This is to certify that the
dissertation entitled

USING MULTIPLE LENSES TO ANALYZE A CASE OF
TEACHING A CHILD ACADEMIC SELF-REGULATION

presented by

STEPHEN VASSALLO

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for the

PhD degree in Educational Psychology and Educational Technology

Major Professor's Signature

8/20/08

Date

USING MULTIPLE LENSES TO ANALYZE A CASE OF TEACHING A CHILD ACADEMIC SELF-REGULATION

By

Stephen Vassallo

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Educational Psychology and Educational Technology

2008

ABSTRACT

USING MULTIPLE LENSES TO ANALYZE A CASE OF TEACHING A CHILD ACADEMIC SELF-REGULATION

By

Stephen Vassallo

In order to understand some of the complexities of self-regulated learning (SRL), in this dissertation I used multiple theoretical frameworks to analyze data from a case of teaching one elementary student academic self-regulation. In this qualitative case study, the researcher implemented an intervention with one student to help her improve her academic performance by teaching her to use SRL. The data were then analyzed using three complementary theoretical perspectives: psychological (Zimmerman, 2000), sociological (Bourdieu, 1977; Lareau, 1989/200; 2003) and critical postmodern (Foucault, 1997; Rose, 1996). The research question was: How could using multiple perspectives illuminate some of the complexities of SRL as they related to the lived experience of one student? Analytical insights from psychology, sociology, and critical postmodernism suggest the following: 1) Sociological factors including habitus affected the student's ability to self regulate; 2) Self-efficacy and self-regulation were simultaneously empowering and disempowering; 3) Self-regulation interventions affected not only the student, but also implicated the parents, the family's lifestyle, the teacher, and the school counselor. Given these factors, the study suggests that research on self-regulated learning take insights from sociology and critical postmodernism into account in order to gain understanding of self-regulated learning in practice.

To Frances, Anthony and Mikayla, whose love and support make everything possible

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Lynn Fendler, the director of this dissertation, mentor and friend; her steady confidence in both the project and me made everything possible. Lynn has stood by me throughout graduate school and has helped me in countless ways. I would like to thank Punya Mishra whose support, thoughtfulness and friendship gave me strength throughout this project. David Wong whose toughness always helped me to think more productively about my work. I would like to thank Dorothea Anagnostapoulos whose penchant for dialogue and thoughtful considerations led to wonderful conversations.

I would like to thank my family for their patience, love and support. Frances provided both intellectual and financial support even when it was difficult to envision an end to my studies. Thanks to my mom who, even though did not always understand what I was doing and why, supported me when I needed it. And thanks to my siblings Vickie, Debbie, Charlie, Billy and Eddie; I always felt your love and support when I was many physical miles away.

I have had many invaluable conversations with people that have helped my work to develop. Included are friends from my cohort: David Gallagher, Bo Yan and Natalia Collings. The diversity of their perspectives and interests helped me to consider phenomena from multiple angles. I am absolutely indebted to all those who participated in the critical studies group. While there are many and it is difficult to name them all, there are those who have been particularly important to me: Steven Tuckey, Cleo Cherryholmes, Lynn Fendler, Ira Socol, Brett Merritt, Adam Greteman, Jeannie and John

Lockhardt.

There were also many people who have been important for my intellectual development: Kelly Mix, Shi-pei Chang, TE 150 instructors, TE 250 instructors, Curtis Lewis, Ruth Riddle, Robin Harris and Megan Fedor.

I am indebted to Karen, the participant in my dissertation; we have developed into great friends and I wish the best for her. I would like to thank the teacher and students of Karen's class for welcoming me into their classroom.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES..ix

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION 1
Problem Statement..2

CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW..6
SRL and Individual Human Agency..7
Constructivist Perceptions of Agency..8
Socioulturalist Perceptions of Agency..15
Limitations of Agentic Perspectives..19
The Successful Student/The Self-regulated Learner..20
Habit and Control..22
Primary and Secondary Discourses..24
Goals..27
Ethics of SRL..34
Individual and Social Betterment..34
Empowering and Disempowering..36
Chapter Conclusion..40

CHAPTER THREE
METHODS..42
Case-Study Design..43
Why One Student..43
Length of Time..44
Research Sites..46
Introduction to Karen..49
Choosing a Struggling Student..50
Choosing an Upper-Elementary Student..52
Choosing a Student with CAPD..54
Intervention..57
Baseline Data..58
Self-efficacy.. 59
Analytical Frameworks..64
Social Cognitive Perspective..64
Critical Postmodernism..67
Habitus and Cultural Capital..70
Chapter Conclusion..73

CHAPTER FOUR
ANALYSIS FROM A SOCIAL COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVE..74
Social Cognitive Theory: An Agentic Perspective..75

Understanding Self-efficacy and Self-Regulation....78
Self-efficacy and Performance Outcomes....79
Help Seeking: Learned Helplessness and Self-regulation....85
Self-efficacy and Goal Setting....90
Metacognitive Awareness....96
Self-efficacy and SRL....100
Self-efficacy Development: Issues and Challenges....100
The Intervention and Obstacles to Self-efficacy....101
Teaching and Obstacles to Self-efficacy....103
Chapter Conclusion....107

CHAPTER FIVE
INTRODUCTION: SOCIOLOGICAL ANALYSIS....109
Habitus and Child Rearing Practices....111
Parents, Schools and SRL....113
Separation between Home and School....114
Expectations for Concerted Cultivation....116
Cultivation of Comprehension Skills....118
Class Implications of Concerted Cultivation of Reading....120
Reading Comprehension and SRL....123
Parental Intervention in Schools....127
Intervention in Assignments....129
Parental Intervention and Karen's Disability....136
Teacher's Expectations for Concerted Cultivation....138
What this Means for SRL....141
Deferring Education....144
Deferring Education to Professionals....145
Deferring Education to Karen....147
Cultural Capital and Learning Resources....149
Access to Computer Technology....150
Value of Computer Technology....152
Chapter Conclusion....155

CHAPTER SIX
INTRODUCTION: A CRITICAL POSTMODERN PERSPECTIVE....158
Empowerment and SRL....158
Making Responsible Learners....162
Internalization of Learning Strategies....163
Homogenization of Rules of Engagement....170
SRL and the Moral Imperative....172
Responsible Learners....176
Calculation and Documentation: An Exercise in Truth....177
The Truth Will Set Karen Free....180
Truth Telling and Coercion....183
SRL as Truth Therapy....188
Chapter Conclusion....189

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONLCUSION..........191
Social Cognitive..........191
Intervention..........192
Teacher's Pedagogy..........193
Concerted Cultivation..........194
Sociological..........194
Critical Postmodern..........196
Future Research..........199

APPENDICES..........201
Motivated Strategies Learning Questionairre..........202
Teacher Interview Protocol..........207
Child Interview Protocol..........210

REFERNĖCES..........211

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1
School Observation Schedule..47

Table 2
Daily
Schedule..48

Table 3
Research Sites..49

Table 4
Report Cards..52

Table 5
Interviews..59

Chapter 1

Introduction

In this research study, I worked with a fifth grade student named Karen who was struggling in school since the second grade. The purpose of working with Karen was to support her academic success by helping her regulate learning. I implemented an intervention designed to foster self-regulated learning (SRL). The intervention was mainly implemented at home with Karen while helping her with her homework. The intervention lasted five months. I worked with Karen after school to help her learn to regulate learning while completing her homework. What this meant was that I worked with Karen to help her:

1) Acquire learning strategies
2) Evaluate tasks and implement strategies to engage with those tasks
3) Understand how her beliefs impacted her behavior so she could gain control over her behavior
4) Evaluate and document features of her thinking and behavior and their relationship to the environment

Zimmerman (1998) defined SRL as being metacognitively, motivationally and behaviorally active in one's learning.

Karen was identified as academically struggling since the second grade. While in the fifth grade the areas with which Karen struggled most were math, social studies and certain components of language arts. Karen struggled with tasks that involved reading and writing. During the second grade, Karen was diagnosed with a central auditory processing disability (CAPD). Researchers argued that the cognitive limitations associated with this disability could be overcome by regulating oneself (citations). In addition, Karen's special education teacher, general education and parents stated that Karen could benefit from a SRL intervention.

Karen came from a working class family background. While conducting the research study, Karen lived with her biological father, stepmother and her two sisters, 16-years-old and 2-years-old. Karen's father described himself as having Mexican heritage. Karen's stepmother described herself as Caucasian. Karen's biological mother was also described as Caucasian. Karen identified as both but identified more strongly with being, what she called, "white." Karen liked to play sports, especially softball and basketball, which she played in organized leagues. During recess and lunch, at times students went outside, Karen mostly played basketball with only other boys.

In this research study, I used different perspectives to explore some complexities with teaching academic self-regulation.

Statement of Problem

In the National Research Council's (2000) book that describes the ways people learn, the argument was made that the goal of education has shifted from "knowing" and "repeating" content to helping students develop the intellectual tools and learning strategies needed to acquire the knowledge that allows them to think productively about school subjects (p. 5). This educational shift reflects and has been reflected by what has been described as a rapidly growing body of research and theory of self-regulated learning (SRL) (Winne, 2005).

SRL is described as proactive engagement in one's learning whereby self-initiated strategies are used to control and monitor behavior, cognition, and environment in order to achieve one's learning goals (Zimmerman, 1989). In the SRL literature, researchers have argued that teaching students to be self-regulated learners has become increasingly necessary because of diverse student populations (Masui & De Corte, 2005; Perry, 2004), nonlinearity of knowledge sources (Whipp & Chiarelli, 2004), and abundant knowledge and knowledge sources (National Research Council, 2000). Researchers in educational psychology contend that SRL is important for students' academic achievement, lifelong learning, and ability to solve problems outside of school (Lapan, Kardash, & Turner, 2002; Zimmerman, 2002). Researchers have suggested that learning to academically self-regulate can ameliorate social, economic and educational inequalities (Lapan et al., 2002; Meyer & Turner, 2002; S.G. Paris & Winograd, 2003; Perry, VandeKamp, Mercer, & Nordby, 2002; Zimmerman, 1998, 2002).

There has been a steady increase of research and theory on student SRL over the last decade (Winne, 2005; Martin, a2004). In this flurry of scholarship, SRL has been treated as a form of empowerment whereby students enact a better sense of control over their learning (Bembenutty & Chen, 2005; Corno, 1989; Harris, Graham, & Mason, 2003; Lapan et al., 2002; Mahoney & Thoresen, 1974; Pintrich, 2000). Though researchers do not reduce all achievement to SRL, it carries substantial weight as an explanatory framework for differences in achievement (Schunk, 2005). Some of the seductiveness and allure of SRL surely comes from its potential for educators to move beyond static explanations of achievement to dynamic explanations of achievement that could be facilitated and enhanced through individual SRL training. It is generally accepted that SRL helps to overcome limitations brought about by natural endowment, native tendencies and limitations in cognitive processing. The assumption is that academic success could be achieved by harnessing the personal power to monitor, control and transform, if necessary, such conditions as emotions, cognition, behavior and the environment.

With the increase in research and theory on SRL, I was concerned that SRL has not been adequately, if at all, considered from different perspectives. There are multiple constructs, such as, but not limited to, control, freedom, empowerment and agency that are intimately entangled, implicitly and explicitly, in SRL. These notions are complex and mean different things from different perspectives. I would like to investigate the complexities of SRL by considering it from multiple perspectives. If multiple perspectives are ignored, the usefulness of SRL as a mechanism for supporting academic achievement could be limited. Paramount to any view of SRL and often laying the foundation of conceptions of the self-regulated learner, these notions are worth analyzing in considerable depth from multiple points of view. If the trend continues towards teaching and valuing SRL, it is important to understand the multiple dimensions of SRL, so not to see it too narrowly.

From my reading of the field, this exploration into these dimensions has begun in educational psychology literature and elsewhere. Contemporary researchers and theorists within educational psychology have begun to critically examine self-regulated learning (Martin, 2004a, 2004b, 2006; Martin & McLellan, 2006; Wong, 2007). I see these examinations as not suggesting that SRL be abandoned. Rather, these critical treatments of SRL help to highlight the importance of clarifying and adding nuance to research and theory on SRL. These critical examinations have also pushed me to consider the aims and goal of SRL and to evaluate the ethical and practical implications of those goals.

The critical examinations that have already been conducted were theoretical and philosophical. While these examinations have enormous value for considering the complexity of SRL, my research study was intended to contribute to this budding critical dialogue by adding both an empirical dimension and analysis from multiple perspectives, ones not been typically used to study SRL. The purpose for using these rather unconventional perspectives was to see what SRL look liked from different epistemological standpoints. The perspectives that I used were as follows: sociological, psychological and critical postmodern. The variation and juxtaposition of these perspectives have the potential to cast different lights on the notion of SRL and illuminate interesting considerations that have received little to no attention. It is important to broaden our conception of SRL by examining some its foundations so that teachers and educational psychologists have elaborate repertoires for understanding, evaluating, researching, and facilitating SRL.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

In this literature review I highlight some of the complexities that I found in the self-regulated learning (SRL) literature. The central theme in the first portion of this literature review is the notion of individual human agency, which is a notion that implicitly and explicitly lies at the foundation of SRL (Martin, 2004b). The question driving this segment of the literature review is as follows: Is SRL an expression of individual human agency? I find this question important because of ethical and conceptual reasons. When I discuss conceptions of agency, these reasons will be explained and explored further. In my discussion of agency and SRL, I note that responses to this question vary when considered from different epistemological standpoints. I will consider the relationship between agency and SRL mainly from constructivist and sociocultural perspectives.

Another complexity of SRL is an ethical one. Researchers have argued that fostering SRL is an important goal for teachers to achieve (Perry, VandeKamp, Mercer, Nordby, 2004; Pressley & Ghatala, 1990; Zimmerman, 1998). The proliferation of models to teach SRL attests to the importance given to this educational aim. With all the research conducted on SRL, there has been little exploration of the ethical implication of teaching SRL. That is, there has been little research and theory on SRL that thoroughly examines issues related to social and individual betterment, empowerment and disempowerment and freedom and domination. In much of the literature, it is assumed that SRL is empowering, good and right. I will consider the ethical implications of SRL by examining the way that its functions have been conceptualized. There will be some of this ethical exploration in the first section of the paper, but will be concentrated mainly in the latter section.

SRL and Individual Human Agency

Agency endures a taken-for-granted status in research on and theory of SRL. Though the notion of agency is ambiguous, politically charged, debated and contested, it often remains an implicit assumption undergirding constructions of the self-regulated learner. Martin (2004b) stated, "The self as agent is pervasively implicit in most writings on the topic of self-regulated learning, as it is in the larger psychological literature on self-regulation" (p. 135). Often conceptualized as opposite to structural determinism, agency is a notion that identifies intention, purpose, choice, selfhood and freedom as the cause and effect of human functioning.

Martin (2004b) defined agency as "the capability of human beings to make choices and to act on those choices in ways that make a difference in their lives" (p.135). This definition is not unlike Bandura's (2001). He stated that to be an agent "is to intentionally make things happen by one's own actions (p. 2). For Bandura, forethought, intentionality, self-reaction and self-reflection are core features of agency.

Agency seems directly tied to control. Who or what controls what individuals do? Is it individuals' choices, perceptions, will, thinking or intention—things potentially controlled by individuals—that determine what they do? Is it internal or external structures, thought of as uncontrollable, that determine what individuals do? Are individuals born as agents or must individuals learn to be agents? These questions speak superficially, at best, to only a few of the complexities of agency. The reason for starting with agency and some of its conceptual complexities was because of the importance agency plays in research and theory of SRL (Martin, 2004b). In the next section, in relation to SRL I explore what agency looks like from constructivist and sociocultural perspectives.

Constructivist Perspectives of Agency

According to Martin (2004b), a constructivist perspective of agency involves the treatment of learners as active participants in the construction, organization and reorganization of knowledge structures that are internal to the learner. Also from his interpretation, Martin viewed a constructivist treatment of agency as developmental. He stated, "for the constructivist, learner activity is an instrumental means of experimenting with an independent reality so that a pre-existent 'mind' with agentic capability can achieve appropriate kinds of intellectual and moral development" (Martin, 20004, p. 136). From Martin's understanding of agency in relation to constructivism, individuals are born with agentic capabilities but must achieve that agency with certain kinds of knowledge.

Despite Bandura's denunciation of dualisms, Martin (2004b) charges that contemporary formulations of SRL using the social cognitive theory rely on constructions of the learner that are informed by constructivism, which, as Martin noted, relies on a mind/world split. Martin's interpretation of social cognitive treatment of SRL makes sense. Similar to many models of SRL, researchers who draw from social cognitive theory often emphasize the harnessing of psychological power to develop the skill and will to control one's self and one's world.

Given the pitfalls associated with behaviorist views of learning (Greeno, Collins, & Resnick, 1996), such an emphasis on agentic capabilities in social cognitive theory and research on SRL research seems justifiable. For behaviorists, changes in behavior occur as a direct result of an environmental change. Skinner (1971), for example, believed that behavioral technologies could be developed that could, with the consideration of past reinforcements histories and genetic endowment, systematically and predictably lead to the expression of certain behaviors. Such external determination of behavior would seemingly dissolve constructs such as agency, and some of its accompanying notions such as autonomy, independence, and individual responsibility, which are all notions that characterize contemporary studies involving the self and SRL.

Skinner (1971) characterized the shift away from behaviorism as being compelled by the notion of a "miraculous" and "autonomous" human who has the power to choose and control environmental effects on thoughts and behaviors (p.23). Obviously Skinner's use of "miraculous" has a patronizing tone. For him, thoughts are a byproduct of an environmental association and less the mechanism that determines human behavior. In a similar line of thinking, Wegner and Wheatley (1999) argued that individuals often wrongly attribute the determination of behavior to thoughts because of the contiguity between a behavior and a thought.

Few researchers and theorists would probably dispute the fact the environment is a factor for understanding human thought and behavior. A key feature of the social cognitive view of SRL, and most treatments of SRL in general, is that thoughts can be used to understand and control the affects of the environment. Also from this perspective, one's thoughts are believed to shape environmental potentialities. So for the social cognitive perspective, the environment was not removed as variable influencing thought and behavior but was something that could be controlled and shaped by harnessing and developing certain psychological capacities.

Mahony and Thoresen (1974), who were from Pennsylvania State University and Stanford University, respectively, were social cognitive oriented researchers writing about issues pertaining to self- regulation. They stated:

> It has been our contention that the truly 'free' individual is one who is in intimate contact with himself and his environment. He knows 'where he's at' in terms of the factors influencing both his actions and his surroundings....He is free to exert countercontrol on his environment...and free to draw upon a repertoire of effective behaviors. (p. 72)

In this quotation, Mahoney and Thoresen are alluding to the ethical implications of environmental, behavioral and self-awareness. I will come back to this in the later section. For now, I just want to highlight the ways they view self-regulation. The authors do not use the notion of self-regulation, but rather use the notion of self-control, which was the 1970's zeitgeist (Martin, 2004a), to discuss forms of engagement that resemble contemporary formulations of SRL. An important feature of self-control, according to Mahoney and Thoresen, was control over the environment through the understanding of the relationship between the behavior and the environment. The authors believed that all individuals have the capacity to achieve self-control by learning techniques of observation and calculation of the self, behavior and environment. These forms of calculation and documentation were purported to enable individuals to know the ways the environment effected behavior. This knowledge was then supposed to be the means by which to go about changing the environment to elicit targeted, desired behaviors. From this position, certain kinds of cognitive awareness and technical skills could help individuals overcome environmental determinisnm, and essentially realize and exercise one's agentic capabilities.

Zimmerman (1989) drew from the Mahoney and Thoresen's (1974) work to inform early formulations of SRL. An element that Zimmerman (1989) emphasized, which was informed by Bandura (2001), was the role that self-perceptions played in one's motivation, volition and skill at controlling the environment, behaviors and emotions. In particular, Zimmerman (1989) identified self-efficacy as the key psychological mechanism of SRL. Zimmerman, Bonner and Kovach (1996) defined self-efficacy as "the degree to which a person feels capable of successfully performing a certain task, such as solving a type of science problem" (p. 140). In more contemporary formulations of SRL, Zimmerman (2000) connected self-efficacy to individual human agency. He (2000) stated:

> Our regulatory skill or lack thereof is the source of our *perception of personal agency* [emphasis added] that lies at the core of our sense of self....it [SRL] entails not only behavioral skill in self-managing environmental contingencies, but also the knowledge and the sense of personal agency to enact this skill in relevant contexts (Zimmerman, 2000, pp. 13-14).

In this formulation, "personal agency" is treated as a key factor in SRL. From my understanding, "personal agency" used this way seems to comprise a number of personal variables, one of them, perhaps the most important, is self-efficacy. From Zimmerman's (2000) brand of the social cognitive perspective, SRL is connected to perceptions of agency, which involves self-perceptions, such as self-efficacy.

The use of the phrase "perceptions of personal agency" is worth noting because it reveals Zimmerman's (2000) underlying epistemological commitments. Perception connotes an individual construction of something that may or may not be objectively verified or justified. By using the word "perception," I am led to believe that Zimmerman is making a distinction between what is subjective and objective. As a result of this distinction, it would seem that the main obstacle to successful SRL involved one's subjective misreading of possibilities and potentialities. Or instead, it could suggest that individuals' perceptions are responsible for shaping potentialities. Regardless if there are objective possibilities or if possibilities are constructed by an individual, it is clear that Zimmerman (2000) viewed individuals as having the capacity to control the outcomes of their lives by shaping environmental possibilities and potentialities. It seems to follow from this logic that the realization that the field of possibilities is wide open and that the right perception will enable individuals to control the outcomes of their lives.

Before I continue, I would like to offer a recapitulation of what I have thus far presented. I began with a definition of agency, making the claim that many SRL researchers and theorists assume agentic capabilities in learners. I wanted to show that these researchers and theorists, especially those writing within the social cognitive tradition, have connected agency to SRL. The argument postulated by Zimmerman (2000) is that realizing ones' personal power, that is having the right perceptions of oneself and the world, could lead to the achievement of personal learning goals by controlling the environment, behavior and one's psychology. I have suggested that this postulation is similar to suggesting that all individuals have agentic capabilities and can regulate learning, only some have the right perceptions and are therefore more likely to take control of their lives.

The positioning of an agentic self-regulated learner informs many conceptualizations of SRL. Many prolific SRL researchers explicitly start with the premise that all individuals are self-regulated learners. The corollary to this premise is that differences in academic performance are explained by the quality and quantity of SRL strategies (Schunk, 2005; Winne, 2005; Zimmerman, 1998, 2000). The discourse seems to have shifted to difference rather than exclusion. For example, in Zimmerman's contemporary formulations of SRL, he used the notions of ineffective (2000), dysfunctional (2000) and naïve and expert (1998) self-regulated learners. He stated:

> It has been argued that every person attempts to self-regulate his or her functioning in some way to gain goals in life and that it is inaccurate to speak about un-self-regulated person or even the absence of self-regulation. From this perspective, what distinguishes effective from ineffective forms of self-regulation is instead the quality and quantity of one's self-regulatory processes."
> (Zimmerman, 2000, p. 15).

From this way of thinking about SRL, if everyone attempts to self-regulate and has the capacity to do so, the feature that distinguishes learners is the quality and quantity of SRL.

Winne (2005) also dissolved this distinction between those who self-regulate and those who did not by informing his understanding of a learner using constructivist epistemology (Greeno et al., 1996; Martin, 2004b):

> Learners are agents. Learners construct knowledge. Whether scaffolding is

> available or not, these paradigmatic stances necessitate that learners can and do self-regulate learning. Empirically, it is impossible to prove every learner is constantly engaged in SRL because data to validate this claim cannot be collected for each learner at every instant whenever they learn. (Winne, 2005, p. 559)

Though he acknowledged the difficulties with empirically proving the claim all individuals are self-regulated learners, the foundation that learners are agents and that they construct representations of the world brings him to make a universalizing statement about SRL, a statement that reflects epistemologically narrow presuppositions.

The juxtaposition of the notions "constructing knowledge" and "agent" reveals an association worth noting. While Winne (2005) does not say that learners are agents because they construct knowledge, the juxtaposition of these statements might certainly lead one to make this causal attribution. If constructing knowledge qualified individuals as agents and also qualified individuals as self-regulated, then it would seem that it might be empirically impossible to prove everybody is not self-regulated or an "agent." If knowledge is always being constructed, in the heads of individuals I assume is what he meant, and that knowledge construction necessitates that individuals "can and "do" regulate learning, then individuals are not self-regulating when they are not constructing knowledge. From a constructivist perspective, when do individuals not construct knowledge? Is knowledge construction always controlled and controllable by individuals?

To summarize, agency is a notion that rests at the foundation of conceptions of SRL. Agency could be considered the personal power to make choices that affect one's life outcomes. For SRL theorists and researchers, agency is the perceptions of personal power to achieve learning goals by controlling thoughts, behaviors and environment. I have argued that widely cited and influential SRL researchers and theorists assume agentic capabilities, which is similar to the assumption that all learners are self-regulated. SRL and agency are conceptual siblings, if not conceptual conflations, in much of the literature on SRL. From the social cognitive perspective, having certain perceptions of self-efficacy, fears and doubts are key to SRL. Personal power is hindered by faulty perceptions of it and so dysfunctional SRL is changed at the level of the psychological.

Socioculturalist Perspectives of Agency

The agency attributed to all learners, which has been used to justify the claim that all learners are self-regulated learners, has not gone uncontested. Martin (2004a; 2004b; 2006), who theorized from a socioculturalist position, raised critical questions about the status of the agent in self-regulated learning, suggesting that the conception of agency in SRL research is grounded in Enlightenment assumptions of a rational individual with an interior core that is separable from social cultural constitution. Thus, to begin with the assumption of an *a priori* agent is epistemologically narrow.

Additionally, relying on *a priori* agentic capabilities fails to account for the way context shape ideas of choice, control and selfhood. In an attempt to address the the context might shape choice, control and selfhood, researchers and theorists have relied on notions such as other-regulation (Azevedo, Winters, & Moos, 2004), co-regulation (McCaslin & Hickey, 2001) and shared-regulation (Vermunt & Verloop, 1999) to differentiate kinds of regulation in the classroom. While this research could work to compartmentalize SRL and still preserve the constructivist conceptions of the learner, it is notable because it also works to identify context as essential for understanding SRL. The socioculturalists paradigm of SRL involves the examination of the emergence and deployment of student SRL in a context (Martin, 2006; Packer & Goicoechea, 2000; Patrick & Middleton, 2002; Perry, 2002; Perry et al., 2002).

Packer & Goicoechea (2000) stated that sociocultural theories emphasize "characteristics of social participation, relationships (such as between novice and expert, newcomer and old-timer), the setting of activity, and historical change" (p. 227). Martin (2006) noted that all, what he called, social cultural perspectives share a common approach to human learning that eschews assumptions about individuals as having natural, universal and interior cognitive structures that are responsible for representing the world. Researchers who draw from sociocultural theories reject the brain-in-a-vat conception of human learning. This metaphor is used to describe Cartesian rationality whereby individuals are viewed as accessing truth and reality through and by reason and that this ability to reason is *a priori*.

Emerging from this epistemological distinction were two different conceptualizations of SRL: SRL as an aptitude and SRL as an event. Perry (2002) defined aptitude as "relatively enduring characteristics of an individual that can be aggregated over or abstracted from behavior across multiple events" (p.2). Though outwardly rejected (Schunk & Zimmerman, 1997), the social cognitive view of SRL has been interpreted as treating SRL as a relatively enduring trait that involves the ability to adapt knowledge and skill across multiple events (Perry, 2002). Perry (2002) argued that treating SRL as an event meant considering the context in which SRL is happening as the unit of analysis rather than the individual. Patrick and Middleton (2002) noted, "Research from an event perspective focuses on individuals' engagement in specific activities, rather than averaged across multiple occasions" (p. 28). Although these researchers did not define temporal or spatial parameters around the notion of event or activity, it seems the emphasis on the notion of event is a move away from the proclivity to characterize individuals as self-regulated learners, as if it were some internal characteristic or a corollary to a priori agentic capabilities. Similarly in the motivation literature, some researchers moved away from viewing students as either motivated and unmotivated; rather, the emphasis shifted to account for and understand the external conditions that affected motivation (Good & Brophy, 2008; Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2006).

Depending on the brand of sociocultural theorizing, agency from a sociocultural perspective could be understood differently. For one, the acquisition of language could be viewed as the means of developing mastery over oneself and one's environment (**Rorhkemper**). From this perspective, it might be said that individuals could be controlled by biological forces until the necessary qualitative changes occurred in the development of signs and tools that permitted self-mastery (Vygotsky, 1978). This reading of Vygotsky might seem epistemologically inaccurate. Martin (2006) suggested that researchers who draw from Vygoskian sociocultural theory might neglect to consider that individuals are constituted within particular historical contexts and are not developing stable, disconnected and rational psychological processes independent of any context. According to Martin (20006), those who neglect to recognize this feature of Vygotskian sociocultural theory are theorizing closing to a constructivist epistemology.

In the Handbook of Educational Psychology, Martin (2006) proposed an expansion of the perspectives that constituted sociocultural theorizing. In this chapter, he categorized the poststructural work of Nikolas Rose and Michele Foucault as a particular brand of sociocultural theorizing. From my understanding of Rose and Foucault's work, they have not relied on the notion of agency in their work, nor have pursued explanations for their objects of study using the notion of agency. When invoked, the notion of agency gets tangled in dualisms between mind and world, willful and powerless, empowered and disempowered, liberation and subordination, and free and dominated. In Rose and Foucault's work, these dualisms break down, and from this perspective, it does not make sense to ask the question: is SRL an expression of agency? In chapter six, in which I analyze data using the critical postmodern work of Rose and Foucault, I try to make it clear why invoking agency from a critical postmodern perspective is problematic.

To summarize the section on sociocultural theory and agency, researchers and theorists who draw from sociocultural theory have tried to conceptually and epistemologically differentiate SRL from constructivist epistemology. In an effort to distance themselves from constructivists, the *a priori* agent has been removed. Still, some researchers and theorists who draw from sociocultural theory treat agency as a cumulative development, whereby the development of cognitive tools provide individuals with the capacity to master the self and the environment. So, self-regulation is something to be achieved through interaction in the world and is not pre-ontological. Not all brands of sociocultural theory treat agency and self-regulation in the same way. I SRL has yet to be examined from a critical postmodern perspective, which Martin (2006) categorized as a brand of sociocultural theorizing.

Limitations of Agentic Perspectives

Although sociocultural research on SRL has addressed criticisms of constructivist emphasis on *a priori* agentic capabilities, much of the existing sociocultural research on SRL suffers for a number of reasons. First, the validation and metaphysical certainty assigned to psychological constructs, such as self-efficacy and metacognition, work to locate this research towards more constructivist conceptions of SRL. Second, emphasizing the way environmental conditions affect student SRL, researchers do not go far enough in trying to dissolve the individual/world dualism. Martin (2006) stated, "All social cultural perspectives understand persons as actually constituted by sociocultural practices, not just influenced or affected by them" (Martin, 2006, p. 596). From my reading of the field, sociocultural treatment of SRL treats context as influencing or affecting SRL enactment.

Third, to contend that SRL depends on environmental conditions identifies those conditions as the causes of thought and behavior. Thus, the question is raised whether or not student engagement that depends on external conditions could be described as SRL. To some extent, this limitation has been circumvented through the semantic shift to co-regulation. Finally, sociocultural theorists are starting with the premise that all students are inherently capable self-regulated learning, only that certain environmental conditions either curtail or support acts of student SRL. To presume that SRL depends on context seems tantamount to a presumption that individuals have a disposition to act certain ways under proper external conditions. Taken together, constructivist and sociocultural perspectives of SRL presume that individuals are self-regulated learners or have the disposition to regulate learning, respectively.

The Successful Student/The Self-regulated Learner

In the previous section, I noted that for the social cognitive view of SRL one's perception of agency was a key feature. I began to consider what counts as SRL by considering ideas of agency embedded in the theories of SRL. Because of the taken-for-granted assumption of the acting agent, it seemed that any thought or behavior could count as self-regulated. If that were the case, then, as Zimmerman (2000) noted, what differentiates individuals is the quality and quantity of their SRL strategy use. From Zimmerman's (2000) account, one of the factors affecting the quality and quantity of SRL strategy use is one's perception of agency, which includes self-efficacy.

What is quality SRL? What is the quantity of SRL needed to be academically successful? How can teachers tell the quality and quantity of SRL? Is academic success a gauge for high quality and quantity SRL? The question that drives this section is as follows: can one infer the existence of the high quality and quantity SRL based on performance outcomes, such as standardized test scores, grades and teacher reports? Asked another way: are successful students self-regulated learners?

The association between successful student and self-regulated learner has been a common association (van Den Hurk, 2006; Whipp & Chiarelli, 2004; Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1986). In the manual for developing self-regulated learners, Zimmerman, Bonner and Kovach (1996) referred to the success of, at once, disenfranchised and impoverished individuals who overcame political, economic and social obstacles by regulating themselves. Other historical figures, such Benjamin Franklin, George Washington Carver and Indonesian immigrants, were also named for their accomplishments, which were associated with self-regulation (Zimmerman, 1998). Zimmerman (1998) stated that these individuals and group of individuals went beyond their "humble origins" and "limited access to high-quality education" by educating and disciplining themselves, and by recognizing that "learning is a proactive activity requiring self-initiated motivational and behavioral processes as well as metacognitive ones" (Zimmerman, 1998, pg.1).

The conflation of the successful student with the self-regulated learner manifests in a couple of different ways. For one, making reference to historical figures and interpreting their behavior in terms of SRL assumes one knows what those individuals experienced. When considering historical, or even contemporary figures, it seems difficult to unequivocally attribute their accomplishments to self-regulation. How did Zimmerman know what these individuals experienced? It seems success was used to infer what they experienced.

Another way this conflation manifests is through research studies whereby successful students were studied. In a study conducted by Zimmerman and Pons (1986), successful students were interviewed in order to discern what they do to be successful. For this particular research study, success was based on standardized test scores, teacher reports and grades. From this research study, the authors developed a list of 13 strategies for SRL. In this early formulation of SRL, the definition of successful and self-regulated was recursive. That is, successful student meant self-regulated and self-regulated meant successful.

The association between successful students and self-regulated learners warrants some caution. First, success in school might be due to habits, which could be understood as mindless processes. Second, which is related to the first, success in school could have had to do with compatible primary and secondary discourses (Gee, 1992). Third, self-regulation does not always align with institutional expectations and mandates and therefore, highly skilled self-regulation might not be construed as self-regulation because it does not lead to the achievement of some norm. Fourth, if success is confounded with self-regulated, then fostering success could involve homogenizing the rules of academic engagement. I will address each point in succession.

Habit and Mental Control

SRL is often associated with the exercise of control, a conceptual commitment I connected to agency. For SRL, control over thoughts, behaviors and the environment are essential. Vohs & Baumeister (2004) stated: "... various well-developed theses concerning the broad idea of self-regulation as "the many processes by which the human psyche exercises control over its functions, states, and inner processes" (p. 1). I interpret the social cognitive perspective as construing SRL this way. From this perspective psychological variables are treated as the intermediary between behavior and the environment. So, it seems that psychological, or mental, control is necessary for and part of SRL.

Wegner & Erber (1993) wrote that during a time of mental control a person is of two minds: there is one part of the mind that "harbors certain thoughts, emotions, or desires that another part of the mind wishes to dispel, modify or replace" (p. 36). This treatment of mental control is not entirely different from views of mental control that rely on an executive function, which is a psychological mechanism in charge of monitoring and altering other psychological, behavioral and environment mechanisms to ensure the achievement of one's personal goals. With these fragmented treatments of consciousness complicates the attribution of mental control to successful student/self-regulated learners.

Based on the definition of mental control noted above, if self-regulated learners were to experience mental control, they would have these two minds, a sort of internal fragmentation whereby each mental part struggled to ensure the moral and ethical function of the entire system. Being of two minds of course connotes the idea that one of the minds has access to more favorable thoughts, emotions and desires. Based on the logic above, if mental control is a necessary condition of SRL and successful students are self-regulated, then it follows that successful students have this fragmented consciousness in which the academic, moral and social part executes its authority over the other parts to ensure successful school functioning.

What about habit? Do successful students rely on habit for academic engagement? If so, could habit be construed as a form of mental control? According to Wegner and Erber's (1993) definition, habit would not count as mental control. It seems, however, relying on habit does not necessary preclude others from classifying individuals as engaging in self-regulation. For example, Bargh and Chartland (1999) identified three important skills of a self-regulated learner: monitoring and interpreting one's behavior, goal setting, and evaluation. They sated that as an adaptive function these skills become automatic, nonconscious and "perform the lion's share of the self-regulatory burden" (pg. 462). For these social psychologists from New York University, self-regulation involved automatic, nonconscious and habitual processes.

It is not entirely clear if SRL must necessarily involve mental control. And if so, it is not clear what that control looks like: conscious, fragmented, nonconscious, automatic or a mixture of all of these. These conceptual ambiguities are accompanied by some practical ambiguities.

If SRL involved mental control and mental control was attributed to the successful students, then fostering SRL involved homogenizing the rules of engagement by teaching all students to be like successful students. If successful students are not engaging in mental control but mental control is attributed to them, then students who perform poorly might have unfair expectations for mental control. Students who are unsuccessful might be engaging in mental control but that might not be recognized because it does not fit within acceptable academic behaviors and outcomes. Success, self-regulated and control are muddy constructs that are often confounded in the literature. This confounding makes the waters even muddier when considering the practical implications of teaching SRL.

Primary and Secondary Discourses

It is difficult for me to separate issues of control and habit from ideas about primary and secondary discourses (Gee, 1992), which, amongst others things, are home and schools spheres, respectively. Before, I go into that connection I will discuss how Gee defined primary and second discourses. Gee (1992) defined discourse as social practice that involved ways of talking, acting, interacting, valuing, believing and social and physical spaces. The distinction between primary and secondary discourses was a conceptual differentiation between the socialization into discourses that happens early in life with family and socialization that happens outside home and peer-group socialization.

Socialization into secondary discourses, according to Gee, happens within schools, churches, gangs and offices, for example.

For Gee (1992), his discourse-based theory allowed room to explain variations in academic performance. He noted "behaviors from primary Discourses can also filter or drift from primary discourses into various secondary Discourses. Schools have adopted many values, attitudes, and ways of behaving from middle class homes" (Gee, 1992, p. 110). Those individuals who have their primary and secondary discourses aligned might experience less tension, conflict and fragmentation within secondary discourses, such as school. From a psychological perspective, it might be said that individuals with this alignment experience less instances of mental control because the discourses in which they were socialized extend beyond early home life and sanction existing identities, ways of knowing, values, beliefs and aspirations in secondary discourses. The alignment of school and home discourses might mean less socialization, less learning about new norms, rules for engagement and ways of knowing. For those with a misalignment between primary and secondary discourses, there might be added learning. This new learning might mean involve exercising mental control.

Consider an example offered by Chanowitz and Langer (1980) of how two people at different skill levels experience control when driving. Chanowitz and Langer began an article describing the behaviors and actions of two people driving: a novice and an experienced driver. They also include conjectures about the cognitive processes used by these drivers. Chanowitz and Langer were working towards important questions in this text: in general, what did it mean to control; and specifically, to what degree did these different drivers experience control? They wondered if the experienced driver who gained a "deeper appreciation" for driving experienced control when driving, at least to the same degree as the novice driver. The basis for their contemplation stemmed from the debate surrounding automatic (mindless) and controlled (mindful) processes. The authors contended that the novice driver exercised more control than the experienced driver.

Chanowitz and Langer (1980) separated people into two categories: learners and nonlearners. Learners are those individuals who pay close attention to various details of an activity. For example, the novice driver because of uncertainty about where the car will move pays close attention to the turning of the steering wheel and the movement of the car. Their interaction with the environment is causing constant changes both within the individual and the activity. Nonlearners are those who have routines for engagement and pay little attention to the activity as it is being enacted. These individuals, Chanowitz and Langer argued, are exerting little to no control. Basically, Chanowitz and Langer contended that individuals experience control when they are engaging in activities that are not habitualized, and also when there is a change is self and environment.

Let us imagine that the alignment between primary and secondary discourses affect academic success. The more the home and schools spheres were dissolved, the less negotiation, validation and learning would need to happen. That is, if one links success to the alignment between students primary and secondary discourses, in this case home and school, respectively, then some students will be advantaged and others will be disadvantaged because they have different learning burdens. If students have that alignment and are successful as a consequence, then the conceptual conflation with SRL might bring some to attribute executive, intentional and purposive learning skills to those individuals who might rely more on habit and less on mental control.

This discussion brings to me ask two questions, which I find have not be adequately explored in the SRL literature.

1. Does SRL involve mental control or the enactment of habits? Are these the same?
2. Can SRL be attributed to students based merely on the compatibility of an individual's home and school discourses?

These questions are considerably large. In my research study, I do not believe that I will produce definitive, blanketed responses. Rather, I just hope to say something smart about the questions and the responses by considering them from multiple perspectives.

Goals

Researchers contended that setting and pursuing goals is key for SRL (Shah & Kruglanski, 2000; Zimmerman, 2000). In the educational psychology literature, goals have been divided into orientations and proximal and distal goal setting. Shah and Kruglanski (2000) represent these different kinds of goals using a hierarchy. In this hierarchy, abstract goals (orientations) have subservient goals (proximal and distal goals). There are some complexities surrounding the structure of goals:

1) How do goal structures develop?
2) Are certain goals necessary for SRL?
3) Must personal goals align with goals set by schools?

Before considering these questions, I discuss the role goals play in SRL. A goal structure involves an orientation accompanied by larger and smaller goals, which, according to SRL theory, should have internal coherence (Pintrich, 2000; Shah & Kruglanski, 2000). So, if individuals have orientations to reach mastery for mastery's sake, then their distal goals might not be exclusively to get good grades in order to please parents or peers. The way I read this structure, goal orientation is the platform on which distal and proximal goals function and make sense. Researchers who focus on goal networks construe goal networks as hierarchical (Carver, C.S. & Scheier, 2000; Shah & Kruglanski, 2000) whereby there are overarching goals that influence both subsets of goals and the means to achieve those goals.

A number of different kinds of goal orientations have been identified and for SRL research, mastery orientation and performance orientation receive the greatest amount of attention (Pintrich, 2000). Broadly speaking, a mastery orientation is defined by one's intrinsic interest to pursue learning for understanding and improving competence. A performance orientation involves the mobilization of thoughts and behaviors in pursuit of some normative standard. Individuals with performance goals might work diligently to understand a topic in order to be seen as competent to their peers, teachers or parents.

These orientations have been further divided into approach and avoidance types (Elliot, 2005). Thus, mastery and performance goals were expanded to include the distinctions between approach and avoidance. So, individuals with mastery-avoidance orientation seek task mastery to avoid self-referential or task-referential incompetence. Performance avoidance orientation means that one will avoid tasks so as not to be seen as incompetent. The approach types have been correlated with more positive academic outcomes (Beghetto, 2006; Elliot, 2005) and have been associated with SRL (Greene & Azevedo, 2007). A performance-approach goal is characterized by the drive to outperform others, to be seen as more competent than others. The mastery-approach goal aligns with mastery orientation.

While there is some controversy surrounding which orientation(s) is necessary for SRL, there seems to be little disagreement that the mastery-approach orientation is associated with successful SRL (Greene & Azevedo, 2007). In their review of the SRL research on mastery and performance goals, Greene and Azevedo (2007) stated

> "Most of the research on mastery goal orientations has focused on the approach form and has almost universally found positive associations, including increased monitoring of comprehension, more use of cognitive elaboration and organization strategies, higher levels of theory motivation construct such as self-efficacy and positive attributions, and more frequent help-seeking behavior" (p.347).

From this statement, the authors found that mastery approach orientation is intimately tied to the processes and cognitive conditions associated with successful SRL.

In the SRL literature, there is stronger evidence that mastery orientation correlates with successful SRL and research on performance orientation, which is typically considered mastery's counterpart. Yet, a performance orientation has not yielded satisfactory correlation or causality to successful SRL (Greene & Azevedo, 2007). Greene and Azevedo (2007) noted that a performance approach has been shown to correlate more with SRL than performance avoidance. They stated:

> Research suggests that performance-avoidance orientations are associated with negative outcomes, such as the use of fewer cognitive strategies and decreased self-efficacy and interest. (p. 347)

Another kind of goal orientation, which, for obvious reasons, receives little attention in the SRL literature, is work-avoidance. Somewhat self-explanatory, this orientation marks kinds of engagement whereby individuals exert energy to avoid doing work. Individuals with this orientation want to do the least amount of work possible. It could be argued that a work avoidance orientation requires sophisticated self-regulation. However, such an orientation has not been associated with academic success.

Mastery and approach orientations have been correlated with SRL and academic success. What is unclear in the literature is the degree to which these orientations are domain specific or stable across contexts. This conceptual ambiguity divides SRL researchers. Those who draw from sociocultural theory are more likely to view an orientation as domain specific. For that reason, the notion of orientation is not used in the sociocultural literature on SRL because of its connotation of stability and generalizability. I have noticed that in the sociocultural literature on SRL that the notion of mastery is used for task specific engagement. Used this way, mastery means the same thing but it is context dependent and not a stable feature of one's engagement.

It could be argued that the social cognitive view of SRL involves orientations as a component of SRL. As Bandura (2001) noted efficacious people see tasks as challenges to be mastered. The social cognitive view of SRL has been criticized as relying on stable and fixed psychological and behavioral conditions, despite the fact that Schunk and Zimmerman (1997) have outwardly rejected such a characterization.

While having a mastery orientation towards academic tasks has been shown to be characteristic of successful SRL, researchers have added that there needs to be specific academic proximal and distal goals in order to achieve mastery of content (Zimmerman, 1989). Mastery goals signify an orientation towards a task. Thus, it is not enough to be oriented towards mastery; systems of long and short term goals must be set, pursued and modified, if necessary, in service of mastery goals. These goals could involve the pursuit of better study strategies, success on an assignment, or desire for certain grades. For SRL, it is important that students set goals and strive for the achievement of those goals.

There are some conceptual complexities with goal orientation and goal pursuit that have implications for notions of agency. The first complexity involves the origination of goals. The second, which will be discussed with the first, involves the alignment between personal goals and institutional goals. The third involves the obligation to pursue goals.

Origination of Goals

How could one tell the difference between goals that originated from within and goals that originate from without? When thinking about goals, Martin and McLellan (2007) suggested that the origination of goals would change the degree to which SRL could be constituted as an expression of agency. This suggestion made sense. If the goals towards which students were to regulate their learning were defined and determined by the institution of schooling, then assigning agency to self-regulated action becomes complicated.

As noted above, certain orientation lend themselves better to SRL than others. So, if a teacher crafts pedagogy to elicit, invoke or shape a certain orientation, is that orientation one that is formed within or from without? This question is tied to epistemological differences between constructivism and socioculturalism. A constructivist perspective (Martin, 2004b) provides the conceptual tools to make it possible to think of the internal origination of goals, or at least the internal mediation of the goals. From a socioculturalist perspective, goal orientation and proximal and distal goal formation could be argued to have originated from interaction with the external world. Some theorists suggest that discerning the origination of a goal is not simple (Martin & McLellan, 2007), though conceptual frameworks might help to obscure such complexity.

While the social world is taken into account, Martin and McLellan (2007) are less optimistic than other SRL researchers that the origination of goals and other SRL processes could be delineated. Expressing incredulity they stated,

> "…is it really possible to make such distinctions on the basis of whether or not the goal-setting, strategic acting, monitoring, and evaluation said to attend the worldly activity of human persons is self-generated and self-determined versus occasioned and determined externally by circumstances and others." (Martin & McLellan, 2007, p. 10)

In this quotation, the authors speak broadly about a variety of features of SRL and question the possibility of discerning their origins. The question to consider here is: how do individuals know when they are pursuing self originated goals as opposed to goals determined by external factors. Martin and McLellan (2007) would suggest that this question makes sense in modernist construction of the subject in which the individual is rendered separate from the world. With this separation, there is a set of extreme explanations that range between the individual and structural determinism. Martin and McLellan (2007) suggested that it is not so easy to know what is determining what individuals do and cast doubt on the rational agent steering all behavior and thinking and is responsible for life's outcomes. They also cast doubt on attributing the origination of goals to the social world.

Obligation to Pursue Goals

As Popkewitz (1996) noted, setting goals and being oriented towards goals are a modern cultural artifact. Popkewitz was not necessarily suggesting that during pre-modernity individuals were not striving towards anything. Instead, it seemed to suggest that goals in modern times have taken on a different meaning. Setting and pursuing goals is a key feature of many accounts of SRL. Its role in the social cognitive perspective is especially important because of its direct link to self-efficacy. A concern that needs to be addressed is the degree to which students' goals need to be aligned with goals set out by parents and teachers. In other words, are successful self-regulated learners those who have the same goals as their teachers and parents, and can effectively achieve those goals in the time expected?

If goals are aligned, then work does not need to be done to align individuals' goals with goals set out by teachers and parents. If goals are not aligned, then work must be done to make those goals functional and adaptable within schools. The conflation of the self-regulated learner with the successful student supports the necessity of this alignment. Some researchers have suggested that self-regulation does not necessarily involve this alignment. Paris, Byrnes and Paris (2001) suggested that one's expression of identity requires self-regulation, even if that identity competes with academic success. Arguably, those children might not be considered as regulating their learning because the regulation in which they are engaged is not academically sanctioned.

There might be more of an obligation associated with the orientation because, for example, a work avoidance orientation might not be effective at organizing subservient goals in pursuit of academic achievement. Considering orientation, it world seem that students who are going to be effective at SRL would need to have a particular orientation. In this way, an alignment between personal goals and expectations of schools is needed. For proximal and distal goals, there seems to be more opportunity for self-determination. There could many different sub-goals used to achieve a higher goal.

The Ethics of SRL

Up to this point, I focused my literature review on some of the conceptual complexities associated with SRL. In this section, I shift my attention to the ethics of SRL. The discussion in this section is part of the conceptual ambiguities. I separated the topics in this section because it had to with some of functional and ethical implications of SRL. In this section, I explore what researchers and theorists suggest SRL does or is supposed to do. I discuss two interrelated topics: individual and social betterment and empowerment and disempowerment.

Individual and Social Betterment

A review of the literature on self-regulated learning revealed that researchers and theorists treat SRL as a form of individual betterment (e.g., Zimmerman, 2008). Martin (2004) would describe notions of individual betterment embedded in the literature on SRL as a focus on better learning and study strategies. Martin pointed out that this focus on individual betterment does not necessarily equate to, what he termed as, civic virtue or civic responsibility, or what I call here, social betterment. The conceptual complexity here involves exploring the degree to which SRL connects to self-interested goals and social goals.

Steven Graham and Karen Harris are two prolific SRL researchers, who have developed the Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) model. In a research study conducted by Santangelo, Harris and Graham (2008), the authors argued that SRSD supports the development of planning, drafting and revising of written texts that mirrors the kinds of strategies of professional writers. Also, Zimmerman (2008) stated:

> SRL is viewed as proactive processes that students use to acquire academic skill, such as setting goals, selecting and deploying strategies, and self-monitoring one's effectiveness, rather than as a reactive event that happens to students due to impersonal forces" (p. 168).

Even those researchers who treat SRL as an event rather than an enduring aptitude emphasize individual outcomes (e.g., Perry, 2004a). It is fairly common for SRL researchers and theorists to express the need for individuals to improve control over emotions, thoughts and behaviors for the purpose of improving academic performance.

These conceptions of SRL focus on individual pursuits. Martin (2004a) critiqued these conceptions of SRL. He argued that teaching students to be self-regulated learners is an approach to teaching and learning that is individualistic and reductionist. In addition, he (2004a) stated, "Knowing how to study effectively, or to motivate oneself are important and useful, but hardly equate with hallmarks of personhood such as civic virtue and responsible living" (Martin, 2004a, p. 22). According to Martin, the conceptual piece that is responsible for these conceptions of SRL has to do with modern conceptions of the self. As Martin (2004a) argued, research studies involving the notion of self, such as self-regulation, view the self as rational and isolated with an interior core responsible for actions and thoughts. Martin (2004a) argued that such studies rely on a self that are inadequate and irrelevant for the education of persons. He argued that in order to educate individuals for democratic participation, core assumptions of the modernist self must be challenged. He argued that emphasizing a self with a profound interiority, a predisposition for self-mastery and detached from historical and cultural terrain renders self-conceptions "empty" with little recourse to virtue and civic responsibility.

What if individual betterment was viewed as social betterment? In terms of economics, it might be argued that individual self-interested pursuits benefit society. Arguably, this logic could be extended to include the pursuit of individual achievement by working on individual learning strategies. If SRL could be used to support socially desirable and moral behaviors and intellectual achievements for individuals, then would not all individuals benefit? Maybe individual betterment could support better competition in the global market place by creating a better workforce. Zimmerman (2000) argued that self-regulation could help solve social problems, such smoking, teen pregnancy and crime. Considering schools, one social benefit that Zimmerman, Bonner and Kovach (1996) mentioned was that individuals who self-regulate learning could serve as models for others, and thus, a be a community resource.

Empowering and Disempowering

In this section, I explore empowerment and disempowerment as they relate to

SRL. I present literature on SRL that suggests it is a humanistic effort to realize our personhood by being able to exercise control over our lives. This treatment of SRL is typically found in the literature on self-regulation, especially from the social cognitive perspective. There is also literature that suggests SRL is disempowering. There is not much literature informing this latter consideration.

Yowell and Smylie (1999) referred to the motivation literature to define empowerment as "students' capacities to understand behavior-outcome relationships within given contexts and their belief that they have the capability to enact the behaviors necessary for such desired outcomes" (p.478). According to Mahoney and Thoresen (1974), individuals exercise self-control by monitoring behavior, discerning environmental contingencies, and altering behavior or the environment, which would alter behavior, for the purpose of generating meaningful and positive experiences. Such self-regulation, they argued, led to dignity, autonomy, self-actualization and freedom. The authors reasoned that part of the humanistic quality of heightened self-control comes from the increased degree of responsibility and control of actions. Mahoney and Thoresen further reasoned that environmental cues and consequences are ultimately shaping behavior, so if individuals develop awareness of those contingencies they could actively shape them. For Mahoney and Thoresen, this behavioral self-control carries with it connotations of individual emancipation. From this line of thinking, if the social is oppressive, then understanding the ways individuals are implicated in such a system will help to free oneself from that system.

Another way to think about SRL as empowering is by considering the role of schools in social mobility. If social mobility is an individual's goal and school is a channel for social mobility, SRL could provide the skills and tools to perform well in school. Zimmerman (1998) suggested that there was an association between SRL and social and economic upward mobility. In the manual that I used for this dissertation, the authors made an analogy between SRL and learning to fish (Zimmerman, Bonner & Kovach, 1996). They argued that learning to fish is similar to learning academic regulation, in the sense that long-term and self-reliant skills will be invaluable through ones' life course. From this way of thinking, being given fish fostered dependency and helplessness.

Considering the section on individual and social betterment and the discussion up to this point on empowerment, SRL could be seen as empowering because it could be a form of or lead to:

1. democratic participation
2. lifelong learning
3. self-sufficiency
4. academic success
5. economic upward mobility

There are some features of SRL that complicate idea of empowerment in SRL. I began to consider this other side of empowerment by considering the relationship between the self-regulated learner and the successful student. When successful students are conflated with the self-regulated learner, which is a conceptual limitations made by teachers and researchers, facilitating successful academic performance becomes reduced to the propagation of scripts generated from studying what successful students think and do. Prescribing such scripts for academic engagement blurs the distinction between self-regulated academic performance and performance that is obedience. While SRL can be productive, that is, enabling efficient and effective ways to learn, the generation of scripts for SRL has normative components to them. In my research, I would like to explore the relationship between this production and normalization.

Not only did I consider the normalization associated with SRL as disempowerment, I also considered the degree to which learning academic self-regulation involved obedience. Post, Boyer and Brett (2006) cite literature from the early 1980s by researchers in developmental psychology, who stated that

> self-regulation 'is the ability to comply with a request, to initiate and cease activities according to situational demands, to modulate the intensity, frequency, and duration of verbal and motor acts in social and education settings.' In addition Kopp highlights the sophisticated cognitive system enabling a young child 'to postpone acting upon a desired object or goal, and to generate socially approved behavior in the absence of external monitors. (p.5)

Based on this understanding of self-regulation, which the authors stated combine adaptation and compliance with control over cognitive systems, it seems reasonable that students' non-compliance to school expectations serve as indices of failure at self-regulation. From this treatment of SRL, compliance and the generation of socially approved behaviors—in other words, obedience—is self-regulation.

Researchers who hold this view of self-regulated learning seem to believe that the purpose of SRL is to help manage behavior. So in this view, there is little that distinguishes SRL from obedience. Ostensibly, many theories of SRL would not explicitly espouse compliance as self-regulation, even though it seems reasonable to do so, especially given the rationale that all individuals are choosing to comply and are engaging in "sophisticated" self-regulation of behavior and cognition. Instead, it seems the compliance component is subtler.

Others within educational psychology view SRL differently. Martin and McMellan (2007) characterized SRL as "the disguised manipulation of student self-surveillance in the service of the institutional mandates of schools" (p. 2). While the connection between self-surveillance and institutional mandates makes sense, I will avoid describing teaching SRL as "disguised manipulation" because the connotation is that power is located in a fixed and creative source. Holding on to that meaning makes more sense from Marxist or neo-Marxist standpoint. Anyway, attending to Martin and Mclellan's treatment of SRL helps to consider another interpretation of SRL, an interpretation that certainly makes sense from the neo-Marxist position of Bowles and Gintis (1976).

Chapter Conclusion

In this literature review, I discussed some enduring and complex issues with SRL. Some of these issues extend beyond SRL and have been enduring topics in a variety of disciplines. Individual human agency, for example, is a notion that I have encountered in sociology, philosophy and psychology. There have been and continue to be many debates surround issues with agency, and other issues as well, such as freedom, empowerment and the social good. In my dissertation research, I am not suggesting that I could adequately address all these complexities. What I tried to do was keep these complexities in mind when I analyzed case study data from multiple perspectives. Aside from my effort to support academic success for a struggling learner, I wanted to see how one person's experience learning academic self-regulation illuminated some insights into the complexities that I have noted.

The use of multiple frameworks, those not traditionally used to talk about SRL, could help to differentiate conceptions of SRL. Understanding this complexity could promote the careful crafting of instructional strategies that support students' successful academic performance.

Chapter 3

Methods

In this chapter, I discuss the empirical, educational and conceptual importance of conducting a single person case study of self-regulated learning (SRL). The features of the methods are organized by case-study design, introduction to Karen, intervention and analytical frameworks. In each section, I discuss what I did and the rationale for making certain decisions. It was difficult to contain all of the methodology in this chapter. While there is a large portion of the methodology here, there is more dispersed in other chapters where some of my analyses are presented.

Case-study design

To restate my research question: how could using multiple perspectives illuminate some of the complexities of SRL as they related to the lived experience of one student? In my research study, I worked with one student. The single-person case study was appropriate for practical, ethical, methodological and professional considerations. In this section, I discuss the contribution of conducting a single person case study and how this examination contributes to the literature on SRL. In this case study I have had the opportunity to explore SRL at much deeper levels than was available in any existing literature. Aside from contributing to the literature on SRL, this case study approach also provided a rich place from which to start my career as a researcher. With a deeper and more nuanced understanding of SRL, I am in position to design future studies of SRL at different scales and sites.

Why One Student?

From a social cognitive perspective, becoming a self-regulated learner requires specific contextual conditions, time, and work. As Zimmerman (1998) contended, learning to academically self regulate requires many hours of practice in contexts where students have choice and control. He reasoned that because classrooms are seldom places where students have opportunities to choose or control, enacting or developing SRL happens primarily outside of school. From this perspective, learning to academically self-regulate has more to do with out of school experiences. Zimmerman (1994) also stated that learning to academically self-regulate happens in a broader context that serves to support SRL. In that sense, a concerted effort among many people, such as parents, teachers and coaches is needed (Zimmerman, 1998).

My implementation of an intervention to foster SRL required close and intensive collaboration with teachers, parents, siblings and Karen. It also required many hours of working with Karen outside of class. To include multiple participants in this research study could have led to less individual attention to Karen. It could have led to less time collaborating with and consulting individuals involved in Karen's life. It could have led to less attention to the broader context in which the Karen operated. Typically, case studies are justified because they provide in-depth analyses. That is true for this study. Also, the case study was advantageous because it provided me with the means to work to effectively implement the intervention, study its impact on Karen's academic achievement and carefully craft and revise the intervention in order to best meet Karen's needs.

Looking this closely at SRL has worked to support my efforts to become a better teacher of SRL by understanding the process involved with teaching and learning it. By closely examining the intervention and Karen's experience with it, I was able to explore a number of points of tension with SRL. The case study approach afforded me the opportunity to consider the complexities and limitations of teaching and learning academic self-regulation.

While there are limitations with using one participant, the research has the potential to contribute to the literature on SRL by closely examining the lived experience of one student who is learning academic self-regulation. One of the limitations of the study has to do with generalizability. On a modern epistemological plane, a sample of one does not make sense for generalizability. On a postmodern epistemological plane, however, a sample of one is different: it broadens understanding by inviting different kinds of readings and disrupting taken-for-granted assumptions. With one participant, my goal was not to generalize principles of SRL to other cases. Rather, my goal was to push researchers and teachers to expand their repertoires and increase the variety of perspectives for understanding SRL.

Length of Time

The data-generation phase of this case study was four and one-half months long. Researchers disagree about the amount of time needed for SRL to be implemented. On one side, researchers might resist the idea that time used for cognitive training needs little consideration for SRL. The argument for this side is that certain contextual features facilitate student SRL. That is, there are certain instructional design practices that support SRL. Therefore, the need for teachers to acquire the skills, knowledge and dispositions to structure their classrooms to foster SRL becomes essential. This position reflects a Montessori idea that spontaneous self-regulation emerges in the absence of confining environments.

On the other hand, researchers contended that students need many of hours of training and practice in order to learn to academically self-regulate (Zimmerman, 1998). From this perspective, instructional design should not determine the enactment of SRL. Part of the power of SRL is for its efficacy to help students harness their own personal power in order to overcome environmental constraints (Zimmerman, 1989). Connected with the SRL manual, I will operate with the assumption that Karen could develop SRL with practice and training.

The question about length of time is important to consider for ethical reasons. I wanted to be sure that I spent an adequate amount of time with Karen to optimize the benefit. Methodologically, the justification for the length of time the intervention becomes more important if I were examining the effectiveness of the intervention. The research study is focused on what illuminating some of the complexities of SRL while involved with an intervention. With that said, it was still important to consider a reasonable amount of time to increase Karen's chances of adopting SRL and to give the intervention its due.

Perry and Drummond (2002) worked with third grade students and after one year of exposure to pedagogy designed to foster SRL, the students in their research showed signs of SRL. Zimmerman, Bonner and Kovach (1996) suggested the children with the proper guidance and right tools could start regulating their learning immediately. Zimmerman (1998) made the distinction between expert and naive self-regulated learners. To be an expert, Zimmerman contended that it takes several hundred hours of practice with SRL. The time commitment in the intervention was much more modest and generating expertise with SRL might have been difficult. While some researchers have discussed specific time demands for SRL, others have suggested the time can be variable (Harris, Graham, Mason & Saddler, 2002). Some of the reasons for variation in time have to do with different skills levels, dispositions and pedagogical practices. Part of the assessment of the time came from analysis of Karen and the experiences with school.

Research Sites

My research had two sites: home and school. I observed in Karen's classroom three times a week for two hours a day for the entire five-month research period. I observed Karen in a variety of classes (see table 1). Out of all her classes, Karen liked science the most and liked social studies and math the least. The reason for wanting variability with content was to account for the potential variability of different kinds of engagement. The purpose of the observations was to explore how SRL strategies were used, if at all, in the classroom and to understand how the teachers support or curtail Karen's SRL efforts. Observations were also used as ways to assess and discuss Karen's engagement and understanding. I minimized my interactions with Karen in classrooms in order to avoid casting a spotlight on her. I wanted to avoid potential peer ridicule or speculation of academic deficiency or abnormality. In the classroom I observed the participant's strategies for engaging with classroom tasks using an instrument with both a SRL checklist (appendix D) and space for field notes.

Table 1
School Observation Schedule

	Duration	Frequency	Total	Subject(s)
General Classroom	1-3 Hours	2-3 times a week/ 4 1/2 months	36 hours	Social studies, math and language arts
Science	55 minutes	Attended 7 consecutive class periods in the middle of the research period	7 hours	Science
*Resource Room	30-55 minutes	6 times throughout observation period	5 hours	Math and Language arts
Other	45-60 minutes	2 times throughout observation period	2 hours	Individualized Education Plan meeting and the parent and teacher conference

*Karen was pulled out once a week by the special education teacher and two times a week by the teacher responsible for fulfilling title I services.

Supporting SRL took place mostly in the Karen's home (see Table 3). At this location, I worked with Karen 4 to 6 hours a week. We worked Monday through Thursday. We never worked on a Friday because she did not have homework. That was her decision. Also, each Friday at 6:00pm Karen would go to her biological mother's house. I describe Karen's family structure in the next section. The data sources were audio-recorded sessions with Karen. During this time, I worked with Karen 1.5 to sometimes 2.5 hours each evening for 3 to 4 days each week on completing her homework. When working with Karen to complete homework assignments, I implemented the intervention. Below is a skeleton of a typical day for Karen.

Table 2
Daily Schedule

Time	Event
7:00-7:30am	Karen wakes up and gets ready for school
7:50am	Karen leaves to catch the bus
8:45am	Karen arrives at school
8:55am	School begins
3:48pm	School ends
4:30-4:45pm	Karen takes the bus and arrives home
5:00pm	I arrive at Karen's home
*5:00-7:00pm	Work with Karen on homework

*This amount of time varied: sometimes it was more and sometimes it was less.

Table 3
Research Sites

	Duration	Frequency	Total	Subject(s)
School	1-3 hours a day	2-3 times a week	Total = 50 hours	Social studies, math language arts, science, IEP meeting, parent and teacher conference
Home	1.5-2.5 hours a day	3-4 times a week	Total = 80 hours	Homework, library, bookstore

Introduction to Karen

Karen was an upper elementary student who was identified by parents as academically struggling. Karen was from a midwestern elementary school with 5^{th} and 6^{th} grade students. From the parents' description, it seemed that she could benefit from a SRL intervention. Karen was described as struggling with concentration, comprehension and motivation in school and performing formal academic tasks at home. In the 2^{nd} grade Karen was diagnosed as having a central auditory processing disability (CAPD). In this section, I discuss the reasons for choosing a student who was struggling, the benefits of focusing on an upper elementary student and describe features of the CAPD, as discussed in the Individualized Education Plan meeting and literature on CAPD, that speak to the potential benefits of a SRL intervention.

Before presenting a portrait of Karen, I would like to describe some features of her family. Karen lives in a household with five people: her stepmother, who is identified as Caucasian, and her biological father, who identified as Mexican American, one full sister and one half-sister. Karen's biological mother, identified as Caucasian, lives in a town that is 20 minutes away. While class identity can be difficult to determine precisely, I identified Karen's parents as working class. Some criteria for class identification were cultural identity, occupational status, income level, and educational background. As discussed in chapter 5, Karen's family displayed similar cultural practices as compared to the working class families in Lareau's (1989/2000; 2003) research studies. Francisco, Karen's father, worked for a local cable company as an installer and Laura, Karen's step mother, worked from her home as a manicurist. Both Laura and Francisco have high school diplomas and did not attend higher education. The household did not contain many books, and the parents regarded computers as game-playing devices.

Choosing a Struggling Student

I began with an assumption that was consistent with a longstanding one made by many researchers, namely successful students are self-regulated and unsuccessful students are not. Often researchers and teachers conflate the successful student with the self-regulated learner (van Den Hurk, 2006; Whipp & Chiarelli, 2004; Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1986). Concomitantly, unsuccessful students are characterized as not self-regulated or naïve self-regulated learners.

By operating with the same assumption, I am starting with a number of presuppositions about the student and the student's learning habits that might not necessarily be justified. One of these presuppositions has to do with the source of academic difficulty. By using "struggling student" as a criterion for SRL intervention, I was positioning Karen as the source of that struggle. Although I find it problematic to use academic success to judge the degree to which one is self-regulated and to make claims about the potential benefit of a SRL intervention, I needed to use that criterion in order to at least begin research with a participant.

From the data, I found that Karen was having difficulties in school. She struggled most with math, social studies and language arts. Part of these struggles had to do with her dislike for writing and her struggles with reading. A reflection of these struggles is represented in the grades listed below (see Table 4). There were also some indications of Karen's academic struggles from the Iowa Achievement Test. In all parts of this standardized test, she was in the 40th percentile or below. While I did not have access to all this data early in the research study, examination of earlier report cards, initial interviews with teachers and parents' reports, and examination of IEP documents led me to conclude that Karen could benefit from a SRL intervention.

Zimmerman (2000) argued that there is a link between poor academic performance and low self-regulatory skill. He stated, "there is evidence that students who have trouble self-regulating their academic studying achieve more poorly in school and present more deportment problems for their teachers" (Zimmerman, 2000, p. 26). Zimmerman, Bonner and Kovach (1996) stated that students who are struggling in school improve their academic performance through self-regulatory "training" (p. 136). Karen was struggling in most subjects. Also, I discuss later literature on Central Auditory

Processing Disability (CAPD) that identified SRL training as a way to overcome the cognitive limitations purported to result from CAPD.

Table 4
Report Cards

Subject	Report Card 3/15	Interim Report 4/16	Interim Report # 2 5/14	Final Report Card 6/14
Science	A-	A-	A	A-
English/Lang. Arts	D	D	D	D+
Social Studies	C-	C	D	C-
Spelling	B	B +	B-	B
Math	C	A-	B-	C

Choosing an Upper Elementary Student

There were a number of reasons for choosing an upper elementary student. First, it is important to note that in the early 1990s, researchers contended that elementary-aged students were incapable of SRL. Perhaps Piaget and his universal stage theory of logical reasoning could be credited for such an understanding. According to Piaget and Inhelder (2000), abstract thought does not occur until the final stage of logico-mathematical development, which begins around the 11^{th} year of a child's life. From this perspective, metacognition, which could be understood as a form of abstract thought, might not be cognitively possible in early elementary children. Towards the latter part of the 1990s to the present, however, numerous research studies were conducted that denounced the supposed self-regulatory incapacity of elementary-aged students, especially those in upper elementary (Harris et al., 2003; Hickey, 2003; Perry & Drummond, 2002). Part of this shift had to do with changing conceptions of notions, such as metacognition, which are closely associated with SRL. Another factor contributing to the shift might have to do with a general incredulity towards a predetermined, universal and hierarchical stage theory of human development. Another possibility for this shift towards the study of elementary students and self-regulated learning might have to do with perceptions about shaping certain learning dispositions.

In my practicum research, secondary education teachers viewed their students as already knowing how to learn and, therefore, attributed academic performance to the exertion or effort. It is my contention that there was the underlying assumption amongst my participants that there were more "moldable" moments in different points of students' developmental trajectories. So in secondary education, molding dispositions to self-regulate learning was viewed as more challenging, if not impossible, especially without the recruitment of other teachers, parents, coaches and peers. Therefore, I believed it is more likely that elementary and middle school classrooms would be viewed as possible spaces to teach students to regulate learning. Researchers have identified these years as important for fostering SRL development (see, Zimmerman, Bonner and Kovach, 1996). If teachers perceived that elementary aged children are more moldable for SRL, then it makes sense that the research study be conducted with either upper elementary or middle school students because with teacher collaboration the benefit of intervention could be optimized; the teacher would be more willing to create a space for teaching and supporting SRL.

Another reason for choosing an elementary student was the benefits of SRL interventions for this population. Many researchers have focused their attention on understanding the underlying mechanism of and factors that affect elementary students' SRL, especially for elementary students who have been identified as having special learning needs (e.g., see Harris et al., 2003; Perry, 2004). In these research studies, researchers attributed improved academic performance inside and outside of the classroom to their capacity for self-regulation.

Choosing a Student with CAPD

There was not much literature on Central Auditory Processing Disability (CAPD) before the early 1990s. It is a complex disability to understand because it is a multifaceted neurological phenomenon. When I interviewed the parents, they did not know the name of the disability or any information about the disability and its specific affects on academic performance. To better understand the disability, I relied heavily on the Individualized Education Plan documents, which included reports from the audiologist, and the literature on CAPD. I also interviewed Karen's teachers about the disability.

Researchers have described central auditory processing as "what we do with what we hear" (Stecker, 1998, p. 1). Ferre (2006) noted that Central Auditory Processing Disability refers to a "deficit in the perceptual processing of auditory stimuli and the neurobiologic activity underlying that processing" (p. 225). From my reading of the literature, researchers acknowledge two points of auditory perceptual deficits: 1) perceiving linguistic distinctions, such as tone, pitch, frequency and loudness, and 2) interpreting these distinctions. In other words, researchers of CAPD recognize that there could be a dysfunction with one's auditory faculties or dysfunctions at multiple points where auditory stimuli are interpreted and processed. In either situation, these auditory deficits are treated as having biological bases.

There are many functions for which the central auditory processing (CAP) system is responsible. First, it consists of auditory discrimination, which is the ability to group sounds according to perceived similarity or difference. Auditory memory is the component that is responsible for storing and recalling auditory information. As I discuss later, the audiologist identified auditory memory as the source of Karen's learning difficulties. Another function of the CAP system is auditory perception, which concerns the reception and understanding of sounds and words. It plays a significant part in reading skills, managing verbal information, communication and social relationships. Auditory-vocal association consists of the interaction between what is heard and verbal response. Auditory synthesis is responsible for combining sounds or syllables to formulate comprehensible patterns (words) and de-combining words into separate sounds. Auditory-vocal automaticity is the ability to predict how future linguistic events will be heard by utilizing past experience. Auditory figure-ground is the component that helps one focus on some sounds while diminishing other less important ones. It is due to this component that someone can listen to another person talking in a railway station, where a lot of environmental noise exists.

As per the audiologist's evaluation, there were indications that Karen's auditory faculties were functioning at a normal level. In the evaluation, the audiologist noted:

Conventional audiometry was completed. Pure tone test results indicated hearing within normal limits bilaterally. Word discrimination abilities were excellent for both ears. Impedance audiometry revealed normal middle ear functioning bilaterally. Ipsilateral acoustic reflexes were present at normal levels for both ears.

The assessment in which Karen showed evidence of a central auditory processing disability was the Staggered Spondaic Word (SSW) test. The SSW test is a ten-minute evaluation that measures binaural integration abilities through the dichotic presentation of spondees. In other words, the right and left ears were presented with different spondees, which are words with long meters. These spondees overlapped. For example, a right ear was presented with the word "upstairs" and the left ear was presented with the word "downtown." The "up" syllable was played without competing auditory stimuli. The second syllable "stairs" would be overlapped with the first auditory syllable of the second spondee, which is presented in the left ear. The second syllable "town" would be played without competing auditory stimuli. According to this test, an individual with CAPD might construct the auditory stimuli as "uptown" and "downstairs" rather than "upstairs" and "downtown."

The SSW was among a battery of assessments that were intended to measure Karen's CAP. Another examination was the SCAN-C. Overall, the audiologist summarized the auditory processing evaluation by noting the results of the assessments indicate that Karen has difficulties with Tolerance-Fading Memory (TFM) and lexical decoding. Individuals in the auditory tolerance-fading memory category are thought to have severe auditory-processing problems because they are highly distracted by background sounds and have poor auditory memories (Stecker, 1998). However, for those in this group, school performance is not typically far from grade level, and the resulting reading disabilities stem more from limited comprehension than from an inability to sound out the words (Stecker, 1998).

Because Central Auditory Processing Disability is believed to have a neurological basis, research on brain plasticity has been used to justify the need for targeted experiences, mental training (self-regulatory control) and behavior modification to overcome the limitations of the disability (Banai & Kraus, 2006; Chermak, 1998; Stecker, 1998). In books and handbooks on CAPD, there are many references made to the importance of SRL for overcoming limitations in the CAP system. Additionally, in an interview with the special education teacher, she stated that Karen would benefit from SRL. On her IEP, it specifically listed that Karen needed to develop self-advocacy. While not synonymous with SRL, there was overlap between the way the special education teacher interpreted self-advocacy and SRL.

In the literature on CAPD, there were specific overlaps between the social cognitive model of SRL and the kinds of self-regulation important for those with CAPD (e.g., see Chermak, 1998). I chose the intervention Developing Self-Regulated Learners: Beyond Achievement to Self-Efficacy because it is a comprehensive manual from a widely cited framework. While this alignment might seem fortuitous, I noticed in literature on CAPD that self-regulation in general has been viewed as an important for overcoming the limitations resulting from CAPD.

Intervention

The primary source for the intervention was Zimmerman, Bonner and Kovach's

(1996) manual titled Developing Self-Regulated Learners: Beyond Achievement to Self-Efficacy. The manual is a comprehensive source identifying the important components of SRL and strategies for individuals to use in order help others acquire or sharpen their SRL skills. There were documents for self-evaluation, self-monitoring, time management and goal setting. They were important external sources for managing learning. In this section, I describe the intervention and how it shaped my interaction with Karen.

Baseline Data

In order to develop a baseline understanding of Karen's academic performance, I interviewed Karen's parents and teachers and administered the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ). Amongst other SRL components, the self-report survey measures individual's self-efficacy, goal orientation and learning strategy use. As Schunk (2005) noted, the scale has good internal reliability and demonstrates moderate correlations with academic success. The scale has been used by many and, as Schunk argued, will continue to be a valuable instrument for the study of SRL. The items pertaining specifically to self-efficacy in the MSLQ are general perceptions about expectancy success.

To ascertain more information, I conducted planned and unplanned interviews with Karen, her teachers and her parents (see Table 3). I asked questions about Karen's grades, classroom performance, homework strategies, test scores and general concerns about her academic performance. This baseline data was used to consider the impact of the intervention. These interviews were designed to get more information about Karen and use that information to ensure that the intervention was in Karen's best interest. The unplanned interviews with the parents randomly occurred while visiting Karen at her home. The unplanned interviews with the teacher occurred during classroom observations. We typically conversed when students went to recess or gym.

Table 5
Interviews

	Planned			Unplanned		
	Total Hours	Duration	Format	Total Hours	Duration	Format
Parents	3	45-60 min	Taped; Semi-structured	6	5-15 minutes	Field notes and no recording; Semi-structured
Teacher	2	45-60 min	Taped; Semi-structured	8	20-25 minutes	Recorded and field notes; Semi-structured
Child	3	30-45 min	Taped; Semi-structured	4	10-20 minutes	Some recorded and field notes; Semi-structured

Self-efficacy

Important for the intervention was developing appropriate levels of self-efficacy and developing the skills and knowledge to evaluate and monitor thoughts beliefs, behavior and environment. Initially, I used a number of strategies to foster appropriate levels of self-efficacy (see also chapter 4). Zimmerman (1989) defined self-efficacy as one's beliefs about capabilities to organize and implement actions necessary to attain designated performance or skill for specific tasks. I worked with Karen to support the identification, measurement and possible alteration of self-efficacy in ways that were supposed to make successful self-regulation of task completion possible. To support productive levels of self-efficacy, it was important for Karen to recognize, measure, and evaluate those beliefs.

Early in the research project, there was an emphasis on providing Karen with the tools to reflect on her self-efficacy. The tools that I used to help Karen recognize, measure and evaluate self-efficacy beliefs were self-efficacy scales, journal writings and daily interactions. The first tool I used was quizzes. For the intervention, Karen was expected to take quizzes and predict the number she thought she would get correct and rate the confidence of her prediction. The authors of the intervention suggested that quizzes with only ten questions should be used because plotting results would and charting changes were more manageable.

Before taking a quiz, Karen was expected to predict the number of questions she thought she would get correct. The prediction was supposed to be 0-10. After the prediction, Karen was expected to rate the degree of confidence in that prediction. This rating was on a 3-point scale: not very sure (-1), quite sure (0), and absolutely sure (+1). The confidence rating is used to adjust the prediction. The authors stated the "self-efficacy is defined as the estimated score after the point adjustment" (Zimmerman, Bonner & Kovach, 1996, p.27). For example, if Karen predicted she would get 6 but was not very sure (-1), her self-efficacy would be a 5.

These adjusted scores were then supposed to be graphed with actual test scores to see the discrepancy between the two. The authors stated "students who misjudge their self-efficacy will quickly see their errors and will adjust their standards when judging their self-efficacy in the future" (Zimmerman, Bonner & Kovach, 1996, p.29). From this tool to monitor self-efficacy, the importance of aligning performance with beliefs is apparent. According to the authors of the intervention, it was important to learn to monitor self-efficacy because it focused attention on beliefs about effectiveness of learning methods. The authors also stated that monitoring self-efficacy by rating and graphing it could support evaluation of the effectiveness of beliefs for homework and test preparation. The key outcome of monitoring self-efficacy was to associate beliefs with learning practices.

I discuss in chapter four some of the difficulties with this self-efficacy measurement, namely Karen's reluctance to predict, do extra work and rate her confidence. There were other ways suggested to evaluate and monitor self-efficacy. I used daily interactions to get a sense of Karen's self-efficacy beliefs and to point attention to it. While working on various academic tasks, I asked Karen to describe her beliefs while performing tasks. The goal of questioning Karen about her beliefs and prompting her to consider the role of them for performance was to encourage her to internalize these techniques of self-efficacy assessment.

Early in the research my efforts were geared towards helping Karen pay attention to and monitor self-efficacy. As discussed in chapter four, I experienced difficulty with these efforts. Understanding the importance of having appropriate levels of efficacy for SRL, I used strategies to both help Karen pay attention to her efficacy but also to improve her efficacy, which I found to be low (see chapter four). To help her pay attention to and improve efficacy I used modeling, reinforcement and verbal persuasion.

SRL researchers have identified modeling as a key strategy for supporting the recognition, modeling and transformations in students' self-efficacy beliefs (e.g., Schunk, 1994; Zimmerman, 1989). Teachers can act as models, or recruit other students to model improvements in skill and knowledge acquisition. Such modeling, Schunk (1994) argued, could increase students' self-efficacy for making improvements towards the acquisition of skills and knowledge. While working with Karen at home, I illustrated problem solving and metacognitive strategies by verbally expressing thoughts when engaging with activities. For example, I thought aloud while reading a text to illustrate how to monitor comprehension of the text and use different strategies to comprehend the text. After doing the think aloud, we deliberated over the strategy to consider its usefulness.

As Schunk argued, peer modeling could be a powerful force for impacting self-efficacy. As Zimmerman (1989) noted, students do not always seek out appropriate role models, whether peers, teachers, parents or media symbols. Therefore, I worked with Karen to consider appropriate role models and discuss what these role models do. For this strategy, I was careful to not overstate social comparisons because it could have competed with mastery orientation and could have been counterproductive for facilitating SRL. An additional concern had to do with using social comparisons to create a normalized subject. I did not want to position Karen as someone who needed to be like somebody else.

Other ways I tried to promote productive levels of self-efficacy was by using verbal encouragement or verbal persuasion. This strategy was typically considered to be less effective by itself (Zimmerman, 1989) and therefore, was accompanied by the strategy of supporting successful completion of tasks perceived as moderately difficult.

Schunk (1994) noted that students who exert some degree of effort, early successes would presumably raise their self-efficacy (Schunk, 1994).

Goal-setting and strategic planning were important components of self-efficacy in particular and SRL in general. As Zimmerman, Bonner and Kovach (1996) noted, goal-setting and strategic planning "occur when students analyze the learning task, set specific learning goals, and plan or refine the strategy to attain the goal" (p. 11). I asked Karen about what she was thinking prior to task engagement and what her goals for completing the task were before she began. The purpose was to see if, at all, Karen was strategizing prior to task engagement. From the social cognitive perspective, the relation between self-efficacy and goals are key. If individuals have overly optimistic self-efficacy, then their goals might be to spend less time on a task and pay less attention to accuracy.

Learning strategies were also part of the intervention. Strategies included comprehension monitoring using self-questioning techniques, developing self-assessments, task management and organizing information and time. I worked on homework with Karen and assisted her with using appropriate learning strategies to complete assignments. Depending on Karen's needs, I adapted different strategies. Karen's responses to the intervention, the homework assignments and classroom practice influenced the strategies for the intervention.

I continually monitored this intervention with Karen and her parents and teachers in order to keep the Karen's best interests paramount. Throughout the process, I asked Karen about her experiences with the intervention. This questioning took place while working on homework.

Analytical frameworks

I draw from expertise in self-regulated learning, and analyze data through three complementary theoretical lenses: educational psychology, sociology, and continental philosophy. I am not striving for theoretical coherence or the reconciliation between these perspectives. Rather, what is needed is a strengthening of the theoretical conceptualization of SRL in order to give researchers and practitioners' more differentiated understandings of SRL. By strengthening, I mean adding more nuance and subtlety to the conceptual threads of SRL by expanding the frameworks used to examine SRL. In this section, I briefly describe each framework while highlighting key conceptual contributions to the study of SRL.

One of the reasons for choosing a sociological framework informed by Bourdieu and continental philosophical framework informed by Foucault was that these frameworks have not been used to study SRL. Aside from the novelty of these two perspectives for the study of SRL, I believed that conceptual contributions of these particular frameworks could have provided a rich conversation to highlight multiple angles of SRL. Moreover, I have found the works of Bourdieu and Foucault to be particularly generative and intellectually interesting in my research and thinking about educational psychology.

Social Cognitive Perspective

For this perspective, I drew mostly from the intervention's framework to analyze the data. The intervention was written from a social cognitive perspective. From this perspective self-efficacy is the key personal variable that affects SRL. From this perspective, conventional codes associated with SRL were used to make sense of Karen and her relationship to the intervention. These categories include metacognition, cognition, learning strategy use, self-efficacy, help seeking and goal formation. These conventional categories were organized using the social cognitive perspective.

Bandura's (1989) social learning theory lays the foundations for many of the ideas in the social cognitive view of SRL. An essential component of the social cognitive view of SRL is reciprocal causation. From the perspective of reciprocal causation, psychology, behavior and environment are all seen as discrete entities that interact in bi-directional feedback loops. A key conclusion coming from this framework is that individuals are both producers and products of their environments. As Bandura (1989) explained, people produce their environments by exerting behaviors in them. From this perspective, an environment is not a fixed entity, and a person is not a discrete entity. Rather, both the person and the environment embody potentialities. When an individual exerts a behavior, the environment takes form through the relationship to the behavior, and the person takes form through the relationship to the environment. Therefore, certain behaviors generate different environments, and therefore, different environmental effects, which influences our thoughts and beliefs.

When theorizing the environment this way it seems to follow that individuals are viewed as having the capability and capacity to shape the environment and control the outcomes of their lives. If behaviors give form to the environment, then control over the environment becomes possible through the control over behavior. Bandura (1989) does not view the relationship between behavior and environment as uni-directional. As the model title suggests, there is a reciprocal relationship between behavior and the environment. There are also reciprocal relationships between thoughts and behavior and thoughts and environment. A foundational assumption undergirding this perspective is that certain psychological conditions could alter other psychological conditions and behavior. Psychological variables such as self-efficacy and goal formation could lead to a wide range of different behaviors that might shape the environment in different ways.

An important feature of the social cognitive approach to SRL is that the environment does not passively shape individuals' behaviors and thoughts. Rather, individuals are thought to shape the environment and mediate the effects of environmental feedback. In the contemporary formulation of SRL from the social cognitive perspective, Zimmerman (2000) distinguished between two different orientations to the environment: reactive and proactive. People who are reactive self-regulators react to environmental stimuli and therefore are bound to the results of social comparisons and external evaluations, which might be unfavorable. As Zimmerman (2000) noted, the result of reactive self-regulation is a decline in intrinsic interest in academic tasks, loss of self-efficacy and lack of specific process goals (Zimmerman, 2000). Proactive means that the potentiality of the environment and personal power is recognized and individuals shape the environment and themselves in ways that help them achieve their goals. As Zimmerman noted, key mechanisms for proactivity are planning and self-recording. The logic is that baseline information about oneself and strategic goal setting generate a sense of personal agency needed for student progress.

Critical Postmodern Perspective

I borrowed the term "critical postmodern" from Martin (2006). Popkewitz (1999) also used this label to distinguish critical modernism (e.g., work derived from Marxism such as the Frankfurt School) from critical postmodernism (e.g., work derived from French continental theory such as that of Michel Foucault). According to Martin, the critical postmodern work of people such as Rose, Gergen, and Foucault count as another brand of social cultural theorizing. In the new edition of Handbook of Educational Psychology, Martin (2006) stated that social cultural theorizing can take three lines: Vygotskian, Meadian, and critical postmodern. The commonalities Martin (2006) drew across these three lines of social cultural theorizing involve incredulity towards progress and the modernist construction of the individual. By making these connections, Martin wrestles with those researchers who use social cultural perspectives only to make claims about how the social environment impacts the individual rather than how the individual is constituted in and by certain relationships.

Work that might be classified as critical postmodern varies considerably. So, what does a critical postmodern perspective look like? The way I understand the critical postmodern tradition is that there is no single way in which to see things. Also, there is arguably not a singular methodology for conducting a critical postmodern analysis. From a critical postmodern perspective, I set out to examine some of the taken-for-granted assumptions of SRL and to consider multiple dimensions of SRL that have been ignored.

While I wanted to explore taken-for-granted assumptions and highlight features of SRL that have been ignored, I relied on the work of Rose (1996), Foucault (2007) and Cruikshank (1999) to inform this exploration. Each author's work provided different conceptual tools to analyze different features of the data. While there is variability in their objects of study, I found their work to converge in regards to their analyses of the employment of different technologies used to produce self-governing individuals. I briefly discuss features of each author's work that was influential in my analysis.

I borrowed some of the conceptual work from Cruikshank (1999), who alluded to ideas of dis/empowerment by studying the technologies of citizenship. These technologies fell under the rubric of, what she titled, playing off Nietzsche, "the will to empower." The will to empower involves mobilizing various sorts of technologies to "empower" subjects for the purpose of solving political and social problems. As Cruikshank argued, empowerment carried with it constraints and subjection. Empowerment, according to Cruikshank, was not autonomy from power but another form of government, only to be conducted by oneself with the help of experts. Cruikshank suggested that the will to empower positions those individuals that need to be "empowered" as deficient and the cause and cure for social and political problems. Cruikshank gave me a framework for understanding the multiple dimensions of empowerment and the will to empower.

Similar to Cruikshank, Dean (1999), a philosopher of education who writes in a critical postmodern tradition, pointed out that empowerment programs are a shifting form of government. He stated, "Programmes of empowerment are particularly clear examples of those contemporary liberal rationalities of government that endeavor to operationalize the self-governing capacities of the governed in the pursuit of governmental objectives" (Dean, 1999, p. 67).

From Rose's (1996) work, I draw the notions of calculation and documentation.

He discussed these notions in the context of behavioral therapies of the 1950s. According to Rose (1996), during that time social ailments were believed to have been solved by contingency management. Such management was no longer administered by the therapist, social worker or the teacher but was to become part of systematic management of one's own behavior leading to better social adaptation. Rose noted that the new field of application was called self-control. He argued that psychotherapists reasoned that such self-control mechanisms have a humanistic end. He stated "...while many associate behavior techniques with manipulation and control, their practitioners stress their potential for enhancing skills of 'self management' and helping clients gain control of their feelings and behavior; they see them as consonant with profound humanistic values" (p. 230). Calculation and documentation were two techniques used to support greater self-control.

While Rose (1996) did not dispute freedom associated with the achieving self-control by calculating and documenting truths about the self, he argued that this freedom has another side to it. By following advice from experts on how to self-inspect and self-reform, individuals become entangled in normalizing and individualizing practices. It is individualizing because techniques are used to construct an identity, one in which Rose argued individuals become obligated to construct. It is normalizing because there is often a generalized and homogenized construction on how to live coming from experts.

Calculation and documentation are not only intended to develop truths about selves, rely on the ability to tell the truth about the self in order to make calculation and documentation useful. From Foucault, I use the notion of truth therapy (which I discuss more in chapter six) and consider some of parallels between Foucault's study of truth therapies and SRL. What this framework has allowed me to do was consider the ways SRL can realize the promises of human empowerment and at the same time require disciplined and normalized forms of engagement mediated by experts on how to live. When viewed this way, I was able to consider the ways SRL was simultaneously empowering and disempowering.

Habitus and Cultural Capital: Bourdieu

From this perspective, I draw from the work of Bourdieu (1977/2004) and Lareau 1989/2000; 2003). In particular, I use the notions of habitus and cultural capital to consider the connection between SRL and different class habitus. Prior to this research, I did not recognize the potential correlation between SRL and class habitus. This connection emerged in the analysis. To organize the data from this perspective, I allowed certain codes to emerge from the data. After some consideration, I noticed patterns that were similar to Lareau's work and eventually adopted a coding scheme informed by her work. Below is a discussion the definition of habitus and allusion to its usefulness as an interpretative tool.

There are many components to the notion of habitus. Before going into those components, it is important to understand the role of habitus in Bourdieu's work. In order to avoid objectivism and subjectivism, and mechanism and finalism, Bourdieu used the notion of habitus to explain the negotiation of practice within objective structures. According to Bourdieu, human thought and behavior could not be understood by considering only the material conditions, nor could they be understood as cognitive and motivational structures independent of cultural inscriptions.

Bourdieu described the habitus as the "durably installed generative principle of regulated improvisations" (p. 78). Additionally, he stated that the habitus is

> transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles of the generation and structuring of practices and representations which can be objectively 'regulated' and 'regular' without in any way being the product of obedience to rules, objectively adapted to their goals without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary to attain them and, being all this, collectively orchestrated without being the product of the orchestrating action of a conductor." (p. 72)

From this description, one of the more important concepts for understanding habitus is disposition.

In a footnote, Bourdieu (1977/2004) stated that the notion of disposition is well suited to understand habitus. In that footnote, he defined disposition as "the result of an organizing action, with a meaning close to that of words such as structure; it also designates a way of being, a habitual state (especially of the body) and, in particular, a predisposition, tendency, propensity, or inclination" (p. 214). Although the translator noted that the French use of disposition has a wider semantic cluster, he found that Bourdieu's description of disposition matches an English use[1]. From Bourdieu's description, I understand dispositions to be those cognitive and motivational structures that resulted from action and interaction in and through objective structures. These structures then become the impetus for future practices and the determination of objective

[1] The translator's comments could be found directly following Bourdieu's definition of disposition, which is found on page 214.

potentialities. That is, dispositions influence the field of operation and the position taken in this field.

Perhaps Bourdieu's notion of disposition resonates with some English uses of the term. However, in some research literature, such as personality and education, the notion of disposition diverges from Bourdieu. For example, Katz (1993) conceptualized dispositions as habits of mind or tendencies to respond to certain situations in a certain way. Stanovich (1999) defined dispositions as "relatively stable psychological mechanisms and strategies that tend to generate characteristic behavioral tendencies and tactics" (p. 157). Some research on dispositions has correlated particular dispositions with particular kinds of behaviors. For example, evidence has been reported that dispositions such as engaging a task in an "open-minded" fashion and weighing evidence against personal beliefs accounted for differences in problem solving performance (Kardash & Sinatra, 2003).

For physical objects dispositional properties can be talked about differently. Disposition can be thought of as a property in which the thing that has the property would change or bring about some change under certain conditions. For instance, to say that an object is elastic is to say that under certain conditions that object can stretch. A disposition of an object means that under certain conditions that object would change or bring about some change. There can be a high level of predictability to how much an object can be stretched given a consideration of the physical properties of the object and the amount of force used. Such controls and measurements are fundamental for scientific inquiry.

The way Bourdieu talks about habitus leads me to believe that he thinks about dispositions differently from researchers in the United States. For one, the habitus produces the field of operations and structures the participation within that field. Second, habitus is not something that manifests under certain environmental conditions. It is the movements of the body, sensations, tastes, skills and ways of thinking that are part of and shape everyday practices. The interesting thing about habitus is that Bourdieu argued that there is a degree of homogeneity in habitus for those in a certain economic stratum. Such homogeneity is understood to be a result of similarities in material conditions.

Conclusion

My research question for the dissertation was: how could using multiple perspectives illuminate some of the complexities of SRL as they related to the lived experience of one student? I conducted an in-depth analysis of SRL by working with an upper elementary student who had been having academic difficulty. I implemented an intervention designed to support the development of SRL while improving academic performance. I worked with Karen for nearly 5 months on completing class and homework assignments. I analyzed the data from three theoretical perspectives: psychological, sociological and philosophical. My goal was to be in a position to consider SRL in a deep and nuanced way and not make universalizing claims about the utility of the intervention or SRL in general. As noted early in this chapter, on modernist epistemological plain a sample of one does not make sense for generalizability. On a postmodern epistemological plain, a sample of one is different: it broadens understanding by inviting different kinds of reading and disrupting taken-for-granted assumptions. My goal for the dissertation was to support Karen's academic success and to push researchers and teachers to expand their repertoires for understanding SRL.

Chapter 4

Analysis from the Social Cognitive Perspective

In this chapter, I analyze my data using the social cognitive perspective. This chapter is the first of three perspectives that I use to consider the data. Because the intervention was informed by social cognitive theory, the analysis in this chapter involves both an examination of some of the complexities involved with the social cognitive treatment of self-regulated learning (SRL) and a consideration of what the social cognitive perspective allowed me to see. I focus on the notions of agency and self-efficacy, which are two related notions that are at the foundation of a social cognitive view of SRL. The social cognitive treatment of SRL is distinctive with its emphasis on agentic capabilities, which individuals could learn to harness in order to effect their learning. From the social cognitive perspective, self-efficacy is a key psychological condition connected to agentic capabilities, a relationship I make clearer in the upcoming chapter. In this chapter, I consider Karen's self-efficacy and obstacles for fostering levels of efficacy necessary for SRL.

I argue that from the social cognitive perspective Karen needed to have certain psychological conditions (e.g. self-efficacy) and skills (e.g. evaluation and monitoring) to be more effective at SRL. Connected to this perspective I made a few observations about Karen. She:

1. improperly perceived her agentic capabilities
2. had unrealistic perceptions of her beliefs and outcomes
3. had a conflicting goal structure
4. lacked the executive skills to monitor and control her thoughts, behaviors and

the environment

5. struggled with using and evaluating learning strategies

I argue that Karen did not have the necessary psychological conditions or skills to regulate her learning effectively and fostering the necessary psychological conditions and skills added additional learning burdens when Karen needed more support. Working to harness agentic capabilities seemed to take time and effort, two commitments with which Karen struggled.

Social Cognitive Theory: An Agentic Perspective

As I have mentioned in the literature review, the social cognitive treatment of SRL has been described as being epistemologically aligned with constructivism (Martin, 2004b), despite Bandura's effort to merge, what we see today as, constructivist and sociocultural epistemologies. The association with the social cognitive view of SRL and constructivism made sense to me, even when considering Bandura's original work. According to Bandura (2001), individuals were both producers and products of their environments. In the conceptualization, the reciprocal relationship between individual intentionality and social interdependency were acknowledged. While this relationship was acknowledged, Bandura emphasized the capacity for individuals to control behavior and the environment by having certain psychological tools (e.g., forethought self-evaluation) and psychological conditions (e.g., high self-efficacy).

Bandura (2001) noted that the exercise of control through the production of identities and environments, an exercise of human agency, occurs as a result of intentionality, forethought, self-regulation, self-reactive influence, and self-reflectiveness about one's capabilities, quality of functioning, and the meaning and purpose of one's life pursuits. Forethought, self-reaction, reflection about capabilities and goals are all key mechanisms of the social cognitive view of SRL. Bandura (2001) wrote, "The capacity to exercise control over the nature and quality of one's life is the essence of humanness (p. 1).

It seems that the notion "capacity" in relation to "essence of humanness" signifies a universal and innate human quality. Also, it seems that the term "capacity" signifies exclusion. That is, I take that term to mean that all people have the "capacity" to "exercise control" but only some harness that capacity and others fail to harness it. Thus, from this perspective learning to exercise agency was something that could be developed. According to social cognitive researchers, self-efficacy is a key feature of exercising agency. Self-efficacy is defined as the belief in the ability to complete certain tasks and effect life outcomes. It is important to make clear the relationship between SRL, agency and self-efficacy. Before I delve into that relationship, I want to highlight that from the social cognitive perspective beliefs play a key role in self-regulation and harnessing agentic capabilities.

As stated in the literature review, Zimmerman (2000) suggested that self-efficacy goes hand in hand with perceptions of agency. The logic is that the perception of capabilities to produce desired outcomes is key for intentional, strategic and proactive self-regulation. If individuals did not believe they had the capability to do certain things, there would be little motivation to act. Researchers and theorists who draw from the social cognitive perspective to inform their understanding of SRL treat personal perceptions, in particular self-efficacy, as the variable that affects control over behaviors, the environment and oneself (Bandura, 2001; Schunk & Zimmerman, 1997; Zimmerman, Bonner & Kovach, 1996). The feature of the social cognitive theory that makes it an interesting agentic perspective is the emphasis on beliefs as the mechanism to steer one's behavior to pursue goals. While beliefs are not the only mechanism needed, they are a key source of personal agency.

From the social cognitive perspective, individuals who are efficacious are people who exercise their will: shape their own behavior, thoughts and environment (Bandura, 1997). Those efficacious people are those who are more likely to engage in the cycle of regulation (Zimmerman, et al., 1996). Some individuals might not be aware of their self-efficacy and the relationship to behaviors and outcomes. Or individuals might be aware of their self-efficacy but their self-efficacy beliefs might have, at best, a loose connection to outcomes. Therefore, evaluation and monitoring self-efficacy and its relationship to performance outcomes is a key psychological skill for SRL.

Being deliberate about fostering self-efficacy and the evaluation and monitoring of it was an important overall goal of the intervention. From my work with Karen, I observed that realizing her agentic capabilities by evaluating and monitoring her self-efficacy was difficult. There were many obstacles to evaluating and monitoring self-efficacy, forming the association between beliefs and outcomes, and understanding the role beliefs play in outcomes. There are many explanations for Karen's difficulty. I will try as earnestly as possible to consider these explanations from a social cognitive perspective. I try to do this without necessarily identifying the problem with SRL. At the same time, I want to acknowledge some of the complexities associated with the application of SRL by considering some of the messiness associated with it.

Understanding Self-efficacy and Self-Regulated Learning

As I noted earlier, researchers drawing from social cognitive theory emphasize the importance of self-efficacy for SRL. Individuals who are efficacious are people who exercise their will: shape their own behavior, thoughts and environment. Those efficacious people are those who are more likely to engage in the cycle of regulation. Some individuals are not in tuned with their self-efficacy and therefore must start to regulate by evaluating and monitoring their efficacy. Those individuals who are not efficacious could learn to be so by evaluating and monitoring their self-efficacy, learning strategies, goals and outcomes associated with them. Individuals could learn to be efficacious through self-monitoring, verbal persuasion, the experience of success and exposure to successful models.

In this section, I present a portrait of Karen that helps to consider the difficulty Karen had with becoming efficacious. Infused in this portrait are analyses and some methodological rationales. One of purposes of this next section is to get a general sense of Karen's approach to learning and its impact on self-efficacy. Another purpose is to consider the cognitive demands associated with the promotion of efficacy. I never stopped learning about Karen, and so I will include data about Karen that spans the entire research period. First, I discuss her sense of self-efficacy, which I found to be inconsistent with her performance outcomes. Then I discuss the notion of help seeking and its role in the development of efficacy. Third, I discuss Karen's goals and describe how that contributed to her difficultly with becoming efficacious. Fourth, I describe Karen's learning strategies and include observations about her metacognitive awareness.

Self-efficacy and Performance Outcomes

During the first interview with Karen, I selected items from the Motivated Strategies Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) (Appendix A), which is a Likert scale, to assess, among other things, her sense of self-efficacy. Some of the items pertaining to self-efficacy gauged Karen's overall beliefs about her ability to learn in school and her self-efficacy to employ effective learning strategies when needed. While Karen "slightly agreed" that she might not receive good grades and employ effective study strategies when learning, she "strongly agreed" that she had the ability to learn all subjects. The MSLQ is not subject specific, so I further elaborated on those items by gauging her beliefs about her ability to perform in each of her different school subject areas. Her sense of self-efficacy to learn math was rated a little lower (but still optimistic if considering her math performance) than the other subjects; it received a five out of seven rating.[2] Ratings for all other subject areas received a six or seven rating.

With Karen, there was a discrepancy between her performance and what she believed she could do. From my investigation into Karen's academic performance, I noticed that she had a history of poor performance in those subjects she believed she had the ability in which to perform well. Not only observing past report cards, when I

[2] I understand that there are limitations to self-report data: individuals could interpret questions differently, might answer questions based on self-preservation or could be considered delusional. While the MSLQ has been shown to be valid and reliable, I triangulated the data using observations and interviews to assess the relationship between what Karen did and what she believed.

worked with Karen I noticed many academic struggles with engagement and performance with most of the homework tasks. In addition to our interaction and past reports cards, performance on standardized test scores and reports from teachers were further evidence that Karen was struggling in many academic areas.

According to Zimmerman, Bonner and Kovach (1996), if outcomes and beliefs about ability to perform did not match, then potential problems could have ensued. According to the authors of the intervention, increasing or improving SRL must be precipitated by realistic representations—neither too low nor too high—of self-efficacy. As Zimmerman, Bonner and Kovach (1994) noted, "Pessimism can lead to poor motivation, and over-optimism can lead to insufficient preparation" (p. 30). Arguably, individuals could be efficacious but believe that because a teacher does not like them, they expect to perform might perform poorly; hence, the distinction between self-efficacy and expectancy outcomes. Or there might be other issues involved that the individual might see as affecting outcomes. From the social cognitive perspective, it could be argued that those individuals who surrender to external determinants of outcomes are not efficacious enough to mobilize personal and social resources to influence external variables.

While an alignment may or may not be always be necessary, I believed that it was important for Karen to have it. For one, it was important for the intervention. Also, she had a history of academic struggles (since the second grade). Therefore, to attribute these struggles to external determinants while preserving a sense of efficacy could conflict with the realization that Karen could affect learning outcomes. There is evidence to suggest that Karen visualized failure and, therefore, avoided tasks. Wanting to preserve her selfesteem or self-worth, it was possible that Karen continued to perceive herself as having the ability to perform specific tasks in specific subject areas. Regardless of why there was a discrepancy between efficacy and outcomes, there was a discrepancy.

While Karen reported a high sense of self-efficacy to perform tasks in school subjects, observations led me to conclude that her perception of her self-efficacy might have been lower than what she reported. I relied on observation data to inform my understanding of Karen's self-efficacy. I paid attention to Karen's goals and her persistence as indicators of self-efficacy because, as Bandura (2001) noted, efficacious people persist with challenging tasks and set appropriate goals to master those challenging tasks. As I discuss later, Karen's persistence was questionable and her goals were seldom mastery. Karen displayed reluctance to begin tasks, refused to work on tasks independently, experienced frustration when engaging in tasks and avoided challenging tasks. According to Bandura (1994), people with high assurance in their capabilities approach difficult tasks as challenges to be mastered rather than as threats to be avoided. It is argued that such an efficacious outlook fosters intrinsic interest, deep engrossment in activities and the setting and maintaining of challenging goals (Bandura, 1994). From working with Karen, I did not observe an approach to difficult tasks as challenges to be mastered or deep engrossment. Her approach seemed to reflect more of a way to avoid challenges.

There were two possibilities that I have considered thus far: 1) there was a discrepancy between self-reported efficacy and outcomes 2) there was not discrepancy because Karen's efficacy was lower than what she reported. To support the first possibility, it could be argued that Karen had the efficacy but was lacking the behavioral skill and appropriate goals for SRL. From my work with Karen, I interpreted her as having low self-efficacy, poor behavioral skill and a set of goals that competed with mastery learning. Efficacy, behavior and goals are all related. From the social cognitive perspective, being efficacious could influence goal pursuits and behavioral skill. Karen first had to realize the role beliefs, doubts and fears played in academic performance. She was expected to achieve this by monitoring and evaluating her self-efficacy and its relationship to behaviors, goals and performance outcomes.

While it was important for me to discern the features of Karen's academic functioning, it was a key goal of the intervention to support the development of her evaluation and monitoring of her functioning. It was expected that Karen get in touch with her beliefs and their relationship to outcomes (see chapter three).

The authors of the intervention suggested that quizzes and homework should be used as an "objective" measure to achieve monitor and evaluate self-efficacy and achieve, as they suggest, "slightly optimistic," self-efficacy ratings (pp. 27-29). The formula suggested by the authors to measure and monitor self-efficacy to achieve this alignment is described in detail in chapter three. The proposed formula from the intervention would have helped generate the data to create a visual representation of self-efficacy and its changes. Using this to support the calculation of Karen's sense of self-efficacy was difficult for a number of reasons. First, Karen had a difficult time predicting the number of homework problems she would get right. That is, when I asked her to tell me how many problems she would get correct, she often responded, "I don't know." This response was common for Karen, especially when it pertained to discussing her beliefs, predictions, thinking and goals.

It is important to mention that this formula would have only worked for her math homework because it had a clear and predetermined set of problems that she was required to complete. I tried to use this strategy for other subject area homework but it required that I generate quizzes, something with a set number of questions on which she could have predicted possible correct responses. The two times I generated quizzes, early in the intervention, Karen refused to take them. In addition, she would not make predictions about how many she might get correct. Throughout the intervention, Karen refused to work on anything related to school that was not assigned by the teacher. In part, the time and cognitive effort required for these tasks was probably reason for resistance. Before introducing this component, we were already spending at least two hours a night on homework that her teacher stated should have taken 50 minutes. From the beginning of the intervention, Karen already expressed resistance to academic tasks by sitting quietly and staring downwards for sometimes 10-15 minutes. Pertaining to her disability, the special education teacher noted that resistance to academic tasks was common for individuals with central auditory processing disability because tasks would seem too overwhelming to begin.

This more formal, documented and graphed approach to aligning performance outcomes and perceptions of self-efficacy was difficult. For the measurement, evaluation and monitoring efficacy to have worked the way it was supposed to, Karen needed to write more (something Karen typically did not like to do), spend additional time on tasks and learn to evaluate tasks and predict her performance. These requirements added additional temporal and cognitive demands to tasks, ones Karen rejected. According to the intervention, discerning this relationship was supposed to be made possible by participating in extracurricular activities, ones that, as Karen viewed it, would not satisfy any academic requirement. From the social cognitive perspective, Karen's struggles could be construed as a personal unwillingness to work towards becoming a better learner.

Supporting the immediate and consistent evaluation of self-efficacy was unsuccessful. While I did not abandon the goal to produce awareness and monitoring of self-efficacy, I shifted the approach. I still continued to assess her self-efficacy throughout the intervention and help her pay attention to those beliefs (see chapter three). To assess her self-efficacy beliefs, I relied mostly on observational data because questions pertaining directly to her beliefs about self-efficacy were answered with "I don't know" or a shrug of the shoulders.

While we consistently talked about her beliefs, there was little evidence that Karen was evaluating and monitoring her efficacy during her homework. Towards the end of the research period, I observed that Karen showed commitment, persistence and interest for writing her magazine article. Potentially associated with efficacy, there was still little evidence to suggest that Karen both associated beliefs with outcomes and monitored and evaluated her efficacy. I administered the same MSLQ items at the end of the intervention period and Karen's ratings of efficacy for performing in specific subjects were nearly the same from the first time I administered these items. As compared to the report card at the beginning of the research period, there were slight improvements in her final report card. Even though her grades were nearly the same and her efficacy ratings were nearly the same, Karen's academic performance improved. Her teacher acknowledged this improvement.

Help Seeking: Learned Helplessness in Relationship to Self-Regulated Learning

A feature of the social cognitive perspective of agency is the role of the social context. Bandura (2001) discussed the notion of proxy agency, which involves using others to achieve personal goals. Bandura acknowledged that individuals could not control every part of a social context and therefore, must be able to use others for the purpose of achieving personal goals. In schools, proxy agency could be discussed with the notion of help seeking, which has been identified as a key SRL mechanism. Karen's help seeking patterns helps to reveal information about her self-efficacy and illustrates competition with efficacy development. As Bandura (2001) noted, proxy agency could get in the way of promoting personal competencies. In this section I discuss Karen's help seeking patterns and consider them in relation to self-efficacy.

Karen would often ask where to write things, and she would often ask how to begin a task. Karen would seldom initiate task engagement. Karen would often pause in the middle of a task and ask questions such as, "is this right," "is this where it belongs," and "is this how I should write it." The question with which I struggled is when do the proclivities to ask these questions count as dependency or learned helplessness, and when do these questions count as strategic help-seeking that is important for self-regulation? When working with Karen, I had a difficult time distinguishing between, for example, concepts such as strategic help seeking and learned helplessness.

It was important to make these conceptual distinctions because of the different value placed on each form of engagement. For example, strategic help seeking has been identified as an important part of SRL (Azevedo, Moos, Greene et a., 2008) but dependency and learned helplessness seem to conflict with SRL. Learned helplessness might be construed as dysfunctional perceptions of agency. In relation specifically to struggling readers, which is a characterization that matches Karen, Vacca and Vacca (2008) explain:

> Learned helplessness...refers to students' perceptions of themselves as being unable to overcome failure. They usually sabotage their efforts to read by believing that they can't succeed at tasks that require literate behavior. Their struggles with literacy tasks result from a lack of knowledge of and control over the strategic routines needed to engage in meaningful transactions with texts. (p. 38)

The logic of learned helplessness is that there are no direct external constraints for certain behaviors, only that individuals' beliefs about what is possible shapes behavioral possibilities. From a social cognitive perspective, and as alluded to in the quotation above, inactivity at times when action is apparently possible results from incorrect perceptions of self-efficacy.

Not unrelated to learned helplessness, dependency could be seen as the desire to exert the least amount of effort while pursuing the "accurate" completion of a task. For some teachers, help seeking could be seen as a kind of dependence to circumvent thoughtful engagement in the task. Mrs. Jones valued student help seeking only if students evaluated what they knew and did not know and then used her to support the acquisition of the knowledge that they did not know. Amongst other forms of executive functioning, it is suggested from this position that students (good, self-regulated learners) could have insight into what they did not know and use resources to support knowledge acquisition. This treatment of help seeking is aligned with the notion of proxy agency. This conceptualization of the student, which Mrs. Jones described as the good student, matches conceptualizations of self-regulated learners. From Mrs. Jones' perspective, help seeking counted as such, and not dependency or learned helplessness, when it was strategic, intentional and oriented towards knowledge acquisition.

Were Karen's questions or attempts to garner academic support strategic, intentional and in support of filling in the gaps in her knowledge? Or were her questions expressions of learned helplessness or dependency? Before considering responses to these questions, it is important to consider more evidence pertaining to Karen's "help-seeking." During homework, Karen relied almost exclusively on me for task initiation and task completion for math and social studies. For her language arts homework, which was usually much shorter and required little reading, Karen typically initiated and sometimes completed it without my support. There were also a number of instances when Karen needed support to complete her language arts homework. For extended assignments (ones that typically took multiple days to complete), such as the magazine article, book report and fantasy short story, Karen seldom worked on them without my assistance.

There were many instances in which Karen immediately asked questions and I withheld direct responses and scaffolded supports because I wanted her to develop the skills, knowledge and disposition to assess tasks and employ and evaluate strategies. The transcript below described a common occurrence, especially in the early part of the intervention, whereby Karen was engaging with an insert of a book. I brought Karen to the library to select a book for her fantasy book report and I gave her the opportunity to choose her book. I explained the assignment to the librarian because Karen refused to do it. The librarian took Karen to a section in the library and gave her five books from which to choose. Karen immediately wanted me to tell her which book to choose. I responded by encouraging her to read the inserts and the descriptions on the back covers to help her make a decision. I viewed Karen's initial help seeking as conflicting with SRL. It was important that she assess the merit, degree of difficulty, and level of interest.

At one point after perusing the books, Karen was trying to read the insert of the book Tuck Everlasting. After reading the first paragraph of the insert, she pointed to it and asked me:

Karen: What does this [pointing to the entire paragraph] mean?

Stephen: What do you think it means?

Karen: I don't know.

Stephen: What did you do to try to understand?

Karen: I don't know.

Stephen: Try reading it again and tell me what you did to understand and what you think it means.

Karen had a difficult time understanding the description of the book. I engaged her with some leading questions and withheld any direct explanation of the contents of the book. Showing clear signs of confusion and misunderstanding of the text in the insert, I expected her to enact strategies and reflect on and evaluate them.

When Karen asked for help trying to discern the meaning of the insert, I prompted her to engage with the text. Upon reflection, it seemed I prompted her because of the difference in kinds of help seeking and their implications. If I viewed Karen inquiries as help seeking that was part of SRL, then it would have made sense to support her inquiry by responding directly to her question. If viewed as dependency or learned helplessness, then her approach needed to be altered. I responded to her efforts for support by redirecting questions back to her, pushing her to make more strategic and intentional deliberations over the text. My questions required her to have, be able to use, reflect on and verbally communicate strategy-use.

Similar to the transcript above, I would often ask her about her thinking during an academic task. Almost always, Karen would respond, "I don't know." Part of the logic of giving Karen opportunities to work independently and asking her questions about strategy use was to support strategy activation so that she could monitor and evaluate certain strategies for their utility for certain tasks. Again, the logic underlying this approach is that Karen could learn academic self-regulation by employing strategies and then evaluating them. Also, she had to recognize the current quality of her thoughts and strategies in order to regulate learning. Anyway, I interpreted much of Karen's help seeking as learned helplessness and dependency because she illustrated little evidence of forethought, reflection and planning when beginning a task.

After I suggested reading the insert again, Karen stared at the text for a few moments and then decided to take the book <u>Tuck Everlasting</u>. To me, it did not seem like she read the paragraph again. I realized that there might have been an issue with the book selection, so I tried additional ways to engage Karen with the inserted text and the choice of the book. At that point, she refused and wanted to leave the library. Karen seemed a bit frustrated. After speaking with Karen's teacher, she notified me that the book she selected was at a 5^{th}-6^{th} grade reading level; Karen was reading at a 4^{th} grade level.

For the next week, Karen was reading a book 1-2 grade levels higher than her tested reading level and was expected to write a report identifying, among other things, the plot, moral of the story and six key events for understanding the story. She worked hard to complete the assignment and she had two weeks fewer than the rest of the class. So not only did the experience of selecting a book cause Karen some frustration, the assignment, which we worked on every night for four days, caused us to work harder and have longer than two-hour sessions. Karen experienced more frustration and fatigue during this particular week as compared to other weeks. The way she expressed her fatigue and frustration was with body language, silence and resistance to activities.

As per the intervention, I operated on the idea that Karen would increase self-efficacy by independently using learning strategies; I wanted to give her opportunities to control and have choice about what strategies to use. Also, it was instrumental for the intervention that Karen initiated tasks independently so she could reflect on and evaluate her learning strategies. With that piece and the differentiation of different kinds of help seeking, Karen was obligated to take control and make choices that ultimately caused more frustration and potentially reinforced a work-avoidance orientation, the topic for the next section.

Self-efficacy and Goal Setting

In the discussion about self-efficacy, I argued that there was a discrepancy between Karen's responses on the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) and her performance outcomes. That is, Karen reported being capable of performing well in all schools subjects yet struggled with many tasks for each subject. I did not just rely on grades and teacher and parent reports to determine that she was struggling. I also considered observations made during the research period. I observed that Karen had difficulty starting tasks, completing tasks, accuracy, speed and comprehension. In this section, I consider the way goals might have contributed to academic performance, self-efficacy and overall academic struggles.

From the social cognitive perspective, goals are an important feature of SRL. It was important that Karen set learning goals that could support the successful completion of academic tasks. It was also important to monitor, evaluate and adjusts goals in order to meet task demands.

As noted in the literature review, there is a distinction made between goal orientation, on the one hand, and proximal and distal goal setting, on the other hand. Pintrich (2000) described the former as "an individual's general orientation (or schema or theory) for approaching the task, doing the task, and evaluating their performance on the task" (p. 473). While the synonym for orientation goal is purpose goal (Pintrich, 2000), the latter label seems to have a more mutable connotation than Pintrich's description suggests. The words "general orientation" and "schema" connote an overarching tendency that seems to take the form of a foundational principle for engaging in a task. Proximal and distal goal setting are those smaller and larger tasks we set for ourselves everyday, often in service of the orientation.

A mastery orientation has been correlated with successful SRL (Greene & Azevedo 2007). Performance approach orientations have been shown to correlate, not as strongly as mastery, with successful SRL only if it were an approach orientation. From my interactions with Karen's parents and teachers, I noticed that they characterized

Karen as having a work avoidance orientation. While they did not use the language of work-avoidance, they described Karen as unmotivated and stubborn student who stubbornly sat quietly in order to avoid doing her work. Laura stated that Karen just did not want to do the work. Laura believed that Karen could do all the work if she just dedicated more effort. These statements led me to believe that Laura viewed Karen as having a work-avoidance orientation. Additionally, when I had Karen's homework load reduced, Laura expressed concern that Karen would take advantage. Laura was suggesting that Karen would use the reduction to avoid having to do her work. This interpretation made some sense to me. It did not seem like Karen wanted to exert effort on challenging tasks and often sat quietly for several minutes at a time when it was time to read, answer questions for social studies, write (before integration of technology and even sometimes during).

Like the parents, Mrs. Jones stated that Karen was unmotivated and cared little about school. She stated Karen often wanted to do as little work as possible. Instead of attributing her orientation solely to an intentional willingness to do avoid work, Mrs. Jones attributed Karen's orientation to the parents. She believed that Karen's parents cared little about Karen's academic success and shaped Karen's orientation. Mrs. Jones characterizations fell in line with a work-avoidance orientation, but identified parent involvement and care as a mechanism to change her orientation.

I could understand why her parents and teacher would have perceived Karen as having exhibiting a work avoidance orientation. During a few instances when we cut her math homework sheets in half, Karen displayed much more motivation. Towards the end of the intervention when I took on more of the learning burden, she was much more eager to work. The reduction of work produced more motivation to get the existing work done. Also, losing worksheets, something Karen periodically did, could be interpreted as a way to avoid work. Sitting quietly for several minutes instead of starting work could be seen as work avoidance. Not completing in-class worksheets, which was common for Karen, could be viewed as avoiding work. Karen did not avoid all tasks, however. Mainly she avoided those tasks that were more challenging and required more effort.

I could see why teachers and parents conceptualized Karen's orientation as work avoidance and I can see why Karen avoided work. While working with me, Karen cried at least six times during homework sessions. Her crying was not a new phenomenon, though the tasks I assigned were probably responsible for an increase in its frequency. She had difficulty completing her language arts homework, starting her math homework and understanding her social studies readings. Despite all the hard work she exerted on some of the assignments, she was not getting the grades she felt she deserved. Working for at least two hours each night with these frustrations might have contributed to a work-avoidance orientation. With this in mind, if work avoidance was her orientation, there was a good reason for her to avoid the work: it was frustrating, unrewarding and time consuming.

A work avoidance orientation does not work well with SRL. A goal of the intervention was to support a mastery orientation. The way to support that orientation was to promote high self-efficacy. According to Bandura (2001), efficacious people persist with difficult tasks and see those tasks as challenges to be mastered. Such a position directly connects self-efficacy to goal orientation. In particular, it is suggested that there is a relationship between high self-efficacy and mastery orientation, especially when faced with challenging tasks. Considering Bandura's (2001) connection between efficacy and mastery, it seems orientation does not have a universal connotation but is task specific. From the social cognitive perspective, to promote mastery with tasks and increase volition to persist with challenging tasks occurs with the increase in self-efficacy.

Proximal and distal goals play a key role in self-regulation. Karen listed a set of goals, which were all related to completing her homework. Before I list the goals, I want to note that I made many attempts to have Karen record or state her goals for school learning in general, and for her homework in particular. Early in the intervention during some homework sessions, I asked Karen to record her learning goals in a journal and orally articulate them. Initial attempts requesting that Karen articulate her learning goals were unsuccessful. After three days of asking, she eventually articulated a set of goals for completing her homework. These goals were repeated throughout the research period.

1. To finish
2. To finish quickly
3. To get it right
4. Not get frustrated

These goals could be described as a set of distal goals that have some alignment with a work avoidance orientation. While I viewed some internal coherence of Karen's goal structure, there are clues to the complexity of the relationship between her goal orientation and distal goals. The list of distal goals in itself was complex and contradictory. For example, finishing quickly was not always compatible with getting it right. Finishing was not always compatible with avoiding frustration.

There was competition between "getting it right" and "finishing quickly," which are two potential outcomes of SRL. Cognitive psychologists have referred to this tension as the accuracy/speed tradeoff (Fitts, 1954). The speed/accuracy tradeoff is a notion that describes two potentially competing cognitive and behavior orientations. When engaging in a task, individuals who are oriented towards speed might use a set of strategies to quickly complete the task. Research has shown that a speed goal and its associated strategies could compete with an accuracy goal (e.g., Fitts, 1954). The assumption is that accuracy requires slower completion of tasks. The logic is that wanting to finish quickly and wanting to be accurate are potentially competing goals that evoke different strategies.

The tension between speed and accuracy was prevalent for Karen. For example, when starting her math homework she often rushed through some of the beginning problems, in which she used formulas that did not help her yield the write answers. Often, she would have to redo the first few problems of her math homework. For Karen, having an accuracy goal did not necessarily elicit correctness. There were times when she took her time and concentrated on accuracy and still struggled with accuracy and completion of tasks. So both getting the work done and getting it done right, competed with not getting frustrated.

In this set of goals, the one most closely related to a mastery orientation is "to get it right." As I discuss later, getting it right for Karen did not necessarily mean understanding for its own sake and improving competence in a particular area. For Karen, "getting it right" had more to do with performance. Consider some of the examples noted in the previous section on help seeking. Karen often asked for affirmation for writing things in the right place, drawing all math related graphs neatly and keeping her homework sheets neat. There was some preoccupation with the getting the content of the homework right. Her parents described her as being preoccupied with perfection, which might explain her work avoidance. If she believed she had to her work perfectly and believed that she could not do it perfectly or that it would be too difficult to do it perfectly, she might avoid the task. Attention to these beliefs might have helped Karen recognize the ways these beliefs were debilitating. From this characterization, it seemed that Karen's distal goals contributed to a work avoidance orientation and competed with manifesting levels of efficacy that could support SRL.

Metacognitive Awareness

> Karen performs well when she just memorizes how to do things. She has difficulty understanding why she is doing those things. (Mrs. Jones, interview, 4/12)

Often I asked Karen, "What are doing?" "What have you tried to do?" and "What can you do?" Her typical response was "I don't know." I frequently asked what she was thinking, requesting at times that she "think aloud." When verbally communicating her thought processes, her statements were reflections of only her actions. For example, if I asked her to think aloud while doing long division, Karen would state the steps she was taking, such as "I am carrying the X," "I am subtracting X" and "I am multiplying X." Based on these responses, it is possible to consider the fact that Karen performed rote functions and described her thinking based on those functions. Mrs. Jones suggested this interpretation. While it was possible that Karen did not have language to recognize or evaluate cognition, I agree that Karen mostly activated scripts for academic engagement. There was little evidence of reflection and flexibility for task engagement--that is, there was little evidence that Karen was operating with an executive function monitoring and evaluating features of psychological and behavioral functioning.

This executive function is often referred to as metacognition. Researchers and theorists have identified metacognition as an important component of SRL (e.g., Schunk & Zimmerman, 2003). Flavell (1979) defined metacognition as "knowledge and cognition about cognitive phenomena" (p. 906). Schunk and Zimmerman (2003) defined metacognitive awareness as "knowledge of the task (what is to be learned and when and how it is to be learned), as well as self-knowledge of personal capabilities, interests, and attitudes" (p.61). In relation to metacogntive awareness, the authors continued, "Self-regulated learning requires learners to have knowledge about task demands, personal qualities, and strategies for completing the task" (p. 61). Metacognitive awareness is also said to involve procedural knowledge, which includes the self-assessment of learning and making appropriate decisions for task completion (Schunk & Zimmerman, 2003). It was described as the execution of procedures, such as learning strategies (McCormick, 2003) to achieve a learning goal. Such procedural knowledge facilitates the control of information (Schunk & Zimmerman, 2003).

Based on that understanding, Karen's metacogntive awareness, or at least her communication of it, was limited. Her inability to discuss and evaluate her self-efficacy, learning strategies and their relationship to performance outcomes can all be explained as the lack of metacognitive awareness. There is additional evidence that suggests Karen had little metacognitive awareness. For example, Karen had to complete a language arts assignment whereby she had 60 seconds to think of as many words that started with the prefix "con." I timed her and after the time was up she did not have any words on the paper. I told her we can do it again and I suggested this time she use a dictionary. She found many words beginning with "con." Three days later, she had a language arts assignment whereby she had 60 seconds to think of as many words that ended in "tent." When I began the time, I noticed that she immediately went to the dictionary. Karen did not use a dictionary for assignments prior to the intervention. Before I bought her a pocket dictionary, I asked if we could use the dictionary in the house and her parents could not find it. On the basis of this observation, it seemed to me that she was trying to generalize the dictionary strategy to other language arts assignments. She had difficulty with finding words with the ending "tent." After 60 seconds passed, I asked her why she decided to use that strategy. She stated that she did not know.

This instance illustrated some of the challenges associated with difficulties of suggesting strategies and deliberating over them. Her implementation of the same strategy to a new task without considering the task demands was for me evidence that her repertoires of strategies have expanded, but she was not evaluating the strategy and adapting it to fit new task features. That is the fundamental feature of SRL; that is, evaluating task demands and adapting strategies to those demands.

For Karen's math homework, for example, the typical format involved performing the same computations to a number of problems that varied somewhat. In most of her homework assignments, the last few problems presented different representations of the problems and required Karen to engage with the problems differently. That is, the last few problems required some flexibility in thinking and evaluation of the demands. Karen often struggled with these last problems. She would often use the computations from the previous problems.

Karen's teacher noted that Karen relies mostly on rote learning for performing academic tasks. Rote learning might be considered part of metacognitive awareness if it was strategic and intentionally used to overcome the limitations of cognitive functioning. One advantage of rote learning is that something could be learned to a level of automaticity and free up other cognitive resources. Automatic human functioning is viewed an adaptive response to a complex world. It has been estimated that 95% of daily actions are performed on an automatic level. While I believe that daily automatic functioning is difficult to quantify, it seems a common assumption in psychological studies that individuals perform functions automatically and this mechanisms is supposed to enable individuals to adapt to their environments and free up cognitive capacity, which is viewed as limited. While having an adaptive function, this automatic functioning has its drawbacks.

One of the drawbacks of automatic functioning is that there is little reflection and flexibility in automatic responses. While rote learning was the strategy Karen most often used, the examples above help to illustrate its tension with the flexibility of strategies that seem to be needed in schools. From my observations, I have noticed that Karen relies on automated scripts for approaching, among other things, math. For many of her math worksheets, she would mostly have difficulty starting. If she did start the worksheet, she would often get the first couple of problems wrong before I would intervene and remind her how to perform the calculations. Once reminded of the scripts, she would do well until a question was encountered that required her script to be flexible. This drawback seemed especially salient in Karen's academic performance. Her automatic functioning made her less able to monitor and problem solve. Rote learning made academic self-regulation more difficult.

Self-efficacy and SRL

Karen might be described as a dysfunctional (Zimmerman, 2000) or naïve (1998) self-regulated learner. From the social cognitive perspective, it could be said that Karen:

1. improperly perceived her agentic capabilities
2. had unrealistic perceptions of her beliefs and outcomes
3. had a conflicting goal structure
4. lacked the executive skills to monitor and control her thoughts, behaviors and the environment
5. struggled with using and evaluating learning strategies

From this perspective, the root of Karen's struggles was her self-beliefs, which affected her motivation, goals and behavior. While the intervention was designed to support the acquisition of behavior skill and metacognition, it was key to support efficacy. In the next section, I discuss both specific ways efficacy was targeted and some of the challenges of targeting it.

Self-Efficacy Development: Issues and Challenges

With the importance placed on high self-efficacy, it was important to make a substantial and sustained effort to promote high self-efficacy. Consistent with suggestions made by social cognitive theorists, I used a number of strategies for increasing self-efficacy: modeling, reinforcement, verbal persuasion and success. I begin with some of my efforts to help Karen experience success with both academic tasks and SRL. In this section, I include a discussion about the intervention and the teacher's pedagogy. In this section, I argue that there were certain complexities with increasing self-efficacy that got in the way of SRL.

According to social cognitive theorists, experiencing success is a way to increase self-efficacy. From this perspective, success must be achieved with tasks that require some effort. If tasks are perceived as easy, then there might not be an increase in self-efficacy for future tasks that are perceived as challenging. For the intervention, I worked with Karen to support success with both academic performance and SRL. In this research study, I encountered obstacles with using success to support self-efficacy development.

The Intervention and Obstacles to Self-efficacy

Early in the research study, I viewed the goal of promoting SRL as competing with improvements in efficacy. According to the authors of the intervention, promoting independence with task engagement was important because it provided opportunities for individuals to exercise choice and control during learning. Independence also provided individuals with opportunities to experiment with learning strategies. Finally, and most important for efficacy, independence with task engagement was supposed to provide individuals with opportunities to evaluate thoughts, beliefs and strategies and consider the relationship between them and performance outcomes. Consider the goal of the intervention:

> Its [the SRL intervention] purpose is to empower students to self-observe their *current* study practices more accurately, to ascertain for themselves which study methods are ineffective and replace them with better ones, and to be more personally aware of their improved effectiveness—that is, we want to show them how to become smart learners! (Zimmerman, Bonner & Kovach, 1994, p. 4; emphasis added).

According to the goal of the intervention, Karen was expected to self-observe her "current" study practices. Based on the logic of the intervention, it was important to give Karen the autonomy to select strategies. I was to provide scaffolding for monitoring and evaluating but she was supposed to initiate a strategy, especially for the first two weeks of the intervention. I noticed a number of difficulties with providing Karen with opportunities to makes choices and take control over her learning: 1) increased the time to complete tasks 2) increased frustration and 3) limited academic success.

As I noted earlier, for the fantasy book report assignment (see chapter five and above for the description), Karen had the opportunity to initiate strategies for comprehension of texts and discuss them with me (see dialogue in the section about help-seeking). This approach led Karen to select a book that was 1-2 grade levels above her measured reading level. Karen struggled with understanding the story. Subsequently, she struggled with writing the report on it. In this early instance, giving Karen an opportunity to have control and choice and exercise independence made success more difficult to achieve.

When I modeled SRL strategies for Karen, she showed evidence of imitating those strategies. In modeling strategies, I thought aloud when evaluating the task and considering strategies that could master that task. There was evidence that Karen imitated strategy use but did not engage in task evaluation. Karen was working towards SRL by imitating those strategies but had difficulty with evaluating the appropriateness of strategies for different tasks. As Zimmerman (2000) noted, individuals move from imitation to SRL when they have internalized strategy use but have adapted those strategies to meet new task demands. Consider the instance in the section on metacognition. In this instance, I describe a time when Karen generalized a learning strategy from task to another. Generalizing strategies without task evaluation created difficulties for Karen. The use of a strategy that was inappropriate for the task led Karen to complete the homework incorrectly and have to spend more time on the task.

When learning SRL it should be expected to be difficult, especially when learning to deliberate over appropriate strategies for specific tasks demands. I only want to point out that experiencing these difficulties were competing with self-efficacy development. I do not want to suggest that self-efficacy development has to happen by experiencing constant and consistent success. Only that for Karen who was already experiencing academic difficulty, the expectation for SRL placed additional cognitive and temporal demands that seemed to compete with self-efficacy development. She needed more support, yet was expected to take on more of a learning burden.

Teaching and Obstacles to Self-efficacy

Karen's teacher built organization and time management components into her assignments. For the fantasy book report, Karen was required to complete and submit her final report with an organizational note-taking sheet. The organizational sheet listed eight components of the book report and had lines for note taking under each component. Karen was supposed to take notes on this form as she read the book. The note-taking sheet was only partially completed and not submitted. As a result, Karen lost 5 points out of 50. The loss of points brought Karen's grade for the assignment from a B to a C.

In a similar instance, Karen had to write a report on an endangered animal that was to have been included in a class magazine. As part of the requirements for the assignment, Karen had to fill out and submit a proofreading checklist, which was worth 5 points out of a total of 50. This proofreading checklist was designed to support the monitoring of her writing. On the checklist, there were items such as "The introduction is related to the conclusion," "All paragraphs are indented," "All sentences have begun with a capital letter," "Subjects and verbs have tense agreement," and "The main thesis is supported." Similar to the instance above, Karen did not complete and submit the checklist. Like with the fantasy book report, she lost points and received a C instead of a B.

In another instance, Karen was required to write a report to King James I that was contrasting Jamestown and Plymouth. With the report, Karen was supposed to submit note cards that were supposed to be used to help organize the information. This assignment was submitted the week I began the research study, so I did not work with Karen on this assignment. From review of the grades assignment, Karen had many incomplete sentences, many misspelled words and conceptual ambiguities. Karen also lost points for not submitting note cards. She stated that she did not make them.

In all these instances, Mrs. Jones administered penalties for not using strategies that could support Karen's academic self-regulation. As stated in an interview, the teacher commented that the submission of all components of the assignments were to support the development of responsibility. She stated:

> I try to support student's management of their learning. I give them note-taking sheets and checklists because I want them to take more responsibility for their learning...to be able to check themselves...you know. I want them to self-advocate. It is my hope they use these [the note-taking and proofreading worksheets] to help them with future learning tasks.... If I do not make them part of the requirement, students will not use them (Mrs. Jones, interview, 5/7).

I have not identified any literature on SRL that explicitly suggested using a system of operant conditioning in order to train individuals to use SRL instruments or strategies. I use the word *train* because this is the language used in the intervention and there was evidence of deliberate and repetitive practice to develop the dispositions to use SRL instruments. In these examples we can also see the increased learning burden. The quality of the final product was not sufficient for a good grade. The grade also depended on another level of learning, namely self-regulation. While Karen might have been able to produce improved work on the projects, she had produced the added work required for the goal of self-regulation.

While the intervention does not suggest penalties for failing to use SRL instruments, it does find the use of instruments to be necessary in order to support students' self-evaluations and monitoring of task performance. In this research study, however, there was an explicit use of operant conditioning designed to train Karen to use and submit SRL instruments. As noted in the above statement, the teacher rationalized this pedagogical approach by stating such penalties would support the development of responsibility and self-advocacy. From the above statement and other interview responses, the teacher viewed responsibility as engaging in inspection and monitoring of one's academic work. By the latter the notion, Mrs. Jones meant that students would develop the disposition to discern when they do not know something and then ask her questions to obtain that knowledge.

There are a couple of interesting ideas to be considered about the use of penalties associated with the completion and submission of instruments used to support SRL. As I have mentioned, I have not encountered a model of SRL that explicitly advocates the use of punishments to train individuals to use SRL instruments. That does not mean that operant conditioning is absent from SRL models. Researchers and theorists who draw from operant theory consider the enactment of consequences an important part of SRL, as long as they are self-enacted (e.g. Mace, Belfiore, & Hutchinson, 2001). For instance, individuals might reward themselves with 30 minutes of participation in a more gratifying activity after they have achieved their specific goals set for the school activity. Zimmerman and Pons (1986) called the self-enactment of consequences *self-consequating*.

One concern with using punishments for not using instruments designed to support SRL was that it directly competed with my efforts to support success with the assignments. Karen's effort should have matched her performance outcomes, but because she did not submit certain documents she received substantial point reductions. I am not convinced that she cared about the point difference. Regardless, the opportunity to use her improvements in her work to boost self-efficacy was lost. I tried to explain to Karen that her work was of higher quality. I do not think my verbal reinforcement and validation were all that influential.

Chapter Conclusion

In this chapter, I used a social cognitive perspective to analyze the data of Karen learning academic self-regulation. From this perspective, self-efficacy is a key psychological condition affecting SRL. While Karen reported having self-efficacy, I presented evidence from the data and the social cognitive literature suggesting that her self-efficacy was lower than what she reported. Self-efficacy, from a social cognitive perspective, is used to explain some problems with SRL. In this chapter, I related each section to self-efficacy, exploring its interaction with other psychological conditions and some of difficulties with producing levels of efficacy that support SRL. As Bandura (2001) noted, efficacious people are more likely to regulate learning by mobilizing personal and social resources to achieve learning goals.

It was difficult to promote efficacy for Karen. In theory, SRL was supposed to make academic learning more efficient and effective for Karen. While I am not disputing this function and effect of SRL, this research study has generated sensitivity to the way SRL increased the learning burden and made academic success more difficult for Karen. Karen was struggling with academic content, and the demands associated with the SRL intervention made learning both academic content and self-regulation itself more difficult. By working closely with Karen, I was able to notice some of difficulties, frustrations and tensions. In this chapter, I am not arguing that SRL does not work nor could not work. Rather, for Karen the cognitive demands associated with trying to teach her SRL made learning more difficult and this difficultly posed potential problems for efficacy development.

The increased cognitive burden associated with SRL should not have been surprising. I explored this possibility in my literature review. For Karen, learning to be an effective and efficient learner required a time commitment to academic tasks and learning new ways of engaging in school (evaluating and monitoring). It also meant experiencing significant bumps along the way. Arguably, to become a "smart learner" Karen had to exert more effort and time for the intervention to be more successful. From this perspective, it could be argued that Karen was unwilling to work to harness her agentic capabilities and make a difference in her academic performance.

Chapter 5

Introduction: Sociological Analysis

In this chapter, I draw on Bourdieu's and Lareau's uses of habitus to explore the relationship of Karen's socio-economic class to her dispositions, knowledge and skills. Bourdieu (1977/2004) used the notion of habitus to explain the way material conditions correlate with similar cultural patterns and dispositions across people in the same social and economic stratum. Focusing specifically on child rearing, Lareau (2003) harnessed the idea of habitus to inform her understanding of different cultural logics of child rearing. She identified two distinct patterns of child rearing between middle-class parents, and working-class and poor parents. I will refer to both Bourdieu and Lareau to explore some of the ways socioeconomic conditions are related to the dispositions, knowledge and skills that are expected in self-regulated learning.

Some specific studies from which I drew heavily were conducted by Lareau (2003), who was described as "Americanizing" some of Bourdieu's central theoretical concepts (Wrigly, 2000, p. vii). Conducting ethnographic research, Lareau has been instrumental for developing an understanding of the intertextual relationships between class background and education. Lareau uses Bourdieu's notion of habitus to explore class differences and their implications for education. In one of her ethnographic studies with 12 families—six middle class and six poor and working class—Lareau (1989/2000) explored class differences and parental intervention in education. She found that occupational conditions were linked to parental intervention. One finding was that working class occupational conditions and the identity of working class parents closed off possibilities for parents to intervene in and monitor their children's education.

Additionally, limited access to social networks and dominant cultural repertoires limited families from poor and working class backgrounds from cultivating skills, knowledge and dispositions that could potentially increase chances of academic success.

In a different study, Lareau (2003) conducted what she described as "intense naturalistic observations" with 12 families, who were again divided by their class affiliation (p. 8). Attempting to move beyond parental intervention, she sought to capture "the reciprocal effects of children and parents on each other" (Lareau, 2003, p. 8). For nearly two years, Lareau and her research team embedded themselves in the lives of their participants. She found that meaningful patterns of child rearing correlated with particular class backgrounds. For example, middle class parents were more likely to engage in "concerted cultivation" of their children. Whereas, parents from poor and working class backgrounds used the logic of "natural growth" for their child rearing practices. She argued in the book that concerted cultivation helped to instill certain knowledge, skills and dispositions that were sanctioned by schools.

From these studies, Lareau (2003) identified patterns of practices that existed across individuals from the same economic stratum. She also made the link between these patterns and the kinds of advantages and disadvantages they afford. In both studies, the habitus of families from working class and poor backgrounds lent themselves to disadvantages, particularly in schools. As discussed in chapter three, Karen's household can be described as working class: I based this on indices of family income, education level, and parents' occupations. The purpose of this chapter is to consider the ways in which dimensions of working class habitus affect how we might understand some of the values embedded in the literature on self-regulated learning. Class habitus will be used to explain Karen's relationship to the intervention and opportunities for her to develop into a successful self-regulated learner.

Habitus and Child Rearing

According to Lareau (2003), middle-class parents rely on *concerted cultivation* of their children's talents and skills. *Concerted cultivation* is understood as the set of organized activities, such as sports teams, school, and dance and music classes, in which children participate under the direction of adults. As part of the cultural logic of concerted cultivation, Lareau asserted that parents reason with children, continuously assess their talents and skills, intervene on their behalf, and make deliberate and sustained efforts to stimulate their children's development. This cultural logic involves parents forging relationships with various individuals within organizations in order to teach those skills, knowledge and dispositions that align with institutional expectations. In connection with these child-rearing practices, Lareau observed that the middle-class children in this research study developed better verbal agility, strategies for negotiation, and interactive patterns with adults. The children from middle-class backgrounds interacted more with teachers and did so in a comfortable way. Lareau found that not only did parents negotiate and intervene on their children's behalf, but that the children also interacted with the teacher in order to ensure their learning needs were met. Lareau asserted that these children "internalized the idea that it is legitimate and reasonable for others to adjust their actions to suit [their] preferences" (p. 132).

In contrast to middle-class families Lareau (2003) stated that working-class and poor families' childrearing practices were characterized by the logic of "natural growth."

According to Lareau, this means that as long as children have food, shelter and comfort, their development is viewed as "unfolding spontaneously" (p. 238). From this cultural logic, children were given more autonomy during their leisure time. While some of the children from working-class and poor families participated in sports activities, their participation in organized activities was much less than that of middle-class children. Another characteristic of this cultural logic included maintaining clear boundaries between adults and children. Also, there was more interaction with kin rather than other parents who might have access to different kinds of capital or who would be instrumental for creating closed social networks. In addition, Lareau noticed that there were boundaries between home and work.

Lareau (2003) argued that children from working-class backgrounds who participated in her study were less stressed, had more leisure time and were more content. However, she found they had significant institutional disadvantages because they did not have the disposition to negotiate with teachers, the agility to verbally express themselves, nor the alignment between cultural repertoires of home and school. Additionally, working-class parents and their children were less likely to intervene in their child's education in order to negotiate school mandates.

Throughout this section, I will paint a picture of the family in order to spotlight the alignment between the family's cultural repertoires of child rearing with the repertoires Lareau (2003) identified as characterizing a working-class habitus. This link served as a lens for understanding Karen's behavior and her relationship to the SRL intervention. I highlight the ways Karen's habitus lent itself to disadvantages in school, especially in her general education classroom where the teacher emphasized the importance of interacting with adults, organization for assignments, and self-advocacy.

The nuance that a Bourdieuian perspective adds is to consider the link between SRL and socioeconomic class. The link between SRL and middle class habitus and the value placed on SRL potentially worked to value and validate middle class habitus. Thus, I argue that expecting Karen to regulate her learning doubled her learning burden, when in fact she needed more support to lessen the burden. Karen was expected to learn both self-regulation and content. By linking SRL to middle-class habitus, learning to self-regulate involved more than just acquiring the conditional and procedural knowledge to manage learning. Bourdieu's perspective allowed me to see that for this working-class family, self-regulated learning involved reconditioning dispositions, appropriating new cultural repertoires, and changing systems of values and beliefs. Connecting SRL to middle class habitus was also be used explain why facilitating SRL was difficult. My data show that there was a cultural conflict between the school and Karen's parents because the school was operating under a different cultural logic than Karen's family was.

Parents, Schools and SRL

There were a number of overlapping characteristics between Lareau's description of working class and poor families' child-rearing practices and those practices I observed in this research study. There were particular assumptions about education that could be understood using the distinction between different cultural logics of child rearing. Without multiple participants, it is difficult to make an argument that these assumptions about education exist within meaningful patterns organized around class conditions.

Nonetheless, some of these assumptions about education connect to Lareau's class distinction of child-rearing practices.

My analysis has suggested three themes that capture the cultural expectations that are different between Karen and the school: the space where learning happens, the parties involved in education, and the ways in which learning happens. These themes correspond to the following rubrics: separation between home and school spheres, parental intervention and deferring education, respectively. Following an analysis of these three themes, I discuss implications of learning resources, putting particular emphasis on computer technology use for facilitating SRL.

Separation between home and school

> "To find out that she is doing that bad, homework assignments not being turned it...that really bothered me. You know, we work on things here, but we only work on things she brings home." (Francisco, interview, 3/26)

The poor and working-class families in Lareau's (1989/2000; 2003) studies treated work and home as separate spheres. For Lareau, the separation between these spheres meant that documents such as papers and grades were left in school, institutionally valued education was conducted only between school hours, there was little reading to and with children and there was little parent intervention in schooling (Lareau, 2003). For middle class parents, Lareau (2000) argued that school and home were interconnected and education was part of everyday living. Education was what she would call the "habitus of daily life" (p. 290). Lareau did not suggest that poor and working class children were not being educated outside of school. Rather, the education they received outside of school was not aligned with the cultural repertoires valued in schools.

Lareau (1989/2000) found that occupational conditions were correlated with the separation and interconnection between school and home. For example, middle class occupations tend to have characteristics that work to dissolve the boundary between home and work. These include, but are not limited to, parents bringing their work home, entertaining associates and having office space in the home. She argued that the overlap between these spheres served as a model for the interconnectedness between home and school. The work habits, such as organizing, meeting deadlines, reading, writing and analyzing reports, appear in the home of parents who have middle class occupations. Given that these work habits are important for SRL, it is more likely that children from a middle class background will have observed and acquired these habits at home.

Before delving into the separation between home and school that was so glaring in this case, it is important to mention that I am not alluding to causality for this separation. In this section, I made deliberate attempts to craft my presentation of the data as not to implicate sources for the cause of the separation. Any number of factors, which include, but are certainly not limited to, curriculum, occupational conditions, interaction scripts and intellectual competence, could have contributed to, or could have been, the cause of this chasm. My goal was less to study the causes and more to highlight instances of this separation and discuss the potential effects the separation has on SRL.

In this research study, the separation between these spheres was glaring. In the beginning of this section, I allocate lengthy discussion regarding the separation as it pertains to reading comprehension. The authors of the intervention assigned a great deal of significance to the self-regulation of reading comprehension because of the ubiquity of reading in school. After this aspect of the home and school separation, I present other instances when this chasm curtailed my efforts to facilitate SRL. At the conclusion of this section, I consider that requiring the dissolution of this chasm between home and school had placed, or had the potential to place, additional constraints on and produce multiple points of resistance for my participant and her family.

Expectations for Concerted Cultivation

Efforts at home to support Karen's reading seemed to be misaligned with the expectations that school personnel had for supporting her reading. The parents spoke about their approach for supporting Karen's reading during the Individualized Education Plan (IEP) meeting. At this meeting, the principal, teacher and special education teacher provided suggestions for the parents to help Karen improve her reading comprehension. It was evident that those within the school expected these spheres to be interconnected in a particular way. Below are extractions from the IEP meeting; it is a compilation of statements made by school personnel suggesting strategies for parents to align their child rearing practices with schools.

> <u>Mrs. Jones</u>: It is a normal thing that children will do. When they are reading and something does not make sense, they will go back. Reading is making sense of the written word. One thing that it is important to do is to work with Karen to help her make sense of text.

Principal: Is there some kind of work she can do to pull that gap together? Take turns? [The principal suggested that parents take turns when reading with Karen].

Mrs. Jones: [Speaking to the parents] Keep her in ear shot so when she reads a word that clearly does not make sense. So you are listening but not listening.

Principal: Maybe give her questions before hand. Maybe read it before hand. Maybe that would help.

As Lareau (1989/2000) noted, teachers from schools serving students from both middle and lower class socioeconomic backgrounds agree that reading to and with children is one of most important strategies parents could use to support their children's academic success. As noted above, school personnel suggested dissolving the boundary between home and school by suggesting ways Karen's parents could support reading comprehension.

The principal suggested a strategy that would include the parents in the education process. This form of engagement would qualify as participation in concerted efforts whereby the goals of schooling come to shape the interactions at home between a child and parents. The suggestion that the parents read texts and prepare questions in advance is evidence that the principal supported and expected concerted cultivation. The suggestion presumes parents have the conditional wherewithal to mobilize resources surrounding school texts in ways that serve to maximize advantage. The strategies school personal suggested aligned with a middle class cultural logic of "hovering" over a child to cultivate certain talents, skills and the acquisition of school sanctioned knowledge.

Based on the suggestions by school personnel, Karen's reading "problems" could have been addressed by altering the strategies and interactions at home. The parents were held accountable for not cultivating certain skills, knowledge and dispositions connected with, in this case, reading comprehension. Mrs. Jones also valued concerted cultivation. While it is evident in the passage that she supports this child rearing approach, during nearly every interview Mrs. Jones commented that the parents needed to do more to help Karen improve with reading comprehension specifically, and academic success more broadly. As argued by Lareau (203), concerted cultivation aligns with a middle class habitus. Therefore, expecting the parents and Karen to engage in concerted efforts to improve reading comprehension involves reconditioning dispositions, appropriating new cultural repertoires, and changing systems of values and beliefs.

Cultivation of Comprehension Skills

As expressed in responses to suggestions made by school personnel and as evidenced from at home observations, there are some challenges with engaging in concerted cultivation of reading comprehension. In the IEP exchange, Laura's response to school personnel's suggestions to engage in concerted cultivation of reading comprehension speaks to these challenges.

> <u>Laura</u>: We told her to read to the baby, the dog...just so she is more comfortable.
>
> <u>Laura</u>: We do that [have Karen read aloud to her parents] and I thought that is why she does not want to do the reading. It does not make sense. Sometimes she gets the words wrong. It does not make sense at all (laughs). So we [parents and

child] would be confused.

In response to the principal's suggestion to take turns with Karen when she is reading, Laura stated that she suggested that Karen to read to the baby or the dog. She stated this because she was concerned about Karen's comfort with reading to more interactive beings. While there might be some space created in the home for reading to happen, there is a certain status given to reading and the parent's role in it by suggesting that Karen read to the dog or the 18-month-old baby. From this exchange, there seemed to be resistance to creating interactive reading between the parents and Karen. Laura's admittance that she and Francisco have difficulty understanding school texts, a point discussed in more depth later, might certainly have something to do with their suggestion that Karen read to the baby or the dog.

In Karen's home there was little engagement with or discussion about classroom texts. There were few books in the home. Karen stated that she owned four Goosebumps books, but I never saw them. She told me they were strewn about in her room. Laura once made the statement that there was little sense in buying books that Karen would only read once. The kinds of written texts sanctioned as a school text were barely present in the home. In fact, there was little presence of any texts that might count as an official school text. There were a number of popular culture magazines, including, but not limited to, Vogue, Cosmopolitan and Glamour. While these magazines were used to support her manicuring business (the magazines were for waiting clients), Laura enjoyed reading these texts. During an informal conversation, Laura described an instance when she and Karen read a magazine together. There was evidence to suggest that Karen did not view reading these magazines as "reading." One afternoon when I arrived to work with Karen on the intervention, Karen, Laura and I were sitting in the living room discussing the topic of reading.

Researcher: I think reading is fun.

Laura: [expressing agreement] Yeah.

Karen: [referring to Laura] Why don't you read?

Laura: I read.

Karen: [expressing incredulity] You read magazines.

During the research, I did not witness Karen reading with anybody in the home. The scenario that Laura recounted to me describing the time she read a magazine with Karen was the only story I was told that depicted a "participatory" engagement with reading.

From this portrait, a few ideas could be gleaned about the separation between home and school as it connects to reading. First, there is not much reading present in the home. Any reading in the home involved texts not sanctioned by the school. Reading was conducted mostly in isolation, especially surrounding school related texts. Last, there was little engagement in the home with the texts that Karen was reading for school. With these circumstances, it is challenging to view the home as supporting reading and the subsequent development of reading comprehension. Assuming reading comprehension is improved through contributions in the home, a presupposition held by school personnel, the separation between home and school poses problems for the development of reading comprehension.

Class Implications of Cultivation of Reading Comprehension

The school personnel who had worked with Karen described her reading comprehension as poor. Interviews with these individuals revealed that their assessments were based on grades, standardized test scores and personal interaction with Karen. As evidenced from the transcription above and other interview data, school personnel identified home practices as essential for improving Karen's reading comprehension. During the IEP meeting, Karen's special education teacher stated to all attendees that Mrs. Jones was an excellent teacher—her daughter was in her class the previous year—and ultimately disqualified her as a potential source of change. For school personnel, the missing piece for Karen's improvement was the contribution at home. During both of the school meetings or during any of the interviews with school personnel, there was no discussion about what could be done differently in schools to support Karen's improvement in her reading comprehension. The responsibility was placed on the parents, who often times found the language of schooling to be confusing.

Aside from the evidence from Laura's responses to school personnel's efforts to promote concerted cultivation, there is additional evidence that Laura found school texts to have been confusing. One time at 8:00 o'clock on a Sunday evening, Karen's parents found a detailed list of requirements for completing a book report. Neither they nor I had seen these papers and were not aware that the assignment had to be completed according to any guidelines. The book report was divided into eight sections and they did not understand what was required for many of the sections. Laura called me to come over and discuss it with her, Francisco and Karen.

In another instance, the parents showed me an interim report card that they had received. I could not understand the report card and they could not explain it to me. The grades were understood but the constitution of the grade was not. In another instance, Karen was supposed to do a book report on a fantasy novel. The book that Karen had taken out of the school library was a compilation of short stories. When discussing the book with the parents, they stated that they understood each story title to be a chapter title that comprised a novel. The book, which Karen had been reading for a week, was unacceptable for the assignment.

There are many other instances in which Karen's parents had a difficult time understanding the language of the school. Another important difficulty involved understanding the nature of her Central Auditory Processing Disability, which may have had direct effects on listenting, and indirect effects on reading and reading comprehension. This particular disability is multifaceted and complex. With difficulty understanding the diagnosis and its implications, there was little the parents could have done to support efforts to overcome the limitations of the disability.

Because the missing piece to Karen's improvement in reading comprehension was thought to reside in the parents' efforts to align the home and school spheres, Karen was disadvantaged. Laura and Francisco did not have the cultural capital to merge these spheres. To be effective at supporting self-regulatory control of reading comprehension, Karen's parents would have to work with her to assess her current reading strategies and suggest ways to modify those strategies to best comprehend texts. The feasibility of improving self-regulatory control over reading comprehension with parents who have a difficult time with school related texts seems rather problematic. The occupations of Karen's parents also provide little opportunity for them to model reading comprehension strategies that might be related to their work.

To summarize, the school personal involved with Karen's education viewed concerted cultivation as necessary to improve Karen's reading comprehension. This emphasis on enlisting the parents directed attention away from what can be done differently in schools. While much of the weight of improving reading comprehension rested on the parents, I observed that they did not have the cultural capital to support this effort, either through modeling, engaging and interacting. The parents expressed the concern that the teacher needed to be doing more to support Karen's reading comprehension. As Lareau (1989/2000) noted, some parents who do not have the social and cultural capital to support their children's participation in the dominant culture expect schools to provide that capital to their children. With such a key role attributed to reading comprehension for the development and enactment of SRL, the expectations of both parents and school personnel left Karen with minimal support for developing strategies for reading comprehension. Basically, the teacher relied on the parents and the parents relied on the teacher.

Reading Comprehension and SRL

Before I delve into ways I tried to support Karen's reading, reading comprehension and self-regulation of reading comprehension, it is important to understand why the authors of the intervention put a premium on such efforts. Zimmerman, Bonner and Kovach (1994) highlighted the importance of reading comprehension by stating,

> Because much school learning is gained through reading of textual material, students must become proficient in understanding text. Teachers can bring text-comprehension skills under self-regulatory control by highlighting the processes

students use when they read and summarize text. (p.47)

Though teachers were explicitly named as the supporting factor for rendering reading comprehension controllable by self-regulatory forces, we can generalize this effort as being supported by other individuals. Gaining self-regulatory control over reading comprehension depends on working others who have the social and cultural capital to support this effort; it depends on another's feedback and analysis of learning processes; it depends on suggestions by others concerning the adaptation of learning strategies.

My goal was to support the self-regulation of reading comprehension with explicit, targeted and strategic efforts. In this effort, immediate feedback was essential in supporting the development of this skill. In her general education classroom, which has 27 students, Karen had little opportunity to receive immediate feedback concerning her reading comprehension. Even when Karen was pulled out, she was usually in groups of 2-5 and the tasks were initiation- response type interactions. In other words, the interactions were highly structured with the aim of producing a right answer and not reflection about the process.

Feedback was not entirely absent from her school experience. Every Friday, each student would be given a packet, called the "Friday folder," to take home. The packet consisted of week's work, in-class work, homework assignments and tests, with the teacher's comments and grades. Often, Karen did not give the folder to her parents and her parents do not ask for it. These events were significant because the Friday folder provided a potential link to home and school, one that could be used for reflection on strategies used, though up to five days later. The graded work acted as consistent feedback for Karen's performance. I question its usefulness for supporting reflection on reading comprehension, especially when provided at the end of the week. With the teacher not giving feedback directly and immediately to Karen and the folder not being evaluated at home, Karen did not receive the feedback that was necessary for the evaluation and adaptation of her reading comprehension strategies. Now, there was no guarantee that examining the feedback from the Friday folder would have encouraged Karen to evaluate and consider her comprehension strategies. There were many instances when I tried to use feedback to push Karen to evaluate her strategies, but to no avail. The point is to highlight ways the absence of that feedback does not give her the opportunity to develop self-regulation of reading comprehension.

Thus far I have focused mainly on challenges that the separation between home and school might have for the development of reading comprehension. This aspect received a fair amount of attention because of the importance for overall academic success. For example, Karen would do poorly on math word problems because of the difficulty comprehending passages. My effort to support her self-regulation of reading comprehension was unsuccessful (see chapter 4). The notion of class habitus could be used to explain that difficulty. Now, there are other ways in which there was a separation between the home and school that I found impeded my effort to foster SRL.

I had a number of contacts with Karen outside of our typical meeting time, which was allocated for homework. Karen would not do school-related work if her teacher did not assign it. She would not do school-related work if it were outside our typical meeting time. As a pedagogical move, I brought Karen to the bookstore. There were a number of Spark Charts related to the academic work she was doing: writing book reports, the thirteen colonies, and fractions and decimals. I called her over to see if she thought these sources would be useful. Karen immediately identified that the charts in my hand had to do with school and said homework was done. Immediately, she asked me if there were music samples in the store to which she could listen. I was hoping for an affirming response concerning the charts because there were a number of instances when I asked her to work with me to develop her own charts for various academic areas. For example, she was struggling with adding, subtracting, multiplying and dividing fractions, improper fractions and mixed numbers. Though the information was in her math textbook, it is scattered and not in her words. So, I thought developing a chart where all the steps to calculate responses to fraction problems were listed in her words would have helped. While the Spark Charts were not in her words, it could have acted as a quick, consolidated reference. Karen refused do anything with me that related to school that was not assigned. This separation made the practice and development of SRL more challenging.

In this section, I highlighted ways in which the home and school spheres were separated. Like the working-class families in Lareau's (1989/2000) studies, the separation between spheres was stark. Lareau (2003) noted that the working-class and poor families in her research study allocated more responsibility to children for their lives outside the home. Lareau discussed this "responsibility" in terms of the absence of organized leisure time, which is uncharacteristic of middle class children's lives. From my analysis, I would like to extend this idea of responsibility as it pertains to life outside the home. Because home and school were treated as separate spheres, when those spheres merged through compulsory assignments, namely homework and projects, there were conflicts. found that although each night Karen did most of the assigned homework, there was still this separation between home and school. So, taking responsibility for life outside the home also meant taking responsibility for things outside the home that were brought into the home. In this research study, I saw that for Karen, home and school were more than just physical spheres; they were separate sets of cultural practices.

From the point of view of school cultural logic, Karen's family was expected to change their childrearing practices. However, from Bourdieu's theoretical point of view, we can see that the home practices are not deficient relative to the school, but rather, the home is operating on the basis of a different cultural logic. In this case, the bulwark between home and school made facilitating SRL difficult in a particular way. If the dissolution of these boundaries is necessary for fostering SRL, then certain people who have the cultural capital will be advantaged when it comes to facilitating SRL. If that dissolution becomes an expectation and requirement for academic success, then cultural circumstances become a disadvantage not only for succeeding in school, but also for succeeding in self-regulated learning. While my research provided an opportunity to bridge these spheres, the boundaries actually became starker. As Lareau (1989/2000) noted, working class families tend to leave the education of their children to professionals (which I discuss below).

Parent Intervention in Schools

Lareau (2003) stated that a crucial component of concerted cultivation is parental intervention in institutional organizations, such as schools, medicine or sports. In relation to school, Lareau found that parents from middle-class backgrounds do not hesitate to "criticize teachers' choices of projects, book report assignments, homework amount, or classroom arrangements" (p. 177). She also found that there was little hesitation by middle-class parents to complain about grades. For example, one of the middle-class parents complained because they were not notified of their child's "looming 'C'" in math. Lareau also found that middle-class parents criticized certain grades, complaining that some grades were unwarranted. Lareau described these middle-class parents as "closely monitoring…their children's institutional experiences" and intervening to support their child's success in those institutions (p. 177). Overseeing institutional practices and intervening was a crucial dimension to concerted cultivation.

Even though Lareau (1989/2000) classified parental intervention under the rubric of the separation between home and school, I teased it out for a couple of reasons. First, I did not want to allude to directionality or causality. That is, I wanted to avoid suggesting that the separation between home and school causes certain kinds of parental intervention or that certain kinds of parental intervention cause the separation between home and school. Second, I wanted this section to be its own category because of the role parental intervention played in the implementation of the intervention and Karen's overall academic performance. Last, interconnecting the school and home spheres may be one form of parental intervention, but it does not define all its forms. Parental intervention is multidimensional and complex. Even though I teased it out as a separate category, it does not mean parental intervention is conceptually independent from the home and school separation.

Parental intervention could take on many different forms and have many different degrees. The teachers from both middle-class and working-class communities wanted similar kinds of intervention from parents: read to children, reinforce the curriculum and respond to teacher requests. Lareau (1989/2000) referred to these as the three "Rs". For middle class teachers, a fourth "R" was added: respecting the advice of teachers (Lareau, 1989/2000). While parents from middle-class backgrounds were more likely to challenge the teacher and complain, they participated in a continuous assessment of their children's skills and talents in order to adjust, if necessary, their child rearing repertoires in such a way as to cultivate or sharpen certain skills and talents that would foster academic success. Lareau found that parents from middle-class backgrounds "hover" over their children to ensure academic success.

I argue that like the working class families in Lareau's (1989/2000; 2003) studies, there was little parental intervention and monitoring of Karen's academic performance. These intervention patterns could be used to consider some of the difficulties Karen had with SRL. My goal, however, is not to identify parental intervention as an essential factor for supporting SRL. To do so would support a position that altering the attitudes, beliefs and behaviors of parents would lead to better educational outcomes and improved SRL. As noted by Lareau (1989/2000), it is not solely the parents intervention patterns that affect academic outcomes, but also the schools expectations and rewards for certain patterns that affect outcomes.

Intervention in Assignments

The first instance of parental intervention about which I discuss involved the fantasy book report. In this event, there were elements of the separation between home and school and parents proclivity to defer the responsibility of education to others, which is the topic of the next section. The aspects of particular importance for this section are those that involved the potential for parent intervention to support or curtail SRL efforts.

Students had to choose a fantasy novel on which to write a book report. They were given a sheet describing the assignment, and on that sheet there was a space for the teacher and a parent to sign after a book was selected. The purpose for requiring these signatures was for both parties to approve the reading and to inform parents about the assignment. Karen took out a book from the school library. For one week she had this book that was compilation of short tales, not a novel. One evening early in the intervention I was thumbing through the book and I asked Karen and her parents if the fantasy book was supposed to be a compilation of short tales. The parents expressed surprise. From their review of the table of contents, each short tale title was a chapter title. During that evening, her parents and I agreed that I would inquire about the appropriateness of the book to fulfill the requirements for the assignment. The next day during classroom observations, I asked Mrs. Jones about the book of tales and she notified me that the book was unacceptable for the completion of the assignment and that Karen would have to get a new one.

For one week, Karen had the book and nobody, including her, recognized that she began reading a book that was a compilation of short tales. Already more than one week into the assignment, the sheet that required signatures for approving the book was not signed by either the teacher or either of the parents. If the book was taken out of the school library, I wondered why the teacher did not already sign the paper. There was a good chance that Mrs. Jones would have noticed the book was a compilation of short tales.

During an interview, the teacher noted that Karen was responsibility for choosing her book and seeking approval from the teacher. Karen was not comfortable interacting with Mrs. Jones. That is, she seldom asked questions in class assignment, maintained a timid posture when talking to her and, as per Karen's report, got nervous each time the teacher addressed her. During observations, the only instances in which Karen addressed her teacher were to ask for a drink of water or to go to the bathroom. Often when working with Karen in class or at home, questions would emerge about assignments or concepts and I had Karen write down to ask her teacher. From my observations and from Karen's self-report data, Karen never asked those questions.

As Lareau (2003) noted, comfort interacting with adults comes from experience negotiating with them in multiple context. Like the working class and poor families in Lareau's studies (1989/2000, 2003), Karen interacted mostly with kin. Lareau (2003) also noted that the proclivity to be comfortable interacting with adults came from a sense of entitlement and verbal agility, two products of middle-class child rearing practices. The sense of entitlement comes from the practice of negotiating. Lareau (2003) argued that negotiation works to validate one's position because individuals acquire the sense that conditions could be changed to suit their needs and desires. All the time spent in the home, I have never witnessed negotiation between Karen and her parents. There was no evidence of Karen negotiating with any adults involved in her education. Karen's inexperience with interacting with adults, the absence of the sense of entitlement and her verbal stagnation could be seen as contributing to her reluctance to approach her teacher in any context relating to academic work. It seemed that requiring Karen to select a book and seek approval added additional stresses on an activity that already carried substantial stress. While the teacher required independence by providing Karen with an opportunity to control the challenge and content of the book, this pedagogical move made completing the task more difficult for Karen.

Now, it was already over one week into the assignment and I told Karen that she needed to get a new book from the school library. I suggested that she ask her teacher for time to go to the library. Upon analysis of the data, I realized the suggestion was wrought with complications, for reasons named above. Although I suggested to Karen on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday evenings that she ask Mrs. Jones for time to go to the library, she did not go to the library to obtain a new book. The weekend arrived and Karen did not have a book for the fantasy book report assignment. There was now only a little over one week to complete the assignment.

On that Saturday, one week before the assignment was due, Laura called me on the phone to notify me that Karen did not get a book from the school library. We discussed the urgency of getting a book for the fantasy report. While on the phone, I suggested that Karen go to the library. Laura asked a number of questions about the library: where is it, are they opened, do I need a library card? She did not have a library card, so I told her that I would take Karen to the library.

For two weeks Karen did not have a book for assignment. Having only three weeks for the assignment, Karen had a much shorter time to complete the assignment. On that Saturday, I took Karen to the library; we spent about two hours there. Karen refused to talk to the librarian, so I described the assignment to the librarian and she took Karen to get some books. The librarian gave Karen a stack of books. After Karen asked me what book she should choose, I suggested that she read the inserts to find which books most interested her. I provided little support in the process of choosing. Because it was early in the research, I had little knowledge about her reading history. Karen had difficulty understanding the insert of the book Tuck Everlasting. At this point, I suggested strategies for helping better understand it. She got frustrated and decided to take that book with which she was struggling. Both Perry's (2002) and Zimmerman's (1998) suggestion that students needs opportunities to control the challenge of task in order be self-regulated and develop better SRL strategies informed my decision to give her more autonomy to select her book. In this instance, having a better understanding of Karen's reading history and using that to support and guide her decision making process might have helped me make a better decision for supporting her book selection, especially considering the time constraint.

As per her school records, Karen was at a 4th grade reading level. Only a few days before the assignment was due, Mrs. Jones had reported to me that Tuck Everlasting was a book that was on a 5th-6th grade reading level. So, Karen had a little over one week to read a book that was 1-2 grade levels higher than her tested reading competency and write a report on that book. She worked diligently to read the book and we spent lots of time after school writing that report.

There are a few interesting points to be discerned from this event. First, the inquiry into the appropriateness of the book became my responsibility. I suggested that it made sense for me to inquire about the book because I was scheduled to go to the school the next day for classroom observations. After having completed data collection, I am incredulous that either of the parents would have conducted the inquiry. To continue, on Tuesday I learned that the book could not be used for the assignment. I worked with

Karen each night that week and reminded her to get a new book from the school library. Karen would come home and state that her teacher would not give her the time to go to the library. I did not verify this claim. Karen did not get another book until the upcoming Saturday when Laura called me on the telephone and expressed concern that Karen still did not have a book.

There are elements of Karen's education being deferred to what the parents might have construed as a professional. The idea of deferring education will be explored more in the next section. For now, I would like to highlight the way parental intervention made successful completion of the assignment more difficult. It was early in the intervention and information about Karen's reading level was not yet disclosed to me. I am not sure if the parents were aware of that information. Based on Lareau's (1989/2000; 2003) description of middle class habitus, middle class parents might know information about their children's reading level. Having this information would have helped to ensure that an appropriate book was selected, especially given the amount of time to complete the task.

Another form of parental intervention could have involved taking their child to the library to get an appropriate book, one that was appropriate to her reading level. Of course, that is made possible by the parents knowing the information about the child's reading and understanding the implications of that information when choosing books. It may also involve insight into the contents of the books and it may require reading some of the contents before hand to make sure the book is appropriate. Another way the parents could have intervened was by complaining to the teacher about the fact that Karen was permitted to check out a book from the school library that could not fulfill the assignment. Given the circumstances of obtaining a book, the parents could have requested an extension for the assignment. Another way to intervene was for the parents to know the assignment and be able to accurately judge the book. The purpose of pointing out possible actions is not to say that Karen's parents should have enacted different behaviors. These behaviors require certain dispositions, knowledge and skills that might not comprise their working-class habitus.

With a difficult text and little time to read and write, supporting self-regulated learning was difficult. We rushed to complete the assignment and submit it on the day that it was due.

In this one scenario, there were many factors that influence the effective handling of Karen's learning and development of SRL. For one, I could have done many things differently to support Karen's learning and SRL. Similarly, the teacher could have intervened in more effective ways. The point that Lareau makes about middle-class parents is that they have the cultural and social capital to intervene in their children's education to secure maximum advantage. Overall, there was little evidence that Karen's parents exerted the effort to monitor, hover over and intervene on behalf of her education.

During the research study period, I have heard few complaints against the teacher or other school personnel. On a few occasions Laura and Francisco have complained to me about school personnel's effort to educate Karen. During an interview Francisco expressed in bewilderment why Mrs. Jones was not doing more to help Karen. During another interview, Laura expressed concern that the teacher might have positioned Karen's bad ear towards the teacher. Towards the end of the semester, Laura expressed concern that Karen's teacher did not given Karen makeup worksheets. The only times the parents interacted with the teacher and other school personnel were during the IEP and the parent and teacher conference.

Parental Intervention and Karen's Disability

Karen had a Central Auditory Processing Disability (CAPD). According to the parents, this meant that Karen had improper auditory functioning in one of her ears; Laura and Francisco were not certain about which ear was functioning improperly. Laura was concerned that Karen's academic problems might have to do with her spatial positioning. They reasoned that if her low performing ear were positioned towards the teacher, Karen might not be able to hear the teacher and therefore, not pay attention. In an interview, her parents expressed frustration that information about her hearing problems might not be passed from teacher-to-teacher and was therefore, not considered when seating Karen.

This particular concern about spatial positioning was mentioned to the participants of the IEP meeting. At that point, Karen's parents were confronted with contradictory information about Karen's disability. The special education teacher stated that Karen had a lexical decoding issue and that the problem was not with her physical hearing. While the intervention of Karen's parents was less frequent and qualitatively different than what Lareau observed from middle-class parents, this instance opens up the possibility to consider the way the difference in language between the school and home works to position the parents in ways that make certain kinds of intervention difficult.

I want to be clear that I am not blaming the parents for not having a better understanding of the disability. Similar to the parents, the teacher had an understanding of Karen's disability that was different from the audiologist's report. I consulted many books and websites and talked to doctoral students in school psychology to help better understand this disability and its implications for Karen's learning. Because the disability is connected with the central auditory processing system and its communication to the brain, it is multifaceted and is often described using specialized language. It took me many hours over many weeks to read the audiologist report and make sense of it. The parents had a difficult time understanding disability and therefore, it was even harder for them to work with Karen to overcome the limitations of that disability.

While it is difficult to unequivocally say that parents from middle class might have had a better understanding of this disability, Lareau's (2003) research suggests that there might have been more of an effort to understand the learning needs of their children and acquire the resources to overcome the limitations of the disability. As Lareau found, parents from middle-class backgrounds have the capital and competence to form networks with professionals that enable them to play a significant role in their children's education. In addition, middle-class parents understand that their role is to participate in the education of their children; it is part of their cultural logic of childrearing. In this research study, I did not see the parents working to understand the disability, even after they were confronted with a contradictory explanation about the disability during the IEP meeting.

As Lareau (2003) found, middle class parents also intervene early and often. During the IEP meeting, Laura expressed a concern about the potential effects of spatial positioning. The meeting was held two months before the end of the school year. If spatial positioning were an important variable effecting Karen's academic performance, then it would have only been addressed close to the end of the semester. The teacher noted that she sees Karen's parents twice a year during parent and teacher conferences.

Teacher's Expectations for Parental Intervention

For Karen, parental intervention was important for a few reasons. For one, the teacher expected it and viewed different kinds of parental intervention as an index for the level of value Karen's parents place on education. Lareau (1989/2001) sought to dispel the myth that parental intervention was an index of value. The families in her study valued education but did not intervene the ways middle-class parents because of occupational conditions, social status and perceived competence. Like the working class families in Lareau's study, Karen's parents parent value education. As we will see in the next section, their handing over their education to professionals is evidence that they value education for Karen. For this section, I want to spotlight the teacher's expectations for intervention and the dangers of those expectations for Karen's overall academic success.

Mrs. Jones made numerous comments that the parents needed to be more involved with Karen's education. From the teacher's perspective, the parents were the so-called "missing link" to Karen's education. She viewed the parents as uninvolved with Karen's education. Some of the factors that influenced these perceptions involved the frequency of parent and teacher interactions, the frequency of homework submission and Karen's lack of academic success.

During the five-month intervention, Karen and Francisco only had two contacts with Mrs. Jones or other school personnel: the parent and teacher conference and the IEP meeting. For the parent and teacher conference, Laura and Francisco did not attend the initial meeting because they stated that they were unaware of the appointment. After they missed the conference, I spoke with Laura and she expressed that she knew the conference supposed to take place soon but was uncertain of the exact date and time. She was waiting for notification. In this case, Mrs. Jones blamed the parents failing to be more proactive in ascertaining the conference information. The teacher stated:

> all they had to was call...(brief pause), check the website. I am not surprised they missed the conference. I have said many times, the parents need to be more involved.

Mrs. Jones also relied on frequency of homework and assignment completion to make judgments about the value of and intervention in Karen's school. Mrs. Jones stated that a major problem for Karen was submitting assignments. I reviewed Karen's past report cards and noticed that her grades were significantly lowered because assignments were not submitted. In the past, Karen would have would have only sporadically submitted homework assignments and larger home and class assignments. As noted earlier, I took on all the responsibility of ensuring homework and other assignments were submitted. While there were some in-class assignments that Karen needed to complete and submit, there were no more issues with assignments that needed to be completed at home. One issue with this change is that the teacher was able to see that assignments could be completed with substantial improvements and submitted, but because there was an issue before the research study began the teacher's perception that parents did not care or were uninvolved was further reinforced.

Again, there were countless times that Mrs. Jones commented that the parents needed to do more to support Karen's education. From the first transcript, in the section on the home and school spheres, it was clear that the teacher and parents expected an effort of concerted cultivation, which as I have noted was aligned with a middle class habitus. While I found it to be alarming that the only way school personnel envisioned educational success for Karen was through concerted cultivation, there was an even greater concern. The concern was that certain forms of parental intervention were rewarded, which, according to this framework, is tantamount to rewarding habitus.

While providing feedback on student's drafts of the book report assignment, I was interviewing Mrs. Jones. While writing on student drafts, she expressed that she wished she could spend more time providing feedback on Karen's assignments. She also commented that overall she would like to spend more time on the "Karens" in the class. I interpreted that statement as meaning those who were struggling and needed more attention. She made these statements following a statement that she spent more time on another student's paper because her parents expected to be told exactly what needed to be done to get an A. The student whose paper was being reviewed at that time consistently performed well in the class. Mrs. Jones commented that her parents closely monitored her homework and often complained about grades or not having explicit guidelines for getting "As" on assignments. Mrs. Jones stated that she spent more time on the assignments of student who had parents who closely monitored, hovered over and intervened on behalf of their child's education.

Karen was given feedback on the assignment but Mrs. Jones spent less time and was less thorough with both her feedback and justification for final grade. Karen and I addressed all the comments Mrs. Jones made on her draft. For the final project there were two sections on which she lost points. On the draft, these sections did not have comments. After reviewing the final grade, I inquired about the justification of the grade. I brought the article back to Mrs. Jones and she read it again. I got the sense she was second guessing herself because she could not give me a clear reason why Karen lost points on those sections. Regardless of why she lost points, the teacher did not address those sections in the draft and did not write or verbally articulate why Karen lost sections on the section in the final draft. Based on the comment Mrs. Jones made while commenting on the drafts, it is my guess that certain kinds of parental intervention from Karen's parents might have led to different treatment of Karen's draft and her final grade. Perhaps, she would have been provided clearer expectations and justification for graded.

What This Means for SRL

From this discussion, the education implications of parental involvement and expectation for certain kinds of parental involvement have been articulated in other research (Lareau, 1989/2000). School personnel and Karen's parents expected the other to take on the responsibility of making sure Karen does well in school. Karen's general education teacher did little to vary her pedagogy to meet Karen's education needs. During all conversations, she never deliberated over the possibility of varying her pedagogy. At home, parents expected school personnel to education Karen because they did not have the cultural capital to support educational success. These expectations competed with SRL in a number of ways.

First, because the teacher expected the parents to be more involved and rewarded involvement by providing more feedback on assignments, Karen was not given the opportunity to use feedback to reflect on strategies. Feedback is important for SRL because it provides information about performance. Without that information, it could be more difficult to reflect on current learning strategies. Also, Karen's parents expected the teacher to do more to educate Karen and Karen's teacher expected the parents to share the responsibility. As a result, I noticed little intervention at home or school to support Karen's specific learning needs. My effort to support SRL was conducted in isolation because the teacher and parents both believed there was not much they could do. I found this problematic because there was little reinforcement both in school and at home of the kinds of engagement I was trying to promote. There were fewer opportunities to practice SRL in multiple contexts.

I also want to talk about instances when Karen's parents intervened and that intervention competed with my efforts to support Karen's SRL. While working with me after school, Karen sometimes spent over two hours a day working on homework. There were times when homework was taking so long that I had to leave before it was complete. In an interview, Mrs. Jones stated that she tried to operate on the formula that for every school grade students should get ten minutes of homework. Thus, students in the fifth grade should have 50 minutes of homework a night. Mrs. Jones suggested that the homework should take about that time to complete. The least amount of time Karen ever spent working on homework with me was 90 minutes.

In order to increase motivation and work on SRL strategies, I asked Mrs. Jones if Karen could reduce her homework responsibilities by completing half of some of the worksheets. Karen would often have math problem sheets with sometimes 30 problems. Mrs. Jones agreed as long as her parents signed the back of the homework sheet. The first time Karen's homework was reduced, she was more motivated to start and was less resistant to discuss strategies used to solve problems. Karen's responses opened more opportunities to deliberate over thinking during the learning task.

Reducing the homework load incited a cautionary response from Laura. She was concerned the Karen would "take advantage" of this opportunity and use it as an excuse to avoid homework. Therefore, I had to assure Laura that homework reduction would be infrequent. By expressing concern that reducing homework would foster work avoidance goals, I had to try to ensure that Karen made an effort to complete all the homework. This intervention I found problematic because I was hoping to free up some time and reduce cognitive expenditure related to task completion so SRL strategies could take a more central position.

A similar situation occurred in relation to the math games that Mrs. Jones linked to her class website. Mrs. Jones linked websites that students could visit to help practice their math. Karen expressed interest in going to these sites to play math games. Laura was concerned that Karen would see school activities as more like video games, about which she was incredulous that they any educative value. By not permitting Karen to use the computer to play these games, Karen was missing an opportunity to develop a better understanding of content by practicing self-regulation during task engagement. I further discuss this particular point in the section about cultural capital and technology use.

By linking SRL to middle-class habitus, learning to self-regulate involved more than just acquiring the conditional and procedural knowledge to manage learning. Bourdieu's perspective allowed me to see that for this working-class family, SRL involved reconditioning dispositions, appropriating new cultural repertoires, and changing systems of values and beliefs. It was not that parent involvement, in whatever form it took, was necessary for academic success. Only that when it became valued, expected and necessary for academic achievement, did parental involvement, or lack thereof, become significant for affecting school outcomes.

Deferring Education

As noted in the last section, Lareau (2003) argued middle class parents focus on developing talents and skills by consistently monitoring and guiding their children's learning. Lareau described this engagement as "hovering over" children (p. 8). Working-class and poor parents, on the other hand, tend to defer the education of their children to teachers (Lareau, 2000). Lareau (2003) stated that it is characteristic of working-class and poor families to "hand over" the education of their children to those who are considered professional, such as teachers (p. 4). Lareau (1989/2000) explained this difference between middle-class and working-class families in terms of confidence and competence. Similar to Lareau, I found that the parents in my research study believed they lacked the cultural capital and social capital to hover over and support Karen's learning.

In this section, I discuss ways the parents deferred their education to the teacher and me. While Lareau's analysis centered on the ways working-class parents defer education to professionals, I include here some of the ways parents also deferred education to Karen. I found that the cultural logic of natural growth could be used to explain the parents' treatment of Karen's education. So, while there was the expectation that the teacher and I take on much of the responsibility for Karen's education, there was also the expectation that Karen take on this responsibility as well.

Deferring Education to Professionals

> "I feel as if you are getting *trapped* [emphasis added] into being responsible for Karen's homework." (Email correspondence with Mrs. Jones, 4/5)

> "Mrs. Jones spends time trying to find things wrong with Karen...I am wondering why she is not doing more to help her." (Interview, Francisco, 4/12)

In an email correspondence, Mrs. Jones used the word *trapped* to point out that my role shifted from one who was to foster self-regulated learning to one who was responsible for ensuring assignments were completed and submitted. Shortly after that email, I went to school to drop off Karen's book report and Mrs. Jones made a comment about my assuming the role of her father. These statements illustrate the teacher's expectations for certain kinds of parental intervention in education and also pointed to a trend. In this research study, Karen's academic work outside of school became primarily my responsibility. I ensured assignments were completed, printed and submitted to the teacher in a timely fashion.

The parents seemed to defer Karen's education to me. On certain occasions when I did not work with Karen on her homework it was not completed. During my four and a half months in the home, her father came over and worked with us on three different occasions. During those times, he worked with us for 15-20 minutes. Laura did work with us at any time. In an interview, Karen reported that she never worked with Laura and only on occasion worked with her father on math. In an interview, Laura flippantly, though with a soupcon of seriousness, asked if I could work with Karen until she was a senior in high school.

From the data, it was becoming evident that the parents deferred Karen's education to me. Deferring education to me seemed like it could have been a natural response to the intervention. Still, based on interviews with Karen, Francisco, Laura and Mrs. Jones, it did not seem like Karen's parents were assuming the responsibility for Karen's education prior to the intervention. Based on Francisco's comment above, he relied on Mrs. Jones to do more to help Karen in school. The conflict in expectations between Karen's parents and her teacher is the conflict that Lareau (1989/2000) identified in her research. Parents from working class backgrounds want teachers to educate their children and teachers want parents as partners in the education process.

In this research study, I noticed that this conflict in expectations became problematic when Mrs. Jones rewarded the dissolution of boundaries between home and school, which included, but was not limited to, parent complaints. Lareau (1989/2000) found that the working class parents in the research study deferred education to teachers because they perceived them as more competent to handle the education. So, making a similar observation in this research study was not novel. It was not difficult to imagine the link between this conflict and learning; the novelty came from linking this deferral to the development and enactment of SRL. For example, as noted elsewhere, Mrs. Jones spent less time providing Karen feedback on Karen's newspaper magazine article and allocated more time and provided more specific feedback on other work of other students who had parents who she expected to intervene on behalf of their children if there was not adequate feedback for getting a high grade. Mrs. Jones explicitly made this commitment clear. She was concerned about those parents she knew would complain and that manifested in differences in the quality and quantity of feedback, which I have noted throughout this dissertation is an important tool for SRL. I could not say unequivocally that Karen's SRL would have improved with more specific feedback. The issue is that she did not get the opportunity because Mrs. Jones perceived that it mattered less because the parents were not involved.

The teacher believed that she could not educate Karen without the parents dissolving the home and school boundary and aligning their child rearing with schools. It could be viewed the teacher was deferring Karen's education to her parents. Mrs. Jones continuously stated that success for Karen's education depended on what happens in the home and this belief affected how Mrs. Jones treated Karen. I argue that deferring education in these ways could be used to explain some difficulties with academic self-regulation.

Deferring Education to Karen

While there was evidence that Karen's parents deferred education to those viewed as professionals, there was also evidence that they deferred responsibility to Karen. This logic can be aligned with the cultural logic of natural growth. Lareau (2003) discussed this cultural logic in relation to leisure time. I have taken this cultural logic and used it to explain the expectations Karen's parents have for her in relation to school. Karen's parents did not work with the teacher and they not work with Karen at home. Based on Francisco's comment above, he perceived Mrs. Jones as not doing enough for Karen. I observed was that they expected Karen to exert greater responsibility for her learning.

The year before I began working with Karen, she was given a summer folder with worksheets and other curriculum materials. The expectation was that Karen would have used the contents of the folder during the summer in order to review the content of the previous year. Early in the research when I asked to see the folder, Laura stated that Karen has it. Karen was unable to find it. Laura stated that Karen was supposed to work on the material. Laura did not know what was in the folder. The way I interpreted this was that Laura was relying on Karen to keep track of the folder and engage with its contents.

In the transcript data discussed above, Laura suggested that Karen read to the baby or the dog. While she had the intention to try to make Karen more comfortable, this statement treats reading engagement and comprehension as something for which Karen is responsible. The baby and the dog could not take on any of the cognitive burden. Also, Laura instructed Karen to complete her school reading in the kitchen as soon as she arrived home from school. Usually at this time Laura had a client. Many of her clients work full time, and therefore schedule their appointments between 4:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m.

Early in the research study, Karen did not bring home the math workbook that was needed to complete the homework. She stated that she thought she had it because her teacher checked her bag. Everyday before leaving, the teacher stated that she checks all students' bags to make sure they have all the materials needed to complete the homework. In this instance, the teacher did not notice that Karen did not have her math workbook. The teacher has taken on the responsibility by checking each student. One of the tradeoffs of such a burden is that students rely on her to make sure they are brining home their materials. While I can see the necessity of checking each students' book bag, this practice competed with my efforts to assist Karen with developing habits for writing down each assignment and ensuring all the materials to complete each assignment were brought home.

During a parent and teacher conference, the parents were notified of the teacher's practice of checking students. While the parents did not make reference to this particular instance involving the math workbook, they did not question the fallibility of the teacher's perception or practice. During an interview that followed the parent and teacher conference, the father commented:

> it surprises me that she was doing that poorly. A lot of the stuff the teacher was talking about is a lot of things we did not see coming home, like the math pretest—we didn't see that. So, it just tells me that Karen is just...you know Mrs. Jones said that she checks things as they're leaving the classroom but when they leave their classroom, she might be putting stuff away and not bringing it home.

Cultural Capital and Learning Resources

The activation and mobilization of cultural and social capital in an effort to cultivate children's talents and skills is characteristic of middle class habitus (Lareau, 2003). This mobilization of different forms of capital would seem to be important for helping learners develop the knowledge, skills and dispositions for SRL. In this section, I use the notion of cultural capital to discuss ways resources were present in the child's life but were not used in ways to support SRL. In other words, Karen's parents did not have the cultural capital to use resources to support Karen's SRL. This observation has been a theme running throughout this chapter. I separated this section about technology because of the importance I believed it played in supporting Karen's learning and SRL. Most of what I discussed above had to with cultural capital.

In this section, I focus on technology. Researchers have suggested that SRL is important for computer technology (NRC, 2000). With Karen, computer technology played a key role in supporting her academic success. While I did not observe SRL with technology use, Karen increased motivation, volition and improved academic performance with technology. Her engagement with technology use led me to believe that with more experience with technology Karen could have developed sophisticated SRL. Karen had computer technology in her home but access to it was limited. Karen's parents also viewed computer technology as having limited educational value.

Access to Computer Technology

<u>Karen</u>: Laura, can I use your computer upstairs?

<u>Laura</u>: (looked bothered when Karen made the request to use the computer) No.

Karen looked a little uncomfortable (could be because I was there) and she kept looking at Laura as if she did not know what else to do.

<u>Laura</u>: (After a brief pause) What do you need it for? It is very messy up there. I don't think you can even get upstairs. (Karen stood still for another few seconds. It seemed like she was thinking.) (Laura stated in a bothered tone) I guess you can use it...but you need to clean upstairs first.

In the home, there was a computer with a printer and Internet access. It was on the second floor of the house. The parents' bedroom was also on the second floor. The computer was tucked away in a tight little corner. As evident in the transcription, accessibility was one obstacle to home computer use. Although the computer was nestled in a corner on the second floor amidst some clutter, there seemed to be general disapproval of allowing and promoting computer use in the home for any reason, including school. During a parent interview that was conducted early in the research study, Laura stated that she does not permit Karen to use the computer because of the cost associated with printing. During the intervention, Karen and I used the home computer on one occasion; we needed to print an assignment. Karen was often hesitant to request access to the computer.

Aside from the economic cost of printing, Laura also suggested that the spatial positioning of the computer led to her unwillingness to allow Karen to use the computer. With the computer being upstairs, Laura suggested that Karen's use could not be monitored. She was concerned that Karen would chat with her friends instead of working on homework.

After three months into the intervention, Francisco brought home his work laptop that had wireless capability, in which the service was not always dependable. Still, there was a laptop in the home. Francisco was concerned about it breaking and did not let Karen use it for school. Allowing her to use the computer for writing without my being there could have supported Karen's experimentation, implementation and monitoring of learning strategies. While I worked with Karen she relied too much on my support and guidance. My support and guidance could have acted as scaffolds for her learning but at some point she would have needed to try things out on her own. Because she was always dependent on me for the laptop, there were few opportunities for her to work independently on writing.

Economic capital seemed, at least in part, to shape the way technology was integrated into Karen's academic learning. There was another factor: value. In the next section I present evidence that communicates the educational value that Laura believed computer technology use has for learning. First I discuss the impact that computer technology had for Karen and then I describe Laura's response to a report that I made to her about computer technology use.

Value of Technology

Based on my assessment of Karen's inefficiency with writing, I introduced computer use for assignment completion. With limited access to her parents' computer, I brought my laptop with me during stints of time when the book report, magazine article and short story had to be written. The files for the assignments were saved in a folder on my desktop. Bringing in my laptop to complete writing assignments seemed like the best available option. The purpose for introducing sustainable computer use for the intervention was to encourage writing without being preoccupied with handwriting, create more efficiency for writing by avoiding re-writing drafts of assignments, and garner interest in writing and revision.

There were many assignments that required research and writing. Her discontent and distaste for writing with manual instruments, such as a pen or pencil, made writing assignments arduous. Additionally, having to write multiple drafts of assignments, the arduous process of writing became an inefficient rote task. Often Karen would revise drafts by re-writing the entire story with some minor changes and additions. I noticed early in the intervention that she used this time consuming approach. Examining Karen's manually written text, I noticed that her letters were big and there were multiple spaces between lines. When she would reach the page limit, which was a prompt for her to discontinue the writing process, there was superficial, at best, fulfillment of the writing requirements.

Informed by Michigan standardized test (MEAP) scores, Mrs. Jones worked to cultivate the capacity for descriptive writing. For the fantasy short story, students had to demonstrate an ability to inundate the story with detail about the setting, characters and events. Karen manually wrote the first draft of this assignment and I noticed that little detail was included and yet, the four-page minimum was fulfilled. For her the assignment was completed. I had asked her to type the story. She showed a rare enthusiasm for writing. I took the typed version of the short story and read it that evening and inserted track changes. The feedback involved the insertion of questions for clarification and elaboration and to identify, not correct, grammatical or syntactical errors. I seldom made the corrections for her. While she struggled with addressing some of my tracked changes, we were able to engage in a dialogue about the short story and immediately insert changes into the document.

The fantasy short story was the first assignment in which I introduced my laptop. Every subsequent assignment that needed to be written was also typed in a word document using my computer. Following the integration of a computer into the intervention, there were multiple times when Karen asked if we could work on her writing assignments. Making these requests were a dramatic shift from her strong aversion and resistance to writing. Regardless of the reason why Karen was motivated to write using my laptop, the essential point here is that the technology motivated Karen to write, created a space for Karen to receive feedback, enabled her to work more efficiently and provided opportunities for comprehension monitoring.

I found that the use of technology to support Karen's learning and SRL was instrumental. First, Karen submitted all her homework writing assignments on time. Before the intervention, Karen did not submit many of her assignments. Second, the quality of her writing improved. Although Karen was not getting the grades I thought she deserved, Mrs. Jones acknowledged that the quality of the written assignments had substantially improved.

Because I wanted to avoid telling the parents what to do, I reported in an interview to the parents that the quality of Karen's writing improved, motivation to write increased, and that the benefits of using the track changes function in Microsoft Word helped her revise her writing. Laura responded by saying that using the computer to write made the homework more like a video game. I was uncertain how well Laura understood what was transpiring between Karen and me while using Word for her writing assignments. I would not have made the association between video game playing and track changes. Her statement also revealed her perceptions about the educative value of game playing. According to her, video games were devoid of educational value.

Mrs. Jones had links to the math games located on her website that Karen liked to play. Laura considered these games as activities to circumvent homework. Karen was not allowed to play those games. These games were intended to provide practice with up-to-date mathematical content. As for using Microsoft Word to type assignments, I explained to Laura that using the computer to type her assignments involved sophisticated academic work. Though I tried to make a strong case for the importance of using the computer, especially for developing and sharpening SRL, I observed little incorporation of technology, such as the computer, to support Karen's homework. There seemed to be a limited understanding of what learning was and how it could happen.

Though the intervention does not directly allude to the incorporation of technology use for developing SRL, more contemporary researchers have conducted research studies that have suggested that computer use could be an important tool for developing SRL (Hadwin & Winne, 2001; Nicol, 2007; NRC, 2000; Whipp & Chiarelli, 2004). In support of this research, my interaction with Karen led me to believe that computer technology was an important tool for fostering the regulation of her learning.

To restate, Bourdieu's perspective allowed me to see that for this working-class family, SRL involved reconditioning dispositions, appropriating new cultural repertoires, and changing systems of values and beliefs. To support Karen's SRL through technology use, Karen's parents would have to view themselves as players in Karen's formal schooling, would have to evaluate the educational potential of technological resources, have access to those resources and be able to know how to use those resources.

Conclusion

By linking SRL to middle-class habitus, learning to self-regulate involved more than just acquiring the conditional and procedural knowledge to manage learning. Bourdieu's perspective allowed me to see that for this working-class family, self-regulated learning involved reconditioning dispositions, appropriating new cultural repertoires, and changing systems of values and beliefs. Self-regulation implicates other people in the student's family, including lifestyle and home resources. Connecting SRL to middle-class habitus could also be used explain why facilitating SRL was difficult. My data show that there was a cultural conflict between the school and Karen's parents because the school was operating under a different cultural logic than Karen's family was.

From the sociological perspective, practices and thoughts associated with SRL might belong to a particular cultural sphere. Thus, by expecting, rewarding and teaching SRL might disguise power relations by valuing and validating the habitus of a particular social group. For my participant to learn to be a self-regulated learner, her habitus needed to be shaped differently. Additionally, those who do not have middle-class cultural repertoires have a double learning burden: must learn content and must learn self-regulation. This learning of self-regulation for Karen was not simply acquiring a repertoire of strategies. By linking SRL to middle-class habitus, learning to self-regulate involved more than just acquiring the conditional and procedural knowledge to manage learning. Bourdieu's perspective allowed me to see that for this working-class family, self-regulated learning involved reconditioning dispositions, appropriating new cultural repertoires, and changing systems of values and beliefs.

This concerted effort to foster certain skills resembles the middle class cultural logic of child rearing. From a sociological perspective, viewing SRL as requiring a concerted effort requires that parents activate and mobilize cultural and social capital in order to forge strong relational ties with various individuals from a variety of organizations. Such relationships are supposed to work towards establishing norms for behaviors that are aligned with various organizations such as schools.

Considering Lareau's (1989/2000; 2003) analyses of class differences and parental participation in education, middle class parents have the structure of child rearing in place that lends themselves to facilitation of SRL. Concerted efforts require that children participate in organized activities whereby the alignment between various organizations is created so that norms for behavior could be developed, enforced and reinforced. Such concerted efforts depend on the dissolution of or a never-created boundary between home and school. As Lareau (1989/2000) argued, families from poor and working class backgrounds have a separation between these spheres. If SRL required the alignment of these spheres, certain individuals and certain kinds of participation would be excluded or would have to change.

While I maintained consistent contact with the teachers and parents, there was not an effort to align the home and school spheres. During the research study, it seemed that aligning these spheres would have required substantial changes in child-rearing practices or school practices. It would have required that Karen have a different relationship with her parents, one centered on the cultivation of certain skills and knowledge that are important for SRL.

Chapter 6

Introduction: A Critical Postmodern Perspective

In this chapter I draw from the work Rose (1996, 1999), Martin (2004, 2006), Cruikshank (1999) and Foucault (2007) to explore some of the conceptual nuances of SRL from a critical postmodern perspective. From this perspective, I observed that SRL looks conceptually different from conventional portraits. Foucault's work on government and Rose explication of it, have provided me with the analytical tools to consider the way learning SRL for Karen could be seen as a new form of government, one in which could be conceptualized as empowering and disempowering. Typically, SRL is treated as empowering or treated as a result of empowerment. In this section, I acknowledge this feature of SRL as it relates to Karen while simultaneously illustrating how SRL was disempowering.

Empowerment and SRL

> I try to support student's management of their learning. I give them note-taking sheets and checklists because I want them to take more responsibility for their learning...to be able to check themselves...you know. I want them to self-advocate. It is my hope they use these [the note-taking and proofreading worksheets] to help them with future learning tasks.... If I do not make them part of the requirement, students will not use them. (Mrs. Jones, Interview, 5/7)

> I want her to ask me questions when she does not know something. I want her to keep track of her assignments. I want her to get her work done. I want her to care

about what she is doing. I want her to work hard. (Mrs. Jones, interview, 3/6)

The expectations that Mrs. Jones has for Karen are expectations that probably resonate with many teachers. This statement immediately pushes me to recognize the rich and complex set of behaviors and attitudes that Mrs. Jones wants for Karen. Mrs. Jones has a vested interest in promoting behaviors and attitudes that could support Karen's academic learning in her classroom and in future grades. Both the behaviors and attitudes and the outcomes associated with them are not much different from how some researchers talk about SRL.

> The potential effectiveness of this model [Self-regulation Empowerment Program] is based not only on its development of self-regulatory processes but also on its message for establishing 'hope' and 'empowerment' in students and their respective parents and/or teachers. Empowering students to become more self-directed learners and helping teachers and parents further develop these skills in their children can significantly increase students' motivation and achievement in schools (Cleary & Zimmerman, 2004)

Similar to the teacher, the justification for self-direction, motivation and learning skill have immediate and future achievement implications. The rhetoric suggests that students who struggle in school are in reach of hope, empowerment, self-direction, achievement and increased motivation. Mrs. Jones does not use the language of "empowerment" and "hope", but alluded to these ideas when she stated,

> Really I am just trying to help her [Karen] become a better learner...you know...become more responsible for herself and her learning. (Mrs. Jones,

interview, 5/7)

School was frustrating for Karen and for her to become a better learner, who can take control over cognitive and affective conditions, seemed like goals achievable through SRL. Mrs. Jones stated that her pedagogy was designed to teach Karen skills and dispositions related to SRL. The question arose; if Mrs. Jones was to instruct Karen on how to self-regulate, was she empowering Karen to be more self-directed?

In order to consider the complexity of this question, I will pose a number of more general questions. Is following the direction of an authority figure a source of empowerment? How does one know when an individual is self-regulated? How can we tell if SRL is empowering? These questions have informed my thinking on self-regulated learning (SRL). They speak to a fundamental tension in theory and research on SRL, namely the tension between empowerment and disempowerment. While SRL offers promises of hope, empowerment, achievement and increased motivation, there seemed to be certain obligations and constraints associated with this program.

Consider the quotation below:

> Through self-inspection, self-problematization, self-monitoring, and confession, we evaluate ourselves according to the criteria provided for us by others. Through self-reformation, therapy, techniques of body alteration, and the calculated reshaping of speech and emotion, we adjust ourselves by means of the techniques propounded by the experts of the soul. The government of the soul depends upon our recognition of ourselves as ideally and potentially certain sorts of person. (Rose, 1999, p. 11)

In this quotation, Rose (1999) helped me to consider certain nuances of self-regulation.

Inspection, monitoring, confession, reshaping and adjusting are part of the discourse of SRL. Even though SRL is not mentioned in this quotation, the ways of knowing and forms of engagement are familiar to research and theory on SRL. According to Rose, inspection, monitoring, confession, reshaping and adjusting are entangled in techniques of self-government whereby expertise is used to achieve a certain kind of being, or at least recognize oneself in relation to an idealized being. This quotation speaks to a sense of obligatory self-transformation whereby others instruct on ways to achieve such transformation. Here Rose alludes to the discourse of SRL and points to another side of it.

I used these quotations to introduce the tension of SRL that emerged in this analysis, namely the tension between empowerment and disempowerment. In this chapter, I explore what it meant for Karen to learn SRL by drawing on this tension. I consider the practices, beliefs and motives that Karen needed to appropriate in order to become a "functional" self-regulated learner. From my use and understanding of a critical postmodern perspective, I have come to see SRL as simultaneously empowering and disempowering. Inspired by Cruikshank (1999) who argued that empowering programs connected with the production of democratic citizens involve techniques of self-government in which there are constraints on what is possible and obligations for what to do, I consider a different dimension of SRL, one often given little attention in the literature. Using a similar rhetorical and conceptual tool as Popkewitz (1998), I use the signifier dis/empowerment to designate this inseparable nuance of SRL.

The chapter is organized into two sections. The first section concentrates analysis on the relationship between Karen and her teacher. In this section, I argue that the way the teacher treated SRL is an illustration of SRL as dis/empowerment. Mrs. Jones tried to support Karen's SRL in order to empower her to control her learning and be more effective at it. In doing so, Mrs. Jones engaged in practices intended to make Karen into a particular kind of being, one that simultaneously opened and closed off possibilities for how to engage academically and ethically. The second section is focused on Karen's relationship with the intervention. In this relationship Karen was expected to engage in both psychological and behavioral regulation, which were forms of engagement that required her to think about and relate to her *self* in new ways. For the intervention, it was expected that Karen engage in calculation and documentation of psychological and behavioral capacities in order to help her conduct her own conduct. Like I want to show in this first section, I illustrate the way the intervention both opened and closed off possibilities for Karen.

Making Responsible Learners

In this section, I focus on the teacher's pedagogical strategies that were designed to help make Karen into a responsible, self-directed learner. Mrs. Jones did not use the words empowering or disempowering. Nor did she use the concept of SRL. Still, her pedagogy was aligned with empowering students to become self-regulated learners. In this section, I discuss that pedagogy and consider ways that it could be construed as dis/empowering.

Internalization of Learning Strategies

> It is a normal thing that children will do. When they are reading and something does not make sense, they will go back and try different ways to figure out what it means (Mrs. Jones, IEP meeting, 2/26).

> I try to support student's management of their learning. I give them note-taking sheets and checklists because I want them to take more responsibility for their learning…to be able to check themselves…you know. I want them to self-advocate. It is my hope they use these [the note-taking and proofreading worksheets] to help them with future learning tasks…. If I do not make them part of the requirement, students will not use them. (Mrs. Jones, interview, 5/7)

In this first quotation, Mrs. Jones made this statement in order to point to pathologies with Karen's academic engagement, in particular with reading. She was stating that Karen does not do "normal" self-regulatory things, such as persist with challenging tasks and employ different strategies to complete a task. Mrs. Jones communicated clear ideas about what learners should do. These ideas are entangled with the construction of normal and abnormal. The evidence of this conceptual commitment can be seen not only in these quotations, but also in a number of interactions with Mrs. Jones. For example, during the parent teacher conference Mrs. Jones provided a list of behaviors describing what good students do: they study, inquire, work hard, structure their homework time, do their homework, attend to lectures and take notes during class. As the second quotation suggests, what good students do is tied to responsibility, motivation and commitment to school. Mrs. Jones believed that it was part of good teaching to ensure the children develop responsibility for their learning. This construction of teaching makes sense in a contemporary ethos of high quality teaching.

To support the responsibility of learning, Mrs. Jones built organization and time management components into many of her assignments. For one book report, Karen was required to complete and submit her final report with an organizational note-taking sheet. The organizational sheet listed eight components of the book report and had lines for note taking under each component. Karen was supposed to take notes on this form as she read the book. The note-taking sheet was only partially completed and not submitted. As a result, Karen lost 5 points out of 50. The loss of points brought Karen's grade for the assignment from a B to a C.

In a similar instance, Karen had to write a report on an endangered animal that was to have been included in a class magazine. As part of the requirements for the assignment, Karen had to fill out and submit a proofreading checklist, which was worth 5 points out of a total of 50. This proofreading checklist was designed to support the monitoring of her writing. On the checklist there were items such as "The introduction is related to the conclusion," "All paragraphs are indented," "All sentences have begun with a capital letter," "Subjects and verbs have tense agreement," and "The main thesis is supported." Similar to the instance above, Karen did not complete and submit the checklist. Like with the fantasy book report, she lost points and received a C instead of a B.

In another instance, Karen was required to write a report to King James that was contrasting Jamestown and Plymouth. With the report, Karen was supposed to submit note cards that were supposed to be used to help organize the information. This assignment was submitted the week I began the research study, so I did not work with Karen on this assignment. Reviewing the graded assignment, Karen had many incomplete sentences, many misspelled words and conceptual ambiguities. Karen also lost points for not submitting note cards. She stated that she did not make them.

In all these instances, Mrs. Jones administered penalties for not using instruments that were supposed support Karen's academic self-regulation. As stated in an interview, Mrs. Jones commented that the submission of all components of the assignments were to support the development of responsibility and to help with future learning tasks. She believed that if these components were not built into the assignment, students would not use them. Penalties were seen as a necessary component to be successful at helping students become responsible learners who could internalize SRL instrument use. To restate part of Mrs. Jones quotation,

> It is my hope they use these [the note-taking and proofreading worksheets] to help them with future learning tasks.... If I do not make them part of the requirement, students will not use them.

While the empowering feature of SRL is seen in its potential to improve academic achievement and responsibility by supporting the internalization of SRL strategy use, there is another side to this pedagogical goal that needs attention. In this context, learning responsibility and self-direction required obedience and obligation. It required that Karen do what the teacher told her to do in the way the teacher expected. The expectation was that Karen would internalize strategy use and become less dependent on external direction.

Karen and I worked with nearly all the instruments required for the assignments. I notified Mrs. Jones and requested that Karen not lose points on the assignment. Mrs. Jones believed that Karen needed to take responsibility for her learning and failing to do so must have been followed with consequences. Mrs. Jones stated,

> She has to learn there are consequences to her actions, you know. If I excuse her behavior she is just going to think it is okay. Really I am just trying to help her become a better learner...you know...become more responsible for herself and her learning. (Mrs. Jones, interview, 3/18)

Furthermore, she stated,

> What is going to happen when you no longer work with her...is she going to use these [making reference to the learning instruments]? (Mrs. Jones, interview, 3/18)

Mrs. Jones viewed the parents as uninvolved in Karen's education and in this quotation suggested that it was her duty to shape Karen into a responsible, self-directed learner. This position made a lot of sense. If Mrs. Jones viewed Karen as lacking academic supports or the self-regulatory skill, it made sense that she worked to harness her capabilities in order to be more self-sufficient with her learning. The paradox is that using those documents were also a form of obedience. The instruments structured the assignments in ways that made completing the assignments more like adaptation to a narrow way of doing the assignments. For Karen to have counted as being responsible, she had to follow use and submit these instruments. If she did not, penalties were administered. While Karen was supposed to learn self-advocacy and responsibility, she had to follow orders and remain obedient.

In this context, I want to point to the ways teaching SRL involved dis/empowerment; Karen was expected to learn responsibility and self-advocacy by doing what the teacher required. Is the nuance of SRL that I discuss here specific only to this case? It could be argued that the teacher's limited exposure to models of teaching SRL contributed to her approach to fostering SRL. However, I am not convinced that Mrs. Jones' emphasis on internalization of strategy use for future SRL differs from models of SRL development. For example, discussing the social origins of SRL, Schunk and Zimmerman (1997) suggested that individuals go through a series of stages ranging from imitation to the self-regulation of strategy use. Internalization is a key mechanism for this model. According to this model, individuals count as self-regulated when they have internalized strategies learned from models or direct teaching, and then adapt those strategies to different contexts.

The assumption in both the literature and Mrs. Jones pedagogy is that if students can acquire SRL strategies and employ them without explicit external direction, they have become self-regulated. While that might be one way of understanding SRL, such an assumption calls into question the empowering, self-determined features of SRL. As Martin (2007) noted, external origination of SRL troubles a clear distinction between SRL that is empowering and disempowering.

> ...it is by no means always clear that the highly scripted and externally imposed sequences of strategic activity and instruction evident in many studies and interventions in the area of students' self-regulated learning leave adequate room for the fostering of true self-determination with respect to students' choice and enactment of their learning and study strategies. (Martin, 2007, p. 82)

If SRL involves the internalization of strategy use, and even the rational deliberation of strategy use, then, as Martin suggested, it becomes less clear that individuals are either empowered or disempowered. While Martin's observation is important for considering the complexity of SRL, I depart from him and argue that the internalization of strategy use, and the rational deliberation over strategy use, is dis/empowering. While Martin is not denying this dual feature of SRL, he does not go far enough and state it.

Before continuing, I wanted to briefly discuss what I mean by rational deliberation of learning strategy use. According to Schunk and Zimmerman (1997) if individuals imitate SRL strategies observed from models or explicitly taught, then they would not count as self-regulated. If those individuals have a repertoire of strategies (procedural knowledge) and consider the conditions in which to use them (conditional knowledge), they would count as self-regulated learners. I see the place where procedures and conditions meet as the point of rational deliberation. At this point self-regulated learners figure out what strategies best suit the conditions and adapt to those conditions in ways that allow them to achieve their learning goals. Arguably, reaching the point at which individuals are able to rational deliberate is empowering because that is when individuals, according to Zimmerman (2000), are self-regulating themselves. Arguably, discipline, obligation and obedience make this empowerment possible. An argument from this position might be that disempowerment is necessary to lead to empowerment. For that reason, the fact that Karen was obliged to use SRL instruments in order to be more responsible was necessary for later empowerment. This logic characterized Mrs. Jones' pedagogy.

For now I will superficially point to a concern with treating rational deliberation as only empowering. When individuals are rationally deliberating over which strategy to use given certain contextual features, it is not always clear that this deliberative process is free from external control. Consider a statement about autonomous engagement made by Marshall (1996), who is a philosopher of education:

> It might be said...that autonomy was merely doing one's own thing, doing what one wants to do, being spontaneous and creative, as opposed to being confined to the calculations of (cold and hard?) reason. (p. 84)

In this quotation, Marshall suggested the calculations of reason could be construed as confinement whereby a sense of obligation to a pursuit knowledge using a narrow set of tools and values might be instituted. From a critical postmodern perspective, reason is tied to technologies of control and is not autonomous from power, but is in fact tied to systems of government. To argue that obedience, obligation and constraint are necessary for rational deliberation, which is a form of empowerment, ignores the political and social constitution of that form of reason. I bring up this point in order to point to the concerns with justifying obedience and obligation because it could lead autonomy, empowerment and self-regulation.

I began this section with highlighting some of the ways the teacher tried to make Karen into a responsible learner by building SRL instruments into her assignments. I argued that learning this responsibility and self-advocacy involved doing what the teacher wanted. This feature of SRL helps to point out one of the conceptual complexities of teaching SRL, namely that to learn to academically self-regulate required discipline and obedience to some social norm. It required that Karen internalize rules for engagement. I drew from Martin (2007) to highlight the complexities in seeing this internalization as only empowering.

Homogenizing the Rules of Engagement

In this class, all students had to use the same SRL instruments in the same way. These rules of engagement were part of the construction of responsible, normal students. I noticed that in the literature, researchers have studied what successful students think and do to inform their understanding of SRL. The definition of SRL and successful is circular, in that SRL is defined by success and success is defined by SRL. I understand that not all researchers operate with this conceptual commitment. Still, I have noticed that when successful and self-regulated become correlated, the possibility opens to homogenize the rules of engagement. That is, successful students could be used as prototypes for how all students should behave and think. Thus, the role of teachers becomes helping naive and dysfunctional self-regulated learners to be like their successful, self-regulated counterparts.

In this research study, there was no evidence that Mrs. Jones was observing her successful students and crafting her pedagogy so that all students could be like them. There was no evidence that Mrs. Jones read research that provided a prototype for what successful, self-regulated learners think and do. That notwithstanding, Mrs. Jones operated with the assumption that self-regulated learners are successful and those successful students are self-regulated learners. She stated,

> If you want to see a self-regulated learner, you should look at [made a reference to the best performing student in the class]. (Teacher, interview, 2/14)

The teacher and I had two interviews early in the research whereby we discussed the notion of SRL, which was informed by the social cognitive literature. During one of these interviews, she responded with the quotation noted above. The sort of knee-jerk reaction to assign SRL to her best performing student was revealing. First, I viewed this statement as a justification for the homogenization of the rules of engagement. If a particular student who experienced success is the prototype for the successful, self-regulated learner, then it seems that others might have been measured in relation to this prototype.

While it is difficult to say that Mrs. Jones crafted her pedagogy based on her successful students, she homogenized the rules of engagement by assigning all students the same SRL instruments. In a classroom with 27 students in which Mrs. Jones believed it was her responsibility to teach curriculum, which included subject matter knowledge and SRL, individualizing SRL strategy use might have seen less plausible. Not only for Karen but for other students, Mrs. Jones believe that if children were left to their own devices for SRL, they might be ineffective at regulating their learning. This perception was a reasonable evaluation for Karen. The worksheets were intended to provide Karen with additional learning strategies to add to her repertoire. They were also intended to support the development of self-sufficiency by providing Karen with the tools to monitor and evaluate her own work. Homogenizing the rules for engagement seemed like a reasonable practical response to a class that had students who were ineffective self-regulated learners.

I noticed that Karen did not like to use these instruments, nor did she find them helpful or necessary to complete the assignments. In an interview with Karen, I asked about her experience with the note-taking instrument for the fantasy book report:

Stephen: Do you find this [pointing to the note-taking sheet] helpful for writing the report?

Karen: (silence for 30 seconds) uh…I don't know…sort of.

Stephen: What do you mean?

Karen: I don't know. [approximately 20 seconds pass] I don't like to use it cause I don't like to write.

For her, using these instruments was more of a burden, both cognitive and temporal. While these strategies might have empowered Karen to become more self-sufficient with monitoring and checking her work, the instruments were not tailored to her specific needs. By homogenizing strategy use, there was the chance to be empowered to control learning but while having to do tasks the same ways as all other students.

SRL and the Moral Imperative

> She has to learn there are consequences to her actions, you know. If I excuse her behavior she is just going to think it is okay. Really I am just trying to help her become a better learner…you know…become more responsible for herself and her learning. (Mrs. Jones, interview, 3/28)

> I keep coming back to the parents. Karen is not a self-motivated learner and so the parents need to help her with that. Her sister…what's her name…she on the other hand is self-motivated, she doesn't need her parents or friends. You know…she cares about school (Mrs. Jones, Interview, 4/13).

I juxtaposed these quotations to spotlight the way character was associated with SRL. The first quotation speaks to responsibility and becoming better, themes that appeared throughout Mrs. Jones' reflection on her pedagogy. The second quotation introduces the notion of "care" as it is associated with academic engagement. From these quotations, it seems that Mrs. Jones used SRL as a measurement of character. I have already discussed the conflation of the self-regulated learner and the successful student. In this section, the good student is added in this conceptual conflation. In the second quotation above, Mrs. Jones referred to Karen's sister, who she had never met, and described her as self-motivated, independent and caring because she was successful in school. Mrs. Jones did not use the concept SRL to describe Karen's sister but used language often connected to SRL.

As discussed in the previous section, Mrs. Jones administered penalties for not using and submitting SRL instruments. In the first quotation in this section, Mrs. Jones justified her use of punishment by claiming to support greater responsibility for Karen's learning and for her self. When I asked Mrs. Jones what she meant when she stated she wanted Karen to be more responsible for herself, she stated,

> I want her to ask me questions when she does not know something. I want her to keep track of her assignments. I want her to get her work done. I want her to care about what she is doing and work hard. (Mrs. Jones, interview, 4/11)

Aside from connecting SRL to success, caring and responsibility, there was also evidence that trustworthiness and competence were part of this grouping. In one instance, there was an exam item that many students in the class did not answer. Karen, who performed poorly on the exam and in the subject, received fewer points on that item than other students who have performed well on the exam and who have consistently performed well in the subject. Karen received full penalty for the missed item (-5) and two other students received a partial deduction (-2). I did not ask Mrs. Jones about this discrepancy. One way to interpret this grading discrepancy was that Mrs. Jones viewed those successful students as more competent to answer the question. Perhaps these successful students committed a mere oversight. Karen, on other hand, might have been seen as less competent to answer the question even if she attempted to do it. Part of this grade assignment could have also involved the responsibility Mrs. Jones felt to teach Karen about understanding the consequences of her actions. Mrs. Jones felt she was responsible for teaching Karen to understand the consequences of her behaviors.

In other instances, students who performed well in Mrs. Jones' class received less criticism for losing or forgetting certain objects for school. For example, a student who was getting all A's could not find her music instrument was working with a school administrator to locate her instrument. Mrs. Jones stated to the administrator "Oh, I wouldn't worry. She is a good student." While there was not an analogous situation involving an instrument with Karen, the statement illustrates that assignment of trustworthiness to students who perform well. When Karen turned in assignments late, incomplete or not at all, her teacher attributed those behaviors Karen's lack of motivation, care and responsibility.

Another observation related to second quote connects with the complexity of teaching SRL. Mrs. Jones identified Karen as lacking self-motivation in part because she does not care about school. Mrs. Jones suggested that the parents were an important influence for the cultivation of care and that Karen needed to be taught to care. The suggestion that Karen need to be taught to care deconstructs the notion of self-motivation. Teaching an individual self-motivation seems to deconstruct the notion of self-motivation. I read this complexity in much of the theory of SRL in which researchers and theorists have concluded that individuals must be taught SRL.

Even though Mrs. Jones had limited technical exposure to research and theory of SRL and did not explicitly organize her pedagogy using SRL, the teacher used our discussion to immediately assign students into categories: self-regulated and not self-regulated. To assign the self-regulated status to her best performing student revealed to me that the Mrs. Jones conflated the ideas of successful student with the self-regulated learner. As part of this conflation, I also observed that Mrs. Jones included the notion of the "good student." I argue that the teacher conflated notions of the good, successful and self-regulated student; that is, they all meant the same thing. The conflation of these notions pushed me to consider the way SRL was a technique of normalization.

In the literature, researchers have also made these conflations and have developed homogenized strategy plans. For example, to validate a 13 SRL strategy scheme, Zimmerman and Pons (1986) tested 40 so-called high achieving students and 40 so-called low achieving students. Based on students' self-reports of strategy use in structured interviews, the authors contended they were able to predict with 93% accuracy those who were in the high achieving group and those who were in the low achieving group. Those in the high achieving group were questioned about their strategy use during learning and the researchers found an alignment between what successful students do and this 13 SRL strategy scheme.

Responsible Learners

The goal of this chapter was to consider ways SRL looked dis/empowering. Considering the data involving Mrs. Jones, I would like to talk about three pedagogical features—homogenization, internalization and people making—that helped to highlight this nuance of SRL. From this data, it seemed that Mrs. Jones believed that it was important to facilitate the use of SRL instruments. She was hoping that students would use these instruments, internalize them and use them for future tasks. Her efforts were tied to the production of individuals who were responsible, self-advocates and motivated. And, as Mrs. Jones stated, requiring the use and submission of these instruments and administering penalties for failure to use and submit them was a source of incentive for students to use SRL instruments.

Mrs. Jones does not explicitly organize her pedagogy in terms of SRL. She does not read literature on SRL and so it is reasonable that when trying to support SRL, there might be pedagogical misalignments with ways researchers are suggesting to teach SRL. Some SRL researchers would not necessarily suggest homogenizing learning strategies. This examination pushed me to consider the ethical implications of constructing SRL using a narrow set of behaviors and attitudes. It also pushed me to consider some of the dangers of conflating successful, good and self-regulated. The teacher conflated successful students with self-regulated learners and attributed a narrow set of behaviors and attitudes to what counts as SRL. In the literature, this conflation has not been uncommon. By conflating the successful student with the self-regulated learner, the teacher relied on an image of an ideal student that acted as a model for what her students needed to think and do. In an interview, the teacher stated that she intentionally administered consequences for behaviors that deviated from SRL because she wanted to teach students to be responsible. The teacher seemed to believe that the purpose of SRL was to help manage and normalize behavior. Prescribing such scripts for academic engagement blurred the distinction between self-regulated academic performance that was empowering and disempowering.

Calculation and Documentation: An Exercise in Truth

In a text written by Foucault (2007), he began by recounting the tactics Leuret, a French psychiatrist, used to treat and cure a patient. In this account, Foucault described an interrogation whereby Leuret used showers as a coercive procedure until his patient recognized and declared his madness. Foucault identified procedures associated with helping the mentally ill recognize and declare their madness as an ancient procedure. As he noted, before the middle of the 19^{th} century, those involved in medicine believed there was a problem with the incompatability between madness and the recognition of madness. Therefore, during those times, Foucault noted, there was the belief that one could be cured "if one managed to show them [doctors] that delirium is without any relation to reality" (p. 148). Foucault referred to the practice of recognition of madness as truth therapies.

As Foucault (2007) noted, truth therapies, which have involved individuality, truth, discourse and coercion, have had places in various institutions, such as judicial, psychiatric and religious institutions. The rationale for truth therapies is that "one needs for his own salvation to know as exactly as possible who he is and also, which is something rather different, that he needs to tell it as explicitly as possible to some other people" (Foucault, 2007, p. 148). For Foucault, truth therapies involved making oneself intelligible and confessing that intelligibility. It is not difficult to see the coercive practices embedded in the truth therapy conducted by Leuret. Showering an individual until he recognized and confessed his madness is a fairly blatant display.

I began this section about truth therapies because of some parallels between the implementation of the SRL intervention and truth therapy. There are also many differences between these accounts. I certainly do not want to suggest that the practices involved with the SRL intervention involved such erosive and productive psychological interrogation practices. I was not administering corporeal punishment to get her to admit that she was a "bad" student but I was working with her to help her understand and tell truths about herself. Thus, the interesting connection for me involved the consideration of the SRL intervention as a form of truth therapy. The goal of the intervention was for Karen to develop the skills and knowledge to recognize and speak the truth about herself: self-efficacy, goals, strengths, weaknesses and behaviors. This truth was to be discerned through careful, detailed calculations of her thinking and behavior. Apparent in the social cognitive perspective, calculation and documentation of beliefs and behaviors were to support self-awareness and subsequently self-control. Thus, calculation and documentation were in service of liberating and empowering ends. From a critical postmodern perspective, it was possible to see a different side of calculation and documentation.

Using a critical postmodern perspective, I was able to detect another side to the empowerment coin, one not typically discussed in literature on SRL. Learning to calculate and document behavior and psychology, including beliefs, thought processes, knowledge, goals and learning strategies was for Karen an exercise in telling the truth about herself. Learning to tell the truth about herself involved certain obligations to do things and see things a certain way. Learning to tell the truth about her self also involved the inclusion of some self-interpretations and the suppression of others. Also, my role in intervention was one of an expert, who was guiding, correcting, shaping and training Karen to do things and see things a certain way. Learning for Karen resembled what Rose (1996) described as "a form of professional work to be accomplished with the aid of professional expertise and the under the aegis of scientifically codified knowledge" (p. 125).

Before I continue, I will present the steps in the argument for this section. Using techniques of calculation and documentation, I argue that SRL is a form of truth telling. The relationship to truth therapy is that the intervention was designed to support the development of this truth in hopes to enable Karen to perform better in school. There was also allusion to the idea that SRL could support lifelong learning (Zimmerman, Bonner, and Kovach, 1996). In order to achieve academic success, Karen was expected to know and say something truthful about her beliefs, goals, strengths, weaknesses and behaviors. The validation of truthfulness was supposed to be informed by reality, which in this case could be considered performance outcomes. Then, I suggest that truth telling involved the production of some personal truths and the suppression of others. For SRL, I suggest that Karen was expected to see her self (thoughts and behaviors) in a particular way, one that closed off possible identities and epistemologies. Next I consider the ethical implications of telling the truth, suggesting that truth often involved coercion or imposition. From this line of argument, I am not suggesting that the truthfulness brought about from the SRL intervention is associated with negative outcomes. I think Karen could have benefited greatly from acquiring SRL skill. I am only suggesting that for her to be a self-regulated learner, elements of dis/empowerment could have been discerned because of the relation drawn to the notion of truth therapy.

In this section, the data on which I rely connects to my experience with Karen and the intervention. For the intervention, there is consideration of not only Karen's response to it but consideration of what was supposed to happen if Karen did everything she was supposed. I emphasize the latter part for a couple of reasons: 1) it is a consideration in a four-part framework used by Foucault to consider subjectivity 2) it reveals some of the ethical nuances of the SRL intervention. As illustrated in previous chapters, Karen struggled with certain components of the intervention. That struggle is important to consider and it is also important to consider what was supposed to happen.

The Truth Will Set Karen Free

As noted in chapter four, the authors of the intervention stated that it was important to align self-efficacy with reality, which in this case could be thought of as performance outcomes. Karen was expected to align what she believed about herself and what she did. This feature of the SRL intervention illustrates one of the more unambiguous parallels to the notion of truth therapy, especially considering my role in guiding, shaping and monitoring the procedures used to know and speak the truth about the beliefs and its relationship to outcomes (see chapter four). With self-efficacy, I was helping Karen learn to apply ways to measure her beliefs. As noted by the authors of the intervention, if self-efficacy was too high or too low in relation to outcomes there could be a problem with SRL (Zimmerman, Bonner & Kovach, 1996). Karen was expected to know and say something true about her self-efficacy and that truth was supposed to be measured in relation to how successful she was.

To further explain the connection between efficacy and truth therapy, consider the complexity in measuring Karen's self-efficacy. On items taken from the Motivated Strategies Learning Questionnaire, Karen reported a high sense of self-efficacy for each subject matter. This questionnaire was the first step in helping Karen declare certain truths about her self. Because Karen reported a high sense of self-efficacy, it could have been a signal that efficacy was not something that needed targeting, unless of course a high sense of efficacy was accompanied by poor performance outcomes. With a discrepancy between efficacy and performance outcomes, there were two possibilities that were considered: 1) there were issues with the truthfulness of Karen's sense of efficacy or 2) other variables played a role in the discrepancy.

For the latter possibility, it might be argued that explanations for performance had something to do with expectancy and value, two key motivators. Cognitive oriented researchers have argued that the complete absence of any of these variables could deter individuals from engaging in a task (Wigfield & Eccles, 2000). If individuals had no value in performing a task or was convinced that they could not complete the task, they would not engage in the task. The variables have been quantified to explain variations in motivation. This quantification is represented in terms of expectancy X value. While not entirely absent, I noticed that Karen had low expectancy outcomes. That is, she believed that Mrs. Jones did not like her and that it was difficult to be successful in her class. I also noticed that Karen often found little value in the much of the academic work (see chapter four).

Other variables could have also been used to explain the discrepancy between efficacy and performance outcomes. I noticed that the lack of declarative, procedural and conditional knowledge could have also been used to explain the discrepancy between efficacy and outcomes. These assessments were based mainly on my observations and little from Karen's self-reported data. The purpose of mentioning these possibilities is to illustrate the ways in which truth about Karen was supposed to be discerned. I was working with Karen to guide her in making these calculations and evaluations. For the intervention to have been successful Karen was expected to appropriate ways of calculating, monitoring and documenting knowledge about her self. To develop a plan, we had to be successful at saying something truthful about her self and her engagement.

For other psychological conditions, Karen was expected to do similar things. After one week into the intervention began, I requested that Karen record her strengths and weaknesses in her learning journal. According to the intervention, it was important to solicit this information after one week. The authors of the intervention reasoned that enough information would have been ascertained about one's outcomes and one's learning strategies that would enable one to form a link between study behavior and academic outcomes. Calculating and documenting strengths and weaknesses were in service of developing a set of goals that would provide the volition to improve academic performance through cognitive and behavior modification. The purpose of soliciting self-perceptions of strengths and weaknesses was to develop a plan and set of goals to address weaknesses and build off strengths to improve academic performance. If inaccurate strengths, weaknesses and beliefs are not ascertained, then it could be difficult to develop a plan. A plan for Karen depended on the accurate measurement of her thoughts, beliefs and behaviors.

A major part of the intervention included knowing and articulating features of psychological and behavioral functioning. For Karen to learn academic self-regulation, recognition, calculation and articulation—either through a verbal speech act or textual recording—was the first step in an effort to regulate learning. Doing this served to identify areas of thoughts, beliefs and behaviors that were problematic. It also served to as a foundation for devising a plan alter areas that were problematic or help to overcome those areas. With Karen, there were inaccurate measurements of psychological and behavioral features. In addition, there was a general difficulty with calculating and documenting her thoughts and behavior (see chapter four). Therefore, it was difficult to devise a comprehensive plan that would address problem areas.

Truth Telling and Coercion

In the previous section, I noted that for the SRL intervention there was the expectation that Karen recognize and articulate truthful self knowledge. In this section, I discuss two dimensions, what I have called here, truth telling and coercion. When I use coercion, I do not mean it to have a strong connotation of force. Instead, I use it to designate subtle ways of eliciting compliance. In relation to the SRL intervention, there was a consistent and sustained effort to support certain ways of being in and seeing the world. In this regard, there was recognition for some possibilities and the suppression of others. I want to be careful not to suggest value for these different possibilities. Only, I want to suggest that ways of telling the truth about oneself carries with it potential for dis/empowerment because of the suppression and production of possibilities. Another feature of the relationship between coercion and truth telling had to do with efforts to render Karen vulnerable to be controlled by stating who she was. In this part, I note that being able to tell the truth about oneself could have made it possible to be controlled not only by her self but also by others.

Speaking "a" Truth and Speaking "the" Truth

> Truth...is always enthroned by acts of violence. It entails a social process of exclusion in which arguments, evidence, theories and beliefs are thrust to the margins, not allowed to enter 'the true.' (Rose, 1996, p.109)

This conversation could take the direction of considering the degree to which self-efficacy, strengths, weakness and goal orientation were mere constructions derived from the psychological discourse or are pre-existing psychological conditions that merely needed a language to articulate what was already in existence[3]. While this conversation is important to engage, the outcome would do little to alter the fact that learning academic self-regulation involved the recognition and articulation of certain psychological truths, whether they existed or not before there was language to articulate them. As Rose (1996) stated, the articulation of certain truths "entails a social process of exclusion." In this section, I have to imagine what possibilities for Karen was thrust to the margins as a result of the intervention.

As noted in chapter four, Karen displayed patterns of dependency. These patterns were illustrated in consistent and frequent questions of how to begin, how to proceed and how to finish. This pattern of dependency also played out in other instances. First, Karen seldom worked on long-term assignments when I was not present. Often, when I did not work with Karen after school, she did not do her homework. Aside from this form of dependency, I noticed that Karen worked and performed well with academic task when we collaborated, which included shared reading, discussions and Internet research. While dependency might not be the best label to assign to these proclivities and behaviors, I used the notion here to point to the fact that these characteristics of Karen's performance compete with, what might be construed as, independence, which is a commonly considered feature and condition of SRL. There were efforts to suppress those proclivities that conflicted with the production of independence, which might include, but was not limited to, initiating tasks, self-questioning, persistence with task engagement and persistence while working alone. The effort to change these behaviors and proclivities was one example of suppressing "dependency" and producing "independency."

The suppression and production of different possibilities is a good way to think about SRL as dis/empowerment. First, consider the importance for Karen to learn academic independence. As I have noted in chapter five, Karen's teacher relied on her parents to help educate Karen and Karen's parents relied on her teacher support Karen with her struggles. I argued that these expectations contributed to a lack of support in both home and school for academic betterment. For that reason, learning to be academically independent or self-sufficient could have been quite beneficial for Karen

---

[3] Hacking (1996) would not dichotomize this conversation. He acknowledges the co-

because it could have helped her overcome the limitations in the contexts in which she operated. In this way, I can see the efforts to use SRL in support of academic independency as empowering.

There was another side to this. As I have mentioned, there was suppression of ways of engagement, ones on which Karen relied and with which Karen was comfortable. In some ways, Karen was obliged to be independent. This obligation calls into question "independence" as independence. First, if Karen had to depend on me to be independent, then was she really being independent or extending her dependency? If she was obliged to be independent the way I expected her to be, was she really being independent?

If the intervention worked as it was supposed, Karen would have been able to work independently by evaluating and monitoring her beliefs, goals, strengths and weaknesses and be able to effectively discern task demands and then be able to use the necessarily learning strategies to achieve goals. Rose (1996) helped me to consider the way this brand of independence has another side to it. Rose (1996) wrote,

> promises of self-assertion and self-control offer each of us access to those qualities that ensured the success of these we envy. But these progressive principles are double edged. They institute, as the other side of their promises of autonomy and success, a constant self doubt, a constant scrutiny and evaluation of how one performs, the construction of one's personal part in social existence as something to be calibrated and judged in it minute particulars" (p. 239).

In this quotation, Rose does not use the notion of independence. I associated the notions of "self-assertion" and "self-control" to the kinds of independence supposed to be

---

construction of psychological phenomena.

produced from the SRL intervention. Thus, if Karen did everything she was supposed to then independence would have had the effect of providing Karen with self-control and success. On the other side, Karen was obligated to be independent—both putting into question the independence of independence and suppressing other possibilities for engagement—and institute a constant self-scrutiny. In that way, Karen was supposed to be tied to her identity, engaged in a constant effort of self-scrutiny. Also, consider that Karen came to realize that her beliefs effect the outcomes of her life and that calculating, monitoring and documenting these beliefs would bring her success. The belief individuals have the capacity to control the outcomes of their lives could produce a state anxiety and self-doubt because the responsibility of one's life is supposed to be perceived as controllable by the individual.

Truth Telling and Control

As I noted in previous chapters, I experienced difficultly with guiding and shaping Karen's calculation and documentation of her beliefs and behaviors. From this perspective, I began to imagine what would have happened if I effectively elicited Karen's thoughts, beliefs and behaviors. What if Karen performed these functions well by knowing and telling something truthful about her self? I began to consider that her knowing and telling the truth about her self had the potential for me to be better at guiding and shaping her thoughts and behavior. As suggested by social cognitive theorists, understanding individuals' personal truths through documentation and calculation enables individuals to exercise better control over their thoughts, beliefs and behaviors (citations). I also see that these techniques of truth telling could have also provided me with the tools to shape and guide Karen in ways that aligned her capacities and conditions with goals of the school and goals of the intervention.

SRL as Truth Therapy

One complexity in educational psychology that has always interested me involved the issue of the existence of psychological conditions without the discourse to describe it. It might be thought that each person has self-efficacy and those who understand and attend to it are those who are better at exercising their agentic capabilities. So, once individuals acquire the language and technical skills to measure self-efficacy, they can do something to control it. From the social cognitive perspective, it might be said that self-efficacy exists and is steering behavior, whether it is articulated or not. Identifying self-efficacy and its role in outcomes is liberating because such conscious awareness gives control to the individual. This position is rooted in the social cognitive perspective of SRL. Training and practice were supposed to help Karen discern "the" truth about her self.

The question is: does this practice and training contribute to the construction of psychological conditions, such as self-efficacy, or is it designed to help individuals discern some objective reality—that is, use language to describe what already existed? If one believed that self-efficacy existed and one only needed the language and technical skills to discern and control it, then it is not difficult to see SRL from a social cognitive perspective as empowering. However, if one viewed the concept of self-efficacy and the techniques of measuring it as part of the construction of self-efficacy, then it is possible to see some of the limitations, constraints and obligations associated with self-efficacy. I did not delve into this complexity because it did not alter the fact that Karen had to know and tell truths about her self. Whether these truths were constructed or pre-existent, Karen had to learn techniques to make her self intelligible in a particular way. I argued that telling the truth about her self simultaneously opened and closed possibilities, illustrating the conceptual nuance of the SRL as dis/empowering.

It was also interesting to consider the relationship between the SRL intervention and a form of truth therapy. SRL is treated as a form of individual betterment. Researchers have contended that SRL is not only beneficial for academic learning in institutions, but it is good for lifelong learning and democratic participation. While this might be the case, truth therapies are tied to techniques of coercion and control.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I suggested that from a critical postmodern perspective, SRL could be seen as simultaneously empowering and disempowering. I represented this feature of SRL using the signifier dis/empowerment. I considered ways that SRL ways dis/empowering by illuminating ways it could increase and decrease autonomy from authority and close and open up possibilities for choice and identity. Pointing out these features of SRL helps to develop a nuanced understanding of it as it related to Karen's experience. Viewing SRL as empowering is one part of the story. If that is the only part that researchers and teachers are considering, it could happen that the effects of constructing a SRL subject, measuring students by this construction and trying to teach SRL could ignore the harmful effects on students.

In the first section, I focused on the way pedagogy that was designed to foster

SRL was guided by attempts to support self-advocacy, produce responsibility and improve learning strategy use. I noted that as part of these efforts there were obligations to be a certain way and engage with academic tasks in a certain way. Karen struggled with these obligations and the expectation that she fulfill these obligations led to disadvantages. While there are certain ethical considerations for SRL, there were certain practical one's as well.

In the second section, a similar observation about obligation and struggle could be discerned. Karen was expected to develop accurate knowledge about her self, including beliefs, thoughts and behaviors. She was expected to use a variety of instrument to calculate and document, amongst other things, her self-efficacy. Developing this truth was supposed to support better control over her self. I wanted to show that developing this knowledge of the self had parallels to the idea of truth therapy, which could be understand as using the instruments to tell the truth about one self in order to make one self better. Similar to the teacher's efforts to make Karen a better learner and more responsible and caring person, Karen Struggled with these obligations.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

Based on the definition with which I began the dissertation, Karen was not self-regulating her learning before, during, or after the intervention. Towards the end of the research study, I noticed increased motivation for writing, but mostly in cooperative situations in which she and I shared the cognitive load. Also during these times of increased motivation, mainly with writing, I noticed that Karen began to initiate tasks, sustain effort and display some enjoyment during task engagement. Arguably, the increase in motivation to initiate tasks and the increased satisfaction associated with the tasks was a result of the integration of computer technology. I did not observe that Karen monitored and evaluated her thinking, behavior and environment, even with my prompts to do so.

From this research, I am not suggesting the self-regulated learning (SRL) could not have worked for Karen. I tried my best to support the regulation of her learning and the dissertation allowed me to see that for Karen, there were a number of complexities associated with teaching her to regulate her learning. Each perspective from which I drew allowed me to see different things related to teaching SRL. In this chapter, I focus on how Karen's experience with the intervention illuminated some of the pedagogical complexities associated with teaching SRL.

Social Cognitive

From the social cognitive perspective, I considered the difficulties with teaching

Karen to be efficacious, difficulties that competed with efforts to increase efficacy. I wanted to show that there were certain pedagogical complexities associated with the assumptions associated with the intervention. In addition, the teacher also made pedagogical decisions that competed with my efforts to increase Karen's self-efficacy. Some of her decisions competed overall with the goals and strategies of the intervention. The conflict between the intervention and the teacher's pedagogy could be located in a broader conversation about the necessary conditions for learning academic self-regulation. The implications of the conflict between the teacher's pedagogical strategies and the intervention will be discussed.

Intervention

For Karen, strategies to support efficacy to both regulate learning and perform specific academic tasks competed with my efforts to increase efficacy. For example, regulating learning involved developing an awareness of self-efficacy. In order to monitor and evaluate self-efficacy, Karen had to appropriate a new language and in doing so relate to herself in new ways. This new language was supposed to provide Karen with the tools to achieve a heightened self-awareness. Karen had to learn new behaviors, techniques of relating to her *self* and language to relate to her *self*. In this way, SRL became another form of content to learn. While researchers have argued that learning these new techniques of relating to the self are necessary to make "smart" learners (Zimmerman, Bonner and Kovach, 1996), the additional content to be learned increased Karen's learning burden and made it difficult to experience success with self-regulation and academic content.

Teacher's Pedagogy

Mrs. Jones had her ideas about the kinds of engagement that she wanted to cultivate in Karen. In her effort to cultivate responsibility, Mrs. Jones administered punishments on assignments by lowering Karen's grades for not submitting certain instruments required for the assignment. Working hard on her assignments, it was difficult for Karen to associate hard work with success. It was difficult for her to experience success. Lowering Karen's grade for not submitting instruments happened on three occasions on assignments that were more heavily weighted. Because the assignments were more heavily weighted, Karen not only received a lowered grade on those assignments, but also received an overall lowered grade in the subject. Mrs. Jones' actions competed with my efforts to increase Karen's self-efficacy and help her associate hard work with success.

Requiring SRL instruments not only competed with efficacy, it also competed with overall SRL. The SRL instruments were well defined, homogenized instruments that all students needed to use. I would argue that the instruments alignment with some versions of SRL but they did not provide the flexibility that Karen needed to regulate her learning. Mrs. Jones' SRL instruments undermined my trying to teach Karen to evaluate tasks and employ appropriate strategies and develop tools to complete those tasks.

There were two different approaches to fostering SRL. Mrs. Jones focused on discipline; she required Karen to use SRL instruments and administered punishments for failing to complete and submit those instruments. The approach I took had to do with giving Karen the opportunities to learn self-regulation by practicing self-regulated; she was given the opportunity to experiment with strategies and develop her own tools to regulate her learning. There was a conflict between these approaches that as I have noted led to difficulties with increasing self-efficacy and SRL.

Concerted Cultivation

Making this observation leads me to consider the degree to which concerted cultivation was necessary for Karen to develop into a self-regulated learner. That is, was it necessary for Karen's teacher, her parents and me to agree on outcomes and strategies and then contribute to the realization of those outcomes? Zimmerman (1998) argued that learning academic self-regulation required a concerted effort between parents, coaches, teachers and other adults in a child's life. For Karen, there was a misalignment between pedagogical strategies coming from her teacher, her parents and me. If I conclude that Karen could have developed into self-regulated learner with a concerted effort between her parents, teachers, coaches and me, then there are a number of social and cultural implications.

Sociology

As I have noted, engaging in concerted cultivation of certain talents, skills and dispositions has been identified as part of middle class child rearing practices (Lareau, 2003). I observed that Karen's parents, who I have identified as part of a working class, did not engage in concerted cultivation of skills and dispositions related to SRL. I observed that Karen's parents did not model SRL strategies in the home. There are a few reasons I suggest might have contributed to the absence of modeling in the home.

Occupational conditions required little use of SRL and, if at times it did, there were stark boundaries between what happened at work and what happened at home. Both parents struggled as learners and worked little with Karen on how to be a strategic learner. The few times that I observed Francisco working with Karen, there was more of a preoccupation with product over process. Francisco was more concerned with the completion of the task and therefore, took more of the responsibility for completing the task. Their experience in schools, both as students and parents, were limited. As I have noted in chapter five, Karen's parents expected the teacher to teach Karen to be successful in school.

The use of technology in the home, to me, communicated the most substantial influence on SRL development. I stated that parents had limited understanding of the potential of technology to foster both learning and SRL. As I have noted, the introduction of computer technology led to different types of engagement for Karen. According to Laura, the use of computer technology was seen as playing a game. The suggestion here was that learning was not really happening.

For Karen's parents to engage in concerted cultivation in skills and dispositions for SRL certain social and cultural conditions needed to be in place. The teacher expected parents to engage in concerted efforts. To her, there was little understanding of this social and cultural demand. Mrs. Jones believed that Karen's parents did not value education, a myth that Lareau (1989/2000) tried to dispel about working class parents. Karen's parents valued her education. Mrs. Jones expected the parents to engage in concerted cultivation and her treatment of Karen was influenced by the perceived lack of concerted cultivation. Mrs. Jones provided less feedback and spent less time on a draft of

Karen's magazine article. She spent more time and gave more attention to other students' papers who she stated have parents who complain about grades. Feedback is key for SRL development and so, providing different degrees of elaboration and detail to children who have parents who employ a particular child rearing practice created different prospects for SRL.

I am suggesting that Karen might have had more success if there were concerted efforts to foster skills and dispositions to regulate learning. However, that would have implied not only making changes in Karen's goal orientation, but also making changes to the lifestyle of the family. Considering these conditions from a sociological perspective, I was able to see that the need to foster SRL using concerted efforts meant changing the habits, dispositions, knowledge, and beliefs of both Karen and her parents. Requiring a concerted effort to foster SRL not only added additional cognitive burdens for Karen, it also added social and cultural burdens as well.

Critical Postmodern

From a critical postmodern perspective, I considered different pedagogical complexities associated with teaching SRL, ones that consider the ethical side teaching it. I considered ways that instruction designed to foster SRL increased and decreased autonomy from authority and closed and opened up possibilities for choice and identity, what I described as dis/empowerment. To continue from the previous sections, if successful SRL required that Karen and her parents change their dispositions and child rearing practices to match what has been identified as part of middle class habitus, then it was possible for me to see the dis/empowering features of pedagogy designed to teach

SRL.

From a sociological perspective, it could be argued that Karen was operating in two different cultural spheres (see chapter five): home and school. SRL required Karen to adopt thoughts and practices that were distant from home. These thoughts, behaviors and beliefs were supposed to dispel thoughts, beliefs and desires connected to home. Adopting these thoughts were supposed to be made possible by Karen telling the truth about her self. The authors of the intervention suggested that individuals needed to develop accurate self-knowledge, which included knowledge of beliefs, doubts, fears, behaviors and the impact that behavior has on environments and vice versa, by calculating and documenting certain features of their academic functioning.

There were two ways in which I saw this pedagogy expectation as dis/empowering. Studying her self and developing this accurate self-knowledge, in theory, was supposed to lead to a better sense of control. Even though Karen did not learn to study her self, at least not through the techniques of calculation and documentation, I could see how learning these techniques make certain things possible. I could see how becoming a studier of her self using calculation and documentation potentially free one, or at least generate the illusion of freeing, of habit, environmental determinism and emotional constraints.

I also saw the way writing of the self in a way that made SRL possible involved coercion and obligation. There was a narrowness of the truth and the mechanisms in place to tell this truth. From a sociological perspective, it could be argued that calculating and documenting thoughts, beliefs, behaviors and desires in general, but also in the way expected for SRL, was not part of, what Lareau, called the "habitus of everyday" for Karen. Evidence suggested that Karen did not relate to or understand her self in terms of self-efficacy, goal orientation, see herself as someone who was capable of changing her self and the environment to achieve academic success, nor someone who was of two minds suppressing or altering current thoughts, beliefs or practices in service of academic success. In chapter five, I suggested that her current way of relating to her self was connected to her family, who I identified as working class.

To summarize, I considered the possibility that teaching SRL needed to involve a concerted effort because Karen's teacher, parents and I all had different expectations for outcomes and means to achieve outcomes. These different expectations were at times competing and contradictory. Concerted cultivation requires an alignment between home and school practices. What I saw in this research study was that the parents were mostly expected to change their dispositions, knowledge and practices in order to create this alignment. The expectations for change required that Karen and her parents adopt different cultural, social and cognitive practices. I discussed how these expectations are good examples of the way teaching SRL could be dis/empowering. Karen and her parents were expected to change to adapt to already existing conditions. While devaluing cultural and social practices and maintaining the status quo, such adaptation could have made navigation in particular spheres more fluid.

Another complexity associated with this one had to with the degree to which SRL was a learning gimmick or a disposition. For Karen, SRL was more than a gimmick. I do not use gimmick with a negative connotation. I use it signify the degree to which SRL involved widespread self-transformations and the degree to which it involved the acquisition and employment learning strategies. An example of the latter is from Harris, Graham, Mason and Friedlander (2008). The authors suggested that teachers should use a number of mnemonics, such as POW (pick an idea, organize notes and write and say more) and WWW (who, when and where), for struggling writers. There is a difference between learning to employ a strategy and developing mental control in order to transforming dispositions, beliefs and behaviors. While learning strategies was an important feature of the intervention, there was the expectation of engaging in ways quite different from what Karen was used to. I suggest that the differences in Karen's primary and secondary discourses contributed to the need alterations in dispositions. For Karen, SRL was more than the acquisition of learning strategies.

I was hoping not to present a negative depiction of SRL, only to point out some of the complexities and nuances of SRL that need to be considered in order for teachers to better understand the ethical and practical implications of fostering SRL. This was a case study and the results cannot be generalized. However, I think this work could still inform both teachers and researchers of SRL understanding of some of the pedagogical dimensions of SRL that I explored in this dissertation. As I hope my analysis suggests, SRL is complex and different features of it look different from different perspectives.

Future Research

From this research, I would be interested in further exploring the relationship between socioeconomic class and SRL. It is difficult to make a substantial claim that the kinds of engagement associated with SRL are ones that are associated with middle class child rearing practices and its effects. Even for Lareau (2003) who studied multiple families, such general claims are difficult to make. Still, I would like to conduct a study that includes children and their families from different class backgrounds and consider the relationship between different values, beliefs, dispositions and practices and SRL. As a feature of this study, I would like to consider perceptions of teachers towards children form different class backgrounds. I wonder if teacher's perceptions of students as self-regulated connected to class. That is, are children who come from middle class backgrounds more often associate with self-regulated learning?

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ)

Please rate the following items based on your behavior in your classes. Your rating should be on a 7-point scale where **1= not at all true of me** to **7=very true of me.**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all true						Very true

1. I prefer class work that is challenging so I can learn new things

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. If I study in appropriate ways, then I will be able to learn the classroom material.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. Compared with other students in this class I expect to do well

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. I am so nervous during a test that I cannot remember facts I have learned

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. It is important for me to learn what is being taught in class

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. I like what I am learning in school

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. I'm certain I can understand the ideas taught in these subjects

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. I think I will be able to use what I learn in these subjects area for other subject areas

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. I expect to do very well in these subjects

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. Compared with others in this class, I think I'm a good student

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. I believe I could understand complicated ideas in these subjects

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. I am sure I can do an excellent job on the problems and tasks assigned for these subjects

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. I have an uneasy, upset feeling when I take a test

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. I think I will receive a good grade for these subjects

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. Even when I do poorly on a test I try to learn from my mistakes

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. I think that what I am learning in these classes is useful for me to know

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. My study skills are excellent compared with others in this class

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. I think that what we are learning in this class is interesting

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. Compared with other students in this class I think I know a great deal about the subjects

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. I know that I will be able to learn the material for this class

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. I worry a great deal about tests

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. Understanding this subject is important to me

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. When I take a test I think about how poorly I am doing

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. When I study for a test, I try to put together the information from class and from the book

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25. When I do homework, I try to remember what the teacher said in class so I can answer the questions correctly

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

26. I ask myself questions to make sure I know the material I have been studying

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

27. It is hard for me to decide what the main ideas are in what I read

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

28. When work is hard I either give up or study only the easy parts

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

29. When I study I put important ideas into my own words

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

30. I always try to understand what the teacher is saying even if it doesn't make sense

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

31. When I study for a test I try to remember as many facts as I can

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

32. When studying, I copy my notes over to help me remember material

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

33. I work on practice exercises and answer end of chapter questions even when I don't have to

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

34. Even when study materials are dull and uninteresting, I keep working until I finish

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

35. When I study for a test I practice saying the important facts over and over to myself

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

36. Before I begin studying I think about the things I will need to do to learn

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

37. I use what I have learned from old homework assignments and the textbook to do new assignments

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

38. I often find that I have been reading for class but don't know what it is all about

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

39. I find that when the teacher is talking I think of other things and don't really listen to what is being said

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

40. When I am studying a topic, I try to make everything fit together

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

41. When I'm reading I stop once in a while and go over what I have read

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

42. When I read materials for this class, I say the words over and over to myself to help me remember

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

43. I outline the chapters in my book to help me study

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

44. I work hard to get a good grade even when I don't like a class

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

45. When reading I try to connect the things I am reading about with what I already know.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

APPENDIX B

Teacher Interview Protocol

1. What can you tell me about [student] academic performance?
2. What are [student] grades?
    a. Have they improved, remained stable or worsened over time?
3. What are some strategies used to teach [student]?
4. How does [student] interact with others?
5. Does the [student] participate in group activities?
6. What can you tell me about [student] behaviors?
7. What are some attitudes expressed by [student]?
    a. Attitude towards subject?
    b. Attitude towards classroom activities?
    c. Attitude towards peers?
8. Does [student] understand the content?
    a. To what degree is [student] understanding content?
        i. Has [student] mastered the content?
        ii. Is [student] understanding small portions?
        iii. Is [student] having trouble understanding?
    b. What have strategies have been used to address [student] understanding?
9. Does [student] need to be prompts to get started with work?
10. Does [student] need reminders to stay on task?
    a. If so, can you describe the setting for some of those times?

11. Does [student] listen during lectures?

    a. If not, what are some things [student] does during lectures?

12. Does [student] ask many questions?

    a. What kinds of questions? Can you provide an example?

    b. When are they asked?

13. Are there times when [student] expresses frustration?

    a. When? Can you provide an example(s)?

    b. How has [student] dealt with that frustration?

14. Has [student] undergone any testing related to academic performance?

15. Does [student] receive special services from school?

    a. If so, what services?

    b. If not, from what services might [student] benefit?

Follow-up Interviews

These interviews will be shorter and comprised of questions designed to assess the academic benefit of the intervention. I propose to conduct them once every two weeks a at the teacher's convenience.

Questions

1. Have you seen any changes in [student] behavior? If so, please describe.
2. Have you seen any changes in [student] academic performance? If so, please describe.

3. Have you seen any changes in [student] attitudes towards school? If so, please describe
4. Have you seen any changes in [student] interaction with peers? If so, please describe.
5. Has [student] been initiating learning by asking questions for clarification?
6. Does [student] need to be reminded to stay on task?
7. Has [student] understanding of content changed? If so, in what ways?
8. Do you see an improvement in [student] overall performance in school?
9. What do you see as the biggest improvement in [student] performance?

APPENDIX C

Initial Child Interview Protocol

1. How would you describe your approach to completing homework?
2. How would you describe your thinking before starting homework?
    a. Do you set goals?
    b. Do you plan?
    c. Do you allocate certain amounts of time to certain tasks?
3. How would you describe your performance in school
4. What subjects are difficult for you?
5. What subjects are you doing poorly in?
6. Why do you think you are doing poorly in those subjects?
7. How often do you ask the teacher for help?
8. How often do you ask people at home for help?
9. Are there times when you need help on assignments?
    a. What do you do during those times?

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Azevedo, R., Winters, F. I., & Moos, D. C. (2004). Can students collaboratively use hypermedia to learn science? The dynamics of self- and other-regulatory processes in an ecology classroom. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 31*(3), 215-245.

Azevedo, R. Moos, D. C. ; Greene, J. A. ; Winters, Fielding I. ; Cromley, J. G. (2008). Why Is Externally-Facilitated Regulated Learning More Effective than Self-Regulated Learning with Hypermedia? *Educational Technology Research and Development* v56 n1 p45-72 Feb 2008.

Banai, K. & Kraus, N. (2006). Neurobiology of (central) auditory processing disorder and language-based learning disability. In Frank E. Musiek and Gail D. Chermak's (eds.) Handbook of (Central) Auditory Processing Disorder: Auditory Neuroscience and Diagnosis (volume 1).

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), Encyclopedia of human behavior (Vol. 4, pp. 71-81). New York: Academic Press. (Reprinted in H. Friedman [Ed.], Encyclopedia of mental health. San Diego: Academic Press, 1998).

Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory. In R. Vasta (Ed.), *Annals of child development. Vol. 6. Six theories of child development* (pp. 1-60). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Bandura, A. (2001). Social Cognitive Theory: An Agentic Perspective. Annual Review Psychololgy, 52, pp. 1-26.

Bargh, J.A. & Chartrand, T.L. (1999). The Unbearable Automaticity of Being. *American Psychologist*, vol. 54, No. 7, 462-479.

Baumeister, R.F., Bratslavsky, E., Muraven, M., & Tice, D.M. (1998). Ego depletion: Is the active self a limited resource? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74, 1252-1265.

Beghetto, R.A. (2006). Instructional leadership: Cultivating a learning-focused community in schools. In Stuart C. Smith & Philip K. Piele's, *School Leadership: Handbook for Excellence in Student Learning* (4th ed.). Corwin Press.

Bembenutty, H., & Chen, P. (2005). Self-efficacy and delay of gratification. *Academic Exchange Quarterly, 9*, 4(9).

Bourdieu, P. (1977/2004). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Camridge University Press.

Carver, C.S. & Scheier, M.F. (2000). On the structure of behavioral self-regulation. In Monique Boekaerts, Paul R. Pintrich, and Moshe Zeidner's (eds.), *Handbook of Self-Regulation*. Academic Press: San Diego.

Chanowitz, B. & Langer, E. (1980). Knowing more (or less) than you can show: understanding control through the mindlessness/mindfulness distinction. In M.E.P. Seligman & J. Garber (Eds.), *Human Helplessness*. New York: Academic Press.

Chermak, G.D., Bellis, T.J., & Musiek, F.E. (2006). Neurobiology, cognitive science and intervention. In Frank E. Musiek and Gail D. Chermak's (eds.) Handbook of (Central) Auditory Processing Disorder: Auditory Neuroscience and Diagnosis (volume 1).

Chermak, G.D. (1998). Metacognitive approaches to managing central auditory processing disorders. In Gay Masters, Nancy Stecker and Jack Katz' (eds.) Central Auditory Processing Disorders: Mostly Management. Allyn and Bacon: Boston.

Cleary, T. & Zimmerman, B.J. (2004). Self-regulation empowerment program: A school-based program to enhance self-regulated and self-motivated cycles of student learning. *Psychology in the Schools*, 41(5), 537-550.

Corno, L. (1989). Self-Regulated Learning: A Volitional Analysis. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-Regulated Learning and Academic Achievement: Theory, Research, and Practice*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Cruikshank, B. (1999). The Will to Empower: democratic citizens and other subjects. Cornell University Press: Ithica.

Dean, M. (1999). Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society. SAGE Publications: London.

Elliot, A.J. (2005) A Conceptual History of the Achievement Goal Construct. In Andrew J. Elliot and Carol S. Dweck (eds.), <u>Handbook of Competence and Motivation</u>. Guilford Press.

Fitts, P.M., 1954. The information capacity of the human motor system in controlling the amplitude of movement. Journal of Experimental Psychology 47, 381-391.

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

Foucault, M. (1997). *The Politics of Truth*. Sylvère Lotringer (ed.).

Freire, P. (1971/1993). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Continuum: New York.

Gee, J.P. (1992). The social mind: Language, ideology, and social practice. New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Giroux, H. A (1983). *Theory and Resistance in Education : A Pedagogy for the Opposition Critical Perspectives in Social Theory*. South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey.

Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. (2008). *Looking in Classrooms* (10 ed.): Allyn Bacon.

Greene, J. A., & Azevedo, R. (2007). A theoretical review of Winne and Hadwin's model of self-regulated learning: New perspectives and directions. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(3).

Greeno, J. G., Collins, A. M., & Resnick, L. B. (1996). Cognition and learning. In R. C. Calfee (Ed.), *Handbook of Educational Psychology*: Macmillan.

Hadwin, A. F. & Winne, P. H. (2001). CoNoteS2: A Software Tool for Promoting Self-Regulation and Collaboration. *An International Journal on Theory and Practice*, v7 n2-3 p313-34.

Harris, K. R., Graham, S., & Mason, L. H. (2003). Self-regulated strategy development in the classroom: Part of a Balanced approach to writing instruction for students with disabilities. *Focus on Exceptional Children, 35*(7), 1-17.

Harris, K.R., Graham, S., Mason, L.H. & Friedlander, B. (2008). Powerful Writing Strategies for All Students. Brookes Publishing;

Hickey, D. T. (2003). Engaged participation vs. marginal non-participation: A stridently sociocultural model of achievement motivation. *Elementary School Journal, 4*(103), 401-429.

Kardash, C.M. & Sinatra, G.M. (2003). Epistemological Beliefs and Dispositions: Are We Measuring the Same Construct? Poster session presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (84th, Chicago, IL, April 21-25, 2003).

Katz. L.G. (1993). Dispositions as Educational Goals. ERIC Digest.

Katz, J., Stecker, N. & Henderson, D. (1992). Central Auditory Processing: A Transdisciplinary View. Mosby Year Book: St. Louis.

Lapan, R. T., Kardash, C. M., & Turner, S. (2002). Empowering students to become self-regulated learners. *Professional School Counseling, 5*(4), 257-265.

Lareau, A. (1989/2000). *Home Advantage: Social Class and Parental Intervention in Elementary Education.* Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Linnenbrink, A., & Pintrich, P. (2006). Motivation as an enabler for academic success. In R. G. Harrington & L. Holub (Eds.), *Taking Sides: Clashing Views on Controversial Issues in Classroom Management* (pp. 37-44): McGraw-Hill.

Mace, C. F., Belfiore, P. J., & Hutchinson, J. M. (2001). Operant theory and research on self-regulation. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theoretical perspectives (pp. 39-65). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.

Mahoney, M. J., & Thoresen, C. E. (1974). *Self-Control: Power to the Person.* Monterey: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Marshall, J. (1996). Michele Foucault: Personal Autonomy and Education.

Martin, J. (2004a). *The educational inadequacy of conceptions of self in educational psychology.*Unpublished manuscript.

Martin, J. (2004b). Self-Regulated Learning, Social Cognitive Theory, and Agency. *Educational Psychologist, 39*(2), 135-145.

Martin, J. (2006). Social Cultural Perspectives in Educational Psychology. In P. Alexander & P. Winne (Eds.), *Handbook of Educational Psychology.*

Martin, J., & McLellan, A. (2007). The educational psychology of self-regulation: A conceptual and critical analysis. Studies in Philosophy and Education.

Masters, M.G., Stecker, N.A., & Katz, J. (1998). *Central Auditory Processing Disorders: Mostly Management.* Allyn and Bacon: Boston

Masui, C., & De Corte, E. (2005). Learning to Reflect and to Attribute Constructively as Basic Components of Self-Regulated Learning. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 75*(3), 351-372.

McCaslin, M., & Hickey, D. T. (2001). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: A Vygotskian view. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-Regulated Learning and Academic Achievement: Theoretical Perspectives (2nd ed.).* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McCormick, C.B. (2003). Metacognition and learning. In Irving B. Weiner, Donald K. Freedheim, John A. Schinka, Wayne F. Velicer's (eds.), Handbook of Psychology. John Wiley and Sons.

Meyer, D. K., & Turner, J. C. (2002). Using Instructional Discourse Analysis to Study the Scaffolding of Student Self-Regulation. *Educational Psychologist, 37*(1), 17-25.

Musiek, F.E. & Chermak, G.D. (2006). H*andbook of (Central) Auditory Processing Disorder: Auditory Neuroscience and Diagnosis (vol. 1).* Plural Publishing: San Diego.

National Research Council (2000). *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School.* Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Nicol, D. (2007). Laying a foundation for lifelong learning: Case studies of e-assessment in large 1st-year classes. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, v. 38 no4 (July 2007).

Packer, M. J., & Goicoechea, J. (2000). Sociocultural and Constructivist Theories of Learning: Ontology, Not Just Epistemology. *Educational Psychologist, 35*(4), 227-241.

Paris, S. G., Byrnes, J., & Paris, A. (2001). Constructing theories, identities, and actions of self -regulated learners. In B. J. Z. D. Schunk (Ed.), *Self-Regulated Learning and Academic Achievement: Theoretical Perspectives* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Lawerence Erlbaum Associates.

Paris, S. G., & Winograd, P. (2003). *The Role of Regulated Learning in Contextual Teaching: Principals and Practices for Teacher Preparation.*Unpublished manuscript.

Patrick, H., & Middleton, M. J. (2002). Turning the Kaleidoscope: What we see when self-regulated learning is viewed with a qualitative lens. *Educational Psychologist, 37*(1), 27-39.

Perry, N. (2002). Introduction: Using Qualitative Methods to Enrich Understandings of Self-Regulated Learning. *Educational Psychologist, 37*(1), 1-3.

Perry, N. (2004). Using Self-Regulated Learning to Accommodate Differences amongst Students in Classrooms. *Exceptionality Education Canada, 14*(2&3), 64-87.

Perry, N., & Drummond, L. (2002). Helping young students become self-regulated researchers and writers. *The Reading Teacher, 56*(3), 298-310.

Perry, N., VandeKamp, K. O., Mercer, L. K., & Nordby, C. J. (2002). Investigating

Teacher-Student Interactions that Foster Self-Regulated Learning. *Educational Psychologist, 37*(1), 5-15.

Piaget, J., & Inhelder, B. (2000). *The Psychology of the child*. New York: Basic Books.

Pintrich, P. (2000). The role of goal orientation in self-regulated learning. In M. Boekaerts, Paul Pintrich & M. Zeidner (eds.), *Handbook of Self-Regulation*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Popkewitz, T. S. (1998). *Struggling for the Soul: The Politics of Schooling and the Construction of the Teacher*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Pressley, M. & Ghatala, E.S. (1990). Self-Regulated Learning: Monitoring Learning *Educational Psychologist*, 25, 1, 19-33.

Rohrkemper, M. M. (1989). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: A Vygotskian view. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.) *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theory, research and practice*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Rose, N. (1990). *Governing the Soul: Shaping of the Private Self.* Routledge: London.

Rose, N. (1998). *Inventing Our Selves: Psychology, Power and Personhood.* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Santangelo, T., Harris, K.R., & Graham. S. (2008). Using Self-Regulated Strategy Development to Support Students Who Have "Trubol Giting Thangs Into Werds." *Remedial and Special Education*, Vol. 29, No. 2, 78-89

Schunk, D. H. (2005). Self-Regulated learning: The educational legacy of Paul R. Pintrich. *Educational Psychologist, 40*(2), 85-94.

Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (1997). Social Origins of Self-Regulated Learning. *Educational Psychologist, 32*(2), 195-208.

Schunk, D. & Zimmerman, B.J. (2003). Self-Regulation and learning. In Irving B. Weiner, Donald K. Freedheim, John A. Schinka, Wayne F. Velicer's (eds.), *Handbook of Psychology*. John Wiley and Sons.

Shah, J. Y. & Kruglanski, A.W. (2000). Aspects of goal networks: implications for self-regulated learning. In Monique Boekaerts, Paul R. Pintrich, and Moshe Zeidner's (eds.), *Handbook of Self-Regulation*. Academic Press: San Diego.

Skinner, B. F. (1971). *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Stecker, N (1998). Overview and Update of Central Auditory Processing Disorders. In

Gay Masters, Nancy Stecker and Jack Katz' (eds.) Central Auditory Processing Disorders: Mostly Management. Allyn and Bacon: Boston.

van Den Hurk, M. (2006). The Relation between Self-Regulated Strategies and Individual Study Time, Prepared Participation and Achievement in a Problem-Based Curriculum. *Active Learning in Higher Education: The Journal of the Institute for Learning and Teaching, 7*(2), 155-169.

Vermunt, J. D., & Verloop, N. (1999). Congruence between learning and teaching. *Learning and Instruction, 9.*

Vohs, K. D. and Baumeister, R.F. (2004). Understanding Self-Regulation: An Introduction. In Roy F. Baumeister, Kathleen D. Vohs (eds.), *Handbook of Self-Regulation: Research, Theory and Applications.* The Guilford Press: New York.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes.* Micheal Cole, Vera John-Steiner, Sylvia Scribner and Ellen Souberman (eds.). Harvard University Press: Massachusetts.

Wegner, D. & Erber, R. (1993). Social Foundations of Mental Control. In D. Wegner & J. W. Pennebaker's (eds.) Handbook of Mental Control. Prentice Hall; New Jersey.

Wegner D M, Wheatley T. (1999). Apparent mental causation: Sources of the experience of will. *American Psychologist,* 54: 480–92.

Whipp, J. L., & Chiarelli, S. (2004). Self-Regulation in a Web-Based Course: A Case Study. *Educational Technology Research & Development, 52*(4), 5-22.

Wigfield , A. and Eccles , J. S. (2000). Expectancy-Value Theory of Achievement Motivation Contemporary Educational Psychology 25, 68-81.

Winne, P. H. (2005). A perspective on state-of-the-art research on self-regulated learning. *Instructional Science, 33,* 559-565.

Wong, D. (2007). Beyond Control and Rationality: Dewey, Aesthetics, Motivation and Educative Experience. *Teachers College Record, 109*(1).

Yowell, C.M. & Smylie, M.A. (1999). Self-Regulation in Democratic Communities. *Elementary School Journal,* v99 n5 p469-90 May 1999

Zimmerman, B. J. (1989). A Social Cognitive View of Self-Regulated Academic Learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 81*(3), 329-339.

Zimmerman, B. J. (1998). Developing Self-fulfilling Cycles of Academic Regulation: An Analysis of Exemplary Instructional Models. In D. Schunk & B. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Self-Regulated Learning: From Teaching to Self-Reflective Practice.* New

York: The Guilford Press.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attaining Self-Regulation: A Social Cognitive Perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P. Pintrich & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-Regulation*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a Self-Regulated Learner: An Overview. *Theory into Practice, 41*(2), 64-70.

Zimmerman, B. J., Bonner, S., & Kovach, R. (1996). *Developing Self-Regulated Learners: Beyond Achievement to Self-Efficacy*. Washington: American Psychological Association.

Zimmerman, B. J., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1986). Development of a structured interview for assessing student use of self-regulated learning strategies. *American Educational Research Journal, 23*(4), 614-628.