity to move farther along the continuum of learning to teach than the typical teacher candidate who is completing a relatively quick ten to fifteen week student teaching experience. Given the range of learning to enact culturally responsive teaching demonstrated in the three cases, it is possible to consider what is reasonable for teacher candidates as they complete teacher preparation programs with intensive field placement components.

Feiman-Nemser (2000, 2003) pushes for preservice teachers to learn about students' culturally backgrounds, something that aligns with Villegas and Luca's desire for sociocultural consciousness and knowledge of students' period knowledge and experiences. Feiman-Nemser advocates attention to attitudes during this phase. When it comes to attitudes towards students, David, Jane and Elizabeth demonstrated varying degrees of awareness of the complexity and impact of student diversity in the classroom. David struggled with the entire process of learning to teach and spent much more of the year focused on himself as one who was learning to teach than on the specific needs of his student. However, he did make significant progress and was successful in becoming certified to teach. Elizabeth and Jane were able to move very quickly to a focus on their

students as learners with specific needs. That prepared them to be able to take on more actions designed to work with their understandings of student needs in the classroom. One can only imagine how David would have experienced this work in a semester long student teaching program. While all students were developing an understanding of student diversity, only Jane and Elizabeth could transfer theoretical understandings about student learning needs to actual attempts at responsive practices. However, based on Feiman-Nemser's recommendations, Elizabeth and Jane are beginning to make progress past the expectations for preservice teacher education.

Although this dissertation includes only three cases and thus can not be used to generalize to all interns, they provide evidence that teacher candidates can begin to develop a limited sociocultural consciousness (Villegas & Lucas, 2002) even if they are unable to enact it in their practices with consistent effectiveness during their field placement experiences. These three teacher candidates did begin to learn about their students' diverse backgrounds. What is missing is a more complete and detailed picture of diversity for each classroom. No intern successfully addressed the diverse learning needs of every component of a diverse student population. There were gaps in knowledge, practice and exposure that can not be filled in the context of this one experience. However, it does seem appropriate to use teacher education field experiences as a place to begin to develop and explore sociocultural consciousness. When it comes to complex notions such as sociocultural consciousness that commonly challenge fundamental beliefs about schooling and society, the development of sociocultural consciousness is something that must begin early in teacher preparation programs. This is the only way that teacher candidates can possibly be prepared to tackle the

implementation of these beliefs in practice during an internship. It is particularly critical to support this in ways that lead to actual practices that affirm students' diversity as it impacts learning needs.

Is it reasonable to expect a teacher candidate to make the transition from attitudes to practices that are responsive to diversity? Our year-long approach to the internship as well as the support that is provided for interns as they learn to teach indicate that there is room to begin to help them transfer their ideas to actual practices related to students. Even if they do not succeed in meeting every need during the internship, any progress on this front would be valued and important to support as field instructors and collaborating teachers. This progress may put a number of novice teachers ahead on the continuum that Feiman-Nemser describes, better preparing them to make effective instructional decisions for a wider population of diverse students during the early years of their careers.

Feiman-Nemser (2000) never specifically used the terms of developing teachers as agents of change in her description of the teaching continuum. At the earliest stage of the curriculum during teacher preparation, Feiman-Nemser advocates for a critical analysis of teaching beliefs and forming new visions. She recognizes that these ideas can act as barriers that impede new learning or exposure to new ideas that challenge the prior experiences of a teacher candidate as a former student. I am not sure that the talk or behaviors demonstrated by any of the interns in this school setting indicated an awareness of the complexity of the inequalities in the school system at a larger level. In a suburban setting such as Lancaster, the relative inequities are not particularly visible to the interns as they go about their daily lives of learning to teach even though they are present.

However, I do believe that at least two of these interns made progress on the first two criteria of developing attitudes that are culturally responsive towards student learning needs in the classroom. Perhaps this is significant enough progress given the complexity of the challenges of learning to teach. However, it does serve to alert us about the messages that intern candidates do not take from their suburban placement and may indicate a need for further attention to the concept on the part of the field instructor in order to help interns develop more complex visions of the reality of schools in our country today.

Some aspects of the Villegas & Lucas (2002) framework are beyond the scope of expectations for preservice teachers. In Feiman-Nemser's (2000) framework, designing a responsive instructional program is a task that is considered to be part of induction during the first few years of a teaching career. So if interns progress on this front during the preservice field placement it could be viewed as early progress in advancing along the teaching continuum. Elizabeth and Jane demonstrated the ability to build off students' background knowledge and prior beliefs in order to design and implement constructivist teaching practices that were responsive to the curriculum and to the learning needs of their students. Although David was unable to do this in ways that responded to Lucia's English Language Learning needs, he did demonstrate a trend towards constructivist practices in his science instruction.

For our intern candidates, it is possible – with a supportive context such as these interns had where teachers are already invested in constructivist practices – to encourage them to design constructivist teaching practices that are responsive to learner needs. In some instances, designing practices that are responsive to multiple aspects of learner

274

diversity may be the next challenge to take on in school contexts where constructivist practices are already in place to deal with a range of ability needs. If this is the case, field instructors who advocate similar approaches can support interns' development of knowledge about the role of the students' prior knowledge and beliefs in learning.

Pushing the interns to achieve at the level that Elizabeth and Jane did during this year may not be wise field instruction practice in every case, given the learning needs of the intern and the context of the specific classroom in which that intern is practicing as a novice teacher. Some interns may not be ready to take on the challenges of this work even though it is important to help them understand what it is that they're not yet able to do. However, this work demonstrates that, at least for some interns, it is possible to begin to learn important lessons about student diversity and responsive instruction in suburban field placement settings with support. Given where interns are on the continuum of learning to teach, it is reasonable to ask them to develop attitudes and beliefs that are responsive towards diverse student populations and to begin to work with that information in all aspects of classroom life. Villegas and Lucas (2002) write:

> It is unrealistic to expect teachers-to-be to become the type of culturally responsive teachers described in this strand [responsive instruction] during their preservice preparation. The extensive knowledge and sophisticated skills of culturally responsive teachers develop only with experiences. In fact, becoming a culturally responsive teacher is a lifelong process. It is realistic, however, to expect prospective teachers to come away from their preservice teacher education programs well on the way to becoming responsive educators. (p. 110)

I believe that Elizabeth demonstrated the type of progress that Villegas and Lucas are advocating. Jane is making progress towards that goal with gaps in that knowledge; only David lacks the degree of progress that would indicate a strong basis for his own future learning about issues of student diversity and the impact that those issues have on the

teaching and learning process. I agree with Villegas and Lucas that it is fair to begin to expect teacher candidates to start to make sense of the learning process in ways that impact instruction. They state that preservice teachers "could be expected to demonstrate an initial ability to tailor their teaching to particular students within particular contexts" (p. 110). As a field instructor, I expected to see that occur in their instruction during lead teaching in the spring semester. Even if teacher candidates are unable to act on these ideas that foster tailored instruction, we need to encourage them to explore options and understandings through conversation and reflection with field instructors and collaborating teachers. That leaves us with the question of what sort of field instruction support helped Elizabeth to achieve what she did and what lessons we can learn from what David did not accomplish during the period of the internship.

Implications for Field Instruction Practice with Issues of Diversity

This set of criteria for culturally responsive teaching and the outcomes of this study on how the three interns engaged with these ideas in the classroom suggest some implications for field instruction practice. This section explores these implications to determine possible directions for field instruction practices that help interns learn to work with student diversity in the classroom. While the next chapter is focused more broadly on issues of social constructivist field instruction practice, several implications for practice are included here because they focus specifically on helping interns become culturally responsive teachers. These include field instruction attention to the students in the classroom, the types of support that the intern is receiving from the collaborating teacher and how to work with that relationship, and several structures of field instruction practice that can support learning about student diversity.

Elementary Students

When helping interns to address issues of student diversity in the classroom, it is crucial to know something about the particular needs present in each classroom. In this study, the glue that held our work together was a focus on the students in each intern's classroom. While this study was designed to focus on critical incidents that demonstrated the work we did together around a particular student or group of students, all field instructors need to know about the children in the classroom. One of the strengths of this study was to uncover the importance of being able to talk with interns about their experiences with specific students in the classroom. While all supervisors may talk about what happened during a lesson, how a lesson went, etc., it was particularly important to my efforts to engage interns in discussion about diversity that I speak with them about the challenges of specific children in specific situations. Without the ability to talk about the children, this experience could have failed to become focused on addressing the learning needs of the students in meaningful ways.

In a study focused on supervisory practices in a professional development school environment, Gimbert and Nolan (2003) found that one positive outcome was a mutual focus on the support for children's learning that both the supervisor and the student teacher possessed. Nolan, as the supervisor, was someone who the children knew and thought of as another teacher in the classroom setting. This relationship with the students allowed him to involve himself in activities and work with children in a way that gave him insight into the particular needs they faced. Jane, Elizabeth and David all recognized the support they received from me because I understood the needs of particular learners

in the classroom. As well, Amanda commented on this as one of the effective

components of my field instruction practices:

> Amanda: I like that flexibility that you and that maybe a little bit of downtime
> where you know what, I can just go in and be a part of that room. I mean my kids
> see you as another teacher in this building. They know that you're Ms. P's
> teacher but you're not a stranger to them and I think that's really important. I
> think it's important to make it better when you do go in to observe your intern
> because the kids aren't like who's that lady and what is she doing here? I think
> you get a truer sense of what's going on.
> **Alisa: Yeah, I have to turn kids away.**
> Amanda: Leave me alone, I'm working!
> **Alisa: One of them says "I'm going to write with you" and it's "I'm sorry I
> have to write today too."**
> Amanda: But I think that's a great thing about you, Alisa. My class, and they did
> this last year too, Ms. Bates is here. It's just, you're a part of the team and I think
> that's a real strength. (Amanda's spring interview, p. 13-14)

This demonstrates the natural role that I was able to play in the classroom, developing an

understanding of the learners and becoming a natural part of the classroom learning

community. This information allowed me to tailor my feedback in the most supportive

ways to facilitate the kinds of practices that were responsive (Gimbert & Nolan, 2003).

In order to help the interns move forward in working with the specific children in their

classroom, field instructors must use the children and their learning needs to

communicate the expectation that interns will move from a focus on themselves as a

teacher to the students in the classroom as individual learners. Being able to talk about

students and model the kind of thinking that promotes culturally responsive teaching in

the classroom was an important component to our work together. While working to meet

individual needs is a daunting task for a novice teacher, support through field instruction

can begin to make this possible.

Given the importance of this knowledge of learners in the classroom context, it is

critical to consider how it influences field instruction practices. Knowledge of the

learners in each classroom did not develop quickly. It took time to come to know the learners in each intern's classroom in ways that ultimately could help me to design field instruction responses that addressed these particular students' needs. This is a commitment to spend time in each classroom at a more informal level in order to come to know the setting, focusing on the students and their activity as well as the intern and his/her activity. Also, during this study, I was in my third year of field instruction practice at Lancaster Elementary. A number of the students were in classes I practiced in during previous school years, particularly in Jane and David's classrooms. In this study, only Elizabeth's first grade class was an entirely new set of children for me. This allowed me to become more quickly involved in knowledgeable conversations about their students' learning needs. Additionally, the time commitment in a given week was quite high compared to the load of interns. I had six interns with a time commitment of ten hours a week in one school setting to work with them. This suggests that field instruction practice needs to continue to be viewed as a time intensive process where there is a commitment to working in depth with a small group of interns in a school setting. In order to help interns work with complex visions of student diversity, it is worth the time commitment and structural support to design field instruction in ways that allow for this individual attention to interns' classroom settings.

There are several ways that field instructors can begin to build this knowledge about the learners in collaboration with the intern. Field instructors observe interns in the field placement classroom multiple times during a semester. One responsibility that the field instructor already possesses is to ensure that the intern is capable of teaching all subject areas in the traditional elementary school curriculum. This sampling is a natural

279

way to learn about the students in the classroom, allowing a field instructor to determine where an intern might struggle to meet learning needs (e.g. it may be harder for them to address learning needs in literacy than in science) but also to understand how students learn and perform in different contexts. Early in the year, the field instructor can begin to discuss these patterns with the interns, encouraging them to share from their teaching experiences but also to share from their observations of how students work in content areas that the intern may not yet be attempting to teach.

Given this understanding, the intern and the field instructor can then work together to select focus students that demonstrate a range of the diverse learner issues present in the classroom. At the beginning of the year, these students can serve as the center of conversations about issues of diversity in the classroom and how these learners' needs are or are not effectively met through instruction. If interns need support in selecting the focus students, the field instructor can engage the intern in a discussion of the students on the class list, asking them how they are meeting the academic, social and linguistic needs of their learners. This focus also allows field instructors to begin to understand the theoretical perspectives and attitudes of the interns on issues of diversity. This intensive focus provides a common basis for the reflection that serves as a central part of the work together as intern and field instructor. It also narrows the range of stimuli that a field instructor is asking an intern to pay attention to at a time in the learning process when it's possible for the intern to become easily overwhelmed by the complexity of the teaching practice.

This careful attention to the attitudes and understanding of the intern during the early phases of the internship can play a critical role in helping the field instructor

understand how to design practices and responses that are reflective of the interns as learners with particular needs for their own knowledge of learning to teach.

Supporting the Intern's Context and Enhancing Existing Field Instruction Practices

If we do indeed make the commitment to design and implement field instruction practices in ways that support the intern's and field instructor's knowledge of their students, then there are several steps that can be taken by the field instructor to further support the intern's learning. This includes work on the typical activities of the field instructor as well as the structure of the internship.

Villegas and Lucas (2002) recognize that learning to become culturally responsive teachers requires attention to attitudes and dispositions as well as practices that teachers use for instruction with students. This study demonstrates that there are gaps in the interns' knowledge about particular aspects of diversity, perhaps overlooked by them partly due to their school placement setting in a relatively homogeneous school community. Given this stance, I believe that field instruction practices need to consider whether or not interns have a deep understanding of the complexity of the issues of student diversity. Very few interns are likely to make significant progress in implementing extensive practices that respond to all aspects of student diversity. This is reasonable given the expectations that Feiman-Nemser (2000, 2003) and Villegas and Lucas (2002) set out.

Field instructors need to do more to probe conceptual and theoretical ideas about aspects of diversity to help interns meet diversity needs and tailor field instruction practices. It is not enough to assume that teacher education courses have fully developed the theoretical knowledge that interns need to have in order to begin to make sense of the

complexity of educating students with diverse features in mind. Jane and David demonstrate, in particular, that there needs to be more done to help interns conceptualize their understandings of the interconnectedness of the diverse features of students as learners. While I endeavored to work with issues of student diversity during our weekly seminars, I do not believe that I was effective in all situations in communicating the complexity of these various factors as they influence student learning. I believe it might be more effective to try and connect this work in seminar to the specifics of individual interns' learning needs. I propose that field instructors teach mini-lessons during seminars on the relevant theory about certain practices to meet diverse learning needs that build off what they might already know from their teacher education courses but connect that work to the specific students in each classroom who demonstrate those characteristics. Eventually, interns could begin to share this role and teach each other about the various students they are learning to teach in the classroom. This seminar work or individual 'mini-lessons' can support each intern in figuring out the specifics of his or her learners. Compared to my work during this study, these activities would further push me to be explicit with interns about their knowledge and stances around issues of diversity.

If we advocate attention to issues of diversity in seminar, then another broad implication is a need to focus careful attention on the explicit naming of issues of diversity in the classroom. Too often, we speak of children and their needs in global ways. CTs speak of their students in ways that focus on them as individuals but it may be rare in a context such as Lancaster to hear CTs speak of the explicit features of diversity that can influence a child's learning needs. One outcome of this study is the realization

that there needs to be attention paid to the language that a field instructor uses with an intern. There needs to be attention to the children and in helping the interns identify their learning needs in meaningful ways without shying away from the difficult conversations that may ensue. If CTs are not going to have this conversation, then it becomes the responsibility of the field instructor to help the intern come to understand the complexity of becoming a culturally responsive teacher. Field instructors and collaborating teachers can manage a great deal of progress when they are on the same page about the purpose and value of work that focuses on the issues of student diversity in the classroom. If they are not on the same page about the importance of this work as a part of the internship experience, then the field instructor needs to work in other ways to communicate the importance of this work for student learning.

If this is the case, then one potential implication for field instructors involves modeling the practices that we hope to see interns use. In a case such as David's, where his collaborating teacher was not providing the kind of modeling that he needed in order to understand how to work effectively with Lucia, it is possible for the field instructor to work in several ways to provide that support. Depending on the relationships that exist, one possibility is for the field instructor to do some modeling of the appropriate practices in the classroom by teaching an activity or small group lesson with the intern observing and debriefing the experience afterwards. This takes additional knowledge on the part of the field instructor to be able to step in and work with the intern's students in this way. It also requires that the field instructor and collaborating teacher have a relationship that allows the field instructor to step in and take control of some aspect of curriculum and instruction. This may not be feasible for a number of reasons related to issues of power,

time, space, etc. If that is the case, there are several other options that could be used to meet the needs of the intern as a learner.

One possibility is that the field instructors in a program work together to create a master list that includes teachers who would make exemplary models of work with a particular aspect of student diversity. This group could then serve as a set of teachers who interns could visit to see particular strategies or approaches modeled. This further demonstrates the importance of these issues in the practicing teacher's classroom even if interns are not seeing this in their own classroom. Field instructors would be involved in helping to find appropriate matches for intern visits and in advocating that interns make these visits a part of their personal professional development during the internship year. As a participant in the school setting, the field instructor can then help the intern to debrief on their visits and explore connections between the modeled work and the specific needs of the students in the intern's classroom. This work reinforces the value of the task but also moves interns outside their immediate settings so that they can see the possibilities that are available to them as future teachers of diverse student populations.

As future teachers, interns will need to have additional support during the induction phase of their teaching careers. In order to continue growing in their knowledge and skills as teachers who are responsive to student diversity, induction programs will be necessary that foster these attitudes and approaches. David likely needs different kinds of support than Elizabeth and Jane because of their more developed sense of cultural responsiveness, however, there are also several ideas that would be of benefit to each intern.

Induction programs commonly provide mentors to provide additional support during the first few years of a teacher's career. All three interns would benefit from relationships with mentors who are culturally responsive teachers, attentive to their students' diverse learning needs along a range of dimensions. This study considered limited aspects of the interns' experiences with classroom diversity and no intern successfully attended to every aspect present in their classroom. Since it is unrealistic to expect a novice to succeed in doing this during the internship in a consistent and effective manner, this can be a goal for them as they begin their teaching careers. Attention by a mentor attuned to the complex subtleties of such work would be worth the time and effort.

For example, David could use mentor support and professional development opportunities that forced him to challenge his understanding of the complexity of student diversity on the learning experience. The first step in this may be additional attention to David's theoretical and conceptual understanding about aspects of diversity. This should be done in context of his personal experiences and lack of background with a wide range of diverse people in his own life in order to raise his own sociocultural consciousness. This will support his ability to see connections between learners and their personal experiences or backgrounds. David failed to recognize the connection between Lucia's learning needs and her language background. He also did not grasp the connection between this and her social relationships and experiences within the classroom. Mentoring that provides conversation about these interrelationships as they are playing out in his classroom would benefit his understanding of student diversity and learning.

Because Jane and Elizabeth are both highly reflective teachers in their own right, their support would likely start farther along the continuum. Each was able to recognize student learning needs in at least one domain of diversity. However, both could likely use support as they begin to work in other areas of student diversity and confront different challenges. Elizabeth's reflective nature would naturally support her work with a mentor inclined to help her address these issues and challenge her perspectives in order to help her broaden her understanding of the relative importance of all aspects of student diversity on learning experiences.

Jane's case demonstrated that we did not successfully address all aspects of diversity in her experiences. Further, she claimed a belief about the relative ease of determining how to address cultural diversity. This was an oversimplification that will need to be addressed for her to be effective with all students. Professional development opportunities that connected closely with Jane's experiences in the classroom might fill this need because of her tendency to be highly reflective on her practice (this would also be effective with Elizabeth). Additionally, mentor support that gave her an outlet for conversation as well as another person to support her reflective efforts would benefit Jane's continued growth. Efforts on the part of induction programs to continue teacher development towards culturally responsive practices need to take into consideration the learning needs of the teachers as they move from teacher education environments to responsibility for their own classrooms.

This chapter explored what was learned about the feasibility of interns learning to become culturally responsive teachers. It is a mixed bag that demonstrated both the strengths and challenges of this work. The next chapter looks carefully at how my social

constructivist field instruction practices supported and complicated this process for the interns, critiquing the appropriateness of a social constructivist stance for field instruction.

Chapter 8

A SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVIST APPROACH TO FIELD INSTRUCTION PRACTICE

As a field instructor, I utilize my pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1986, 1987) as described in chapter two to promote intern learning about issues of student diversity. By using my own knowledge about my intern learners, issues of student diversity and the best pedagogical moves to help the interns gain access to that knowledge, I am able to design a thoughtful and responsive practice. As I wrote in chapter two, "Not only does a teacher have to know the subject matter, she needs to know her learners and how to best support the interaction between the subject matter and the students to encourage learning." This is just as true for me as a field instructor as it as for an elementary classroom teacher. I chose to embed my work in a social constructivist stance towards field instruction practice. As described in chapter two, "Social constructivism is not a method – it is a view of learning that provides a theoretical base for making decisions about pedagogy and curriculum" (Oldfather, et al., 1999, p. 91). A social constructivist stance towards my field instruction practice influenced the decisions I made about how to work with interns as learners themselves and focused my efforts on their attempts to work with specific students in their classrooms. I will document the practices that I engaged in with each intern and identify patterns that demonstrate the social constructivist stance I hold about teaching and learning.

To structure this chapter, I will look carefully at the issues for field instruction practice through a social constructivist lens of viewing interns as learners. It is important to note that although this dissertation focused on issues of working with interns about student diversity, I also used social constructivist approaches to my practice throughout

288

all work with interns – all subject areas, classroom management issues, etc. – thus this chapter will consider issues of social constructivist practice more broadly. I will consider the various dimensions of analysis used throughout this study including Glickman et al.'s (1995) continuum for supervisory beliefs and Schon's (1987) notion of naming and framing the problems of practice. The previous chapter explored the knowledge and practices of the interns as they learned about issues of student diversity. This chapter reflects on social constructivism as a stance for field instruction that had a critical influence on this experience of learning to work with diverse student populations. The next section will address the implications that this work has for future practice. In closing, I will consider the continuing research agenda that stems from this work.

A Social Constructivist Approach to Field Instruction

A social constructivist approach to field instruction practice was the foundation of my work with David, Jane and Elizabeth. A field instructor needs to know a great deal about the individual needs of the intern learners, the appropriate ways to engage them in action and reflection that improves practice, and have an understanding of the diverse student population that each intern is attempting to teach. To build on each intern's zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978) and to scaffold their learning in this zone (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988), a social constructivist approach explores the kind of support necessary to engage in this practice. There were moments when this stance was more or less effective depending on the situation and the needs of the learner as well as my ability to see and identify those needs.

Social Constructivist Stance

My practice as a field instructor relied on my own experiences as a classroom teacher and as a teacher educator involved in teaching courses in the teacher preparation program on campus. However, there's more than just experience at play here. I brought my beliefs about teaching and learning to this role and was required to find ways to translate that into effective practices for field instruction work with teacher candidates. As a field instructor conducting research into my own practice, I was forced to conceptualize and identify my beliefs about my practice. This process of determining what I believe and recognizing how that may influence what I do in my day-to-day practice is something that I advocate for all field instructors. Previously in the dissertation, I conceptualized my social constructivist stance towards field instruction practice. In chapter two, I wrote about the five broad features of my social constructivist approaches to field instruction practice:

> These five include: (1) attention to interns' learning needs; (2) support for interns' efforts to learn; (3) recognition of the teaching context's influence; (4) exploration of outside contexts; (5) mutual respect demonstrated through conversation and action. (p. 27)

Doing so heightens the field instructor's awareness of how practice and beliefs intersect. I will show throughout this chapter that awareness of (or lack of) one's own stance is intimately connected to what does or does not happen in interaction with interns.

In chapter seven, I described the learning that came from these three cases around issues of diversity and provided implications for field instruction practice that related to issues of diversity as an important aspect of our work together as interns and field instructor. However, diversity is not the only aspect of teaching and learning that field instructors focus on as they support interns in learning to teach. In addition to work on

diversity, content in field instruction includes (but is not limited to) the following areas described in the table below.

Content of Field Instruction	Field Instructor Knowledge
Classroom management	Knowing how to organize and manage learning opportunities and classroom spaces in order to support the development of classroom learning communities
Subject matter knowledge	Knowing the fundamental knowledge, skills and methods of the content taught in school (literacy, math, science, social studies, etc)
Professionalism	Understanding the development of professional behavior through speech and dress; knowledge of professional roles and responsibilities in the school and community; knowing how to communicate effectively with parents, students, and colleagues
Diversity	Knowing how to respond to and support the learning needs of a wide range of students across a variety of diverse learning needs (e.g. English Language Learning, differentiated instruction, cultural preferences, etc.)
Reflection and inquiry	Knowing how to develop stances that encourage attitudes of reflection and inquiry into teaching practice as career-long habits of mind

Table 2: Content areas of field instruction practice.

Each of these content areas can be viewed as a focus of field instruction practice at different times and with different emphases throughout the internship year. However, this table emphasizes the knowledge a field instructor needs to possess and does not provide the actions or behaviors that might be taken to address the chosen content area in practice with an intern. This is where a field instructor must be aware of the chosen stance towards field instruction practice and consider the impact that this approach has on the learner.

Below is a summary chart of practices I used across all three cases organized across the broad features of social constructivist field instruction. It identifies where it was used in my work with the three interns in this study and what the practice typically

looked like in action. This table provides the actions that can be taken as a field instructor who advocates a social constructivist stance towards practice regardless of the chosen content area. The selection of a focus content area provides a lens through which to view the actions of a social constructivist approach in practice. Thus, while this study focused on issues of student diversity in learning to teach, any of the categories described in the table above are relevant for selection as a lens through which to consider the behaviors in this chart. Further description of each category comes after the table.

	The Action	*Intern Cases*	*Example/Definition*	*Examples of Intern Learning*
COLLABORATIVE INTERACTION	**Attention to novices' learning needs**			
	Goal setting	Elizabeth	Helping Elizabeth to see what was possible with Sam and learning to value their success together	Elizabeth learned to set realistic goals and to take pride in the accomplishments they achieved together.
	Generating choices	David, Jane, Elizabeth	Helping David figure out his options for Lucia during Book Club instruction	David learned that there were multiple options for practice and that it was worth generating these options before choosing.
	Mutual respect demonstrated through conversation and action			
	Respecting interns' beliefs and ideas for practice	David, Jane, Elizabeth	Allowing each intern to explore their own understanding of the situations at hand and respecting the ideas that they came up with for implementing or altering practices	Jane learned that she had something valuable to contribute to our work together and appreciated that her ideas were valued and worth consideration as we discussed practice.
LOCATION	**Recognition of the teaching context's influence**			
	Knowing students and context	David, Jane, Elizabeth	Understanding the specific situations each intern faced with the students discussed in each case as well as the classrooms and school setting	All three interns learned that it mattered to know their students and to be able to discuss them intelligently as learners in professionally appropriate ways.

Table 3: Practices that reflect my social constructivist stance for field instruction.

	Knowing the school and classroom context	David, Jane, Elizabeth	Using my knowledge of the classrooms and school community to help interns make wise decisions about practice with individual students	Elizabeth learned that effective teaching and learning required one to know about a student's needs both in and out of the school context.
TALK	**Support for novices' efforts to learn**			
	Reflection	David, Jane, Elizabeth	Regular talk with each of the interns that focused on what sense they were making of their experiences as well as reflection on my observations of their practice	Jane learned that reflection helped her to think through her options for practice and to assess the effectiveness of instructional choices that she made.
	Providing spaces	David, Jane, Elizabeth	Finding ways, both formal and informal, to talk with each intern regularly about their experiences with these particular issues and children	All three interns learned that conversation about students provided alternative ideas and approaches for handling challenging instructional issues.
	Exploration of outside contexts			
	Sharing personal experiences	David, Jane, Elizabeth	Sharing my experiences with Jane of working with heterogeneous ability classrooms	Jane learned that she was not the only teacher to face certain challenges and learned that it was worth talking to others to gain alternative perspectives on an experience.
	Sharing resources	Jane, Elizabeth	Providing Jane with materials for differentiated instruction	Jane learned of other resources that existed beyond her classroom and learned to talk to colleagues for ideas.
THEORY	**Selecting responsive theories for practice**			
	Reading the situation for appropriate theory and making effective choices	David, Jane, Elizabeth	Recognizing that the situation each intern found his/herself in required attention to the nuances of the situation with the student	Elizabeth learned that her situation was context-specific and how I chose to respond to her was directly related to the challenges she faced in her work with Sam.

Table 3 continued.

Just as I was working to help interns learn to teach in ways that were responsive to the needs of their students, the chart demonstrates that the practices I engaged in focused on the specifics of intern learners. Further, each of these practices is something that the interns (and their collaborating teachers in many instances) valued as a part of our work together, citing these as elements that allowed them to feel supported and encouraged as they took on the challenges of each of these critical incidents. This, in part, reflects the importance of the fact that each of the above activities is structured so that individual learners and their contributions to the learning experiences (Vygotsky, 1978) can be recognized as a critical part of our work together. Each of these issues was raised as a part of the field instruction implications in at least one of the case chapters, exploring how it might influence social constructivist stances as well as future field instruction work in that context. Thus, the following sections document the common features of these interactions as well as the importance of talk and the location for our work together as intern and field instructor.

Collaborative Interaction. The activities in the top rows of Table 2 demonstrate an attention to interns' learning needs as they worked with me one-on-one to develop their teaching practices. Social constructivist approaches in teacher education are based on the interaction between the learner and the mentor, highlighting the importance of a collaborative effort to learn new material, stances and practices (Vygotsky, 1978). Tharp and Gallimore (1988) spoke of the concept of assisted performance where learners are supported in developing new knowledge and skills through scaffolded work with a more experienced mentor. They embedded this work in a social constructivist lens because of the attention afforded to the collaborative work. They divided this work into stages that

involve the decreasing support and involvement of the mentor (in this case, the field instructor) as the learner becomes increasingly able to perform independently. The kinds of activities in the chart are open-ended enough for varying degrees of involvement by the mentor in determining what and how it happens with the intern based on the specific learning needs of each intern. For example, goal setting can be initiated by either party as deemed necessary by either person of the relationship, as can the majority of the ideas on this list. Regardless of the degree to which each of these is used in a particular relationship with an intern, the use of assisted performance (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988) helps us to see where the social constructivist practices were more or less effective with individual interns.

In the three cases described here, the interns displayed differences in their ability to move through the various stages of becoming increasingly independent (Vygotsky, 1978) in their efforts to design and implement instruction. David's case demonstrates that while we were not ultimately successful in working together to help him develop teaching practices that were attuned towards and responsive to Lucia's English Language learning needs, there was still respect and a place for David's attempts and ideas as a novice teacher. David's case required that I modify my preferred social constructivist approaches. I took more responsibility and control for pushing David in particular directions because he was unable to learn from what we were doing together and take that learning into consideration in the design and implementation of classroom instruction. He needed further scaffolding (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988) to see what was expected of him in practice. In the specific case of David's work with Lucia, we did not make significant progress in helping David to move past the early stages of assisted

performance (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). He still relied heavily on others to push him to design responsive instruction or to support him in meeting Lucia's needs in the classroom. For David, social constructivist approaches to work centered on Lucia were a mixed set of results. While he stepped in to play a role in our work together, seeking conversation and ideas that could support his classroom efforts, ultimately the outcome was not nearly as strong as I hoped for his work with diverse student learning needs.

Elizabeth and Jane were more successful at transferring their learning from our work together, pursuing options and reflecting on their practices to design instruction that was responsive to their students' learning needs. Each was able to take a significant lead in working with me on the various activities included in the chart (such as generating choices and reflecting on practice), demonstrating a motivation and curiosity to improve her own practice as well as the more culturally responsive stance as described in chapter seven. Jane and Elizabeth were well matched with my social constructivist stance in most respects and each needed less scaffolded support to move forward in her own zone of proximal development (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Vygotsky, 1978). This may be due to the fact that we were also aligned with the naming and framing of each intern's critical incident (this will be discussed further later). Each felt that the experience was supportive and responsive to their needs, allowing them to pursue their desire to become effective teachers. Both were reflective teachers who wanted to engage in conversation about their experiences, about their new ideas and about their questions or concerns of practice. Highly reflective novice teachers and a social constructivist stance towards field instruction seem like a strong match.

While goal setting and generating choices were practices that worked to support particular interns in particular situations, demonstrating respect for interns' ideas and practices was critical in each case. Social constructivism relies heavily on the efforts of the learner to take risks with ideas and publicly present their beginning efforts to learn new material and demonstrate new knowledge (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). In order to create an environment where those risks feel as safe as possible, it is critical to support the interns' fledgling efforts in ways that encourage them to continue to try and to continue to risk as they move forward in the zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978). The key to this is to demonstrate respect for the ideas as well as the challenge of publicly sharing them. I believe that it is impossible to engage in social constructivist practices without demonstrating respect and support for the interns by appreciating their efforts as well as their ideas for practice. Once these ideas are out, it is possible to use them as the groundwork for developing goals and generating choices for action. By demonstrating respect for each intern, even in situations such as David's where progress was more limited, the relationship can be used a as foundation for further growth.

I do not believe that I can personally determine what works for every field instructor or every intern engaged in the complexity of working together to help someone learn to teach. However, I do not think that it is possible to engage in field instruction that is responsive to the needs of the learner without engaging in many of the practices that are included here. I believe that the three cases described here demonstrate that it is critical to understand the learning needs of each individual intern in order to design approaches that model the responsiveness towards student diversity we hope to see in future teachers. The particulars of how each field instructor approaches this might vary,

but the value of the talk as demonstrated in these three cases pushes for an approach to field instruction practice that relies heavily on knowledge of interns as learners and the critical need to work collaboratively together to foster effective practices.

This table clearly reflects the importance of the work of the field instructor in creating the time and space to engage in the types of interactions that support intern learning. The next section considers the issue of location as critical to the development and implementation of a social constructivist practice.

Location. There are two relevant aspects when it comes to issues of location in social constructivist field instruction practices. The context and features of the location matter when it comes to helping interns make sense of their learning experiences. In this study, Table 2 (bottom rows) displays the features of the student population and the context were critical to understanding the sense that interns were making of their work with diverse student populations. For work with issues with student diversity, the context will always be something that the field instructor needs to understand and address so that the work done together actually reflects the complexity of the intern's teaching situation. Without any attention to the context, there would be no real transfer from the conversations between intern and field instructor to the actual practice of teaching in which the intern engages. Social constructivist teaching practices rely on use of this knowledge about the context in order to support intern learning and are an appropriate choice for field instructors interested in supporting learning about diverse student populations. This is because the work that social constructivist field instructors do values the contributions about and experiences of the intern in the classroom and school setting.

As a field instructor, I need to understand what sense the intern makes of the setting in which he/she teaches in order to understand where to advocate further learning and where to support existing knowledge. David's case demonstrates a situation where this was more complicated than it first appeared. As his field instructor, I did not succeed in developing a deep understanding of his perspectives and attitudes towards Lucia until it was late in the semester. Likely, more explicit conversations and directives would have helped him to implement responsive instruction. However, in my collaborative interaction with David (Table 2, top rows) respecting his perspective as a member of his own learning is a foundational part of social constructivist field instruction practices as I conceptualized them. This is a tension that is difficult to balance but ultimately, when the learning of an elementary student is compromised, it is critical that the field instructor use her knowledge of the context and students to direct the intern with further learning and work that meets the students' learning needs.

In Jane's case, we worked through the entire semester and I did not come to the realization that she needed additional support in thinking through issues of cultural diversity until our final interview in late April. Attention to the social environment in the learning relationship is critical to developing a strong sense of what happens in each intern's attempts to teach. While Jane was successful in meeting the learning needs of the wide ability range present in her classroom, not all aspects of diversity in the classroom were considered – either for those fifth grade students or for the development of an understanding for future student populations. With David and Jane, I did not succeed in gathering all the necessary information to support them in working effectively with *all* issues of diversity in the classroom. The later section on Schon's (1987) concept

299

of naming and framing will explore potential ways to enhance social constructivist field

instruction practices to further improve this aspect. However, one initial issue is to

consider how field instructors can use the spaces of their practice in order to encourage

conversation about these beliefs and understandings.

Talk. Across all three chapters it is evident that the actions in Table 2 took place

in a variety of typical field instruction spaces. These spaces included observations,

seminars, debriefing conferences, informal conversations, and formal evaluation

conferences (mid-semester conferences and end of semester conferences). While some of

these situations included written materials (such as evaluation forms and observation

notes), it is critical to note that all of these spaces relied heavily on the use of talk for

making sense of experiences in learning to teach. It was critical to our conversations

together to provide a variety of venues so that interns had multiple opportunities as well

as structures to connect with me through conversation. By offering both formal and

informal conversations, I was able to learn about different aspects of interns' practice and

personal experiences with diverse student populations. I believe that this variety allowed

them to feel the space to start conversations with me as well as opportunities to be the

ones who were engaged in more formal activities of field instruction.

As Smith (2003) writes, "Through talk with a more knowledgeable other, interns

can reflect on their ideas, encounter new ones, and construct images and views of

teaching" (p. 56). For my practice as a field instructor, this included sharing personal

experiences and resources. By doing so, I was able to use my experiences and

knowledge to support and scaffold (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988) interns as they worked to

make sense of their learning experiences. Doing so pushed them beyond the confines of

what they were seeing at school and gave me an opening to provide them with additional ideas and perspectives on how to deal with specific diverse learning needs in the classroom. By providing this, I was able to help them think beyond the experiences of the internship year and move more towards their own future teaching careers as I pushed further on their individual zones of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978). This kind of talk supported a realization of the future responsibilities they would have as the primary teacher who would need to think about the students' learning needs and their subsequent instruction in all aspects of their teaching practices.

Throughout all of the cells on Table 2 runs a thread of reflection. Each of the activities that we engaged in together pushed us to collaboratively reflect on teaching practices and the learning needs of students. Without reflection, our work together would not have progressed past a description of practice and a recitation of events. The reflection we engaged in together was the lynchpin of my social constructivist practice. Pushing interns to reflect and pushing myself to support and scaffold (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988) their reflection in ways that helped them develop culturally responsive practices centered our conversations in ways that supported intern learning. While the progress each intern made varied, the purposefulness of our work together helped each to make progress in reflecting on their developing teaching practices.

As such, social constructivism as a stance is particularly relevant for this kind of practice (Wells, 2002). In chapter two, the social constructivist stance as described by researchers and authors relies on dialogue as a critical detail in the process of designing teaching and learning experiences. I selected a quote to use in chapter two that I believe is demonstrated by my practice:

> It is imperative to stress that dialogue does not imply simple discussing and telling, but rather, includes the analysis of ideas, the synthesis of verbal sources, the evaluation of the intersection of multiple sources, and reflective explanation of one's own thoughts and understandings. (Doolittle, 2001, p. 512)

Doolittle's text refers to the necessity of doing more than telling and describes the components of reflection through dialogue. This type of work highlights the important nature of the conversations that we had. Talk truly became the centerpiece of my work with interns. I visited classrooms and worked in each classroom context, but the real place where our work together occurred was in the conversation we had together about the experiences of the classroom. While it is certainly fair to say that social constructivism is not the only kind of stance that utilizes talk to accomplish goals, it is one that values the contribution of the learner to the experience and emphasizes the use of the talk between intern and field instructor to make meaning about the learning. Working together through social constructivist approaches highlighted the value of each person's contributions to the relationship. Certainly, there were areas where we may have missed the mark in our work together. However, we were able to capitalize on our conversational work together to help each intern make as much progress as possible. I also learned extensively about my own practice by considering my approaches to practice through conversation with each intern.

While talk is critical to social constructivist approaches to field instruction practice, it is also important to those who choose to use social constructivist approaches that they ensure there is the time and space to engage in the level of conversation appropriate for intern learning needs (Vygotsky, 1978) that encourages reflection and thought about appropriate actions for working with diverse student populations. The intersection of collaborative interaction, talk and location are the cornerstones of my

social constructivist approaches to field instruction practices. Each of these areas informed the theoretical choices that I made as a field instructor.

Theory. Each field instructor brings to the situation a variety of theories that address effective principles of teaching and learning. In my case, these included Schon's work (1987), Glickman et al.'s (1995) continuum of supervisory beliefs, and the criteria for culturally responsive teaching that informed my work on student diversity (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Over all of this was a social constructivist theory that informed my visions of teaching and learning in my work with the interns. While I advocate these as effective choices for me – both in this practice and for the purposes of analysis in this study – there are multiple effective and valuable choices that could have been made in place of these ideas. While engaged in practice, decisions are made quickly about next moves and responsive instruction that addresses a particular moment in time. I do advocate a social constructivist approach to practice but, within that context, there are many more choices to be made about practice that are equally valid with those that I made such as to consider how I named and framed issues of diversity with the interns in this study. For me, this was the right theory at the right time to encourage practices that I felt met the needs of the students in each intern's classroom.

Conclusion. Social constructivist field instruction practices are complex to implement and require that the field instructor is able to work with the subtle nuances of what an intern learner needs, the goals of the teacher education program, and the field instructor's own beliefs about effective teaching and learning practices. Not every action listed in the chart will work for every field instructor, even if they prefer social constructivist approaches to practice. These are *my* activities, not *the* activities of a social

303

constructivist stance towards practice. This research is not widely enough focused to be able to determine whether the approaches that I've taken are representative of others who claim to have social constructivist stances towards practice. However, I do believe that the types of activities that I utilized might be typical of the range used by others who pursue similar agendas with their teacher candidates. This stance affords the interns much involvement in their own learning process, with the potential to help them develop the skills and power to continue to learn what it means to teach all students long past the time period of the internship. By involving the interns in their own learning to the degree that social constructivist practices require, there is truly the opportunity to help new teachers start their careers prepared with the kinds of actions and mindsets that help them continue to be learners throughout their careers.

Implications for Restructuring or Enhancing Field Instruction Practice

The careful look at social constructivist practices across these three cases highlight areas for growth and redefinition of field instruction, both as a practice and as a critical role in the support system for helping someone learn to teach. The previous chapter included implications for field instruction practice that focused specifically on the goal of helping interns learn to work with diverse student populations. This section focuses on those that relate closely to social constructivist teaching practices and the intersection of that with interns' learning needs. As a field instructor, one must constantly select among the best theoretical options for practice. This section will include additional attention to the theoretical frameworks I chose to use in crafting my field instruction practice.

Social Constructivist Approaches to Learning Needs

Field instructors need an awareness of their interns as learners so that they can accommodate the individual perspectives and work to meet the specific learning needs of the intern by scaffolding them appropriately in the zone of proximal development (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Vygotsky, 1978). Not only does this model the kind of practice that field instructors hope interns will demonstrate towards their students, it recognizes the complexity of learning to teach. There are several aspects of the internship that are influenced by this understanding on the part of the field instructor.

One issue that came from this work was an awareness of the importance of tailoring the flow of the internship year in order to support individual intern's learning needs. For example, perhaps letting David step back during lead teaching to watch Catherine teach Lucia would have better supported his need to see explicit modeling of the practices that I was asking him to engage in to meet Lucia's English Language Learning needs. Field instructors need to have the freedom to tailor the program in order to match where learners are in the process of becoming teachers.

David was in a very different place than Jane and Elizabeth throughout the internship year. In the fall, the women were ready to teach and were quick to transition from a focus on themselves as teachers to a stance that focused in much more depth on their students as learners. David spent more time trying to figure out what he was doing as a teacher and was more focused on himself as a learner. David's zone of proximal development was focused on more basic tasks of learning to teach (Vygotsky, 1978). The transition that he made from himself to his students was a more gradual process. Only in second semester did he begin to really understand the ways that his students

learned and how his work as a teacher influenced their learning. For his work with Lucia, this challenge was too great because he struggled to make sense of her learning needs. If we consider the work of learning to teach to be a process of moving across a continuum that moves from a focus on the self as teacher to a focus on the students and their learning needs, it is important to understand the work that interns do in moving from one extreme to the other. In retrospect, I should have done more to factor in this type of understanding in my work with David in order to think about how best to support his efforts to meet Lucia's learning needs. Field instructors should attempt to determine where interns are in the process of moving from a focus on themselves to a focus on their students early in the year and continue to monitor this progress throughout the year. Doing so would allow a field instructor to continue to tailor instruction and provide the appropriate types of assisted performance to meet the learning needs of the intern (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988).

In addition, a social constructivist stance towards field instruction focuses on the relationship between the field instructor and intern. To engage in this kind of relationship, there needs to be a strong commitment to the amount of time that it takes to develop a relationship where interns feel free to contribute their own knowledge as well as pursue the questions they have about practice. It also takes time to come to know each intern as a learner. This is true of time spent both in observation and conversation in order to see the interns in practice as well as to discuss how interns make sense of their experiences in learning to teach. In her spring interview, Amanda described how she felt this approach to field instruction practice supported interns:

> Supportive, instructive, guidance...constructive criticism...edification of the intern and what they're doing that's right and spending the time to tell them what they're

doing right. Questioning, "But have you thought about that?" or "What about this?" (Amanda's spring interview, p. 11)

The kinds of things that Amanda comments on as effective strategies for field instruction imply that field instructors need to know their interns well as learners in order to be able to effectively support their experiences of learning to teach. The commitment of time is significant but worth the trouble.

Additionally, it takes time to understand how an intern views issues of diversity in the classroom, recognizing that the personal and political nature of discussions about diversity will influence how quickly interns and field instructors feel comfortable in their relationship in order to present their true opinions on such topics. It takes time to develop a social constructivist stance towards practice. Thus, if this is a stance that is valued by teacher preparation programs, then it is necessary to figure out how to provide the time and space in field placement experiences to develop these relationships. One additional aspect of this is also to think about how to support relationships with collaborating teachers and school contexts over time. Time spent in the same classrooms, in the same school building over a series of years provides a field instructor with more involved knowledge about the student population, the school expectations and the attitudes towards student diversity. If teacher preparation programs, and field instructors, can find the way to make the commitment to extended work in one setting it appears that the arrangement has the potential to increase the impact of field instruction practices.

The next section compares the work I described in the chart with the supervisory belief continuum and related actions of Glickman et al.'s (1995) work for supervisors.

The Supervisory Belief Continuum

Throughout this dissertation, I have compared the work that I was doing with interns from a social constructivist stance with the conceptions of Glickman et al.'s (1995) continuum of beliefs for supervisors working with practicing teachers. They are that supervisors need to understand their own approaches to practice, and recognize whether they function as a nondirective, collaborative or directive supervisor and what sorts of behaviors cause them to engage in with supervisees. I agree with their argument because this would help field instructors to make more informed choices about their instructional decisions. In each of the three case studies, I have worked to point out in which type of practice on the continuum I engaged. I also identified places where I felt my behaviors and actions no longer aligned with the types of activities or work that they advocated for each of their stances.

Across all three cases, I referred to my practice as primarily nondirective. This stayed true for the entire year with Jane as she dealt with these issues of ability and socialization. With Elizabeth, I would occasionally push her to be realistic about what she could accomplish during the internship year, being more forceful about accepting her own limitations as novice but continuing to work with her around issues of Sam's learning in a nondirective way. In David's case, I moved farther from a social constructivist, nondirective stance as it seemed so difficult to implement action to support Lucia's English Language Learning needs. There was little continued evidence of progress in this case as there was in work with Elizabeth and Jane. Particularly in David's case, where my work with him moved farthest from my own social constructivist

stances, I found some areas of overlap but also some necessary accommodations to this continuum for supervision of teacher candidates as compared to practicing teachers.

The behaviors in Table 2 reflect actions that I engaged in through the lens of my social constructivist practices. Glickman et al. (1995) listed a series of behaviors along a continuum that defined their structure of supervisory activities. There is not a direct overlap between my actions and those of Glickman et al. but there are commonalities between my behavior and those located at the nondirective end of the continuum. Table 3 demonstrates the places that my work overlaps with that of the supervisory behavior continuum. It also demonstrates where there are gaps that exist between my practice and the one designed by Glickman et al. (1995).

My social constructivist stance	*Nondirective supervision (Glickman et al., 1995)*	*Collaborative supervision (Glickman et al., 1995)*
Goal setting		Problem solving
Generating choices	Presenting	
Respecting interns' beliefs and ideas for practice		Negotiating
Reflection	Listening, clarifying, reflecting	
Providing spaces	Encouraging	
Sharing personal experiences	Presenting	
Sharing resources	Presenting	
Knowing students and context		
Knowing the school and classroom context		

Table 4: Comparison of social constructivist field instruction and Glickman et al.'s (1995) continuum

The nondirective approach to supervision describes a series of actions that supervisors would engage in. For the supervision of practicing teachers, this includes *listening, clarifying, encouraging, reflecting* and *presenting.*[22] While all of these are relevant to the work that a field instructor can do with the intern teacher, I believe that a

[22] Presenting is defined as giving "his or her own ideas about the issue being discussed" (p. 114).

309

few more features are also relevant and closely aligned with the work described in Table 2. Glickman et al. describe several characteristics of collaborative supervision that I believe can be adapted for nondirective work with novices. Because novices are lacking the knowledge of option choices that practicing teachers may already have in their repertoire, the field instructor can engage the intern in *problem solving* and *negotiating* without taking a strong stance on the selected choice of options that the intern might make. Glickman et al. define this as something that the teacher and supervisor negotiate together.

I see field instruction from a social constructivist stance focusing more on the choices and decision-making processes of the intern with support and guidance from the field instructor in considering what options may exist, not in determining which option for action will be chosen. In order to help interns develop an understanding of what might be possible, the field instructor can provide guidance and ideas. As stated in table 2, one of the actions I engage in through my social constructivist practice is to provide suggestions for other options by sharing my personal teaching experiences as well as teaching resources. But to also help interns become competent and thoughtful decision-makers about practice and options, she must encourage the interns to be the one to make the choice that is most appropriate and feasible from their perspective. This also provides space for the collaborating teacher with more knowledge of students and context particular (e.g. what the science curriculum requires of first graders) to become a part of the conversation and decision-making support for the interns. As the ones who will provide a great deal of the support for implementing decisions in the classroom, the collaborating teacher's judgment can be of significant use here for the intern. Knowing

how the teacher will support the intern as well as the teacher's knowledge of the classroom context are both critical details for understanding how a field instructor might best support an intern.

Because interns are novices who need support in seeing their options, it is reasonable to alter a set of supervisory beliefs for those who work with teacher candidates to include more involvement in describing options but encouraging the interns to step in and take responsibility for making the decisions of teaching practice. Glickman et al.'s continuum provides a useful starting place for supervisors to consider their own beliefs and then explore how they have altered them in order to support their work with novice teachers. One of the findings of this study is an awareness of how such supervisory behaviors must be surfaced and adapted for the work with novices in order to be responsive to the specific learning needs that an individual teacher candidate possesses.

Glickman et al.'s (1995) continuum offers some ideas for field instructors as they work to improve their practice. I believe that this continuum provides field instructors with a place to begin the work I described. In order to understand how you approach teaching practices in field instruction, the first step is to begin to name those actions. Using a continuum such as the one Glickman et al. provide can serve as a place to start to name what it is that a field instructor believes she/he does in practice. Whether or not this specific continuum is the one used by field instructors to engage in this process, something along these lines can provide a basis from which to expand one's individual understanding of her practice as a field instructor.

Schon's Conception of Naming and Framing

The other primary framework used for analyzing the data of this dissertation was Schon's (1987) notion of naming and framing as a means of developing an understanding about the problems of practice so that they can then be successfully managed. While framing does not necessarily require a social constructivist stance, it is predicated on the assumption that there is something to be learned when mentors and novices work together to understand and manage a problem in practice. This section explores what was learned from this study about the place and value of field instructors and interns working together to name and frame problems and then how the field instructor can provide support that fosters the management of the problem.

When field instructors and interns work together to name the problems that the intern is working to address in the classroom, this kind of careful and thoughtful attention to the challenges of teaching has the potential to put both parties on the same page. However, this study demonstrated that the work of naming needs to be explicit with both groups making clear what it is that they believe they have named as the problem. For example, David's case demonstrated that there was attention to the English Language learning needs in our work together but that we were not effective at naming and framing the problem in the same way and were not making ideas explicit. While we may have named the problem as Lucia's English Language Learning needs, we did not frame how this problem challenged David's teaching practices in similar ways. Instead we relied on the more generic conversation we had about Lucia as a foundation for our work together. We did not come to any explicit and clear conclusion about what we felt the issue was in meeting Lucia's needs.

Jane's case demonstrated the opposite experience. Our work together with issues of academic ability in the classroom was well orchestrated and illustrates a case of cohesive naming, framing and managing of a problem. Our work together in naming and framing this problem was aligned from early in the internship year and provided a strong foundation for our work. Elizabeth's case was similar in that we had a strong focus and similar stance on the naming and framing of her work with Sam as a central focus for her work throughout the internship year. Taken together, these three cases demonstrate the importance of explicit naming and framing as critical in the process of getting to the implementation of action. How the problems are named and framed directly influenced our success in working together to support the interns' efforts to manage the challenge across time. It seems that coherent and thoughtful naming and framing is necessary to get to the point where reflection in and on action is possible in a way that causes forward motion and responsiveness to practice.

When it comes to managing the problems of practice, the effectiveness seems to be directly connected to how clearly and explicitly the problem was named and framed. David and I were unable to successfully manage his problem in practice. This seems to be related to the fact that we were never really on the same page as to what the problem really was, instead framing the needs that Lucia had in different ways. Work that I did with Jane and Elizabeth demonstrate the possibilities of what can be accomplished when the problem is effectively named and framed leading to better management of the situation. Naming and framing the problem in the same way does not automatically lead to a successful experience in managing the situation but it does provide more support for

313

work together than having trouble with the first phase of negotiating what the problem really is.

Although this framework was used for analysis and was not a conscious part of my work during the data collection period of this study, I believe that this work demonstrates the value of this analytic process for field instructors who are supporting interns as they try to make sense of the difficult process of learning to teach. In this study, this framework was particularly helpful for considering how we structured our work together on issues of student diversity in the classroom. Without doing so, efforts between field instructor and intern may be wasted in terms of time spent inadvertently pursuing alternate and possibly conflicting purposes. This may be particularly crucial in relationship to aspects of diversity if these are not seen as a part of the context or not supported/pursued by the collaborating teacher in overt ways and thus tend to take a back seat to the relationship of other ideas that are pursued with the field instructor. Teaching this framework to field instructors seems as though it could offer a way of approaching the student diversity in the classroom in more explicit ways (something that was recommended in chapter seven to improve work on issues of diversity). An awareness of the importance of making sure that the field instructor and intern are interpreting the situation in similar terms seems helpful for supporting the work of the interns as they learn to teach.

Helping Field Instructors Develop Their Practice

Throughout the work on social constructivism in this chapter, I have advocated that field instructors need to be aware of their stances towards their practice. This leads into natural implications for practice. I believe that there need to be efforts made to help

field instructors be metacognitive about their beliefs of teaching and learning. While field instructors in our program typically have previous experiences as classroom teachers, they need to be aware of their stances/beliefs/biases about field instruction as a form of teaching that is both similar and different from work with elementary students to make a difference in how they choose to pursue their practices. This issue of conscious awareness can not be understated. Field instructors need to understand what they believe and how they approach their practice in order to consider how they will handle some of the previously described issues – such as knowing interns as individual learners.

Teacher education has a responsibility to educate all supervisors on these critical issues. Currently, Michigan State requires that all new field instructors, who are also graduate students, take a practicum course that supports the development of their practices. This course began the year that I started doing field instruction at MSU and I believe that it was a significant support for me as I worked to develop my understanding of the role. Teacher education programs must understand that supervision is a complex practice that requires support for the field instructors as they learn to engage in this role. Even those with years of teaching experience who may retire and take on supervisory roles as a later career need guidance in thinking about their new supervisory responsibilities. Many of those fulfilling supervisory roles in university programs are outside the mainstream of the education faculty and programs need to find ways that support their learning needs. One effort made by the teacher preparation time I work for is to have weekly meeting for all field instructors to come together and discuss the problems of field instruction practice with support from programmatic staff. These meetings are designed to help us reflect on various aspects of our practice through

conversations with others experiencing similar challenges. Our work over the last few years has included attention to issues of student diversity but less explicit attention to the stances we use to conceptualize our practices. This may be one further direction these meetings could go to support field instructor learning. While there are no simple solutions to the logistical issues that surround this recommendation (and many of these would vary by university), it is important to understand that these efforts could make a difference in how field instructors are able to support interns' efforts to teach all students.

These implications for practice suggest a range of possibilities for future research into field instruction roles, beliefs, practices and stances. The following section addresses these potential research areas.

Conclusions and Research Implications

Social constructivist approaches to field instruction practice can be used to support the development of interns who are learning to become responsive to all students when field instructors are conscious of and responsive to the learning needs of the interns. Particularly when it comes to critical issues of classroom diversity, it is necessary to consider what might happen when the findings of this study are used as a basis for a continuing research program. Currently, I have several ideas for next steps on this research agenda. I conducted a self-study into my own field instruction practices for my dissertation research. I would now like to move outside of that and begin to explore others' conceptions of their supervision practices and mentoring models. This would include emphasis on several areas of the work that I have started over the last few years. Below are descriptions both of topical areas as well as questions that are of interest for

future research in addition to research approaches that would expand this work beyond self-study.

Field Instruction Stances

There needs to be additional work on the theoretical lens that is use by field instructors or supervisors as a means of conceptualizing their stance towards practice. This study has demonstrated that there is an important connection between how a field instructor conceptualizes her practice and how it is enacted with interns in the school setting. One area of interest for future research is to find out how other field instructors understand and define their practice in connection with their beliefs about teaching and learning. How do field instructors make meaning of what they do as a practice? Are they consciously advocating a stance in their model and activities with interns? These first few questions suggest a specific approach to research that might include work such as case studies of other field instructors and how they utilize their stances in defining their work with teacher candidates. These questions suggest a research approach that moves beyond the confines of one person's practices. A descriptive look at how others conceptualize their practice would add information to the literature on supervision for novice teachers that updates the more traditional work on the use of checklists and objectives.

At another level, there are a series of questions that can be asked about how departments and colleges of education are working with issues of supervision in their teacher education preparation programs. How are other teacher preparation programs training/preparing field instructors with attention to their attitudes towards practice? What do we know about stances of individuals and programs that inform their work with

317

the teacher candidates? Research in this arena would entail studies that cross programs and institutions to determine how others are preparing and engaging field instructors in practice.

Interns as Learners

In addition, there are potential research questions that consider the impact of the interns as individual learners on how field instructors define their work and responsibilities towards their learners. These questions explore how a specific aspect of practice is addressed. How do field instructors respond to interns' learning needs in ways that promote growth and recognize the individuality of the learner? How do they do this in ways that model for teacher candidates the importance of doing the same for their students? While these questions are also connected to issues of stance in the design of field instruction practices, they also focus more carefully on the specific feature of how field instructors respond to individual learners. This is a critical area for further research because how we as field instructors who are teaching others about practice respond to individual needs sends an implicit or explicit message for how teacher candidates think about responding to their own learners. Research approaches in this context would include careful looks, from intern and field instructor perspectives, at how the intern is thought of and responded to as a learner. This is connected to issues of stance but does not imply that the stance of choice must be social constructivist.

Social Constructivist Practices

This study lays down a beginning foundation for continued work on social constructivist approaches for field instruction practices, attending to how they can be used to think about teaching in addition to learning. This study acknowledges how

interns felt about the way I chose to work with them, and identifies places and ways that they felt were particularly effective in supporting them. However, additional work can also be done on how interns feel about this type of support as it works with or against them as they learn to teach with a more overt and explicit announcement and theoretical description of a social constructivist stance towards practice than I provided my interns. To that end, there are some additional questions for future research.

Can a knowledge base or series of actions be determined that continue to foster the use of a social constructivist approach to field instruction practice in meaningful ways? If so, a number of other questions arise that challenge the implications of this approach. How does social constructivist field based teacher education work in varied settings? Do school and collaborating teacher perspectives influence the effectiveness of this approach and in what ways? These two questions demonstrate that context might be varied in different research designs to determine the effectiveness of a social constructivist approach in a variety of locations with differing student demographics. What are the impacts of these characteristics on the role and job description of the field based supervisor? There are many ways that this body of questions can be explored through research. This can be done at the individual case study as well as at the programmatic level, considering the nature of the social constructivist stance as a personal approach or as a programmatic commitment. This set of questions also includes a series that focuses on the school and community context that influences the types of practices that are used to deal with specific situational needs.

These questions suggest a research approach reliant on a set of case studies across locations as well as those that focus deeply into the nuances of a particular context. My

work did more of the latter by looking carefully at how this played out at Lancaster Elementary school. Further research would be useful in settings that are urban or rural and deal with different challenges related to student diversity as a way of exploring how social constructivism is more or less effective as a result of the setting's particular needs. I believe that this approach to research is a necessary first step to determine the necessary features to be included in larger, qualitative studies that focus on samples of more supervisors. Given the understanding that would come from these individual and then programmatic level studies, the foundation would be laid to research across programs and at more complex levels of interaction.

Issues of Student Diversity

As described in chapter seven, issues of student diversity are of particular importance to the development of future teachers. That makes it an important aspect of the work that is done by the teacher preparation program, and more specifically, the work of the field instructors who help teacher candidates to make sense of their experiences in the field. This study focused on the critical incidents in each intern's classroom that influenced our work together as they learned to respond to the needs of particular learners in the classroom. This work, from a social constructivist perspective, is an initial attempt to conceptualize how to work with interns about these issues in a suburban community. Further work needs to be done to answer the questions in more detail and from the perspectives of more participants in the process. There is little literature on the experiences of field instructors' work with issues of diversity during student teaching or internship experiences. Much work needs to be done to simply map the lay of the land with the intersection of these issues. How do supervisors support the work of teacher

320

candidates as they attempt to meet the learning needs of diverse student populations? What role does the supervisor play as a catalyst in this learning process? What approaches seem to be more or less effective in doing so? Research that addresses these questions will need to be done at multiple levels of interaction – both individual experiences that occur in a particular time or place as well as considering how programs are structured to support these goals.

Conclusion

I continue to be interested in research that pays close, careful attention the realities of the field and the experiences that all involved in teacher education have in that context. To that end, I can identify a range of important questions to be asked of these experiences and relationships and the influence this process has on the development of teacher candidates. I recognize two different levels at play here – how to continue to develop deep and thoughtful cases of the experiences that are had in the field and the need to begin to broaden some of this theory (in this case, a social constructivist approach to field based teaching) to consider implications and issues that extend beyond the individual pairs of supervisors and teacher candidates. One of my initial research goals is to begin to develop work at both of these levels because I feel that this approach to practice has rich potential to support the development of reflective, culturally responsive teachers who are attuned to their students' individual learning needs.

321

APPENDICES

Intern Winter Interview Questions

Introductory Statement: This year you have had a LA Practicum as part of fall semester. We will be focusing primarily on the LA practicum in this interview, but if you want to add comments on the math practicum that you think are relevant, please feel free to do so. We'd like to get a sense of your understanding of the practicum, how you have experienced it, and whether and how it has been helpful to your learning.

Practicum:
What is your understanding of the Practicum—its purpose and activities?

Who provided support to you in the Practicum? How?
- Probes: field instructor, course instructor, CT

Team Two decided to offer this practicum to make a bridge between your TE 401 learning to teach language arts and your classroom teaching in the fall. What opportunities to work on your practice, as a teacher of language arts, have you had this semester?
- Probe: ideas, concepts, strategies, specific tools and activities (from practicum handout: types of guided observations, pre/post conferences with CTs, exploration of language arts curriculum materials)
- Probe: how have FT, CT, Course Instr. been involved in supporting those opportunities?

Given your experiences so far, how do you hope to be involved in teaching of language arts during January? During guided lead teaching?
What opportunities to prepare to teach language arts in spring semester do you wish you had?

Context:
Describe your school. What is this place like? Tell me about the community—probes: what opportunities have you had to get to know the parents? What are they like?

Tell me about the students in your classroom. Probes: What are they like as learners? What are they like as people/kids? Are there any particular kids who stand out for you in this group? In what ways?
- When I ask you to think about the range of learning needs (social, academic, linguistic support) that exists in your classroom, what comes to mind for you? [Here is a first step at getting to diversity without specifically using this term.]
- How have you learned about them? Can you describe your strategies for doing this?

Diversity:

When I use the term "diversity" in relation to your classroom, what comes to mind for you? What issues have you faced in your classroom?
- Probe: what conception of diversity is and isn't – if they don't mention all of the following, ask specifically about each: race/ethnicity/culture, ability – gifted or special education, socioeconomic, linguistic [if they've mentioned these in question 2 they don't need to repeat their description]
- how they have learned about their students based on these descriptions, how CT or FI have helped them to identify and understand these various issues of diversity

Have you already faced some challenges associated with meeting the learning needs of your students? What sorts of challenges do you think this classroom diversity will present for you in lead teaching this spring? If so, were you able to work through these challenges? If yes, how did you accomplish this? If not, why do you think you weren't able to do so? [Probe for specific cases so particulars can be explored in depth]
- Probe: strategies they have seen or have in mind to try this spring, issues that they are concerned about, students' needs or characteristics that they are concerned about

To what extent has the TE program helped to educate you on issues of helping diverse learners in language arts?
- Probe: specific courses where worked on this area – ask for specifics

What sort of help has your CT given you in helping diverse learners?

What do you feel like you still need to learn about your students before lead teaching spring semester?

What are your teaching strengths in working with your students? What are some areas where you'd like more information, resources, etc?
- Probe: planning, assessment, making teaching decisions in the moment

Field instruction:
How has your field instructor been supporting your learning? Any strategies you find particularly helpful in supporting your learning?

Collaborating Teacher Winter Interview Questions

Introductory Statement: This year you have had a LA Practicum as part of fall semester. We will be focusing primarily on the LA practicum in this interview, but if you want to add comments on the math practicum that you think are relevant, please feel free to do so. We'd like to get a sense of your understanding of the practicum, how you have experienced it, and whether and how it has been helpful to your learning.

Practicum:
What is your understanding of the Practicum—its purpose and activities?

Who provided support to your intern in the Practicum? How?
- Probes: field instructor, course instructor, CT

Team Two decided to offer this practicum to make a bridge between the intern's TE 401 learning to teach language arts and his/her classroom teaching in the fall. What opportunities has the intern had to work on his/her practice as a teacher of language arts this semester?
- Probe: ideas, concepts, strategies, specific tools
- Probe: how have FT, CT, Course Instr. been involved in supporting those opportunities?

Given the intern's experiences so far, how do you hope to get him/her involved in teaching of language arts during January? During guided lead teaching?

What opportunities to prepare to teach language arts in spring semester do you wish s/he had?

Context:
Describe your school. What is this place like? Tell me about the community—probes: what are the parents like? How do they support the work in your classroom?

How does your class this year compare to classes you've had in the past few years? Describe this year's class. Who are your learners? Have there been changes in your typical class make-up as a result of the redistricting from closing Edgewood?

How does your intern respond to the various learning needs of your students? What catches his/her attention? What do they comment on? How does he/she talk about kids?

Diversity:
When I use the term "diversity" in relation to your classroom, what comes to mind for you? What issues have you faced in your classroom?
- Probe: what conception of diversity is and isn't, how they have learned about their students, how intern has engaged in trying to identify and understand these various issues of diversity
- How are you working with your intern to learn about these students/needs?

What are some of your intern's strengths in working with the learning needs of your students?

What sorts of challenges do you think this classroom diversity will present for your intern in lead teaching this spring? [Probe for specific cases so particulars can be explored in depth]

Have you already observed interns dealing with issues/challenges that involve the teaching of diverse learners? How have interns managed in these situations?

How did this intern compare with other interns you have worked with? Probes: ideas, concepts, strategies, tools. To what extent do you think the Practicum influenced what you saw this semester?

To what extent do you feel the TE program has helped to educate your intern on issues of helping diverse learners in language arts?
- Probe: ask for specifics or why they have that impression

Field instruction:
How has the field instructor been supporting your intern's learning? Are any specific strategies particularly helpful from your perspective?

APPENDIX B

Intern Spring Interview Questions

Practicum and Language Arts:
In the fall we talked about the learning opportunities you had (review what those were).
How well did those influence/support (or not) your teaching of language arts this
semester? To what extent did they seem to prepare you for taking on more responsibility
in the spring?

Who provided support to you in learning to teach language arts during this semester?
- Probe: how have FT, CT, Course Instr. been involved in supporting those opportunities?

How would you describe your knowledge and skills as a teacher of language arts? What
are your strengths and weaknesses?
- How did the Practicum prepare you for teaching language arts?
- How could the Practicum have better prepared you to learn to teach language arts?
- How could your spring semester experiences have better prepared you?

Diversity:
Based on identification of diversity issues in the classroom from the fall semester
interview (review these), would you still describe these challenges in the same way?
Why or why not?
- How did literacy teaching this spring go with these (students, issues, etc)?
- Were you able to address the literacy and diversity challenges that may have
  arisen in this situation? (If yes, how did you accomplish this? If not, why do you
  think you weren't able to do so?)
- Did you feel that you were successful in meeting students' diverse needs? Ask for
  examples (pro or con) in literacy, but in other subject areas if it comes up.
- Who helped you to engage in this work? (probe FI, CT and CI)
- Last time we met, you talked about some challenges you were facing (review
  what they were). Did these remain challenges for you? Why or why not?
- Did you sense a change in your approach, challenges etc over the course of lead
  teaching? How do you feel that you have changed since this time in your ability to
  meet the needs of all of your students over time?
- Are there areas – such as a certain subject matter – in which you find it easier to
  address diverse learning needs? Are there any areas that you find difficult to
  address diverse needs? (Probe for certain instructional/learning instances that they
  feel support their claims. Raise any specific content areas that might seem
  relevant based on observations over the semester.)

What one moment, experience, etc. in the semester was the biggest "aha" moment for
you? What stood out to you in working on teaching practices this year? Particular
issues, kids, etc.

- A critical incident in learning to teach or work with all students?
- If they don't suggest specific groups of children or specific cases, I will probe by suggesting some of the children that I felt were challenging for them (David – Mary, Ashok, Lucia, James; Jane – gifted boys, Julia, Nigel; Elizabeth – Sam)
- Do you think any of that kind of stuff that's been important will show up in your portfolio in some way?

Field instruction:

Team 2 is trying to think about the role of the FI and how to improve FI. Briefly, can you give me some words that you think characterize the field instructor role?
- Based on what they offer, which of these is most prominent? (hopefully something about knowledge, teacher)
- Describe to them the ideas behind the expert novice relationship. Can you characterize the way we work together to develop your knowledge? (telling, guiding, exploring)
- Field instructors are responsible for both assistance and assessment (describe this distinction briefly for them). Where was the emphasis for you and did it feel formative or summative along the way? Did it influence the way you talked to me? If no, why not and if yes, what do you think were the issues around this in helping you to learn to teach?

What else could a team two field instructor do in this role that would help you in learning to teach all kids?

Wrapping up:

What issues of working with diverse students do you feel you need to learn more about in order to become effective with all students?
- Probe: Where/how do you think you will acquire this knowledge?

What type of school/district do you hope to be teaching in next year? What do you think will be your biggest challenges during your first year of teaching?

CT Spring Interview

Practicum:
Overall, how do you feel that the internship went for your intern? Please share some of the intern's strengths and weaknesses during the internship.

In the fall we talked about the learning opportunities the intern had (review what those were). How well did those influence/support (or not) the intern's teaching of language arts this semester? To what extent did they seem to prepare him/her for taking on more responsibility in the spring?
- Probe: ideas, concepts, strategies, specific tools and activities (from practicum handout: types of guided observations, pre/post conferences with CTs, exploration of language arts curriculum materials)

Who provided support to the intern in learning to teach language arts during this semester?
- Probe: how have FT, CT, Course Instr. been involved in supporting those opportunities?

How would you describe your intern's knowledge and skills as a teacher of language arts? What are his/her strengths and weaknesses?
- How did the Practicum assist interns in learning to teach language arts?
- How could the Practicum have better prepared your intern to learn to teach language arts?
- How could the spring semester experiences have better prepared your intern?

Diversity:
Based on identification of diversity issues in the classroom from the fall semester interview (review these), would you still describe these challenges for your intern in the same way? Why or why not?
- How did literacy teaching this spring go with these (students, issues, etc)? Did you feel that the intern was successful in meeting students' diverse needs? Ask for examples (pro or con) in literacy, but in other subject areas if it comes up.
- Did you sense a change in your intern's approaches, challenges etc over the course of lead teaching? How do you feel that your intern has changed over the course of the semester in their ability to meet the needs of all of your students over time?
- Are there areas – such as a certain subject matter – in which you think your intern finds it easier to address diverse learning needs? Are there any areas that you feel your intern finds difficult to address diverse needs? (Probe for certain instructional/learning instances that they feel support their claims. Raise any specific content areas that might seem relevant based on observations over the semester.)

From your perspective, what one moment, experience, etc. in the semester was the biggest "aha" moment for your intern this year? What stood out to you about the intern's learning to work on teaching practices this year? Particular issues, kids, etc.

- A critical incident in learning to teach or work with all students?
- If they don't suggest specific groups of children or specific cases, I will probe by suggesting some of the children that I felt were challenging for them (David – Mary, Ashok, Lucia, James; Jane – gifted boys, Julia, Nigel; Elizabeth – Sam)
- How have they shared their concerns or issues with you? (e.g. face on, waiting until they have a real problem, etc)

Field instruction:
Team 2 is trying to think about the role of the FI and how to improve FI. Briefly, can you give me some words that you think characterize the field instructor role?

- Based on what they offer, which of these is most prominent? (hopefully something about knowledge, teacher)
- Describe to them the ideas behind the expert novice relationship. From your perspective of watching the way we work with interns, can you characterize the way we work together to develop your intern's knowledge? (telling, guiding, exploring)
- How would you hope the FI here would do this job? At the end of next year, what would you want me to tell the team about the needs and expectations you have for a FI?

What else could a team two field instructor do in this role that would help interns in learning to teach all kids?

Wrapping up:
How did this intern compare with other interns you have worked with? Probes: ideas, concepts, strategies, tools. To what extent do you think the Practicum influenced what you saw this semester?

What issues of working with diverse students do you feel your intern needs to learn more about in order to become effective with all students? Where might or how would you suggest your intern learn these necessary things?

APPENDIX C

Student interview conducted with each intern

Talk me through your class list and tell me a little bit about each student. Start with some descriptive words about each child as a learner as well as anything else you think I should know. Pretend that we haven't been talking about these kids on and off all year – some we've discussed a lot and some I don't know very much about. [Use class list here to ensure that all students are included in the conversation]

You've mentioned several students that seem to need a range of accommodations to the general instruction in your classroom. I've got a hunch about the lesson plans you've been creating and wanted to see what you thought. I'm curious about the adaptations and accommodations section – how did your thinking about this change over the course of the year – especially as you moved through lead teaching? (If necessary, point out that the attention to this section really seemed to drop off as they moved on – why was this?)

What do you think is important to know about your learners as you think about going into next year?

How do you think about assessment of kids when you have so much variation in needs and abilities going on in your classroom at the same time? (Talk with them about formative and summative and how this might be affected by the kids, etc)

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Allington, R.L. & Walmsley, S.A. (Eds.). (1995). *No quick fix: Rethinking literacy programs in America's elementary schools*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Avi, (1987). *The fighting ground*. New York: Harper Trophy.

Banks, J. A. (1991). *Teaching strategies for ethnic studies*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Banks, J. A. (1994). Transforming the mainstream curriculum. *Educational Leadership, 51*(8), 4-8.

Banks, J. A., Cookson, P., & Gay, G. (2001). Diversity within unity: Essential principles for teaching and learning in a multicultural society. *Phi Delta Kappan, 83*(3), 196-203.

Bates, A.J. & Rosaen, C.L. (2004). *Making sense of classroom diversity: How can field instruction practices support interns' learning?* Michigan State University, unpublished paper.

Beach, R., & Pearson, D. (1998). Changes in preservice teachers' perceptions of conflicts and tensions. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 14*(3), 337-351.

Bereiter, C. (1994). Constructivism, socioculturalism, and Popper's World 3. *Educational Researcher*, 21-23.

Bereiter, C. & Scardamalia, M. (1996). Rethinking learning. In D.R. Olson & N. Torrance (Eds.), *The Handbook of Education and Human Development* (pp. 485-513). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Berliner, D. C. (1987). Ways of thinking about students and classrooms by more and less experienced teachers. In J. Calderhead (Ed.), *Exploring teachers' thinking* (pp. 60-84). London: Cassell.

Berliner, D. C. (1992). The nature of expertise in teaching. In C.K. Osu, A. Dick, & J.L. Patry, (Eds.), *Effective and responsible teaching: The new synthesis*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Borko, H., & Mayfield, V. (1995). The roles of the cooperating teacher and university supervisor in learning to teach. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 11*(5), 501-518.

Bowman, N. (1979). College supervision of student teaching: A time to reconsider. *Journal of Teacher Education, 30*(3), 29-30.

Boydell, D. (1986). Issues in teaching practice supervision research: A review of the literature. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 2*(2), 115-125.

Bransford, J.D., Brown, A.L., & Coching, R.R. (1999). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience and school.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Brooks, J.G. & Brooks, M.G. (2001). *In search of understanding the case for constructivist classrooms.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Brophy, J. (Ed). (2002). *Social constructivist teaching: Affordances and constraints.* In J. Brophy (Series Ed.), Advances on Research in Teaching: Vol. 9. Boston: JAI.

Bruner, J. (1966). *Toward a theory of instruction.* Cambridge: Belknap Press.

Bullough, R. V. (1995). Inclusion: A view from inside the classroom. *Journal of Teacher Education, 46,* 85-93.

Calderhead, J., & Robson, M. (1991). Images of teaching: Student teachers' early conceptions of classroom practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 7*(1), 1-8.

Calkins, L. (1994). *The art of teaching writing.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Cattani, D. H. (2002). *A classroom of her own: How new teachers develop instructional, professional, and cultural competence.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Children's Defense Fund. (2000). *Poverty statistics.* www.childrensdefense.org

Cleary, B. (1990). *The mouse and the motorcycle.* New York: Harper Trophy.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). Learning to teach against the grain. *Harvard Educational Review,* 61(3), 306-317.

Cohn, M. (1981). A new supervision model for linking theory to practice. *Journal of Teacher Education, 32*(3), 26-30.

Cohn, M., & Gellman, V. C. (1988). Supervision: A developmental approach for fostering inquiry in preservice teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(2), 2-8.

Colville-Hall, S., MacDonald, S., & Smolen, L. (1995). Preparing preservice teachers for diversity in learners. *Journal of Teacher Education, 46*(4), 295-303.

Costa, A.L., & Gamoran, R.J. (1994). *Cognitive coaching: A foundation for Renaissance schools.* Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

Creighton, R. L., & Irwin, A. J. (1994). When new boundaries abound: A systematic approach to redistricting. *School Business Affairs, 60*(5), 13-16.

Creighton, R. L., & Hamlin, D. M. (1995). Crossing the redistricting minefield. *School Administrator, 52*(2), 18-22.

Deering, T. E., & Stanutz, A. (1995). Preservice field experience as a multicultural component of a teacher education program. *Journal of Teacher Education, 46*(5), 390-394.

Denyer, J. (1997). Constructing a practice: How an educational vision shapes the work of a field instructor and her teacher candidates. In S. Feiman-Nemser & C. L. Rosaen (Eds.), *Guiding Teacher Learning: Insider Studies of Classroom Work with Prospective & Practicing Teachers* (pp. 37-52). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Dodge, B. (2001). *Five rules for writing a great WebQuest.* Learning and Leading with Technology, 28(8), 6-9.

Doolittle, P.E. (2001). The need to leverage theory in the development of guidelines for using technology in social studies teacher preparation: A reply to Crocco and Mason et al. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education* [online serial], *1*(4), 501-516.

Duckworth, E. (1996). *The having of wonderful ideas and other essays on teaching and learning.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M. & Short, D.J. (2004). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model* (2nd ed). Boston: Pearson, Allyn & Bacon.

Ellwein, M. C., Graue, M. E., & Comfort, R. E. (1990). Talking about instruction: Student teachers' reflections on success and failure in the classroom. *Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(4), 3-14.

Englert, C.S. & Dunsmore, K. (2002). A diversity of teaching and learning paths: Teaching writing in situated activity. In J. Brophy (Series and Vol Ed), *Social constructivist teaching: Affordances and constraints. Advances on Research in Teaching: Vol. 9* (pp. 81-130). Boston: JAI.

Enz, B.J., Freeman, D.J., & M.B. Wallin. (1996). Roles and responsibilities of the student teacher supervisor: Matches and mismatches in perception. In J. McIntrye & D.M. Byrd, eds. *Preparing tomorrow's teachers: The field experience teacher education yearbook IV.* New York: Corwin Press and Association of Teacher Educators.

Featherstone, H. (1992). *Learning from the first years of classroom teaching: The journey in, the journey out* (NCRTL Special Report). East Lansing: Michigan State University.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2000). *From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching.* New York: Bank Street College of Education.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). Helping novices learn to teach: Lessons from an exemplary support teacher. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(1), 17-30.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2003). What new teachers need to learn. *Educational Leadership,* May, 25-29.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Beasley, K. (1997). Mentoring as assisted performance: A case of co-planning. In Richardson, V. (Ed.), *Constructivist teacher education: Building new understandings.* London: Falmer.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Buchmann, M. (1985). Pitfalls of experience in teacher preparation. *Teachers College Record, 81*(1), 53-65.

Fosnot, C.T. (1989). *Enquiring teachers, enquiring learners : a constructivist approach for teaching.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Fosnot, C.T. (1995). *Constructivism: Theories, perspectives and practice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Fountas, I.C. & Pinnell, G.S. (2001). *Guiding readers and writers (grades 3-6): Teaching comprehension, genre and content literacy.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Fraser, J. W. (1997). Preface. In J. J. Irvine (Ed.), *Critical knowledge for diverse teachers and learners* (pp. v-x). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Freeman, D. (1991). "To make the tacit explicit": Teacher education, emerging discourse, and conceptions of teaching. *Teaching & Teacher Education,* 7(5/6), 439-454.

Friebus, R.J. (1977). Agents of socialization involved in student teaching. *Journal of Educational Research,* 70, p. 263-268.

Furlong, J. (2000). School mentors and university tutors: Lessons from the English experiment. *Theory into Practice,* 39(1).

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory and practice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Gimbert, B. & Nolan, J.F. (2003). The influence of the professional development school context on supervisory practice: A university supervisor's and interns' perspectives. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 18*(4), 353-379.

Glickman, C.D., Gordon, S.P, & Ross-Gordon, J.M. (1995). *Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach (3rd ed)*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Gomez, M. L. (1994). Teacher education reform and prospective teachers' perspectives on teaching 'Other people's' children. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 10*(3), 319-334.

Grant, C. A. (1997). Critical knowledge, skills and experience for the instruction of culturally diverse students: A perspective for the preparation of preservice teachers. In J. J. Irvine (Ed.), *Critical knowledge for diverse teachers and learners* (pp. 1-26). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Grant, C. A., & Sleeter, C. E. (2003). *Turning on learning: Five approaches for multicultural teaching plans for race, class, gender and disability* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Grant, C. A., & Zozakiewicz, C. A. (1995). Student teachers, cooperating teachers, and supervisors: Interrupting the multicultural silences of student teaching. In J. M. Larkin & C. E. Sleeter (Eds.), *Developing Multicultural Teacher Education Curricula* (pp. 259-278). Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Harper, C. and deJong, E. (2004). Misconceptions about teaching English-language learners. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 48(2)*, 152-162.

Hawkey, K. (1997). Roles, responsibilities, and relationships in mentoring: A literature review and agenda for research. *Journal of Teacher Education, 48*(5), 325-335.

Hodgkinson, H. (2002). Demographics and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(2), 102-105.

Hoover, N. L., O'Shea, L. J., & Carroll, R. G. (1988). The supervisor-intern relationship and effective interpersonal communication skills. *Journal of Teacher Education,* March-April, 22-27.

Howey, K. (1994). Teacher preparation: Overview and framework. In M. J. O'Hair & S. J. Odell (Eds.), *Partnerships in education: Teacher education yearbook II* (pp. 77-84). New York: Harcourt Brace.

Hutchinson, N. L., & Martin, A. K. (1999). The challenges of creating inclusive classrooms: Experiences of teacher candidates in a field-based course. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 26*(2), 51-70.

Hyland, T. F. (1989). Seven factors you'd better now forget when changing attendance boundaries. *American School Board Journal, 176*(9), 29-30.

Joram, E., & Gabriele, A. J. (1998). Preservice teachers' prior beliefs: Transforming obstacles into opportunities. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 14*(2), 175-191.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1991). *When difference means disaster: Reflections on a teacher education strategy for countering student resistance to diversity.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into Practice, 34*(3), 159-165.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1999). Preparing teachers for diversity: Historical perspectives, current trends and future directions. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice* (pp. 86-123). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). *Crossing over to Canaan: The journey of new teachers in diverse classrooms.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Lareau, A. (1987). Social-class differences in family-school relationships: The importance of cultural capital. *Sociology of Education, 60*, 73-85.

Lareau, A. (2000). *Home advantage: Social class and parental intervention in elementary education.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Lee, C. D., & Smagorinsky, P. (Eds.). (2000). *Vygotskian perspectives on literacy research: Constructing meaning through collaborative inquiry.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Li, X. & Zhang, M. (2004). Why Mei still cannot read and what can be done. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 48(2),* 92-101.

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

Loughran, J., & Russell, T. (1997). Meeting student teachers on their own terms: Experience precedes understanding. In Richardson, V. (Ed.), *Constructivist teacher education: Building new understandings.* London: Falmer.

Marxen, C. E., & Rudney, G. L. (1999). An urban field experience for rural preservice teachers: "I'm not afraid--should I be?" *Teacher Education Quarterly, 26*(1), 61-73.

Mason, T. C. (1997). Urban field experiences and prospective teachers' attitudes toward inner-city schools. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 24*(3), 29-40.

McIntyre, D. J., Byrd, D. M., & Foxx, S. M. (1996). Field and laboratory experiences. In J. Sikula & T. J. Buttery & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (2nd ed., pp. 171-193). New York: Macmillan.

Michigan State University Teacher Preparation Team Two. (2003). *Elementary and middle school guide to the internship.* East Lansing, MI.

Miller, D. (2002). *Reading with meaning: Teaching comprehension in the primary grades.* New York: Stenhouse.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). *Table: Public school membership by race/ethnicity.* http://nces.ed.gov.

National Center for Research on Teacher Education. (1988). Teacher education and learning to teach: A research agenda. *Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(November-December), 27-32.

Nettle, E. B. (1998). Stability and change in the beliefs of student teachers during practice teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 14*(2), 193-204.

Newman, J.M. (1990). *Finding our own way: Teachers exploring their assumptions.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Nieto, S. (1998). From claiming hegemony to sharing space: Creating community in multicultural courses. In R. Chavez Chavez & J. O'Donnell (Eds.), *Speaking the unpleasant: The politics of (non)engagement in the multicultural education terrain* (pp. 16-31). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Nieto, S. (1999). *The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Nuthall, G. (2002). Social constructivist teaching and the shaping of students' knowledge and thinking. In J. Brophy (Series and Vol Ed), *Social constructivist teaching: Affordances and constraints. Advances on Research in Teaching: Vol. 9* (pp. 43–80). Boston: JAI.

O'Connor, M. (1998). Can we trace the "efficacy of social constructivism?" In P.D. Pearson & A. Iran-Nejad (Eds.), *Review of Research in Education* (Vol. 23, pp. 25-71). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Oldfather, P. & West, J. (1999). *Learning through children's eyes: Social constructivism and the desire to learn.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Pankratius, W. J. (1997). Preservice teachers construct a view on teaching and learning styles. *Action in Teacher Education, 18*(Winter), 68-76.

Pardo, L.S. (2002). Book Club for the twenty-first century. *Illinois Reading Council Journal, 30*(4), 14-23.

Phillips, D. (1995). The good, the bad, and the ugly: The many faces of constructivism. *Educational Researcher, 24*(October), 5-12.

Ramsey, P. G. (1998). *Teaching and learning in a diverse world: Multicultural education for young children* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Renard, L. (2003). Setting new teachers up for failure...or success. *Educational Leadership,* May, 62-64.

Resnick, L. (1987). Learning in school and out. *Educational Researcher,* 16(9), 13-20.

Resnick, L., Levine, J.M. & Teasley, S. (Eds). (1991). *Perspectives on socially shared cognition.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 102-119). New York: Macmillan.

Richardson, V. (Ed.) (1997). *Constructivist teacher education: Building new understandings.* London: Falmer.

Richardson-Koehler, V. (1988). Barriers to the effective supervision of student teaching: A field study. *Journal of Teacher Education,* March-April, 28-34.

Rieger, B. J. (1994). Where to draw the line. *American School Board Journal, 181*(10), 35-37.

Rieger, B. J. (1995). Boundary realignment in the eye of the storm. *School Administrator, 52*(2), 24-26.

Rosaen, C.L. (2003). Preparing teachers for diverse classrooms: Creating public and private spaces to explore culture through poetry writing. *Teachers College Record,* 105(8), 1437-1485.

Roth, K.J. (2002). Talking to understand science. In J. Brophy (Series and Vol Ed), *Social constructivist teaching: Affordances and constraints. Advances on Research in Teaching: Vol. 9* (pp. 197-262). Boston: JAI.

Rust, F. O. (1988). How supervisors think about teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education,* March-April, 56-64.

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

Sergiovanni, T.J., & Starratt, R.J. (2002). *Supervision: A redefinition (7th ed).* Boston: McGraw Hill.

Sfard, A. (1998). On two metaphors for learning and the dangers of choosing just one. *Educational Researcher,* 27(2), 4-13.

Shulman, L. (1986). Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching. *Educational Researcher, February,* 4-14.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57,* 1-22.

Slick, S. K. (1997). Assessing versus assisting: The supervisor's role in the complex dynamics of the student teaching triad. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 13*(7), 713-726.

Slick, S.K. (1998a). The university supervisor: A disenfranchised outsider. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 14(8), p. 821-834.

Slick, S. K. (1998b). A university supervisor negotiates territory and status. *Journal of Teacher Education, 49*(4), 306-315.

Smith, E.R. (2003). *Honoring interns' teaching ideas: Negotiating dilemmas in the expert- novice learning dialogue.* Michigan State University: Unpublished doctoral dissertation.

Solomon, P.G. (1998). *The curriculum bridge: From standards to actual classroom practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Spiro, R.J., Coulson, R.L., Feltovich, P.J., & Anderson, D.K. (1988). Cognitive flexibility theory: Advanced knowledge in acquisition in ill-structured domains. In *Tenth Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society* (p. 375-383). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Standard and Poor's School Evaluation Services. (2003). www.standardandpoors.com

Stansbury, K., & Zimmerman, J. (2002). Smart induction programs become lifelines for the beginning teacher. *National Staff Development Council* (Fall), 10-17.

Stone, E. (1987). Teaching practice supervision: Bridging between theory and practice. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 10(1), p. 67-79.

Taylor, M. (1991). *Roll of thunder, hear my cry*. New York: Puffin Books.

Taylor, M. (1992). *Mississippi bridge*. New York: Skylark.

Taylor, S. V., & Sobel, D. M. (2001). Addressing the discontinuity of students' and teachers' diversity: A preliminary study of preservice teachers' beliefs and perceived skills. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 487-503.

Tharp, R.G. & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning, and schooling in social context*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tomlinson, C. A., Callahan, C. M., Tomchin, E. M., Eiss, N., Imbeau, M., & Landrum, M. (1997). Becoming architects of communities of learning: Addressing academic diversity in contemporary classrooms. *Exceptional Children, 65*, 269-282.

Tyack, D. (2002). Forgotten players: How local school districts shaped American education. In A. M. Hightower & M. S. Knapp & J. A. Marsh & M. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), *School districts and instructional renewal* (pp. 9-24). New York: Teachers College Press.

US Census Bureau. (1999). *Table: Difficulty speaking English*. www.childstats.gov.

VanSledright, B.A. & James, J.H. (2002) Constructing ideas about history in the classroom: The influence of competing forces on pedagogical decision making. In J. Brophy (Series and Vol Ed), *Social constructivist teaching: Affordances and constraints. Advances on Research in Teaching: Vol.9* (pp. 263-298). Boston: JAI.

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 54*(2), 143-178.

Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). *Educating culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wells, G. (2002). Learning and teaching for understanding: The key role of collaborative knowledge building. In J. Brophy (Series and Vol Ed), *Social constructivist teaching: Affordances and constraints. Advances on Research in Teaching: Vol. 9* (pp. 1-42). Boston: JAI.

Wideen, M., Mayer-Smith, J., & Moon, B. (1998). A critical analysis of the research on learning to teach: Making the case for an ecological perspective on inquiry. *Review of Educational Research, 68*(2), 130-178.

Wilmore, E. L. (1995). *A school in change.* Texas: ERIC #: ED391260.

Wilson, S. M., Shulman, L. S., & Richert, A. (1987). '150 different ways' of knowing: Representations of knowledge in teaching. In J. Calderhead (Ed.), *Exploring teachers' thinking.* London: Cassell.

Windschitl, M. (2002). Framing constructivism in practice as the negotiation of dilemmas: An analysis of the conceptual, pedagogical, cultural, and political challenges facing teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 72*(2), 131-175.

Yin, R.K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Zahorik, J. A. (1988). The observing-conferencing role of university supervisors. *Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(March-April), 9-16.

Zehr, M.A. (2001). ESL students pose a special challenge for rural schools. *Education Week, 20(41),* 6-8. Retrieved October 31, 2004, from www.edweek.org.

Zeichner, K.M., & Liston, D. (1985). Varieties of discourse in supervisory conferences. *Teaching & Teacher Education,* 1(2), 155-174.

Zeichner, K. M., & Tabachnick, B. R. (1985). The development of teacher perspectives: social strategies and institutional control in the socialization of beginning teachers. *Journal of Education for Teachers, 11*(1).

Zimpher, N.L., DeVoss, G., & Nott, D. (1980). A closer look at university student teacher supervision. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 31(4) p. 11-15.