This is to certify that the
dissertation entitled

CRITICAL INVESTIGATIONS INTO INTERNS' URBAN
TEACHING APPRENTICESHIP EXPERIENCES

presented by

JOHN LOCKHART

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Doctoral degree in Curriculum, Teaching, and Educational Policy

Major Professor's Signature

27 August 2009

Date

CRITICAL INVESTIGATIONS INTO INTERNS' URBAN TEACHING APPRENTICESHIP EXPERIENCES

VOLUME I

By

John Lockhart

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Curriculum, Teaching, and Educational Policy

2009

ABSTRACT

CRITICAL INVESTIGATIONS INTO INTERNS' URBAN TEACHING APPRENTICESHIP EXPERIENCES

By

John Lockhart

A critical task for public school teachers is to build and maintain productive relationships with their students, especially to facilitate learning. That task is particularly important in preparing new teachers for urban schools because cultural differences between the majority of urban teachers and their students can complicate and impair those relationships. Multicultural education literature often describes and analyzes preservice teachers—typically white, middle class, not urban, and often female—who are entering urban environments as being resistant to learning about race and class. That research has usually been conducted on preservice teachers in their coursework, often in the lone required diversity course, and apart from practice work in the schools.

This study is guided by the theory that in situations, people rely upon the habits of thought, feeling, attitude, and action they've developed through interaction with others, and that people experience a strong continuity in the use of those habits during life. Though these habits may help one to negotiate situations, they may also be a hindrance, especially in situations significantly different from familiar ones. I studied three interns from white, middle class, suburban and rural backgrounds who were placed in urban high schools with many nonwhite students from working class backgrounds, to examine this central question: How did the three interns use the habits they formed as honors students in mainly white, monolingual, middle-class, rural or suburban schools and communities

with their characteristics, to forge conceptions and practices for teaching students in urban high schools and communities with characteristics that differ appreciably?

I conducted this study in the interns' placements using classroom observations, follow-up interviews, and data from university coursework to analyze the meaning of the intern's experiences for them. I highlight how interns' habitual views of race and class were consistent with descriptions in the literature and impacted their practices. However, I also analyze an important dimension not often considered: how interns' habits of being good students hindered their abilities to connect with their students, who generally did not have the same positive attitude toward schools as the interns. I then present a case study of each intern to analyze their teaching practices, which mostly involved lecture, worksheets, and recitation. In doing so, I demonstrate how resistance was operating, but also show a variety of factors that complicated interns' efforts to develop competence as teachers, including their efforts to form relationships with their students. I explore how the interns made sense of their situations in ways that negated issues of race and class.

Because the interns' struggles to learn how to teach included, but exceeded, the scope of the resistance argument, I argue for a reconceptualization of resistance that recognizes it as an expected reaction when a piece of an intern's valued identity is under assault by experiences for which habits are largely unequipped to deal. I argue that such a conceptualization can help teacher educators to work with interns more effectively as learners in very unfamiliar and uncomfortable territory. I discuss some possible directions for teaching and research for teacher educators who undertake the charge of preparing future teachers to work with students from different backgrounds.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people played roles, large and small, to make this study possible. I am grateful to Shih-pei Chang, who's curiosity combined with strange circumstances brought her into my course and led her to convince me of the worth of undertaking this project. My academic advisor, Dorothea Anagnostopoulos, spent much time with me over the six long years of my program to teach me, assist me with writing, and conceptualize the research process. This document would look nothing like it does without the nearly heroic efforts of Tom Bird, my dissertation director, who was the faculty course advisor for *Professional Teaching*, shared much about teaching and learning, and painstakingly read many drafts of this work. Thanks for putting up with that task.

There were several key faculty members that made this project possible, including the other two members of my committee, Andy Anderson and Lynn Fendler, who worked with me over the years and shared many insightful comments. Other people at the university who played important roles in this project include Jay Featherstone, Trudy Sykes, Ernest Morrell, Anne Haas Dyson, and Sonya Gunnings-Moton. I'm especially indebted to the latter for providing the opportunity I needed to fund the end of my program and to work with an emerging model of preparing urban teachers.

In addition, I am also thankful to have been a recipient of the Marianne Amarel Fellowship, which provided generous support during the data collection phase. Working on this project proved exhausting, and I'm thankful for the rest and support offered by the University of Rincon to get things together to proceed on the data analysis.

I also wish to acknowledge my friends and colleagues who have provided important insight into and support for my project including Curtis Lewis, Gina Garner, Sandra Schmidt, Greta McHaney-Trice, Mariah Hyde, Anyta Wilson, and Kenny Murdock.

Of course I am extremely grateful to my participants Amanda, Amy, and Bill, as well as to Sandra, whose story I did not use, for letting me glimpse a challenging piece of their lives with them. I am much richer for the experience and hope their stories may help others to become better teachers.

Finally, I'd like to thank my family for their emotional support in pursuing my goals; who would have thought someone from our family would get a doctorate? And thank you to Sarah, for putting up with so much during our time together on our common path. May life bring great reward.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE
THEORY

A Teacher Educator's Problem

At Midwestern University (MU), student teachers, locally called interns, complete a two-semester internship as the final requirement to earn their teaching certificate. During this time, interns took a course I taught called *Professional Teaching*. While MU certifies hundreds of interns every year, I taught the only section of *Professional Teaching* exclusively for interns in urban high schools, in which I made the urban dimension central to the course. Consequently, interns considered more than the standard *Professional Teaching* topics: classroom management, relationships with people in schools, and the responsibilities of a teacher. I also required them to consider the social dynamics of race and class in their placements, the effects of their schooling pasts on their present teaching, and their assumption of authority positions within institutions with more purposes than only providing education. I taught this MU course for two years.

The course met on twenty Fridays spread over 32 weeks throughout the school year. During my first year teaching the course, a pivotal incident occurred in late January, during a time when the course met seven times within ten weeks. I designed this middle section of the course to focus on social and cultural issues related to teaching in urban high schools. As such, we studied some tenets of multicultural education, viewed the

documentary *Beyond Brown*, considered definitions of pedagogy about students poorly served by mainstream educational institutions, read historical pieces on black education, heard a rap song with a particular view of schooling, and talked about the significance of race and class to teachers' work in urban schools. I presented some of these ideas directly to interns, but much of the class time was spent in class discussion. During the pivotal discussion, I asked interns to focus on students' races and how race might impact learning in interns' classrooms, telling them, "and one of the things that I'd like you to think about for a moment is what do you notice about behavior patterns with the different groups at your school." After a few minutes to talk with a neighbor, we started the class discussion.

The discussion began with students describing some of the outcast groups within their schools, including Asians, nerdy whites, English language learners, and homosexuals. Over the approximately 40 minute discussion, students continued to build on and extend the ideas of their peers. But Wilona, a black female intern, was disturbed by the other black female's statement about the urban students: "everyone's black" with the exception of the outcast groups. Wilona's objection led to a conversation in which interns sorted out what this statement meant. Wilona believed that to say "everyone's black" was an injustice, because some people, particularly white students, could choose to act in what might be called "black ways," but also had the distinction of not actually being black and thus able to act in other ways. In this segment of the discussion the interns came to differentiate race as an attribute of a person's body from the cultural ways in which a person acts.

This distinction between race and culture prompted Robert, a white male, to share an incident that occurred in his class where a low-income white male behaved in a way that might be called culturally black, behavior unusual for the student, according to Robert. Robert told the class that he confronted the student, saying, "And I kind of like, you know, call him up like, 'Jim, it's like, you're white, dude. Just settle down,' you know, 'just relax.' 'Cuz he just was being stupid. And he sounds so stupid." Wilona and Tara, a white female, then confronted Robert about his statement, telling him that apart from his intention, his statement implied that acting black was akin to acting stupid. An argument ensued in which Wilona and Tara attempted to tell Robert how his statement could be interpreted while Robert attempted to defend himself from criticism. A couple of other students spoke during this time. I felt that Robert was not listening to any of the constructive criticism and cut the discussion short.

For what seemed like the hundredth time, I left class thinking that white interns just don't get it, must not want to get it; they seemed *resistant* to learning about the importance of race, social inequality, and class issues, in relation to their placements and the course. My view largely matched that which had been expressed in a number of articles I had read within the teacher education field, which described the dominant population studying to become teachers—white, middle class, largely female, and from the suburbs—as *resistant* to engaging in topics such as race, diversity, discrimination and inequity, and urban environments. I felt as though my efforts were wasted, as these white interns were going to return to teach students on Monday with the same attitudes and habits I saw in class.

Thankfully, two colleagues helped me to think through the significance of the event, and in the process, shape this dissertation study. Through their advice and support I developed a research study of that one discussion in which I considered the conflict between Wilona, Tara, and Robert, how interns defined the meaning of certain terms, the meaning of the conflict, and my own role in facilitating discussions. In that study, I began to reflect on the visits that I made to the interns' classrooms earlier in the year, as well as the papers they'd written that I'd reviewed. This reflection, coupled with conversations with colleagues, led me to examine my conceptualization of the problem.

I initiated visits to my interns' classrooms that year because I was intensely curious about their placements, particularly who the students and teachers were, the types of behaviors that occurred, the feeling of the different interns' environments, and to get some sense of what each intern was like as a teacher. I was also interested in helping the interns better link their placements to the course content, or perhaps more appropriately, tinkering with the course so that interns could more freely discuss and analyze their experiences in an academic space. As this occurred over the year, I began to see that the resistance argument certainly had its merits, but seemed limited in assisting with the difficulties the interns experienced as they learned to teach, especially given most of their previous schooling experiences. And believing that most interns have clearly defined notions of what it means to teach before even setting foot in the classroom as teacher, I also came to realize the difficulty of my job in helping interns to better analyze their situations so they could become more effective, efficient, knowledgeable, and just teachers.

One October day during my second year, I asked interns to engage with some ideas from a short excerpt they had just read from Britzman's (2003) *Practice makes practice.* I divided the class into five groups and gave each group a different topic to think about. I asked my students Isabel (who had attended Stratford High School, featured in this study, as a teenager) and Laura to think about how their "cultural biographies" and their experiences as school students with a focus on social class and race, affected how they thought about their current students and teaching practices. After five minutes, they approached me and said they thought their experiences of being tracked in high school exerted a greater effect on the present. While quick to acknowledge the importance of race and class, they argued that being tracked into honors classes, which meant having the best teachers, a rigorous college preparatory curriculum, and being subjected to high standards, was more important because now they were teaching regular classes in schools generally considered to be of lower academic quality than those they attended. Laura and Isabel shared that by being in honors classes they not only received more of the school's educational resources, but they also internalized a sense of superiority and as a consequence, saw regular-tracked students as having lower academic ability.

Isabel and Laura's comments helped me to further articulate the direction of this current research project, which is focused on interns' experiences as they learn how to teach in their urban placements. At MU, the majority of teaching interns fit the descriptions of typical teacher candidates. The small group of interns placed in urban school districts with significant poor, working class, and nonwhite populations found such schools to be largely unfamiliar and challenging environments. These interns learned how to teach in complex institutions with established practices of how to deal

with students of many types, surrounded by voices of school and university personnel with particular views of teaching. As they learned to teach, interns' pasts operated in the present to make sense of their world, in education and otherwise. As a good student who had quickly figured out the game of school, I was struck by the importance of Laura and Isabel's insight, for it implied that we were socialized to view school and ourselves in a way quite different from many of the students we taught.

My experiences and discussions with the interns, visits to their placements, and interest in trying to understand their predicaments grew into this dissertation study. I sought to find out more about how they thought of themselves as emerging teachers, how they thought about their students, how they related to their students, and how they constructed their experiences. In this ethnographic study, I observed the interns teach and conducted interviews about their teaching, thinking, and histories. I studied the meaning interns make of their situations and how their previous life experiences influenced them.

I begin by describing the theoretical perspectives that have focused this study. In the next chapter, I explain how I conducted the study, including how I analyzed the data presented herein. Chapter Three presents a thematic analysis of the ways interns viewed their placements along four dimensions: as novice teachers in urban schools, as predominately middle-class individuals, as white people, and as long-standing good students becoming teachers. In Chapter Three my analysis examines the validity of the resistance argument. The three chapters that follow are case studies of each intern. Within each case, I describe and analyze the intern's dominant teaching practices as well as several key issues with which the intern struggled, to carefully uncover the particular ways each intern understood the central problem of maintaining productive relationships

with students. Finally, I consider the differences and similarities in the interns' cases and consider what this study suggests about the task of preparing new teachers.

Theoretical Perspectives on Teachers in Schools

National Concerns of Preparing Teachers

A good deal of teacher education literature is concerned with what is sometimes called the demographic imperative—that a largely white teaching force teaches an increasingly nonwhite student body. For example, the National Education Association (2002) reported that more than one-third of students in today's public schools are people of color and that by 2025, at least half will be. However, only 13 percent of today's teachers are of color. In a related vein, the US federal government reported that though 54 percent of teachers taught English language learners or culturally diverse students, only 20 percent felt well prepared to meet students' needs (National Center for Education Statistics, 1999). A conflict arises for many teaching interns entering urban schools because most interns' personal schooling biographies, formed in rural and suburban settings that chiefly serve white students, now interact within urban teaching placements markedly different from their prior experiences. They encounter students who differ from them racially, socioeconomically, behaviorally, and in attitude toward school.

In reviewing research on preparing teachers for multicultural schools, Sleeter (2001) describes the main sources of the "cultural gap" between teachers and students as a lack of nonwhite preservice teachers and a lack of white preservice teachers with multicultural knowledge. Most of the research focuses on how to prepare white, middle class females to develop awareness and effectiveness in multicultural teaching. Sleeter characterizes the research findings as showing that white preservice teachers have little background

and knowledge of cultural groups, including their own, hold limited views of multicultural education, have a colorblind view of the world but are ambivalent about teaching African Americans, and lack understanding of discrimination, especially racism. Importantly for this study, Sleeter points out that the majority of research studies examine the attitudes of white students within a multicultural education course; few studies examine preservice teachers outside of their multicultural education coursework or follow them into the classroom.

In a recent article, Leland & Harste (2005) argued that to prepare new teachers to work in urban settings, a holistic program is necessary. They described a two-year program for prospective elementary teachers they offered in Indianapolis that took place entirely within urban elementary schools. As part of that effort, they also engaged the preservice teachers in critical literacy to understand the context in which they worked: understanding systems of meaning and power which differentially position people; examining one's own position within these systems; and developing an orientation toward social justice. The authors reported that though the cohort was fiercely resistant through the second year, 14 of the 29 graduates obtained urban teaching jobs, even though some were offered employment in schools much like those they had attended. Though they reported limited success in getting their students to question their societal positions and their roles in contributing to systematic inequality, Leland & Harste argued their program impacted many of the preservice teachers' efficacy as potentially successful urban educators.

Leland & Harste's (2005) experience suggests that engaging interns in meaningful urban experiences through which they can begin to understand their placements and how

best to teach in them means that attention must be paid to urban teacher preparation programs. Indeed, as part of the effort to produce culturally responsive teachers, numerous proposals have been put forth to restructure teacher education programs to do just that (Banks, 2002; Nieto, 2001; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). In a study of preservice teachers' expectations before beginning a tutoring experience in Milwaukee elementary schools compared to reports of their actual experiences, Haberman & Post (1992) found that many of their experiences reinforced what preservice teachers already believed. They found that the preservice teachers had gained self-confidence and had come to accept their pupils more, but they also regarded their pupils more negatively. Through this study, Haberman & Post point out that simply placing preservice teachers in urban environments will not in itself lead to positive outcomes: "Confirming invalid perceptions are just as likely an outcome as greater sensitivity and awareness" (1992, p. 31). These and other studies illustrate the degree to which preparing typical teachers for urban schools is a complicated enterprise.

In *19 urban questions,* Kincheloe (2004) argues that urban schools are unique because they are located in areas of high population density and great economic disparity, have higher rates of ethnic, linguistic, immigrant, and religious diversity, are part of a large bureaucracy, and experience high staff turnover. It is certainly true that scholars consider a variety of factors that affect new teachers, particularly typical ones, in urban schools; however, given the importance of race in US society (hooks, 1994; Frankenberg, 1993; Omi & Winant, 1994), race is often the dominant dimension within which multicultural or urban teaching is considered.

The Idea of White Preservice Teacher Resistance

The teacher education literature's general concern of preparing white teachers for diverse classrooms has been enriched by studies of whiteness over the last couple of decades. The majority of these studies focus on preservice teachers' attitudes, dispositions, and learning with regard to diversity issues (Sleeter, 2001). Often, when scholars consider these racial differences, they seem to end up talking about resistance. Among the first was Tatum's (1992) study of white student resistance to learning about race in her psychology of racism course. She suggested three sources of resistance: race is considered taboo for discussion, many people think of the US as a just society, and many students deny the role of prejudice in their lives. About the same time, King (1991) published her study about the dysconscious racism of white teachers who, although being surrounded by talk about diversity, were also anxious about losing their white privileges. In an article titled "Resisting Racial Awareness," Sleeter (1992) reported on teachers' attitudes toward multiculturalism and their resistance to racial awareness through a two-year series of multicultural workshops. She reported that the politically conservative teachers saw multicultural teaching as irrelevant, while most of the politically liberal viewed multiculturalism as helping to facilitate relationships between diverse students or helping minority students to cope with society. A smaller group expressed more complex perspectives.

Lowenstein (2009) examined how much of the literature on preservice teacher learning about multicultural education tends to construct the group as a homogenous, monolithic group that is incapable of learning about diversity. She points out that the demographic imperative argument is often cited as a rationale for multicultural education, and agrees that it is critical to teach about race and racism, and the parts these concepts

play in teaching and learning. In addition, she described how colleges of education generally mirror the teacher workforce, such that a mostly white professorate undertakes the task of preparing a mostly white teaching force for schools with increasingly diverse students, and does so primarily through transmission-oriented teaching techniques. She contends that few studies have portrayed traditional teacher candidates as able to learn about diversity.

Since the early 1990s, more studies on white preservice teachers' resistance have emerged. Some studies have focused on student attitudes toward race and/or multiculturalism, for example, how they see themselves and others in terms of privilege and oppression (Chizhik & Chizhik, 2005). Others examine the discursive modes and techniques used to maintain the dominance of whiteness (Hytten & Warren, 2003; St. Denis & Schick, 2003). Other studies have involved teaching experiments designed to reduce student resistance (Brown, 2004; McFalls & Cobb-Roberts, 2001). In her review article, Sleeter (2001) describes research focused on recruiting and selecting students of color, immersing students in unfamiliar cultural experiences, multicultural education coursework, and restructuring programs. She writes, "The great bulk of the research has examined how to help young white preservice students (mainly women) develop the awareness, insights, and skills for effective teaching in multicultural contexts. Reading the research, one gains a sense of the immense struggle that involves" (p. 101).

Two recent studies illustrate the role of resistance in this line of research. Case & Hemmings (2005) observed and interviewed white female preservice teachers in a required diversity course. They proposed that many of the students used three strategies to distance themselves from the content. Outside of class, many used silence when family

or friends made racist comments, mainly to avoid conflict and prevent disunity, and, in the classroom, to both learn from and not offend black students. Second, they disassociated themselves from racism, usually by explicitly claiming to not be racist. Third, they separated themselves from responsibility, for example, by describing racism as something in the past they didn't create, blaming the victim, or focusing on the effects of reverse racism.

Similarly, another study (Solomon, Portelli, Daniel, & Campbell, 2005) examined preservice teachers' responses to their required reading of McIntosh's (1990) "White privilege: unpacking the invisible knapsack." The authors described three strategies students used to deny the import of race: ideological incongruence that results from learning a story or reality that differs from what one is used to, which runs counter to one's beliefs; relying upon liberalist notions, including meritocracy and individualism, to explain the differential positions in status and achievement; and negating the existence of white capital as a resource. Although both studies offer important insights into strategies preservice teachers use to avoid discussing race and their complicity in racial inequity and privilege, they also tend to reduce the complex range of thoughts and feelings involved in learning about race to the explanatory concept of resistance.

Thompson (2003) argues that in an effort to educate whites to be antiracist, to develop a positive white identity, many progressive whites view themselves as "the good whites," as a benchmark for others to aspire to. When white students don't emerge from university courses as a reformed white person, an ally, it is possible to see them as having failed to assimilate the course themes, which leads to a search for their resistance. It may be that this deficit view partly arises from the desire on the part of course instructors and

researchers to see a change in their students that mirrors their own change as part of their life journey.

Partly in answer to this mounting critique, some researchers have done some work intending to consider these traditional teacher candidates as something more than resistant. For example, Jeanpierre (2007) described how three new science teachers in their 30s and 40s were transitioning from a science-based career into teaching, and how their content knowledge and understanding of science led them to bring high expectations to student learning. In another study, Schultz, Jones-Walker, & Chikkatur (2008) discussed how they attempted to teach candidates in an elementary urban education program a stance of listening at three levels: to students, to the class and its rhythms, and to the community in which students live. Recognizing that the new teachers interpreted events through their perspectives, they attempted to get the students to see teaching as a process of negotiating between their beliefs and histories, between teacher preparation program ideas, and the directives of the school district. Saffold & Longwell-Grice (2008) describe how they applied the concept of heterogeneity to the traditional teacher candidates who went through an elementary teacher preparation program in Milwaukee. In particular, they wrote (p. 205):

> When we listen to the struggles of the three women, we are better able to understand and respond to the heterogeneity that exists among their stories. Each participant came to the program with expectations and beliefs. Their background knowledge and beliefs influenced how they came to understand their experiences in the preparation program.

Although these three studies strove to focus on the differences between these future teachers from traditional backgrounds, they also made use of concepts like colorblindness, similar to those of the resistance argument.

If we accept that resistance is present, then we might ask what the purpose of resistance is, and why does it exist? More specifically, what does resistance do for the person who manifests it and what does resistance do for researchers as an analytic category? In an article in which she argues for a psychoanalytic approach to resistance, Ringrose (2007) begins to probe this idea of resistance. She shares an incident from a third-year women's studies course in which a black woman confronted a white woman's statement about a black author's anger in an article they read. Following Britzman (1998), Ringrose's central concern is to reposition resistance and conflict as vital to learning; it is normal that many people do not readily accept and engage difficult knowledge such as racism, and they will resist experiences that clash with their cherished beliefs. In contrast, much of the education literature focuses on dysconscious racism, the invisibility of whiteness, and how students deny and resist their own whiteness and the implication of their privilege, constructing the students as virtually unteachable. While I have certainly experienced moments of resistance in working with such teacher candidates and can construct an account of their experiences in urban schools along the lines of the resistance argument, I have also come to think the matter of these interns learning to teach in urban schools is more complicated than that.

A Theoretical Framework for the Interns' Experiences

To consider the ways in which the intern experience of learning to teach is more complicated than just being about resistance, while capturing those aspects too, I draw primarily on John Dewey's writing in *Experience & Education* (1997/1938) to elaborate a theory of experience that takes into account the immediate interactions within the teaching situation, and the role of reflection as interns discussed their experiences in

those interactions. My starting point is that the interns are racially different from the majority of their students. But instead of searching for their resistance (which does not mean I do not consider it), I look to understand the complex situations in which interns find themselves, the actions they undertake in their classrooms, and how they position themselves and share their identities as they become teachers in urban high schools.

Experience

In order to study the intern as a participant in complex situations, I theorize the concept of experience, considering the indispensable role of practices and habits, as informed by the contexts in which interns were raised. Experience occurs in the present; it is life living and living life. People live their lives every second, yet most of life is not consciously thought about; most of life is largely lived through. By this I mean that one can perform actions and say things, especially in familiar situations, because one has developed senses for handling situations that help to determine a reasonable response. The majority of the lived-through interactions are by definition, forgettable. But there is always the chance that something will stick out about an interaction, something that will cause us to think more about a particular something, to talk with ourselves and maybe with other people, to construct an experience. Dewey writes: "Every experience is a moving force. Its value can be judged only on the ground of what it moves toward and into" (1997/1938, p. 38). Experiences occur within particular situations, settings consisting of other people, other living beings, inanimate objects, and the environment in which people act, in short, the world that consists of all entities outside of the actor's body. It is in particular interactions within situations that a person can have experiences.

For Dewey, experience depends not just on the interaction, but also on "the principle of continuity of experience," which "means that every experience both takes up

something from those which have gone before and modifies in some way the quality of those which come after" (p. 35). The concept of continuity focuses on the actor, whose body participates in interactions and has experiences. The actor has had experiences in the past, which affect current and future experiences and can modify the meaning, importance, and even descriptions of past experiences. Experience is not just about the meaning of a present experience, but also about building the habits of mind to continuously make meaning. "We always live at the time we live and not at some other time, and only by extracting at each present time the full meaning of each present experience are we prepared for doing the same thing in the future" (p. 49). Whether or not the actor extracts the full meaning of the present experience, the actor possesses habits of thought, feeling, action, and interaction to at least live through the present, the actor's continuity. For Dewey, habit is more than fixed ways of doing things; it includes the formation of emotional and intellectual attitudes as well as "basic sensitivities and ways of meeting and responding to all the conditions which we meet in living" (p. 35). Every actor brings a history and continuity to interactions, which take place in a definable situation with the world. In coming together into the present situation, all will move into the future along fuzzy and unknown, though possibly predictable, paths.

Collective Identities

Dewey's theory of experience focuses on how individuals make sense of particular interactions in light of their prior interactions. Although Dewey often wrote about the importance of context on an individual's life, his elaboration of a theory of experience is one largely focused on individual learning. Dewey's idea of an individual with continuity, acting in a present situation with the world in accord with their habits, that affirms or may alter the present trajectory is at the center of my analytical apparatus.

I will use the notion of collective identity (Appiah 1996) to provide more specificity to the context in which one's continuity is developed. In considering race's role in our lives, Appiah (1996) argues that an individual has two dimensions of identity: personal and collective. The personal includes characteristics we think of as unique to individuals such as humor, courage, rudeness, compassion, etc. The collective dimension includes identities that are socially and politically salient in our society, chiefly related to power and opportunity, including gender, class, sexuality, and race. Appiah considers two actions that make racial identity possible. On one side are racial ascriptions, in which someone expects behaviors, thoughts, and attitudes from another based upon the racial group label they apply. On the other side are racial identifications, whereby a person who can potentially fit within the label may identify with group norms through speech, action, etc. Of course, ascriptions never capture the essence of a particular group, since any person identifying with a particular group doesn't necessarily live in accordance with others' ascriptions, whether they be stereotypes, sociological descriptions, or members' own expectations.

A person's continuity is influenced by others and shaped by the adoption of particular stories one tells and uses to describe and understand oneself. Appiah notes, "collective identities, in short, provide what we might call scripts: narratives that people can use in shaping their life plans and in telling their life stories" (p. 97). Appiah writes: "An African-American after the Black Power movement takes the old script of self-hatred, the script in which he or she is a nigger, and works, in community with others, to construct a series of positive black life scripts" (p. 98). This rescripting takes place in society, wherein others use racial ascriptions, expecting someone to act a particular way.

In US society, the script just quoted would be considered race cognizant, that is, it views racial difference as involving "autonomy of culture, values, aesthetic standards" (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 14), and emphasizes the ways that inequality and racism are inscribed in social institutions. This is in contrast with the dominant scripts of colorblindness, the dominant form of racialized talk used by whites in the US (Frankenberg, 1993; Pollock, 2004). Colorblind people think of race talk as potentially bad because they state beliefs in the inherent equality of all people, but usually believe people should assimilate to dominant cultural norms and practices. Thus, this mode of talk avoids naming differences while extolling universal, humanistic virtues that all people, regardless of cultural background, should engage and believe in.

Appiah again: "we expect people of a certain race to behave a certain way not simply because they are conforming to the script for that identity, performing that role, but because they have certain antecedent properties that are consequences of the label's properly applying to them" (p. 79). I believe these "antecedent properties" refer both to an individual's prior experiences and larger societal discourses, uttered repeatedly over generations, building the continuity that leads one to form and reform habits of thought, feeling, action, and interaction. Appiah's ideas point to the importance of interpersonal interactions, processes through which race is enacted, in short, how race is performed.

John Warren (2001) adapted Judith Butler's work to develop a notion of the racial performative, which focuses on the body as the site of racial processes:

> If we look at race as a stylized repetition of acts where the gestures, movements, and other kinds of communication constitute meaning, then race as an identifier of difference is not *in* the body but rather made *through* bodily acts. This is to say, the repeated performance of race creates an illusion of substance that appears to be bodily. (p. 461)

In *Bodies that Matter*, Butler (1993) argues that the body is not a starting point whose existence leads it on a natural, pre-determined racial path, but rather that the body is "the effect of a discourse of power that has regulated, shaped, and made the materiality of our bodies" (Warren, 2001, p. 462). Specifically, he works with Butler's text to offer five key stakes in viewing bodies performatively, as processes, rather than as natural givens:

> 1. A body's appearance and significance is inherently tied to the effects of power dynamics, a manifestation of social rules and consequences that dictate acceptable racial behavior. Warren writes, "pigment is a product of a stylized repetition of acts" (p. 462).
>
> 2. People have limited power to create in themselves what they name, because they are born into systems and discourses that affect how they see their continuity (subjectivity for Warren and Butler), which strongly influence desires, actions, talk, etc. they undertake.
>
> 3. A body does not, as a biological given, possess race simply by virtue of its pigment, but instead, becomes raced by learning cultural norms that reinforce ways of properly acting as belonging to a particular race.
>
> 4. Racial identification is not imposed upon an untarnished, preexisting self. Rather, one's racial identification is formed by the processes one engages in, processes that require one to assume race when interacting with others.
>
> 5. In assuming a race, one comes to identify with it, but a significant part of this process is that one disavows other racial identifications. "Whiteness does not persist in a vacuum but in relation to nonwhiteness. By uncovering the ways "'white" persons either identify or disavow others, one works to uncover some of the mundane ways people produce race." (Warren, 2001, p. 463)

I use these ideas of identity performance in order to illuminate the ways in which the interns enacted their whiteness or middle classness. I use Gilbert's (1998) nine variables in order to conceptualize class, or the ranking of individuals in the US system of stratification. There are two key sets of variables for this study. The first are economic variables and include occupation, income, and wealth. As the interns were college students seeking to obtain employment as teachers, I refer much more often to the

interns' parents' economic indicators. However, the attainment of both a bachelor's degree and state certification is required from the newcomer to obtain work as a teacher; in that sense the interns' credentials are critical to occupational entry. The second set of variables consists of status indicators, including personal prestige, association, and socialization. According to Gilbert (1998, p. 12), "People have high personal prestige when neighbors in general have an attitude of respect toward them. Another word that is used for this attitude is deference, or the granting of social honor." Although Gilbert discusses that most US citizens conceptualize a class hierarchy, when they do so, their reasons for placing any given person or representative in a particular position are varied. In his ethnography of poor whites, Moss (2003, p. 15) wrote, "I realized people defined class difference in a variety of ways: based on money, education, race, gender, material possessions, nationality, politics, even eating habits." He offers descriptions and analysis that suggests that one's social class is performative, and intimately tied with race.

Accordingly, I use Warren's notions of the racial performative, built on Butler's (1993) notions of the gender performative to conceptualize the ways in which an actor's collective identities are manifested in interaction, for two identities considered important for teachers new to the urban high school: race and class. I also examine a third collective identity, that of "good student" that seemed to also strongly impact interns' views of their work.

Cultural Production Through Common Practices

A critical idea for this theory of experience is the notion of practice, especially because it allows me to operationalize the theory. Many of the practices that people engage in are the result of habits that they have long used to navigate the situations they find themselves in. As the interns learned to teach, they moved from the role of student to

that of teacher, venturing into a new part of the field with its particular culture, relationships, and ways of interaction. Levinson & Holland (1996) argued for interpretive work focused on the processes that are part of "the cultural production of the educated person." They wrote, "Indeed, the very ambiguity of the phrase operates to index the dialectic of structure and agency. For while the educated person is culturally *produced* in definite sites, the educated person also culturally *produces* cultural forms" (p. 14). The idea of cultural production emerged from and in response to social reproduction theory, which imagined state apparatuses, like schools, as producing particular types of people based upon their experiences within the apparatus. Cultural production recognizes that people come to understand themselves and others and construct knowledge through the regular practices in which they engage (Levinson & Holland, 1996).

Thus, one learns to teach in the day-to-day situation of teaching. It is in practicing that one becomes a member of the field of teaching. Miller & Goodnow offer that "practices are actions that are repeated, shared with others in a social group, and invested with normative expectations and with meaning or significances that go beyond the immediate goals of the action" (1995, p. 7). Although they wrote this article in the context of child development, the ideas are applicable to people developing in any field, particularly when they are new to it. The five propositions Miller & Goodnow offer each have repercussions on this research project:

> 1. "Practices provide a way of describing development-in-context, without separating [person] and context and without separating development into a variety of separate domains." (p. 8)
>
> 2. "Practices reflect or instantiate a social and moral order." (p. 9)
>
> 3. "Practices provide the route by which [people] come to participate in a culture, allowing the culture to be 'reproduced' or 'transformed.'" (p. 10)

4. "Practices do not exist in isolation." (p. 12)

5. "The nature of participation has consequences." (p. 13)

Miller & Goodnow's propositions provide ways to probe the meaning of practices for the participant. As participants describe particular practices, their talk may reference any or all of the five propositions. Using these ideas, I can relate interns' teaching practices to their narrated histories, identities, beliefs, learnings, etc. In essence, I am searching for continuities and discontinuities between the interns' formed habits of being a student and the emerging habits of being a teacher as they learn to participate in school practices.

Experiences in Learning to Teach

The problem of learning to teach is directly tied with one's habits developed as a school student: What kind of teaching have I seen before? What are my views of school and how successful have I been within that institution? What kind of teacher am I now and what do I want to become? How do societal discourses impact my views of teaching? Many teachers teach the same way they were taught and enter environments with which they are familiar, that feel right to them, although some adopt some "reforms" and develop a "hybridized" practice (Cuban, 1993; Cohen 1985). Early in her career, a teacher may have many conflicting images of what it means to teach, the images predominately formed by watching teachers while she was a student, but also through participation in educational practices. The images provide both an ideal for how one might teach as well as observed tactics one might use, or fall back on.

Iannoccone (1963) published a study long ago of the changes in perspectives among a group of 25 females during their student teaching phase. Based on daily diaries they were required to keep, he described how the student teachers moved from positions of

criticism, questioning, and sometimes indignation of the mentor teacher's practices, to using those very practices and justifying their use. Iannoccone suggests that the 24 of 25 who fit this pattern used the methods because "When the student teachers follow the co-operating teacher's advice, they find, as Donna says, 'It works.' It gets them and their classes through the lesson" (Iannoccone, 1963, p. 78).

In a review of research on teaching and learning in teacher education, Wideen, Mayer-Smith, & Moon (1998) reported the majority of studies agree with Iannoccone's finding; new teachers tend to teach largely as they were taught. Much research on teacher education has found limited effects on changing preservice teacher attitudes and developing within them new pedagogies and techniques of teaching. However, the authors report that the majority of studies are short-term examinations or interventions. They found that long-term and systematic interventions were more successful with preservice teachers. One thing that Wideen, Mayer-Smith, & Moon make clear is that changing someone's views of the world is a difficult task, and that many researchers who "claimed positive results were rather silent when it came to presenting evidence of change in beliefs" (p. 152). This is likely because measuring the ways that someone has changed their beliefs is difficult, particularly because, short of enlightenment, a person does not generally exchange their old beliefs for new ones because of an experience. Rather, redefining one's beliefs and altering one's practices are ongoing processes that are never completed.

By the time interns are in the process of learning to teach, they have already been socialized to view schools and teaching in particular ways because of their experiences as students in school systems. For example, Lortie (1975) describes the apprenticeship of

observation, wherein almost every citizen has spent over 12,000 hours observing teaching through their compulsory school attendance. Whereas most who would like to be, say, a lawyer have little observation of that practice outside of some media portrayals, most everyone is quite familiar with the work of teachers, through, at the least, being a school student. Lortie notes that teaching does not have a highly developed technical vocabulary, no one has found out how to crystallize the process of teaching and learning for novices, the requirements for entry into teaching are lower than other professions, and there are a number of significant reasons people are drawn to teaching. Lortie offers the hypothesis that "the student's learning about teaching, gained from a limited vantage point and relying heavily on imagination, is not like that of an apprentice and does not represent acquisition of the occupation's technical knowledge. It is more a matter of imitation" (1975, p. 63). In addition, Lortie describes how teachers view their craft as highly uncertain, how teachers experience the majority of personal rewards with their students in the classroom, and how teachers view personal style as critical to the enterprise. He found that a teacher's colleagues exerted only minimal influence on a teacher, usually considered negative, leading him to write, "socializing into teaching is largely *self-socialization*; one's personal predispositions are not only relevant but, in fact, stand at the core of becoming a teacher" (1975, p. 79).

Britzman (2003) discusses some ways in which teachers' previous schooling experiences as students influence and shape their views of teaching. Extending some of Lortie's observations, Britzman describes three myths—"a language for describing who they might become and what they should desire" (p. 223)—that affect interns' perceptions of their teaching selves: everything depends on the teacher, the teacher is the

expert, and the teacher is self-made. In the first myth, everything, including student learning, use of curriculum, and social control is held to be possible and expected from the teacher, ignoring the fact that students, humans with their own thoughts and wills, arrive in school having already learned a lot, including ideas that contradict school knowledge. In the second myth, teachers struggle with knowing how to teach content and knowing all of the content that they teach, which ignores that teaching techniques are political choices involving imperfect knowledge that teachers use in social situations. Finally, the myth of the self-made teacher "is a highly individualistic explanation that produces the construct of 'the natural teacher'" (p. 230), legitimizing the belief that teachers learn what they need to through the experience of teaching.

In describing how these myths work to structure the teacher, Britzman offers that the myths constitute and shape "the given," the typical and reproduced practices of teaching, and looks to "the possible," how teachers might transform their schooling biography that shapes how they see teaching. She notes "these dynamics of cultural reproduction are made insidious by its involuntary nature. Student teachers do not set out to collude with authoritarian pedagogy" (p. 236). Her point is that an intern's schooling biography consists of many discourses and associated practices, some of which will be in conflict with interns' beliefs about what is best as a teacher. As in Iannoccone's study, Britzman's student teachers come to adopt practices they initially opposed, but which make sense and work within their classrooms. Interns variously bring habits they learned as students into their new role as teachers, and develop new ones in conjunction with other teachers and school personnel. To counter the largely unconscious acquisition of beliefs and practices, Britzman argues that experience is useful only when reflected upon, which

involves getting teachers to see how their schooling biography impacts their views of teaching and learning. We will use these insights into teacher socialization—in particular that one has a schooling history, has observed and can imitate the work, and has largely unconscious views of teaching and learning—as a starting point to conceptualize the role of interns' histories in their teaching.

Research Questions

This study's theoretical framework consists then, of the following tenets:

1. Through interactions with the world in situations, actors form and reform habits of thought, feeling, action, and interaction. These habits have the property of continuity, meaning the actor's habits tend to persist and are reformed in new situations as the actor makes sense of the situation and undertakes actions within them.
2. As people new to the teaching profession, these actors have formed habits through interactions in schools as students, and have a strong continuity in how they experience and get through school. As new teachers, these habits are the dominant source from which actors develop and execute teaching practices, and evaluate both their own and students' attitudes, academic performance, and behavior.
3. The actors formed their habits in particular schools and families with their distinctive practices and attitudes toward schooling. The interns in this study come from the backgrounds often characterized as typical of the teacher workforce: white, predominantly middle class, and from suburban and rural environments.

4. When actors find themselves in new situations, they use their habits as much as possible to guide them; interns found themselves in urban high schools, with largely nonwhite and lower social class students. Their continuity provided extensive guidance as the urban high schools bore many similarities to the schools of their youths, primarily in structure and operating norms. However, their habits were not a reliable guide for working with the majority of their students, who differed from the types of people the interns were used to.
5. Patterns of actors' habits can be developed through attention to the practices they enact in fulfilling their roles and the ways that they describe their actions and thoughts. Furthermore, the feelings that arise for actors through interactions help illuminate their continuity and the dissonance and dis-ease actors feel in unfamiliar situations.
6. Interactions challenging one's continuity may lead the actor to construct an experience, that is, to analyze the situation with the goal of learning from the interaction and forming different habits of action, thought, feeling, and interaction.

With this theoretical framework, I set out to answer this study's central research question: *How do three interns use the habits they formed as honors students in mainly white, monolingual, middle-class, rural or suburban schools and communities with their characteristics, to forge conceptions and practices for teaching students in urban high schools and communities with characteristics that differ appreciably?*

Four subquestions focused on prominent features of the interns' situations:

Self. How do the interns think about themselves and their histories, in relation to the students whom, and the settings in which, they now attempt to teach?

Students. How do the interns think about the students with whom they work, in relationship both to themselves and to the urban context of that encounter?

Teaching. How do interns conceive of their teaching role and practices in relation to their students and to their images of teaching?

Context. How do interns think about their placement, including students, teachers, administrators, and environment, in relation to their views of teaching and learning?

CHAPTER TWO

METHODS

Sites, Participants, and Data Collection

This study seeks to understand how three white, middle class teacher candidates learn to teach in an urban context through the following research question: How do three interns use the habits they formed as honors students in mainly white, monolingual, middle-class, rural or suburban schools and communities with their characteristic habitus, to forge identities and practices for teaching students in urban high schools and communities with a habitus that differs appreciably? The study draws on my work with interns both in their schools and in my course, through which I collected observations of teaching practice, interviews, and intern writings.

Context and Research Sites

The participants in this research project were intern teachers at Midwestern University (MU) enrolled in a course with me. MU required those seeking K12 teacher certification to complete a year-long internship experience (commonly known as student teaching); interns work in schools from the end of August through the end of April. In the schools, interns work intensively with their mentor teachers and are supervised by field instructors who visit regularly, about every two weeks. In addition, interns are required to take two year-long courses at the university. One of the courses is a subject specific

course that considers how to teach content knowledge. The other course, called *Professional Teaching*, is focused upon the relationships and social contexts in which teachers work. Its concern is with how interns relate to students, the mentor, other teachers and school personnel, and parents, while considering the larger social phenomena that influence schools. This second course served as the university-based research site, and the selected participants came from the section of the course that I taught.

In this study I observed interns in two locations deemed important for learning how to teach: the school placement and the university. My primary focus was on the interns' placements, where I observed interns' teaching practices and then talked with them about their experiences, which ranged from the day's lesson, to particular students, to interns' school experiences and beliefs about what is best for students. Through the school-based inquiry, I examined how interns constructed experience, narrated their teaching identities, and described the interactions and practices in which they engaged. At the university site, I studied how interns made sense of their placements in a course grounded in critical theory, whose primary focus was on developing interns as teachers in urban high schools. Interviews in the schools allowed me to see what concepts from the university course were present in intern conceptions, while talk and work in the university course allowed me to see how interns represented their teaching in an academic setting. My primary focus throughout this project was on the interns in their placements.

Course Participants

Seventeen students originally enrolled in section 19 of *Professional Teaching* in the 2005-2006 school year. Demographically, there were ten white females, one Cuban-

American female, one black female, four white males, and one Native American male. Their teaching subject concentrations differed: one social studies, five English, two art, five science, and four math. Only one student came from an urban area; the rest came from suburban and rural areas. All interns enrolled in section 19 taught in high schools located in either Grand Pillar or Washington school districts (city populations: 120,000 and 36,000, respectively). This study focuses on intern experiences in Grand Pillar, and in Chapter Three I offer a full description of the city and its school district.

The Interns

The selected focal interns had to meet three criteria: to be teaching in Grand Pillar (the focal district); to be teaching in a high school (one intern moved to a middle school and another to elementary school); and to be participating in the part of the research project in which I collected interns' work and recorded *Professional Teaching* class sessions, which required a separate consent form. In the beginning of January 2006, I presented my research project to the interns to solicit interest. After explaining the time demands on their schedule, the fact that they did not have to participate if uninterested, and my research interests, 13 agreed to participate and six met the criteria. I sought four participants in different subject matters so as to provide the potential for differing experiences and interpretations. Although the subject matter is an important mediator of the teacher-student relationship, I chose not to limit participants to one subject, like science, so as to foreground the participants' interactions and representations of their experiences with students in urban schools, rather than as teachers of specific content.

I chose to select two interns each from two schools to get a manageable variety of situations, school contexts, and subject matters. As only one intern from Robeson met the criteria, I chose the other two schools so that I could spend more time there and become

more familiar with them. Both Stratford interns agreed to participate and so I selected them. Amanda taught ninth grade world geography and Bill taught conceptual physics for tenth graders. At Pinnacle, I selected Amy who taught ninth grade biology and Sandra who taught algebra for ninth and tenth graders. The selected interns are not statistical, random samples intended for generalization, although they are describable in ways consistent with the national concern noted above. The value of these focal interns is that as white teachers in multiracial schools, we can get some insight into the broader phenomenon of interest. As I undertook the task of data analysis, I made the decision to reduce the number of interns studied from four to three, and cut Sandra since my preliminary analysis indicated many aspects of her case were quite similar to the other three interns, allowing me to expend more analytic effort on the other three cases. In Chapter Three, I describe the three participants in much greater detail, and in chapters four, five, and six, I present a case study on each intern's teaching practices.

An Ethnography

This is an ethnographic study as I focus primarily upon the meaning that interns made of their experiences as they learned to teach in urban high schools. As such, it falls into what Erickson (1986) described as interpretive work, because it uses "as a basic validity criterion the *immediate and local meanings of actions*, as defined from the actors' point of view" (p. 119). In this study, I focus on three interns learning to teach, immersed in several significant life transitions. In particular, the intern is transitioning from the role of student to that of teacher; still immersed in a field with which they are familiar, education, but taking on a role that seemed familiar prior to beginning. Through their interactions with others in the field, they bring their habits of doing school into contact with the particular culture, relationships, and interactions present in the

placement. Rosaldo (1993) argues that it is in the areas of borderlands, such as an urban Grand Pillar high school classroom of predominately nonwhite and lower social class students taught by a white, middle class intern from outside the city, that the most important cultural studies will occur. This study attempts to do this, though I focused on the intern, mostly looking at the students more as supporting characters.

Britzman argues that a major benefit of creating critical ethnography is that "we can construct new understandings of the formation of the subject if we can extend what is given into a theory of the possible" (2003, p. 222). Ethnography involves participating with people to understand how they make meaning of situations, practices, and talk. Though focused on the intern, this study necessarily involves me as I cannot write a study about their absolute reality without filtering it through my own perspective. Britzman writes, "Writing ethnography ... is about constructing particular versions of truth, questioning how regimes of truth become neutralized as knowledge, and thus pushing the sensibilities of readers in new directions" (2000, p. 38). Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw write, "the goal in fieldwork, then, is to generate theory that grows out of or is directly relevant to activities occurring in the setting under study" (1995, p. 167). They eschew the idea of grounded theory because they contend that at every stage of the ethnographic process, the researcher uses some theory to make some sort of sense of the situations. I recognize that the theories I hold about the world help construct what I observe in it and how I represent it. Furthermore, I balance two aspects of this study. First, I tried to represent as accurately as possible the events I witnessed and the interns' descriptions of those events and their lives. Second, I took the liberty to interpret their situations, tell of my own reactions to intern actions, and conceive of alternatives to what I observed and interns discussed. This

study is thus a combination of the interns' and my own stories, a recounting of the time we spent together in the interns' classrooms.

Data Collection

I observed the four focal interns one time each week, for nine or ten weeks, for an entire period. I allowed the intern to choose the class they wished for me to observe and visited it for all but one of the visits. Near the end, I visited a class the intern suggested was, in some way, an opposite. I visited from January through April during the time known as "Lead Teaching," where interns are completely responsible for four of their mentor teacher's class load for a full ten weeks. During that time interns do not come to MU for six weeks. I collected the following data:

> 1. Field notes from the classroom. I focused upon the intern teacher, looking often at the front of the room but also following her as she moved about the room and interacted with students. I would regularly (about 4-6 times per observation) study the classroom, the encompassing setting in which I focused upon students, sometimes shifting attention throughout the room and other times focusing on particular interactions. I constructed the field notes from memory with the aid of my scratch notes. On average, each visit yielded seven single-spaced pages of field notes.
>
> 2. Intern teaching materials used in class.
>
> 3. Interviews with interns. After each observation session, the intern and I discussed what happened in class, their intentions, and their thoughts on their teaching effectiveness, etc. My questions were both preconceived and informed by what occurred in the observed class session. In addition, I asked questions of interns' schooling and life histories. Interviews were audio recorded and were each a bit over an hour on average.
>
> 4. Monthly research dinners with the four participating interns. I hosted three dinners with the participants to discuss teaching, the research experience, and general life topics. The dinner meetings were audio recorded.

While I collected the bulk of the data myself, my colleague, Shih-pei Chang conducted the first interviews with each of the three interns. I also collected the following data from the university course: audio recording of all large-group course discussions and

presentations; student work; mid-year interviews with all participants. These data were available for consultation as needed.

Complexity in My Roles as Teacher and Researcher

In this study, I am both the course instructor and researcher. These dual roles presented interesting challenges for the research project, but also provided some distinct advantages. The most important challenge was that I observed interns in their placements while at the same time teaching them in a course in which I assigned them grades, which I addressed with them in the consent process. I will add that I never discussed situations I observed in participants' placements with other interns in or outside of class. In addition, in response to a rumor of taking up one intern's time, I reiterated to my participants that they did not have to participate in the project and asked if they wanted to continue. All agreed every time. A substantial advantage of being the instructor was that I observed and worked with the interns in two different contexts, which allowed me to explore the (dis)continuities for interns as they moved between school and university, which I did primarily by bringing up concepts from *Professional Teaching* during interviews.

I am a brown-skinned multiracial male whose ethnicity includes Puerto Rican, English, German, Cherokee, and Creole roots. I am from a working class family of Northern California, whose parents are an interracial couple. While attending high school, I realized that I was not being taught how to critically think and felt that I was not receiving a full education. I also began to understand how tracking operated and how I benefited by being placed in the college preparatory track. Even so, I graduated second in my class, but was not well prepared for college. It took me some time to appreciate the difference between schooling and education, and to resolve my ambivalence toward formal education. In high school I had been a good student, but did not work very hard

and considered most of the work easy and irrelevant. I did it because of my goal to go to college. Although I had little idea about what college was or how to pay for it, I applied and attended, struggling for the first two years. After majoring in physics, I taught freshman physical science and senior-level conceptual physics at a public high school with a high concentration of poverty in Portland. During my time there, I attempted more student-centered teaching practices because I recognized that lecture and worksheets bored the students. Having had few models for student-centered teaching, I developed such practices through experimentation and a four-week teaching workshop. These inquiry-oriented teaching practices provided challenges to me and the students, and put both of us in uncomfortable and unfamiliar positions, that were also intellectually engaging, contributing to academically productive relationships.

When I was hired to teach *Professional Teaching*, I specifically requested to teach this particular section. I attempted to maintain an open relationship with the four interns, rather than simply sitting them down and asking them previously drafted questions. Although I largely determined the interview agendas, with the help of the observations of the interns' practices, interns sometimes asked me questions and sought advice. A couple of times I even engaged interns in strategizing how to handle tough situations they found themselves in. My interactions with interns in particular situations as a result of our chance meeting to accomplish our own purposes is a part of this story; the story is not, then, an absolutely objective account, but an attempt to perceive how other people understood their situations.

Data Analysis

In this section, I describe the procedures that I used to analyze the data to answer the research question: how do three interns use the habits they formed as honors students in mainly white, monolingual, middle-class, rural or suburban schools and communities with their characteristic habitus, to forge identities and practices for teaching students in urban high schools and communities with a habitus that differs appreciably?

In general, I analyzed the data case by case, started with an interpretation of the first case, and revisited and revised my interpretations after each case. For each case I first read transcripts of all of the interviews to get a sense of the data. I composed memos to begin determining codes for the data. I then read the fieldnotes and coded them for the interns' teaching practices before composing additional memos, with the specific intention of continuing to develop codes for the interviews. I then coded the interviews and wrote memos about the trends that I noticed. I proceeded to do multiple readings within codes and began to develop interpretations about the interns' habits. I read through the university-based data to enhance my interpretations as well as to search for alternative explanations. I then drafted the cases and began writing interpretations that I constantly revised. I detail this process below, and under step three, I provide a more in-depth look at the analysis process.

1. Read interviews. The post-observation interviews are my primary data, and I began by reading through the interview data. As I did so, I also did some basic coding, using codes that reflect concepts in the data that I had already noticed. These sorts of codes include the demographic ones such as race, class, gender, sexuality, and I applied them when these concepts appeared in the transcripts. During this round, I also coded for

references to particular people—such as the mentor teacher, students, university personnel—and places— such as the classroom, the school, and the interns' past schools. As I read through the interviews, I stopped periodically to compose short memos about what I noticed. After I finished reading all the data, I began to develop codes focused on the habits I inferred from intern talk and about what sorts of things the habits concerned.

2. Read and code observation fieldnotes. Having familiarized myself with the sorts of things the intern discussed, I then read and coded the fieldnotes for the types of practices the intern used, as well as for other actions that occurred in the classroom. Codes included teacher practices, teacher talk, student actions, student talk, use of materials, etc. I counted the occurrence of these codes to detect patterns in the interns' teaching practices. Using the framework of Miller and Goodnow (1995), after identifying the practices, I considered the interns' practice within the educational field, as well as in the classroom.

Let's consider the example of Bill's teaching practices. Bill taught in a high school, with a mentor teacher who generally lectured to his students with the aid of a PowerPoint slide show and required students to fill in missing words on an accompanying worksheet. I used teacher practice codes like "lecture," "recitation," "lab," etc., to denote the intern's intended practice and then coded within the practice, and coded for materials used. I coded teacher speech patterns (e.g., "content statement," "evaluation," "question"), student speech patterns, and student actions (e.g., "cell phone," "writing," "laugh"). I coded participants in interactions as well. As I became more familiar with the data, I employed more interpretive codes like when students said something to control the pace of class, when they joked around, or when they challenged another.

3. Code interviews. Because habits and practices are intertwined, at this stage I linked the field notes and the interviews, the practices with the habits, and the actions with the explanations. I used the memos from previous stages to continue developing codes for the interviews. Whereas earlier I had coded for people and places, in this stage I coded for specific actions. For example, under the group of student codes, I developed codes for specific actions such as pencil sharpening, walking around the classroom, touching others, doing class work, etc. I also developed codes for particular types of talk: non-content statement, reply to teacher, content question, non-content request, etc.

Having just finished coding the field notes, in this stage I linked an intern's teaching practice to her articulation of the practices, using the same set of codes to describe field note observations and articulations of particular practices. This process made it easier to relate what the intern did in their classroom to how they described it. The purpose of the coding system was to determine the intern's habits as they described them in relaying their history or in their thoughts about particular subjects, and in their teaching practices. To identify habits, I used the generic interpretive principles of recurrence of topics, emphatic descriptions of things, silence about topics, as well as contrasts between situations. For example, Bill often mentioned that he did not like the use of PowerPoint lectures and contrasted them with what he deemed more sound science teaching practice, and so in this round, I coded for his feelings toward the lecture (applying the codes: "teacher-lecture" and "intern-feelings"), his emphasis about his dislike of lecture, particularly when he used the word "hate," what he normally talked about as alternatives (for example: "teacher-demonstration" and "teacher-desired actions"), and sometimes what he was silent about.

I analyzed the data to infer interns' habits of thought, perception, action, interaction, and feeling. As people live their lives, they tend to rely on particular habits to make sense of the world and to get them through life. Habits of thought refer to the substance of what someone thinks about situations that come, the way that a person describes the situation, whereas perceptions involve the interpretations that one makes about the situation, more akin to the lens through which one views things. Habits of action refer to the things that a person does in an attempt to reach a desired end, whereas habits of interaction refer to the ways that a person interacts with the world, both material and human. Finally, habits of feeling refer to the realm of intuition and emotion. These habits are usually about some sort of object. For example, on any day interns have habits of feeling about how well they did in class, their relationships with students, their varied emotional states, on their views of the urban context and their role within it.

Let me explain some of the ways I detected habits in more detail. I coded each specific action in the field notes and statements in the interviews for their content. I also coded by focusing on recurrence, emphasis, contrast, and silence. These tags identify and combine data with similar characteristics, allowing me to identify themes and objects that recur throughout the data, which allowed me to infer a habit. So for example, Bill exhibited habits of thought about student behavior, and frequently identified his student Joseph as a particular behavior problem. In general as he talked about Joseph, Bill also demonstrated habits of feeling, particularly of frustration with this student, who he regarded as intelligent. As Bill discussed Joseph, he often made contrasts with other students, like those he identified as putting effort into school and displaying good behavior. Similarly, Bill frequently made contrasts between himself and his students as

well as his high school and his current placement. Silence is a code I applied when it seemed to me as though an important aspect of an interaction seemed relevant, but the intern did not speak of it. Silence then became, in part, differences between my and the intern's interpretations of a situation. Because of its tentative nature, I carefully identified and described habits as the result of silence by comparing and considering the habits identified through recurrence, emphasis, and contrast. Examples of silence are most clearly seen in discussion of the interns' colorblindness in Chapter Three.

4. Multiple readings by code. Having coded the data, I carefully read within codes, sorting the data by code. Within a code like "student-behavior," I could see who Bill viewed as a behavior problem, what behavior he focused on, what makes ideal student behavior, and what teaching practices might have precipitated that behavior. While behavior can be examined through recurrence, emphasis, and contrast, I also perceived silence in Bill's talk, such as non-comments on the urban situation or about dealing with students who differed from his previous experiences, or because he focused so intently on an individual's behavior, influences, and the like, he did not seem to see himself as a factor in influencing the classroom environment. At this point, I began to rely quite heavily on the coding software's ability to store my interpretations of the data, and I began to draft the cases.

5. Read university-based data. I read and coded the interns' coursework from *Professional Teaching* primarily to check on their interpretations and search for discrepancies. For example, the interns wrote of the need to make their subject matter relevant to students, yet I rarely observed practices that seemed to me to do that. At this stage, I had to keep in mind that since university work is different from the interns'

teaching and interviews, the interns might have written what they thought they should to get an A, rather than write honestly to move them toward improvement as a teacher. This data is secondary to the school-based data.

6. Draft the case. Having coded the data and written extensively about it in memos and within the coding software, I began to develop a draft of each interns' case.

7. Cross-case analysis. While drafting each case, I frequently recorded my thoughts and interpretations for the cross-case analysis. When the individual cases were complete, I examined the differences and similarities between the interns and their situations. That comparison appears partly in Chapter Three, about the interns' initial reactions to their placements, and partly in the final chapter, seven, where I summarize and analyze how the interns negotiated learning to teach in the schools where they were placed, and to imagine what could be done to aid them in that transition.

CHAPTER THREE
NOVICES TO TEACHING AND URBAN SCHOOLS

I observed and interviewed three young interns in the process of a complex transition, from students in small towns or suburbs to new high school teachers in the urban Grand Pillar School District. While nearly all teachers experience great uncertainty as they learn their new roles, past experiences as a school student provide some guidance. However, these three intern teachers experienced additional dimensions of uncertainty because the schooling histories they brought did not provide reliable guides to some of the challenges they faced in unfamiliar urban high schools. In this chapter, I report their descriptions of their home towns and histories as students, describe the urban district and schools where they performed their teaching internship, and report some of their reactions to their placements and students. I consider how four differences impacted the interns' struggles to learn how to teach: the move from their rural or suburban upbringings to the urban high school; the interns being white in majority non-white schools; (3) the interns as middle class individuals working with students from lower social classes; and (4) the effects of the interns' habits of being good students while teaching in schools where they found fewer good students than they expected.

The Interns' Histories and Hometowns

The three interns described and exhibited middle class patterns in their pasts and the present as they were entering the solidly middle class teaching occupation. They grew up in suburban or rural towns, none more than a ninety minute drive from Grand Pillar, where they taught. The schools that the interns knew as students were similar in some ways to the schools where they were placed for their internships, but also were rather different in other important ways. We begin with the interns' accounts of the places where they grew up and their schooling histories.

Amy

Illitch City is a small town of about 3,800 residents located about 35 miles east of Malone, a midsize city that in many respects is similar to Grand Pillar. The majority of the county is rural; one passed through two other towns along the Interstate heading out to Illitch City. When she got to college, Amy's family moved nine miles north of town into Elkridge Township, but her childhood neighborhood in Illitch City was "a really tight subdivision where there were probably about 60 kids in a three-block radius. We were all out playing together."

Amy reported that her father currently worked as a zoning administrator for Elkridge Township and had worked several different jobs during Amy's life including as a police officer, assessor, and salesman. Amy's mother was a first grade teacher in the Illitch City Community Schools, and had been teaching for 13 years by the time Amy began her internship. Amy's mother started her teaching career when Amy was in fifth grade; prior to that she raised her four children full-time before returning to school for her certification. On a survey, Amy estimated that her parents' combined annual income was somewhere between $55 and $75,000 per year, which compared favorably to the US

Census Bureau's reported $55,800 family median income in Elkridge Township, where just over 98% of the residents were white. But there were a substantial number of Latinos in Illitch City, about 19 percent of the population there. About one-quarter of the county's Latinos lived in this small town, where the Latino population had doubled between 1990 and 2000. Amy quickly acknowledged there was a Latino population, which she described as mainly migrant farm laborers, but she stated that most of her interactions had been with white people.

Bill

Bill was born and raised in Bergen, a larger town of about 21,000 people, but a bit off the beaten path, and surrounded by farms and very small towns. Bergen is located about an hour from a major city, a bit closer to a medium-sized city, and closer still to a couple of small cities. Bergen High School had a student population about the same size as Stratford, where Bill was placed to teach, barely qualifying for participation in the athletic league for the state's largest high schools. One of three boys, Bill was the middle child of two teachers who worked in the Bergen School District. Bill's mother was an elementary music teacher, although she had also taught kindergarten at some point, and his father was a secondary school music teacher and the band director. Bill described his family as a musical family. He estimated his family's annual income between $100,000 and $125,000.

In his first interview, Bill stated that he had just recently looked up Bergen's racial statistics, and spoke ambiguously about what he learned about his town:

> I just looked it up, about 65%, 70% white, about 22% right now I think is Hispanic, Latino—I'm not sure what the proper—but there's a large population of, of that in Bergen 'cause, 'cause, I don't know why honestly, I think 'cause there are some, there's factories around and there's, with the rural-ness there is a, migration, some people do come, some come straight, I think some come straight

In

Berger

reason

against

v. Ber

with E

Schwe

Ama

A

Mulle

city c

of Eu

three

spear

and

Dav

to be

impo

Part

ECS

> from Mexico, like, which I mean is a long, it's a long ways. I don't know why they chose Bergen.

In his research, he uncovered a fairly high proportion of Latino students living in Bergen, a group to which he was not quite sure how to refer. Bill then thought about the reasons why Latinos would be in Bergen and cited both factory work as well as agricultural jobs in the area, hypothesizing that some Latinos come straight from Mexico to Bergen to find work. Besides the fact that he never made any mention of interactions with Latinos while in high school, his language from his position six years past high school graduation indicates very little familiarity with this population.

Amanda

Amanda was raised in Eureka, a town of about 8,000 people at the fringe of a major Midwestern city's metropolitan area; her parent's home was around 25 miles from the city center. In fact, Amanda questioned if her town qualified as suburban. Like 96 percent of Eureka's residents, Amanda is white. Amanda's parents enrolled her, as well as her three siblings, at Eureka Christian School (ECS) for preschool and K-12, so Amanda spent 15 years at this one school before coming to MU. ECS was a fairly small school and Amanda's graduating class totaled only 55. Amanda said that there were between two and four black students at the school.

ECS is affiliated with a Baptist church, whose doctrine states belief both in the need to be born again upon accepting Jesus Christ as the true Lord and Savior, as well as the importance of evangelizing. However, Amanda said that the school did not push any particular religious beliefs, mentioning that anyone, including Muslims, could attend. ECS required all students to take a Bible class every year and to attend a weekly church

service. Unfortunately, when I conducted the interviews I neglected to inquire much into Amanda's religious beliefs and their roles in her life, a limitation of the current study.

Amanda was one of the few in her cohort who chose to do the internship in an urban placement, saying that she had been interested in doing some sort of work in the inner city, so interning at an urban school made sense for her. The literature suggests that many new teachers desire to teach in schools similar to the ones they attended, and at Midwestern University, this was also certainly the case. Of 11 *Professional Teaching* sections that instructed approximately 230 interns, only the one section that I taught was offered for interns in urban schools. Within this section, seven of the 17 interns requested an urban placement. Amanda offered the following reasons for why she chose to work in an urban school:

> Because nobody ever wants to try 'em, and I wanted to know why. Not just from hearsay but, I wanted to know if things were as bad as everybody said they were, if they just made it out to be that way or what the deal was pretty much. ... I guess it was because—I've always heard about the kids who come from those schools how they don't have anything and they're never given a chance and they're labeled so quickly and they're pushed in and out of the school system and nobody cares about 'em and nobody gives them a chance. I was like, well I wanna give 'em a chance. ... Even if it was, even if it was just a year working with those kids, it'd give me, I think, so much enlightenment compared to another, another placement. Plus this would be the year that I would get the most support, per se.

Amanda had a variety of motivations for working in an urban high school: to experience what she'd heard so much about, to become enlightened, and to bring what seems to be a missionary's gift of giving the students a chance that others do not. All three of the interns had an image that teaching in urban high schools would be different than what they had experienced before, but only Amanda specifically requested an urban placement. On the internship application, Amy and Bill were both neutral about an urban or suburban placement, although both expressed concern and a bit of surprise at receiving

an urban placement. Table 3.1 summarizes some basic information about the interns' families and the situations in which they were raised.

Middle Class Identifications

All three of the interns described their class origin, or their parents' social class, as middle class, although Amy described her family as having moved into the middle class. In this section, I describe interns' impressions of their parents' financial and occupational statuses, parental involvement, and the social connections the family possessed.

Economic status.

Amanda described her parents as solidly middle class:

> No, just middle class. If there's, if there's lower, middle, and upper in the middle class, we're probably in the middle someplace, so. We're not, we're not poor, but we don't have a lot of money. We're not super wealthy so, but, my parents have chosen to take that, you know, to take the majority of their funds, well I shouldn't say majority because I don't know, but a lot of their funds were towards our educations though. Not, not college, we all have to pay for college but, um, high school and elementary school.

To Amanda, her family is right in the middle of the middle class, although she also shared that more people with money were moving into her town, which seemed to be becoming more of an upper middle class suburb. Indeed as she restated her family's solid middle class roots, exemplified by not having a lot of money but being able to afford

Table 3.1: Intern Family Characteristics

	Amanda	Bill	Amy
Hometown	Eureka	Bergen	Illitch City
Community type	Suburban	Rural town	Rural
Population	9,000	21,600	3,900
Mother's job	Medical technician	Elementary school teacher	Elementary school teacher
Father's job	Postal employee	High school band director	Zoning administrator
Family's annual income (est.) ($)	55-75,000	100-125,000	55-75,000

tuition, Amanda reported that she was aware that some of the students at ECS possessed much more money than her family.

Bill also strongly considered himself to be from the middle class, as evidenced by the implicit comparison between his family and extreme financial comparisons within Bergen:

> ... but pretty middle class for the most part you know there is the, quote, "East side of town," it's a little more run-down in spots but there aren't any like bad parts really, to be truly honest, I mean there's no bad parts, there's just places that are a little more run-down and there's, I mean, there's a couple places where the houses are you know, $200,000 and above, but again there aren't a lot of those either. It's all fairly budgeted middle class you know.

Although Bill didn't state the value of his family's home, we infer that he didn't live in the more run-down East side or in a very expensive home. For him, his home was average, a middle class home in a town that appeared to him to be largely middle class.

In contrast, Amy described a different childhood background than Amanda or Bill, one that began in a lower social class:

> Anyhow, growing up we were very poor. My mom stayed home with us, my dad worked. He worked like three jobs I think to just support us. We were still on food stamps and we would go to the co-op and get food. Then my mom eventually went back to work. She was a teacher. She had done her student teaching and subbed for awhile. She raised us and then, after she went back to work we directly moved up to a more middle class standing by the time I got into high school.

Amy's story of her mother's educational attainment and subsequent job as an elementary school teacher is a testimony to the upward mobility afforded by teaching. The effects of her mother becoming a teacher, greatly improving the family's material situation, provided Amy a vivid demonstration of the benefits of becoming a teacher. And although Amy's family did not have much money early in her life, her mother stayed home and helped develop some of the skills and dispositions critical for school success within her children, all of whom went on to college and middle class occupations.

One expectation of many middle class families is that their children will graduate from college, which was true of these interns and their older siblings. However, the amount of financial support that the interns' parents offered varied. At one end, Bill's parents paid for five years of Bill's undergraduate education, leaving him the responsibility to finance the internship year, his sixth at Midwestern University, through student loans. Bill reported that his parents had paid for his older brother's five years at the same university and planned on paying for his younger brother's college tuition. However, the other interns' parents did not pay college tuition. Although Amanda's parents paid tuition at ECS for 15 years, they left it up to Amanda to finance college, which she did primarily through student loans she estimated to be about $40,000 at the time of the internship. Because of the full-time year-long internship, Amanda reported that a substantial amount of her loan portfolio financed the internship year, during which she hardly worked. Amy's financial situation was somewhat different, reflective of her lower class origins. Amy's parents did not contribute very much money to her college education, and Amy took out loans and worked throughout her college experience. Even during the internship with its school- and university-based requirements and her additional responsibilities coaching volleyball at her placement, Amy worked as an assistant manager at a retail store for about 15 to 20 hours each week.

All three interns reported that they felt an expectation to attend college while at the same time stating that their parents rarely, if ever, harassed them about grades. Rather, they seemed to subconsciously internalize this expectation, that is, they developed within their continuity the expectation of college attendance.

Th

school.

value th

These d

of cohe

their co

which s

sacrific

obtain

academ

interns

academ

long-te

M

Latter

at the

She re

compa

But sh

didn't

There

These three interns possessed cultural practices that helped them to succeed in school. For example, all three said they acted respectfully by deferring to their teachers, a value they saw as consistent between their upbringing and their school experiences. These three interns were also obtaining the credentials that would serve as valued forms of cultural capital: their bachelor's degrees qualified them for certain types of jobs and their completion of the teacher education program earned them a teaching certificate which served as proof of qualification for employment. Thus, completing college and the certification program yielded cultural capital that would allow these three interns to obtain teaching jobs, and allow them access to middle class status. However, the credentials cost money, and each family situation dictated how much financial support interns received from their parents and what each intern would have to pay for the credentials. All three saw the short-term sacrifice of borrowing worth the prospect of long-term, steady, decent-paying employment.

Money was certainly on the interns' minds, and was a constant complaint back in the university classroom. For example, Amanda wanted to buy a Stratford hoodie, but balked at the 30 dollar cost, considering the money she paid to repair her car during the winter. She reported in an interview that one of her favorite things about Stratford's students, compared to her pre-internship placement at Hope, a nearby suburban high school, was that she appreciated their sincerity and saw them as "more down to earth," since they didn't seem to be as prone to hold material wealth over each other. Earlier in the same interview when asked if she believed she had ever offended her students, Amanda said:

> Sometimes I'll joke about how I'm so poor ... and I don't really realize that my kids are actually probably just as poor as I am, like, if you take apart my parents, my—you know, just forget about that whole thing, who I can have supporting me, but me in and of myself. Sometimes I'll say, "yes I'm very poor right now," and I

> don't realize that my kids are just as poor if not poorer than me. So in that sense I know I offend somebody sometimes.

Amanda's comment possesses several features that indicate her roots and expected continuation in the middle class: a recognition that she did not currently have access to the same material resources as when she lived with her parents; an implication that her parents would be able and perhaps willing to support her if necessary; through the use of the term "joke," an indication that she views her current financial situation as temporary; and a clear class differentiation between her and her students. Although they did not make statements as empathetic as Amanda, both Amy and Bill recognized and described similar class differences between themselves and their students, and their expectation to remain within the middle class.

Parental support.

When asked to describe the cultural differences between him and his students, Bill began by identifying racial differences and quickly turned to his upbringing by his still-married parents, which he stated as differing from the situation some of his students were in:

> Cultural differences, well, other than general, obvious features, I'm white and sixty some percent of Stratford is black, yeah—there were—in my—the thing is too, is, it's hard to tell who's like—my parents, you know, been married for thirty plus years you know, their, it was a good house, I mean, I have great parents you know, which probably from, some of these kids is a big difference, you know, but the simple home life, and my parents, they happen to both be teachers but they both instilled the whole, the respect thing and responsibility, and, you know, and enforced it, and when I went to school I just knew that I, that's the way I had to be and then the school enforced that. So it just does, that's how I was then, I know some of these kids have homes that instill these rules, but I think sometimes they get to school and their groups of friends, you know, power in numbers, and they get a little, they get a little out of hand, and, you know, it's not always cracked down on here at Stratford so they can behave like that. So I don't know, obviously, I don't think my whole life is different from everybody that's here but I think there's some kids that probably didn't have the backing and support that I did in my house.

Bill tied together a number of aspects of how he was raised with his success in school. He noted how his parents instilled respect within him, making explicit that the cultural capital he learned in his home aligned with that valued in school. Specifically, Bill seemed to view the ways that his parents raised him as seamlessly extending into his student role, because he just knew that was the way to act. Bill did not perceive much difference between how his parents expected him to act at home and how teachers expected him to act in school, as indicated by his connection between how he had to behave and the way the school enforced that; Bill experienced a strong continuity between behavior at home with his teacher parents and at school. Yet, Bill dismissed the effect of his parents' occupation on this process when he said, "they happen to both be teachers but...." Bill stated that some of his students may learn the same things in their homes that he learned as a child in his, but then goes on to say that they are encouraged by their peers, presumably those who don't get such lessons at home, to act in what Bill deemed disrespectful ways. While Bill may have thought of other forms of family support, the only dimension of the support in this quote is that his parents taught him proper behavior in school, behavior we might call respectful. This was also true of Amy and Amanda, who described their parents as raising them to be respectful and who frequently contrasted themselves with their students, many of whom they did not perceive to be respectful. This issue of respect is an important cultural marker that we will consider more deeply in Chapter Six.

Sports and organized activities.

All three of the interns had, as students, been involved in organized activities, especially sports. Amy was the most heavily involved while Bill the least. Amy and Amanda spoke very passionately about the role of sports in their high school careers

while for

described

activities

influence

organize

Am

much m

volleyba

Amy pa

Amy en

increasi

football

athletes

about i

together

M

Amy n

had co

had do

all fou

were r

I

repeat

while for Bill, it was the high school band that he most enjoyed, though Amy also described a love for music and playing in the band. In addition to being involved in these activities, the interns described how their participation in these activities exerted a strong influence over their peer association, with Amy's peer associations more strongly tied to organized activities than Amanda's or Bill's.

Amy had started to run cross country in fifth grade, and in high school she became much more involved in organized sports. During her freshman year, Amy tried out for volleyball, a sport she never played before, and made the team. Throughout high school, Amy participated in a sport every season: cross country, volleyball, and then track. While Amy enrolled in the college prep track and continued to associate with students there, she increasingly hung out with the athlete crowd, especially when she started dating a football player in tenth grade. Amy seemed ambivalent about her affiliation with the athletes, naming her affiliation with this group only after I asked her several questions about it, saying, "I guess we would have been the athlete crowd. We all played sports together."

Many in the athlete group had also been popular during elementary school. While Amy made new friends in middle school at her mother's insistence, the popular clique had continued to develop its own identity and ways of interacting. In Amy's words, "they had done so much in middle school, and they all had their inside jokes and they—they'd all found their best friend, and I never had that." Amy reported that most of her friends were male and she didn't get along as well with females.

In the interview that focused most intensely on her schooling experiences, Amy repeatedly referred to her friendship patterns, describing herself at one point as a "floater"

between different peer groups. In addition to the smart kids and the athletes, Amy also knew a lot of people through the school band, which she described as attracting diverse students. Amy commented, "I had such an eclectic group of friends but none of them were ever like best friends," and she acknowledged that this pattern had continued into the present.

Amy's participation in organized activities seemed to have influenced whom she interacted and became friends with. Because she was tracked in the college preparatory sequence, Amy spent a lot of the school day with the smart kids in class. Because she loved music and always played in the band, Amy spent time with other band kids. Because she participated in three different sports, Amy spent time with other athletes. And finally, because Amy was responsible, she held a job at the local movie theater as the projectionist and by the end of high school was in a management position there. These activities scheduled a lot of her time and shaped her interactions, to the point that "having sports, like being on the bus, and going to band events, and like that, those were my social times."

In addition to being a good student academically and behaviorally, Amanda was also involved in playing sports. When I asked Amanda to share some of her favorite memories of high school, she wanted to know if the memories had to be school-related:

> Amanda: Ok, so like sports and stuff don't count?
>
> John: Is that your favorite memory?
>
> Amanda: Well, obviously yes.

Not only did Amanda enjoy playing sports, but she also described how the ECS sports teams were not very good, making her one of the better players. Amanda had played soccer on a club team for years, but it wasn't until her senior year that ECS actually

formed
one of
much.
frustrat
led me
mean I
aspect
aspects
"a lot o
don't k
were st
was jus
Bi
heavily
class fr
student
"band
Bill wi
sigh se
that he
out fro
though
on his o

formed a soccer team, which she joined while continuing to play for the club team. But one of the things that stood out to Amanda was that the ECS teams did not win very much, and she said of the soccer team, "and even then we really sucked, and that really frustrated me," and of her softball team's losing record, "that really, annoyed me." This led me to ask her what exactly she enjoyed about playing sports, and she answered, "I mean I had fun, it was something I liked to do, it was enjoyment. I did not like the losing aspect because I'm quite competitive." She did mention that she also enjoyed the social aspects of playing sports and hung around other athletes at the school sometimes, but that "a lot of the friends I hung out with outside of school were very unathletic. But it's just, I don't know how to describe – A lot of it was we had just been friends for so long that we were still friends. Like these were the kids that had been there so long and you know, it was just like, there you go."

Bill's memories of high school focused more on academic experiences, but he heavily participated in the school band, within which he played the drums, taking band class from his father, the school's band director, for four years. Bill recalled that other students called him and other band members demeaning names such as "orchendork" and "band fag." His participation in the band, as well as in honors classes, seemed to provide Bill with most of his social interaction. Bill also played tennis during his last two years of high school, but did not focus on sports as heavily as Amanda or Amy. In fact, he shared that he and three other friends went out for tennis when they learned that no one ever got cut from the JV squad. Rather, Bill noted, "I was involved a lot with music … even though it wasn't as visual and didn't get seen as much," and put in a lot of time practicing on his own, but also with others.

These activity patterns (see Table 3.2) are consistent with Lareau's (2003) description of the middle class child rearing mode she named "concerted cultivation," in which parents enroll their children in a number of scheduled activities, reducing the amount of free time and autonomy available to them. By participating in so many organized activities for so long, wherein adults direct children to cultivate their skills, the interns thoroughly engaged in middle-class ways of growing up and developed cultural capital that would be useful, and perhaps most to the point in this analysis, immersed within and taught to value middle class modes of operation.

Table 3.2: Interns' Organized Teenage Activities

	Amanda	Bill	Amy
Sports	Soccer Softball	Tennis	Track, volleyball, and cross country running
Music		High school band (drums)	High school band (flute and piccolo)
Work			Babysitting Movie theater

Social connections.

Bill grew up in a family where both of his parents were teachers and Amy's mother was a teacher while her father worked in several high profile jobs in the community. By virtue of their parents' occupations, both Bill's and Amy's families cultivated social capital, relationships with others that could be used to obtain favors, services, or goods. Their parents' social capital extended to and proved useful for both Bill and Amy; Amanda however, was not privy to such types of social capital.

Bill shared that his parents were friends with a number of other Bergen school teachers, and recognized that his experience likely differed from that of the majority of Bergen students because of this:

> The math department, for the most part, is at my house on the Fourth of July, along with many other teachers you know, that's the group of friends, so like, you know you do something really stupid or—I mean, it's gonna spread quick, real quick, you know what you might not, I mean my dad or mom might know about it before I do, you know, and I'm in trouble, so I mean I knew the school. So I was a little different that way because I knew many teachers even before I got to high school you know, I just knew them, I'd known them for a very long time so, I mean I had a little different experience probably than even the average Bergen kid you know, and so, usually it was a benefit to me, I mean they just knew my family and knew I was a pretty decent kid so—

In describing the effects of his parents' occupation and social relations on his schooling experience, Bill focused on behavior. He mentioned that because of his parents' social networks, his parents could possibly know about something he did or might do before he even knew, and this fact lingered in the back of Bill's mind, sometimes guiding his behavior. While we can't know if this fact consequently shaped Bill into becoming a "decent kid," one who does the work that teachers require and largely behaves according to teacher expectations, that is how he perceived himself. However, Bill was certainly not the only decent kid in Bergen, but because of his family, inherited that family's reputation and benefited from it. He noted that teachers in the district knew, at least, who his parents were and that he was a good student, and by saying "I'd known them for a very long time," indicated strong continuity of association with teachers and their habits.

Similarly, Amy benefited from her parents' social connections. Amy's mother worked to ensure that she was placed in the classes of the better teachers, since the district had a policy of allowing parents to make requests of where to place their children. Amy's mother was a teacher, and her parents' social circle included teachers, which gave Amy some access to what she called the "inner circle" of teachers. Amy made explicit the interaction of cultural and social capital when she remarked "our parents had pull, a lot of

us in the top 10 were either students of teachers, or high profile people in the community." In addition, although Illitch City Schools allowed parents to make placement requests for their children, Amy described how her mother and others who were part of the network that knew how to obtain advantages for their children and ensured that their children were placed with the best teachers. Furthermore, Amy babysat for teachers prior to working in a movie theater: "And before that I babysat all the time, every night, I was the town babysitter too. And then once you get into the teacher network and you're known as a good babysitter everybody wants you to watch their kids so, I made a lot of money doing that." The repeated requests to babysit indicate her competence at doing so, and her description of her work history as well as her working situation during the internship indicate that Amy possessed a strong work ethic. At the same time, Amy's reputation as a student and her family's status in the community certainly helped her to become well known and added to her reputation. Both Amy and Bill had relationships with teachers outside of the classroom that informed their sense of interaction with school personnel.

In sum, the three interns' backgrounds are middle class, as evidenced by comparing to Gilbert's (1998) model of American stratification. All interns' parents were gainfully employed with incomes around or above the US median, though all three interns mentioned their parents were not wealthy. Three of the six parents were employed as teachers, a job viewed by the majority of the US public as prestigious. While Amanda did not have access to social networks consisting of teachers, both Bill and Amy enjoyed access to teachers and benefited from such associations. Finally, their upbringings

seemed to indicate they were socialized into middle class views of the world, as we'll explore throughout this study.

The District and Schools Where the Interns Taught

The City of Grand Pillar

The three interns were placed in high schools in Grand Pillar, a Midwestern city of about 120,000 people, in a metropolitan area with twice that population. According to the US Census Bureau's 2006 American Community Survey data, approximately 70 percent of Grand Pillar's residents were white and about 20 percent were black. In addition, about 10 percent of Grand Pillar's residents described themselves as Latino, which the Census Bureau classifies as an ethnic group. The Bureau requires Latinos to also choose a racial group, and reports over 90% of Latinos classify their race as white or as "some other race."

In table 3.3, I compare census statistics of Grand Pillar and the three towns in which the interns grew up. The white population of these three towns ranged from about 85 to 96 percent while the black population was quite small, no more than 3.5 percent. Interestingly, Bergen and Illitch City, which are both rural towns, feature Latino populations close to 20 percent. Between 2000 and 2006, the Census Bureau estimated the percentage of Grand Pillar individuals living below poverty increased from 17 to 28. In the interns' three towns, the 2000 percentage was lower than that of Grand Pillar, although Bill's hometown of Bergen was only 3 percentage points lower than Grand Pillar.

Besides its very white population, Eureka, Amanda's hometown, was also more affluent, with the highest single-family home values, a per capita income nearly double

Table 3.3: Demographic Descriptions of Relevant Cities					
	Grand Pillar 2000	Grand Pillar 2006	Bergen (Bill)	Eureka (Amanda)	Illitch City (Amy)
Population	120,000	114,000	22,000	9,000	3,900
Race (% of population)					
White	65.3	69.1	84.5	96.4	88.7
Black	21.9	19.2	3.5	0.6	0.6
Native American	0.8	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.3
Asian	2.8	4.2	0.8	1.1	1.3
Hawaiian/Pacific Is.	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
Some other race	4.5	2.7	7.7	0.3	7.8
Two or more races	4.6	4.2	2.8	1.2	1.4
Latino	10.0	11.1	17.0	1.3	19.2
% below poverty	16.9	27.9	13.8	3.3	8.1
Per capita income ($)	17,924	17,915	16,528	33,222	16,021
% owner occupied housing units	57.5	57.8	56.4	65.5	57.2
Median value single-family owner-occupied homes ($)	73,500	111,300	86,100	178,700	112,400

Information source: US Census Bureau. All data from 2000 census, unless noted. Since "Latino" is considered an ethnicity, respondents choosing that designation also choose a race.

that of the other communities, more owner occupied housing units, and the lowest number of individuals living below poverty. In contrast, Bergen and Illitch City had similar rates of owner occupied housing and a slightly lower per capita income compared to Grand Pillar.

Grand Pillar School District

As the city's population decreased, so too did the number of students enrolled in Grand Pillar schools, presenting officials with a budget crisis nearly every year. Since 1996, the district had lost about 3,000 students. Between the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 school years, the district lost 788 students, bringing the total student population to just

under 16,000. In anticipation of losing a significant number of students, the district had closed five elementary schools during the summer of 2005, which brought the total number district schools to 35.

With the loss of 788 students for the 2005-2006 year, double what the district anticipated, the school district announced in January 2006 that it would have to cut $1.2 million from its budget for the current year. This situation was familiar for district officials: the local newspaper reported that over the last three years the district had cut $30 million from its budget and eliminated 350 teaching positions. The district's financial chief estimated that about 250 students left the district because their families left the state, presumably for economic reasons because of the state's struggling economy.

However, the reason most cited for the loss of students was the mandatory district-wide school choice program, in which seven percent of the county's students participated, double the number from 2001. Every district announced each year the number of spaces they had available at each grade level for students from outside the district. Parents of students within the county could apply for an available space, and a lottery determined if their child was accepted into the district through the school choice program. Data obtained from the county indicated that the Grand Pillar school district was heavily affected by the program, with 1,815 students choosing to leave the district while only 135 students chose to enter the district. Grand Pillar's loss to gain ratio of 13.4 was well above the district with the second largest ratio at 3.0. Interestingly, urban Grand Pillar and five of six rural districts lost students through school choice while the suburban districts gained students through the program. Grand Pillar officials frequently voiced criticism over the school choice program, which they saw as responsible for drawing the

best students away from the district. The local newspaper quoted the superintendent of the nearby Hope school district, a popular choice for Grand Pillar students, as saying "We know we're contributing, as all suburban schools are, to the death spiral of urban education. We're pulling some of Grand Pillar's finest kids, and they're being left with impoverished kids that don't have families that can transport them. It's a very difficult dilemma." Even so, during the summer of 2006, Hope ended up accepting more students through school choice than it initially indicated it would.

As part of the answer to declining enrollment, Grand Pillar actively sought federal funding to develop and expand their magnet school offerings, which began in 2001 and were bolstered by a 2005 three-year grant of nearly nine million dollars to continue those efforts. Two of the elementary school programs were quite popular and at capacity. During the 2005-2006 school year, the district designated a visual and performing arts magnet program at Robeson High, which had been known for years as being strong in these areas. At the end of the school year, Pinnacle High was authorized to offer the International Baccalaureate program. Stratford had already offered a magnet program in engineering and technology, though the program was small. During the school year, the district began an advertising campaign to increase awareness of its magnet programs, something unique to Grand Pillar.

In this era of increased standardized testing and reporting on test scores in newspapers, the metropolitan area was familiar with lower test scores that Grand Pillar posted relative to surrounding districts. According to the federal No Child Left Behind law (2001 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act), schools must demonstrate that they are making adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward having 100

percent of their students meet the requirements of performing "proficiently" on the state standardized test. The first year the Grand Pillar school district reported that 18 of its elementary schools did not make AYP, but in 2006 reported that all the elementary and middle schools made AYP. The district's high schools however, had never made AYP, although student test scores had improved over the lifetime of the law. Results released in the summer of 2006 showed a 25 percent increase in the number of schools statewide that failed to make AYP, including two other area suburban high schools.

District officials expressed awareness that the public perception of Grand Pillar schools was not positive, and commissioned a survey of parental perceptions of the district. The firm reported in the spring of 2006 that parents desired more communication from the school district. Of parents whose children no longer attended school within the district, some 60 percent said they could not be persuaded to return and three-fourths said the district did nothing to persuade them to stay. In addition, about 80 percent perceived the schools as safe for their children, though they perceived bullying as a problem.

Safety perceptions were a constant concern of district and city officials, parents, and residents. In January 2006, Grand Pillar's newly elected mayor announced a plan to put a police officer in each of the three high schools and the vocational school. Although the school board and superintendent were initially cool to the proposal, the school board narrowly approved a resolution allowing the city to provide the officers to the high schools, provided that the district did not have to contribute any funds to the program and the police department would permanently assign an officer to each school. In 2005, Grand Pillar police responded to about 350 calls in the three high schools.

In April 2006, the Grand Pillar public safety officers were authorized by the state police accrediting agency to make arrests on school district property, but the school district's officers remained unarmed and did not have the power to transport arrested individuals, something that would have to be done in concert with the city police department. In addition, the county prosecutor and city police department received notification in June 2006 that the federal government awarded them a $200,000 grant to provide two officers who would work in the city's four middle schools, primarily to teach students about violence prevention. Thus, the district made several moves to improve the perception of safety within the schools, something the mayor argued was important to attracting residents to the city.

The High Schools

The interns were placed in two of Grand Pillar's three high schools: Amy at Pinnacle and Amanda and Bill at Stratford. In Table 3.4 I summarize some demographic data for Grand Pillar high schools and compare it to data from the interns' high schools. The first fact is the high rate of nonwhite student attendance, from 55 percent for Pinnacle to 80 percent for Stratford. The city's third high school, Robeson, had about 65 percent nonwhite students; although my project did not involve interns at Robeson, I include it to provide a look at the district's high school populations. The rate of nonwhite attendance is particularly significant given the fact that only 30 percent of Grand Pillar's residents are nonwhite. In contrast Bergen High was about 25 percent nonwhite and Illitch City less than 10 percent. Eureka Christian was not required to report such statistics, but Amanda reported that she remembered between two and four black students in her school. In addition, the free/reduced lunch rate is significantly lower in interns' high schools than in Grand Pillar.

Table 3.4: Demographic Descriptions of Schools						
	Pinnacle	Robeson	Stratford	Bergen (Bill)	Illitch City (Amy)	Eureka Christian (Amanda)
Enrollment	1432	1759	1028	1328	619	230
Race (% of enrollment)						
Black	28.1	44.3	63.1	4.3	0.0	
White	44.3	36.6	22.5	76.3	91.6	
Native Am.	1.3	0.3	1.3	0.2	0.0	
Asian	5.4	5.7	6.2	1.2	0.5	
Latino	20.7	13.1	6.9	18.1	7.9	
Free/reduced lunch %	56.5	50.0	54.5	18.0	14.5	
Information source: State department of education database. Grand Pillar data for 2005-2006 school year. Intern school data for 1999-2000 school year. Eureka Christian not required to report demographic data, and enrollment total is for high school students (total school enrollment was 772).						

Pinnacle High School.

Pinnacle was the oldest high school in the city, housed in a three-story brick building that nevertheless sprawled over much land. The hallways were dingy and uninspiring, yet many of the classrooms in the front of the school featured wood floors and large windows. Although students and interns sometimes complained about drafts from the windows, the school seemed largely maintained, and Amy's mentor had to move into a new classroom for the school year because the district was renovating several of the science classrooms. Pinnacle was the home of the district's large field house, in which Pinnacle's teams competed, but the school lacked a football field, a perennial focus of the alumni association. The 1500 students spoke 30 different languages, and Pinnacle was known for housing the majority of the district's refugee population, many from Somalia, other African nations, and Asia, particularly Hmong people, a diversity not captured in the state's statistics.

In late May 2006, Grand Pillar officials received word that the International Baccalaureate Organization authorized Pinnacle to offer the IB program in its school, something uncommon in the state, and about 70 students had signed up to take part in the IB program for the upcoming year. This designation helped to bolster the common perception that Pinnacle was the most academic of the three high schools.

Stratford High School.

Stratford High School's student enrollment had been declining for several years and had just fallen to about 1,000 students, nearly two-thirds of whom were black. The school itself was a solidly-constructed brick facility from the 1940s. Though not an ornate building, touches throughout gave it character: woodwork in the main office; tiles depicting literary scenes scattered throughout; marble stairways. The campus had two buildings, the main three-story building in which the majority of classrooms, cafeteria, gym, main office, and auditorium were found, and the Annex, located about 20 feet from the main building's back door. The Annex was an uninspiring, squat, one-story structure with some ten classrooms, including the art room, and in the back corner was Ms. Cutter's classroom where Amanda did her work. Bill taught on the third floor of the main building.

New for that school year, Stratford was using a concept called the Freshman Academy to provide academic support for freshman, which partly relied on housing most freshmen classes in the Annex, science being the main exception. In addition, the school had adopted a block schedule so that on most days, students attended four of their six classes for 85 minutes each. The schedule rotated through A, B, and C days so that each class met twice during the three school days. The first 20 minutes of each school day were dedicated to a topic or skill, which rotated depending on the day's schedule: talking

about real-life issues, writing via prompt, and silent reading. Ms. Cutter was heavily involved in administering this program and granted some release time to prepare materials.

Interns' Reactions to Their Schools and Students

In this section, I examine the interns' reactions to the situations they found themselves in, and do so in relation to four analytical categories: urbanity, race, class, and being good students. Race, the variable most often considered by the literature, was an obvious difference between the interns and the majority of their students, and emerged as salient in this study. The racial breakdown for each intern's class that I observed is provided in Table 3.5. In the sections that follow I will describe interns' interactions within and perceptions of the schools and their students. In the first section, I study the interns' perceptions of physical safety within Grand Pillar's schools. Then I describe intern fears of being perceived as a racist by students and a situation in which Amanda's whiteness was brought into question. In the next section, I discuss Amanda's views on

Table 3.5: Racial Breakdown of Interns' Classes

Race	Sex	Amanda's 2nd hour World Geography	Amy's 7th hour Biology	Bill's 7th hour Conceptual Physics
Black	female	6	4	8
	male	8	1	5
White	female	7	3	3
	male	3	8	3
Latino	female	1	2	1
	male		3	1
Asian	female	1		
	male		1	1
Arab/Middle Eastern	female		2	
	male		3	
Total		26	27	22

the dynamics of being a white teacher in a majority black school. Then I describe and analyze two racialized exchanges that took place between Bill and his students in the physics class. I finally consider Amy's descriptions of her difficulties managing the classroom, particularly as they concerned her black students. We will see that the interns are involved in very complicated situations, and that they tended to exhibit the continuity of habits, and the protection of their familiar identities, that some literature has labeled as "resistant."

Perceptions of Physical Safety

The three interns noticed the highly visible role of security personnel at their placements compared to their hometown high schools. For example, Bill said:

> You know my school had like *a* security guard, that was there all the time, other people would show up like at the end of school to help with like traffic or something you know, like busses and stuff, like the rent-a-cops would show up. But I mean you know, ok, so you see the security guard, whatever. I mean here they're like, they're definitely much more of a presence, and they are essentially, I think they basically are police officers for the most part, on school grounds here at Stratford they can assign misdemeanors and felonies, they can arrest you.... Like, and I kind of think everybody realizes that, that they're kind of the real deal around here, they're not rent-a cops.

As mentioned earlier, the Grand Pillar School District succeeded in getting its security force deputized as police. Bill was conflicted by the heavy police presence, finding it comforting on the one hand, but on the other questioning if that presence really helped to create a better environment at Stratford, mostly because "some [officers] are kind of buddy-buddy with too many people," which he believed compromised their effectiveness at maintaining order.

The security/police presence symbolically reinforced the image that Stratford was a rowdy, potentially dangerous school. When I asked Bill how his family reacted to the news that he was placed at Stratford, he said:

> I mean they knew the stories just as I did, you know, and they're like, 'Oh, man, good luck.' My younger brother, he's a senior at Bergen right now ... and he's like, 'Well, I'll buy you a flak jacket,' and I was like 'Sweet, thanks buddy.' And, you know, there was that, you know, protect yourself, I mean jokingly but at the same time that was the image of Stratford.

Bill shared his family's concern about physical safety, specifically the idea that in this urban high school, there was the potential for danger, that students within the school might inflict physical harm upon Bill. Bill's brother referred to a flak jacket, indicating specific concerns about gun violence, which elevates physical safety issues to a matter of life and death. In addition, Bill stated his family knew the stories just like he did, an indication of the strong continuity of his background. In a later interview, I asked Bill what was something surprising for him that he learned about Stratford, and he said, "That it wasn't as bad as everybody said it was gonna be."

Amanda reported similar impressions of Stratford. When asked what she knew about Stratford prior to beginning the internship, she replied that it was urban and had an hour-long lunch period. I asked two more times before she said: "I heard that—I don't know. That's a good question. Let me think about that ... [long pause] Well, I had heard last year that there was a huge one hundred person fight there, which wasn't true." As she continued, she explained that her parents were initially concerned about her placement:

> Amanda: Although they were a little worried at first because I think they were thinking it was like downtown Detroit. ... Because ... they've been to downtown Detroit, so they know what the school—schools are somewhat like, so they had the impression that Stratford was going to be like that.

And she explained in the interview with Shih-pei, my colleague who conducted the first interviews with each of the three interns, how people she talked with interpreted her choice to go into an urban high school:

> Shih-pei: Mmhmhmhmhmhm. So um when you pick an urban school as your field placement, um how do people around you react to your choice?

Amanda: (Laughs) Why?

Shih-pei: Yeah.

Amanda: That's probably the number one question, "Why?" "What are you doing?" "Good luck there!" "Oh! You're surviving!" "You haven't gotten a bulletproof vest yet?" The question—er—statements like that.

Just as Bill had, Amanda also received questions or advice concerning her physical safety, notably symbolized again in the bulletproof vest. The reputation of Grand Pillar's schools, though not as bad as those of Chicago, Detroit, Cincinnati, Malone, or other smaller cities in the state, was such that both Bill and Amanda's parents raised questions about their safety, and other people with whom they discussed expressed similar concerns.

Although Amy was at Pinnacle, she reported hearing similar things:

> I heard a lot of negative things, just that it was an urban school, a lot of problems, a lot of fights, that they, the thing I always got when I told people I was teaching at Pinnacle, they were like, 'Oh I'm sorry, oh man.' You get that look like, 'Oh that's tough.' ... So I came into it with an optimistic mind I suppose, but it definitely was in the back of my mind, yep I am going into an urban school, here it goes, tell everyone to pray for me, I'm going need it.

Just like the others, when Amy shared where she was going to intern, people expressed their concern and empathy for the situation she was about to enter. And although Amy tried to remain optimistic about the situation, she was still concerned, as indicated by her desire to be the subject of others' prayers for her safety in this urban high school. When prompted to share a specific incident she had heard about Pinnacle, Amy said:

> I know there was a really bad fight. I don't know if it was this year or two years ago. A kid pulled a knife out on another kid and stabbed him. You hear that and obviously that makes you think about your own safety when you are going to be here. So that was kind of scary but everything else was just broad, just generalizations, you know the kids are bad, bad is not very descriptive. Some of them are not well behaved but—

As Amy shared the one specific incident that she had learned of, she made specific reference to her concern about her own safety in the school. She then noted that most of the other things she had heard were just generalizations, that a lot was said just because of the pervasive beliefs about Grand Pillar's schools. In fact, Amy said she had learned from others in the program who had observed in Pinnacle the year before that "it's really not that bad once you get in and you get to know the students." All of the interns reported things were not as bad within the schools as they had heard or their reputations suggested. Indeed, none of Grand Pillar's high schools used harsh security measures like metal detectors, dress codes or uniforms, coat restrictions, or denial of locker use.

This is not to say that there were not fights in the schools. In April, two days before the interns received their placement assignments, there was a fight at Stratford, widely reported in both the local print and broadcast news media, which came to be known as the hundred person fight. When the interns received their assignments, they reported that this fight added to their apprehension of being placed in an urban high school. Bill and Amanda said they later learned the fight was not the big fracas reported on the news.

During my two years working with Grand Pillar interns, Amanda was the only one who reported having a fight break out in her classroom, an incident she mentioned in several interviews, speaking with pride at her ability to break the fight up, remove the offenders from class, and restore her control over the room. She emphasized how different Stratford was from Eureka Christian School, and was particularly surprised because, "I had no idea that kids were not afraid of what was going to happen to them at Stratford," mentioning they did not seem to care about the consequences that would come from fighting. More interestingly, as Amanda broke up the fight, with the backup, though

not the direct assistance of a university pre-intern male observing in the class, she had several concerns:

> 'Cause all I could envision was this entire class being in a brawl, and then me having to call security, like, 'Hey come help me break up the fight that the whole class is involved in.' But, no, I actually complimented them, like, 'Way to not get involved,' 'Way to not fight too.'

Amanda held an assumption that all of the students in the class were willing and wanting to fight, and that all that was needed was a spark between two people that would have led to a whole class fracas, or even a riot that would require the security force to quell the violence. Amanda's experience sums up the perceptions of the three interns with regard to their urban students: they are a group that is prone to violence and must be controlled to maintain an ordered, violence-free environment. The interns' focus on issues of violence and physical safety resonates strongly with mainstream perceptions of the conditions of urban schools. Under the impression that at any moment violence could erupt, the interns were likely to operate in ways that reduced the chance of violence, relying on behavior management and curricular techniques to increase the interns' control over their students.

Fears of Being Perceived as Racist

Many of my students, including these three interns, reported that at some point during the year, some of their students accused them of being racist, often jokingly, and from the beginning the possibility of such an accusation was of great concern to them. At the end of January, Amanda reported she had not encountered this situation, sharing this story:

> I gave—I don't know if this kid was joking or if he was serious or if he was just trying to be a nuisance to me, but I handed out an assignment … and then I, I gave it to him and he was the first kid in the row, and he looked at me and he was like,

> 'You're just giving this to me because I'm white'.... And I was like, 'I'm white too!' And I was like, no, I'm not, I just gave it to every person in this classroom.

Amanda's answer to her white student was similar to what other white interns usually reported saying to black students who accused them of racism, suggesting that Amanda was aware of the potential accusation and possessed a common cultural script to counter it, one focused on equitable treatment and specific behavior. By the end of February though, Amanda had a different story to tell that involved her fifth hour class:

> This is—happened in the month of February, because it's Black History Month, and we talked about Black History Month in here a little bit, it was in the advisory periods, where you have to write or you have to do whatever, a lot of it was about Black History Month. So Mary wasn't in here for that particular time—it'd be all on me. And so then I'd be getting all these things thrown my way or, you know, 'You're looking down on black kids,' that type of thing. I'm like, 'You're the one singing in class, no one else is singing, you are, you just happen to be black, and I'm gonna tell you to stop.' So in that sense, they really challenged me in areas I had no idea, and that frustrates me a lot of times because I'm like, you know, I don't know what to do with them because they are at such a low level, and they don't perform, and they don't do their work, and they never turn in their work, and then they get mad, and then they throw fits, and then they talk, and then they don't listen.

Amanda clearly found her fifth hour class to be quite frustrating, describing it as the lowest academically of her four classes. Her story started with some of her students' racial statements, notably made when her mentor teacher was gone, moved into the justification that she was addressing the behavior, not the student's race, and then concluded with a list of student characteristics that make teaching and managing them frustrating. An unknown proportion of Amanda's black students are tied to management problems, as students who don't want to cooperate. Amanda's frustration with the students' racialized comments led her to speak of their low academic performance and then their behavior. It is quite likely that Stratford's morning activities focused on Black history led some of the students to make comments they hadn't before. Or at the least,

those morning activities required that race be brought up in class, something that Amanda did not find comfortable. This segment suggests an important question: to what extent does discipline have a racial component?

Later in that interview, I asked Amanda how she thought her race played into students' views of her. She said:

> Amanda: Because I'm some white girl coming in here from who knows where trying to tell them what it's like to be black, not that I do that, but that's how I think they perceive me, (inaud.) or they think that I know it all and I obviously, definitely don't, so—and I know a lot of students in here, well I shouldn't say a lot, I know of a few who have a very difficult time taking instruction from a white person in general.
>
> John: Why do you say that, like what—?
>
> Amanda: Um, just from talking with the other teachers and parent meetings and stuff like that, just—you can tell that—what they say to you, they just don't respect you because you're white and they don't think that they have to listen to you because, you know, you're oppressing them or something like that.
>
> John: Do you feel that you're oppressing them?
>
> Amanda: No.
>
> ...
>
> John: Why would they feel like you're oppressing them?
>
> Amanda: Because I make them do work, I tell them to be quiet, I tell them to listen.
>
> John: Ok.
>
> Amanda: So I tell them to do things that they don't want to do.
>
> John: Ok. Have any of them ever called you racist or—?
>
> Amanda: Oh yeah.
>
> John: Oh yeah? Frequently, or?
>
> Amanda: Not frequently. ... I'm thinking of two particular students in general.... Those two are probably the two students that I have the biggest trouble with, with the race card.

John: They're black?

Amanda: Um-hmm.

John: Um-hmm.

Amanda: Because they like to call me on it: 'Oh well I'm black and you're telling me to—you're telling me to put my phone away because I'm black,' or 'You're telling me to be quiet—nobody else is talking but I said one thing and you told me to be quiet.' I'm like, 'If you're talking I'm gonna tell you to be quiet' so, I don't know, they try to play that card a lot.

John: Like a couple times a week, or?

Amanda: ... it happened probably 3 or 4 times this month on different occasions.

Classroom management was a concern for Amanda, as it was for most other interns, and she felt that the teacher preparation program did not prepare her to effectively manage the classroom. From my observational standpoint, Amanda's second hour class was hardly a management problem. When I visited her fifth hour class though, Amanda's management style was clearly more aggressive with occasional yelling; these students were much less compliant than her second hour honors class as several students voiced their opinions and engaged in behavior like talking out of turn, moving around, and verbally challenging Amanda. When pressed to report on the frequency of these events, they did not seem to occur as often as her language suggested, indicating the importance that those exchanges held for Amanda, since they challenged her view that she disciplined fairly.

Amanda described the race card as a new challenge for her. These interactions occurred during fifth hour, the class Amanda knew the least as she had just started teaching them in late January. Another factor was that Ms. Cutter, the mentor, was gone during those interactions, and Amanda felt that since she was labeled as the intern, and Ms. Cutter reminded the students often enough of Amanda's status, that some students

might have felt comfortable making racial claims. At the same time, since students were singing or talking when Amanda did not want them to, she disciplined them, and sometimes students made the discipline into a racial issue. The reasons why Amanda disciplined certain students and why students acted in particular ways were reactions to a host of factors, but the uncertainty of racial drama added another dimension. And Amanda's chief way of thinking about race was through colorblindness, as illustrated by referring to students bringing up treatment along racial lines as "playing the race card." Dei, Sefa, Karumanchery, and Karumanchery (2005) argue that this phrase helps serve the rhetorical function of devaluing a person's claims that race is a factor in a particular interaction, a charge often made by whites, in the family of phrases like "reverse racism" and "you're being too sensitive."

Of course, Amanda was not alone. Amy described how several students had accused her of picking on them because they were black. She described her reaction:

> You're heart kind of stops for a minute because you are like, 'Oh god, I don't want to be that racist teacher. I'm not racist.' ... In a way you have to defend yourself and make it clear that, no, I'm definitely not picking on you because you are black. I pick on Mark all of the time or something like that. Just turn it around, make it a little more humorous, get off the subject you know, ... because you don't want to get stuck on that sort of thing, at least I don't. I don't want to sit there and have a 20-minute conversation about how I pick on the black kids. ... I'm picking on you because you are talking and you are disrupting everyone else. When you get into that situation I think you just have to defend yourself, defend your actions, make a point to prove them wrong hopefully, and convince the other kids.

Amy made use of several common cultural scripts, including that she was picking on the behavior, not the student, a point reinforced by reference to picking on Mark, a white student. Amy also was quick to point out that she was not racist and that she strove to treat her students equitably, with consistent enforcement of policies. Finally, by talking

about verbal self-defensive, Amy clarified the importance of actively demonstrating to others the fact that she was not racist.

Who can work at Fermilab.

As a conscious observer of race, I saw it as an important factor in several interactions between interns and students. Yet it was rare for race to be made an explicit issue in the classroom, other than in occasional student accusations of teacher racism. As far as subject matter, Amanda's Honors World Geography class dealt with different peoples of the earth, yet I observed few racialized comments. On the other hand, Bill's tenth grade Conceptual Physics students made race a relevant factor on four occasions that I observed.

Bill described his fear of being perceived as racist similarly to the way most interns did:

> I was concerned about the race thing just 'cause I didn't, I mean obviously I think of myself not as a racist, I really, I mean probably a lot of people say that, I really feel that way, but you know—I just, that's the way I feel and I was, you know, I was just worried about saying something and have it taken the wrong way. ... And so that's, I mean, I was just worried about that, it was just one of those things that I was like well I hope it doesn't, I'll try to be careful.

Bill said that he was really worried about the possibility of students accusing him of being racist for the first month at Stratford, but gradually became less worried. In fact, he reported that he got along well with his students, observed how his students would joke about race, and increasingly became more involved in joking about race with the students:

> In the beginning I tried to be very sensitive to the tone, like how did he really, he or she really say that? ... Because they'll say it every now and then during class about like other students, like friends, you know, they'll be like ... 'This girl doesn't like you because she's white and he's black.' So you kind of pay attention to see how they're using it in class kind of. Are they, do they sometimes resort to that, and just use that as a punch line, and, you know, in a lot of classes they do,

> or, I mean, at least in my FST [Functions, Statistics, and Trigonometry] class they do. ... like in the beginning, I always thought about ok, what did I just do?, what have I been doing?, and what did I say?, how did I say it?, and what was their reaction? And then like you know, you don't want to like—because you're like are they for real are they really joking, what did I do? ... It's kind of funny to think about how much you analyze it. ... Luckily this far we haven't had any real ones, at least that I have sensed.

Three times during this day's interview, including in the above segment, Bill made a general statement that he and the students joked about race, and then immediately followed such a statement with something like "at least in my FST class." This indicates that in the Functions, Statistics, and Trigonometry (FST) class, there may very well have been an atmosphere of racialized joking. Bill described his FST students as black, white, and Asian, and who often associated with people of different races, in contrast to his other classes where students were more likely to only associate with people of their own races. In addition, FST is Stratford's second highest math class, and the majority of those students were likely to attend college. Though Bill mentioned a physics student who joked about having to do something because she was black, it seems that most racial jokes occurred in the FST class.

During one of Bill's Conceptual Physics classes, students made race relevant in two different ways. Bill gave a lecture on the structure of atoms and the role of atoms in forming matter. Within the lecture he provided historical information about the development of the concept of atoms, and began with some Greek concepts of the atom. Bill talked about Democritus and his role in describing the atom, and he noted that Aristotle called Democritus the laughing philosopher. Keisha, a black student, asked, "Was he white?" Several students laughed. Bill, with a slight smile, a small laugh, and short stammer, said, "Yes, he was white." Bill then continued the lecture, explaining that atoms are indivisible.

We could certainly say that Keisha's question was relevant to the subject at hand, as she was asking about a characteristic of someone who contributed to the discipline, a discipline with a long history of development by white males. The laughter by some of the other students indicates that they may have regarded Keisha's question as a joke, but Bill's reaction did not indicate to me that he thought of this exchange as a joke, especially because of his short, factual answer, the quickness with which he continued the lecture, and that neither Keisha nor any other student had the opportunity to respond to Bill's answer, which itself had no joking element. I wrote in my field notes that Bill seemed to me to look more embarrassed or surprised by the question than amused.

Bill continued with the lecture, moving into the recent history of the atom and the modern atomic model. Eventually, Bill's PowerPoint slide show depicted the Fermilab, a high-energy particle accelerator outside Chicago. Upon seeing a picture of the Lab, Shaquira said, "My dad work there."

Bill asked, "Where does he work at?"

Shaquira answered, "I don't know. He work there."

Bill asked, "At where?"

And Shaquira replied, "At Fermilab."

Destini looked directly at Bill, and with her strong, commanding voice said, "What you sayin', because her dad's black he can't work there?"

Bill laughed and said, "Yeah Destini. That's exactly what I'm saying." Bill continued with the lecture, explaining that at Fermilab and other places they use huge machines to accelerate particles into other matter.

First we should note the similarities between the Democritus and Fermilab exchanges which occurred within 10 minutes. In both of them, students racialized the lecture content. At the instant the subject was racialized, Bill laughed, a short chuckle with a smile, before making his reply. Finally, after Bill gave his answer, he quickly continued the lecture his mentor teacher had assembled into a PowerPoint show, thereby ending the racialized exchange and returning the public discourse to the physics material. Both of the exchanges were fairly brief, about 10 to 20 seconds each, and Bill avoided entering a longer racialized exchange, similar to what Amy stated she wished to avoid.

However, there are notable differences between these two exchanges. The first exchange focused on the philosopher Democritus's racial characteristics and the second on where Shaquira's father was employed, an issue not directly related to the subject matter. But Destini made it relate by directly questioning Bill's intention behind his questions, implying that Bill did not believe blacks could work at Fermilab, as her question conveyed awareness of mainstream expectations about black people and their lack of qualification to work in high technology environments. Destini's question also displayed indignance at the possibility that Bill, a white male, would deny the respect due to a black man who did work at the Fermilab. Destini may also have just been testing Bill, but there was no laughter from her. Weeks later, Bill confirmed with Shaquira that her father did not work at Fermilab.

Whereas Bill answered the Shaquira's question in a matter of fact manner, he answered Destini's question by using sarcasm. Part of Bill's reaction in this situation can be attributed to Bill's being unprepared to lecture on atomic structure, which he believed his mentor should have done the previous day when Bill attended his university courses,

rather than administer a quiz and lecture on a different subject. However, two other hypotheses also seem reasonable: he did not believe that race was important to someone being employed at Fermilab, and so was resistant to engaging in this racialized exchange; and race was uncomfortable for him so he avoided engaging in this exchange. Both suggest an important role for colorblindness. Bill often referred to racial joking in the context of the FST class within which he seemed to be the most comfortable, but such stories only once involved a physics student, while events that I observed did not appear to be comfortable for him. When asked, Bill pointed out that Stratford was a majority black school and stated that this fact must obviously impact what occurs, yet he was at a loss to explain how this fact might impact his specific classroom and his relationship with students. When he considered the behavior of particular black students, he often used individualistic explanations attributed to home and peer culture, in a manner consistent with colorblind ideology, in ways similar to Amy, whose experiences with classroom management I describe next. With the exception of Bill's unfamiliarity with the lecture material on that day, most of the evidence is easily interpretable as consistent with white teacher resistance described in much of the literature.

Classroom Management's Racialized Dimensions

From the beginning, Amy was impressed that the students she taught were not like her, in a variety of ways:

> Yeah I would say the majority of them, golly I don't really know, I couldn't put my finger on it because it is so broad, I have every single culture, religion, ethnicity, I mean yeah they are all, there are a couple of kids that I would compare to myself, I could relate to that, but I think that more often than not I can look at a student and say, wow, this student is very different from me.

Amy often mentioned Pinnacle's diversity, usually contrasting her students with herself, present or past. In the last sentence, she specifically said, "I can look at a

student," suggesting that there was something about the physical body of the student, such as color, that signified a major difference from herself. Race indeed complicated Amy's teaching life. When asked what groups of students were the hardest for her to relate to, Amy answered:

> Yeah, really disruptive, rude, obnoxious, don't care about school. I have a really hard time relating to that type of student.... I wouldn't, I guess I could generalize and say that I have more trouble with African American students than I do with any of the other students in my class. African American, both male and female, I have had more conflict with than any other students, and I didn't want to stereotype it like that, you know what I mean, but it is a trend that I've noticed personally and I don't— It is something I've tried to look into more to see if I act differently towards them or if its just a cultural thing for me maybe. I know a lot of times they are louder in class even when they are speaking in turn, or when they raise their hands they are louder. They tend to be more active, they tend to be the last students that came to class, the last students that sit down. The first ones to be off task, shout across the room. It's hard, that type of student for me is just I don't know, yeah hardest for me to relate to and most annoying, frustrating.

Although the question is race neutral and Amy's answer began that way, she quickly moved to highlight her difficulties in relating to her African American students. One of the most prominent issues Amy brought up is the volume of black students. In fact, when she was later asked what she meant by this behavior being a "cultural thing," Amy said:

> I think a lot of it is how they act at home. I think when they have more of that type of setting when they are louder, when they say what is on their minds you know, without even thinking twice ... I think the loud outburst is maybe the most frustrating thing. Not that I expect them to sit there and be quiet the entire period, that would be no fun, it would be boring, but when it is like constant, every day right off the bat from the get go, from the time the bell rings they are shouting from across the room from their seats. It's hard.

Here, the loudness is equated with their skin color. The black students, who Amy felt act this way at home, presumably with the blessing of their parents, or in concert with their culture, or because the parents aren't home, have learned that it is ok for them to just blurt out whatever they want to say, any time they want to, without following the protocol of raising their hands or staying in their seats. Amy began by identifying African

Americans as the group that gave her the most trouble and through additional questioning, focused on their behaviors that frustrated her as a teacher and were difficult to control, particularly volume, moving around the room, and talking out of turn. Her descriptions became more heavily racialized as she explained her black students' behavior as an extension of their home life. When questioned if she had issues with other ethnic students, Amy answered:

> Amy: I think I, I don't have to spend hardly any time at all disciplining the other students. It's really weird to me because I can think through every hour and the only students I have trouble with that I have to take time out of my day to discipline are the African American students and I don't know why that is.
>
> Shih-pei: So why do you think that's the case?
>
> Amy: I wish I knew. I really do. Like I said part of it I think is that they are louder, and louder in turn equals more disruptive to me, maybe just stands out to me. I have a couple students that sleep and that kind of bothers me, those are white students, but that is much less annoying to me and disruptive to other people. I don't know, it is really interesting to me. I think that maybe because I'm a white female, but then they do it to Mike as well. I wish I had an answer for that, I really honestly do. I don't know.
>
> Shih-pei: Do you ask other people for suggestions?
>
> Amy: Yeah, we've talked about it in our classes like in 891. We've brushed on it a little bit. I really don't know, I don't think that any of us know. I am young, female, and white. I am opposite in almost every way to them, maybe they don't think I can relate, maybe they don't think I can understand. I don't know.

In this statement, Amy reaffirmed that louder meant more disruptive, a speech pattern that stuck out to her. She then compared another student behavior she did not like and addressed in class: students sleeping. However, Amy pointed out that this was a behavior of white students, and that it was not as annoying to her. Then Amy made some important comparisons. She began by saying that perhaps she doesn't get along well with black students because she is a white female, but then compared herself to Mike, her mentor, a white male, leading her to dismiss that as an explanation. In dismissing that

explanation, Amy seemed to believe the problems could not be due to race, and concluded that since both mentor and intern are white, and both are treated the same, race is not the likely factor. Amy also offered two other factors, gender and age, however, she does not fully explore the impact of these three demographic factors. Part of that is likely due to the fact that she's describing interaction with a class, which contained a variety of ethnicities in both genders, making it difficult to determine patterns.. Another part is that she lacked the concepts needed to examine how such factors impact her relationships. Finally, to be able to do so requires time, and Amy's time was fully booked, leaving little time to reflect on these complicated social interactions, something that Amy ambivalently tried to resolve in this interview segment.

This situation is both Amy's problem and it is not. For one, it is Amy's problem because I have been describing events, thoughts, and feelings from her life, and it is with her habits of thinking about blacks, and her interactional habits formed through her life that she engaged with different types of people. And through this engagement, Amy performed herself as a particular type of person—a caring, concerned, somewhat easygoing person, but also as a white, middle class teacher, and the other person with whom she's interacting will view and judge her as a result. But it is not Amy's problem, nor is it Amanda's or Bill's, in the sense that this is not unique to her, but part of the American drama, as this society was founded upon racist exploitation for the production of material wealth. Nearly all born in this nation learn about race and the proper roles for particular types of people in the society. And these roles, their reasons for them, and the history embedded in these repeated actions, are acted out all the time, often without an actors' conscious knowledge. Having not interacted with nonwhites prior to enrolling at

the university, Amy, like many racially isolated individuals, mainly learned about nonwhites, especially blacks, through her interactions with family, peers, community members, and the media, and these stories and images were her strongest guides as she struggled with the problem of how to teach.

The Social Dynamics of White Teachers with Black Students

In our last interview, Amanda and I further discussed racial issues and their impacts on her teaching. In one question, I suggested that some people of color see school as a place that tries to change them, that tries to make them assimilate into dominant society, what might be called white ways of thinking and living. I asked her if this idea applied:

> Amanda: I think there's a sense of—I want to say rebellion but it's not necessarily rebellion, maybe black kids recognizing that and they're like, 'I do not want that to happen,' er—they don't necessarily want to become white but they know that they have to go through the white process in order to succeed.... They know that you have to talk the talk, you have to walk the walk, and that's the white way, in order, you know, to get out. And I'm not saying that that's necessarily the case, but I think that's their mentality behind it.
>
> John: Do you think that that's the case? Or do you think.... <Amanda shakes head> How do you see it then, as a teacher?
>
> Amanda: Um, I don't necessarily think that's always the case because it's hard to dictate what's right, like I can't say, 'My way is right because I'm white.' Well I'm making up my own way as I go along, so how do I know that's right? ... To each their own. You have to find your own way, you have to find your own way to succeed, no one's going to hand it to you.

With prompting, Amanda presented a nuanced and conflicted account for reasons why some black students do not succeed or try in school. She recognized that school is a white process and that students have to do it in order to succeed, meaning to obtain the valued credential: the diploma. Amanda was in a contradictory place where she saw that what schools required was not necessarily right, or perhaps more correctly, best for all students, while she simultaneously offered a narrow curriculum to her students. As she

continued to speak, it seemed her definition of "succeed" grew from getting good grades and a diploma to describing how each person has to find their own way, to live one's own life so that it's worthwhile to that person. Amanda attempted to grapple with serious and difficult issues, issues that she had not thought much about prior to the internship.

While Amanda thoughtfully explored racial issues with me, she also sought to minimize her own whiteness:

> I'm getting some pretty sensitive questions on topics that I don't necessarily know about, or I don't know how—if I could respond to it in a way that would be pleasing to my students. 'Cause I don't want to—sometimes I'll get—you know if we're talking about a topic that might have racist innuendos within it, I don't want to make a comment back to my kids, making them feel inferior to me, like I hold the power or whatever. I—I'm trying to think of a good example but I can't really think of one.

She was conscious about not being seen as the oppressor, as the one who tells nonwhite students how they should think or live; she does not want to offend others. Interestingly, she couldn't come up with a particular example, perhaps because a situation like this had not occurred though it was something of great concern to her. Regardless, one of Amanda's aims was to erase her whiteness, to be the teacher in control, but not the white teacher overseeing black kids, teaching them they are inferior. This is further evidence of Amanda's colorblind thinking, which she shares with the other two interns. In fact, Amy reported that she talked with her mother about discipline and teaching. While they would speak about ESL students, with whom Amy's mother had worked substantially in an Illitch City elementary school, Amy never brought up her discipline issues with black students that we examined in the last section, saying, "I don't know if I brought that up to here. … I talk about certain students in the class but I don't think I ever even mentioned what race they were. If they were African American, Asian, or Hispanic,

or white, that wasn't something I would bring up." For Amy, race was a silent factor that she only hesitantly mentioned.

Later in the same interview, I asked Amanda about what she made of the fact that she was a white teacher in a majority black school and she said:

> I didn't really think anything of it at first, I was like, 'Oh, whatever.' Seriously I was like, 'whatever.' ... But—and it wasn't until a couple of the teachers, a couple of the white teachers started picking out students and like we would talk about them, ... that would have problems with all of the white teachers but none of the black teachers, or maybe it was just like the female white, as opposed to the male white or whatever. And it wasn't until we started talking about those students who had a problem with white people, or with white authority figures that I really started to think, 'Okay, you know what, they're—it's not—I'm not living in a bubble anymore, like there really are people here who can't accept me because I'm white. And they're students.' And that was kind of a little reality check there.

Amanda began by thinking that being a white teacher in a majority black school did not matter, but over the course of the year Amanda experienced her reality check. She got her wish of experiencing an urban school, something outside of her middle class, suburban, private school experience, which showed a dimension of social interaction that, up to that point, was completely unknown to her: race played a part in people's interactions. Interestingly, talking with some of the other white teachers helped challenge her colorblind views.

I pushed the issue further:

> John: So you have essentially, at that school then, you have a largely white staff overseeing a largely black student population, which in a lot of ways can be seen as symbolic of the country in general. So what do you think then of that, given your position and your authority in the school with this dynamic?
>
> Amanda: It's ironic I think, I mean, I haven't really stopped to think about it that much, but I mean, Miss B is like, 'Wow that is kind of funny that 90% of the teachers are white, and were supposed to get our students, who are black, who we've never— Like I've never dealt with anything—I've never dealt with a black person's perspective— Or, like I can hear about it but I've never lived it firsthand, so from that it would be hard to relate to them. I can see where they're coming

> from— I would want—I don't know if I feel weird with just strictly— if I was the only white person at a black school, but I'm sure it would cross my mind, and I'm sure that they'd recognize that pretty quickly, I'm sure they'd pick up on it. Especially if, you know were up there being like, 'Yeah, this is what you guys have to do,' or 'This is what you have to go through.' I'd pick up on it.

In her statement, Amanda acknowledged a limitation to her ability to understand a black person's experience, because of her encapsulated white experience. Through her internship, she built a better understanding of the systemic nature of racism, and she slowly came to see that in her role, she is implicated in that system. She started her answer by saying that she hadn't really stopped to think about this issue, which is significant because she began her answers that way only a few times, and always in answer to a question that required her to think of herself as a raced individual. She then described how a white person could be viewed as an agent of a system that she had limited awareness of was not necessarily fair for nonwhites. Consequently, we can say that Amanda, like the other interns, exhibited very strong habits of acting white. She was largely colorblind, had had limited interactions with nonwhites, tended to avoid racial discussions, and had some fear that she could have unpleasant and painful racial interactions. I've described Amanda's thinking on the white teacher / black student dynamic because she seemed to be the most racially aware of the three interns, confronting a manifestation of the US race problem. It is a subject that people with much more time and theoretical tools consider and debate. But Amanda was studying to be a teacher and had many concerns besides race, a difficult issue for many Americans, especially when experiencing it for the first time amidst learning how to teach.

So far, stories of "resistance."

So far, the stories of Amy, Amanda, and Bill can be counted as stories of resistance. Arguably, these three interns were largely encapsulated in whiteness and the internship

brought them into significant and extended contact with nonwhites for the first time in their lives. In Frankenburg's (1993) terms, we could say the interns acted in colorblind ways by seeking to minimize their whiteness and by trying to treat their students the same. They used particular habits of being white: ignore race altogether, avoid discussing it when it comes up in class, attribute African American behavior to home life and culture (Ladson-Billings, 2006). The interns deployed these habits of acting white, even as they recognized they might not be adequate. Within my course, I made specific attempts to racialize many of the situations interns described and to force interns to at least participate in that discourse. Over time though, because of interactions with peers and other teachers, as well as through the interviews, these three interns had to think and talk about race. However, their emerging habits of race talk were largely confined to discussing the issues with me, as there did not seem to be much change in the ways they taught class. Ringrose's (2007) argument that people resist unfamiliar situations that bring up a range of conflicting feelings is no doubt at work here. The interns have learned that to harbor negative thoughts and feelings toward others on the basis of race is not acceptable, yet that is what they do as they figure out how to work with their students.

In looking at the interns' schooling histories and how they speak of their histories in contrast to their Grand Pillar placements, we have seen that the interns embody many of the characteristics described in the literature on white teacher resistance, even though that literature is largely limited to preservice teacher education courses. In a nutshell, we can say that these white interns were resistant to engaging with their students as racialized beings as well as quite hesitant to ponder how race affects the teacher-student relationship within these schools. I must give that argument its due, and recognize that

these three interns came into Grand Pillar with a continuity in which race was generally unfamiliar and to be avoided, and doing so would allow the three interns to protect their views of themselves. However, these interns' stories are more complex than the complexity I've just described. Race and class are not the only characteristics that distinguish interns from their students; there is also an important matter of their very different academic histories and orientations.

Good Students Become Teachers

In this section I will consider another dimension critical to understanding interns' struggles learning to teach in Grand Pillar: their reactions to the academic performance of their students. There are many similarities between the interns, but I will discuss each one in their own section to highlight their unique perspectives. I will describe their recollections of being a high school student; examine their tracking in high school and compare to the tracks they taught in Grand Pillar; examine their work habits, thoughts and feelings as teachers and compare those to their student habits, thoughts, and feelings. Finally, I will discuss the importance of grades for interns and compare those to the student attitudes they described.

Amy

Amy graduated as one of two valedictorians from Illitch City High, earning an A in every class. Amy was enrolled in the college prep track, but even so, Amy told me that getting good grades was not hard for her. Amy was assigned class work as well as homework, but she said, "I know my teachers gave homework a lot, but, I was smart enough that I just used my class time." Amy used her class time efficiently to complete work including most of her essay assignments. She said her most difficult class was a

government class, and that was mostly because she had to complete projects at home, which she described as tedious, sometimes spanning six weeks, though among the more interesting assignments she did. However, most classes did not present this level of challenge. Amy noted, "The curriculum was, I don't want to say dumbed down, but it felt like it was a breeze. I never had to study." She added that it was enough for her just to show up to class. A key aspect of Amy's high school student work habits was efficiency, the ability to complete her work at school.

The product of a college-prep education, Amy found herself teaching regular track Biology and low-level Integrated Science classes at Pinnacle. Amy said, "The other teachers say, you know, this is just a really rough group of bio students" this year, as they told her how the implementation of the International Baccalaureate curriculum had tracked some students into the IB program, concentrating lower ability students in the regular classes. In addition, Amy noted regular biology enrolled students who had failed and had to repeat the class, and those who failed the first semester were still required to take the second semester.

Integrated Science was a class primarily for juniors and seniors needing to complete their third year of science required for graduation, who preferred this elective to physics or chemistry. She characterized the students as:

> A lot of the dropouts, a lot of the 'I don't care,' this, 'I hate school,' 'This sucks,' with an occasional good kid, the occasional one that's like, 'Chemistry's too hard for me, physics doesn't make sense, so I'm gonna take this easy class 'cause I know I can pass it and get a good grade.'

Amy added that many students who feel they might not succeed in physics or chemistry usually switch out "'Cause they're like, 'this is way too easy,' and I'm like, 'yeah, you're a lot smarter than this but this is extremely hard for a lot of people that are

in here,' you know. And so finding a balance with that class is just as hard." Amy saw Integrated Science as the low-level required science elective into which students bring their negative attitudes toward school. Amy further described the grading for that class as based not so much on the quality of the work, but because many of the students are "so lazy and unorganized," on their responsibility in completing and submitting assignments. Amy said, "And a lot of them, when they set their goals they're like, a D is their goal.... I'm not going to push them beyond that, I would like to see them do better, I know they're capable of doing better, but I only have so much energy every day." Thus, Amy found herself working with many students who didn't care so much about their grade, as they did about earning a passing grade to graduate.

Amy experienced several other difficulties in teaching Integrated Science, including being unfamiliar with the content (a situation similar to Amanda's, see Chapter Five), which came from a variety of science disciplines; it was her mentor's pet class which he knew how to teach, but for which little was written down; since she taught Integrated second and third hours, she only got to observe Mike teach the class at fifth hour after she had finished; and class sizes were large, with over 40 students. She said of teaching it:

> Amy: Integrated Science, we teach all this crazy, out there stuff that, yeah, should be easy, but not when they catch you off guard. Um, it's just completely different, it's interesting and it's cool, but it's just—I don't like the kids. And, yeah.
>
> John: Why don't you like the kids? In Integrated Science you're talking about?
>
> Amy: Yeah, yeah—I think they're older, they just—a lot of them are just so disrespectful— really, really rude and I hate the fact that I have to be mean and I don't feel like I can let up, like as soon as I let up my guard or try to have fun it just gets out of control. As soon as we try and do a lab, like, it's just outrageous.

Although Amy was frequently exhausted and frustrated with a number of things during the internship, she rarely made comments about not liking her students. However,

the comment is revealing because many of the issues we have already identified contributed to her frustration. In particular, with a large number of students, Amy found it difficult to manage the class, especially during labs when students were moving around the classroom rather than sitting in rows. She also focused on their behavior, characterizing the students as disrespectful and rude, echoing her earlier descriptions of students not wanting to be at school, let alone in Integrated Science. Amy thus created a controlled environment in which she felt she had to be mean to limit the chance for students to act out and express their disdain for school, which could be directed against her as the authority figure in the room.

Amy did report some positive moments with Integrated Science, most notably a few of the lab activities in which students were learning about food chemistry, and a journal activity she conducted with the class. In the journal prompt, she asked students to write down what they thought about the class, their expectations for it, and what Amy could do to help them in the class. She said she was surprised to learn that the majority of the students liked the class, something she felt good about, and that a lot of students found the behavior of a few individuals in class distracting and ruining their experience. Amy added:

> A couple of them were like, 'you know, there's some students who are really mean to you and disrespectful to you and I don't think that's fair and, you know, it's so hard for you up there.' Blah, blah, blah. Which makes me feel good, too, you know, and I'm not the only one that sees it.

Through the journal prompt, Amy felt that students validated her impression of the problems in the class. She said she wrote comments back to each student and after that class period, several students thanked her for the comments, and some even gave her a hug.

When I asked Amy which student in her seventh hour Biology class was most like her, she told me it was Autumn:

> She's just always on top of things, she does amazing work, does her work well. She always has everything here on time, when she's sick she comes in in the morning and at lunch before classes to get the work that she missed, and stays in here and does it so she's on track for the next class and, um—she's really bright. Nice, nice girl, and works, she can work with almost anybody, I mean I could put her in any group and she'd be fine, she'd help them and—she'll do, she'll do good things, she'll go far.

Amy described multiple characteristics that were similar to her as a student: Autumn did her work, came in to make up work that she missed, was a pleasure for the teacher, and will make something of herself. Amy highlighted Autumn's intelligence, something that stood out to Amy when compared to other students in the class. However, it may also be the case that rather than even being really bright, Autumn was a hard worker, or perhaps, a combination of the two. Autumn was also white and a quiet student in class; she spoke only when answering a question or when working with other students, usually, though not exclusively, other white females. In addition to Autumn's academic ability and work habits, Amy also focused on Autumn's personality, who she described as working well with others and being nice. When asked in a different interview what kind of student Amy felt she could most easily relate to, she said, "I think the quiet, well behaved, strong academic students, parent involvement." Except for parent involvement, Autumn embodied all of these characteristics.

In one interview, when Amy described what several different groups were working on for their posters about HIV, and she said of Autumn's group, a total of three white females, "those are all my top students up there." Amy sees herself in Autumn and Autumn is one of Amy's best students; she is able to perform her role well as a student in Amy's class. In an earlier interview, Amy described an extra credit assignment she gave

students and said that Autumn, who had over 100 percent in the class, was the only student to complete it. Amy further compared Autumn to herself as a high school student and to Autumn's classmates:

> And that would be me, that was the type of person I was, so it's hard to understand why they don't take advantage of it when it's right there in front of them, and it would probably take 20 minutes out of their busy hectic lives to do, if that, and that could mean the difference between failing and passing.

For Autumn, completing the assignment was likely a combination of something to do and a way to ensure that she maintained a high grade in biology class, yet the other students did not complete the assignment, even if they were on the pass/fail border, something incomprehensible for Amy.

Amy was aware that student ability was a strong social marker that influenced peer group formation. I asked Amy to describe what she noticed about how students grouped themselves racially at Pinnacle, and near the end of her lengthy answer Amy said:

> They tend not to mix together. They tend to just stay together more by race than anything. You know you will also see that sometimes the really good students will all work together too. I've noticed that. The kids that all have A's will be in a group together and will all work together. That's more of a personality thing or work ethic.

Here Amy described the powerful bonding force of the work ethic of the students who get the best grades, a comparison reminiscent of the fact that Amy socialized with the smart students in her school when she was a high school student. To Amy, most Pinnacle students hung out with their own race, but the smart kids hung out in their own noticeable groups, like Autumn's HIV poster project group. Part of school socialization is dependent on academic ability, strongly influenced by the tracking system. Amy described other smart students as one of her three significant high school peer associations, and now she found herself in front of regular and low-level classes, with

many students whose attitudes toward school differed from her own. Amy is not only a young white female, her habits as a long-time good school student provide the dominant lens she used to evaluate student learning and performance.

Bill

As the son of two teachers who knew several teachers outside of the school environment, Bill had internalized many behaviors of a good student. He commented:

> I was a very good student, I did, you know I was always at school for one thing, I behaved myself the whole time, I, um, you know I liked to have fun but like you know when it was time to shut your mouth and pay attention I could sense that well so I did it, I never pissed any teachers off because I was, you know— so there, you know I had a good relationship with almost all my teachers because of that you know, not too much of a problem, I mean I was a good student, academically I was good, I was near the top, you know that was something I just kind of strived to do too, though, like I wanted, I don't know what it is I wanted exactly, I kind of liked learning but also I was striving for the good grades you know.

In this quote, Bill describes many dimensions of being a good student. First and foremost is his behavior, beginning with regular attendance and continuing into the classroom where his sense of appropriate behavior guided him to silence when teachers required it, another affirmation that Bill was concerned about avoiding trouble and maintaining good relationships with his teachers. Bill then turned his attention to his academic work, through which he became known as a top student, and he did so because of his stated interest in both learning the material and getting good grades. In this respect, Bill indicated that he was both intrinsically and extrinsically motivated to do well in classes, and in his interviews he consistently speaks as highly about his academic experiences as his music experiences. The quote presents a strong feeling that Bill has some natural, indescribable, almost innate sense of how to do school well, especially in the phrase "like

I wanted, I don't know what it is I wanted exactly." He didn't need to know what he wanted, and he got it.

In high school, Bill was tracked in college level classes, including advanced placement courses, earning a GPA that was a bit higher than a 4.0 since honors classes were weighted. I asked Bill how Bergen High tracked students and he said there was some tracking in middle school, but a lot in the high school. He said of the available science classes:

> Most people took biology as a freshman but then you also have the option of ... earth science, physical science, probably a life science, maybe anatomy, something like that, those were technically the lower level, quote lower level classes, because normally, the usual track, or if you were going to college they would suggest that you take biology, chemistry, physics, and then an elective AP class for your senior year, so that's what I did.

Here, Bill heavily described the classes that lower-tracked students would take before moving on to the other two tracks, which he did so by saying, "because normally, the usual track, or if you were going to college...." This phrase marks a clear differentiation between the low level and the other two, which are lumped together as the normal way to take science classes. This lumping is evidenced by his reference that students in these two tracks would take AP classes like he did, something unlikely for most regular-track students.

As far as influential classes, Bill most often mentioned the honors chemistry class that he took as a sophomore, a class "I was privileged to take," not because he was allowed to, but because of the benefits it provided in preparing him for college. He said of the class that "I never worked that hard in my life" and described the work as involving lab work and extensive problem solving. Bill described his chemistry teacher as a dedicated woman who held chem nights after school, providing opportunities for

students to work in groups on chemistry problems while offering assistance. Bill mentioned that his chemistry teacher sometimes even provided up to three chem nights a week, putting in many evening hours.

Bill said that once he got into the groove of going to chem nights in September or October, he didn't miss a week all year. He described the class as difficult, but worthwhile and fulfilling, especially when it "got so hard and so frustrating," but then he figured out the work. He added, "It was awesome, especially because I knew I did want to go to college." In a different interview, Bill described the class as a true college preparatory class:

> I felt real lucky in that because that was like the college prep experience that people always talked about, ... and that one class, I felt I had an advantage over more people or many people in my school, 'cause it was just, you know, it was that one class, I was in it and if you tried— it was a great experience because it was hard, it was real hard but, I mean three and a half years later too, when I was in college chemistry, it all came back to me. I mean obviously something had done, she had done something right.

Bill knew he was going to go to college, and his time in chemistry allowed him to accumulate valuable capital, including how to do college-level work and the work ethic needed to be successful in demanding science classes. Bill specifically stated that this chemistry class provided him with an advantage over others, both at Bergen and at Midwestern University.

Bill felt that Bergen High prepared him well for college, and usually focused on his math and science classes. He spoke about the benefits of having taken college prep classes:

> There's something about being in the harder classes and— like when I was in honors chem. Or when I got into like, calc and stuff, like being in the hardest classes in our school and like being able to do them well, it just felt good and like, one, it was nice to show everybody else that you could do it, but I mean, inside it

> felt good because I know calculus is like one of those words, 'calculus,' 'calculus,' wherever you go.

Bill seemed intrinsically motivated to take calculus and valued learning that material, although in a different interview, he allowed that he liked, but not loved, math and physics. At the same time, he was aware that calculus served as an important social marker, that being able to say that he had taken calculus and did well, that he had a degree in mathematics, or that he was able to teach it, elicited responses from people that involved some sort of awe. In fact, during another interview, Bill and I discussed how when we told people that we taught high school physics, many responded with respect and often made comments on the subject's difficulty for them, if they had taken it. Thus, Bill possessed highly valued cultural capital and knew it, in the ways I described and because his dual degrees and certifications would make him an attractive candidate at many schools.

Yet Bill was teaching Conceptual Physics at Stratford High, a class required of all students, and he lamented the fact there was little mathematics involved in the class. He said he didn't have a preference for teaching math or physics in the future and went on to say:

> To be truly honest I just know that I like the more mathematical, slightly higher level physics than the conceptual physics.... I think it loses a lot, you can, I mean, there's something to be said about making it conceptual, but that's also why there's physical science as opposed to physics, so that's why I don't always love doing it. That's another thing, like, if I wanted to teach physics, the school I would choose would be more based on that, I mean I really probably won't want to teach here at Stratford for a couple reasons, but one, I don't really want to teach Conceptual Physics, I mean their AP class is more like [Bergen's] regular physics class.

To Bill, Conceptual Physics is on par with Physical Science, as both are classes that do not rely on extensive mathematics, and to remove math from physics means that class

"loses a lot." Bill gave an example of what that meant by saying that he could not really teach the idea of projectile motion, the motion of an object in two dimensions, because without math, it was impossible to calculate how far objects could travel before hitting the ground under the influence of gravitational forces. In this sense, Bill seemed to believe that the essence of the discipline was lost, for mathematics is a primary tool in traditional physics classes. Being at Stratford further reinforced this belief because the class was at a lower level than he believed it should be, as evidenced by equating Stratford's AP physics class with Bergen's regular physics class. Bill's view of the difficulty of math and science, combined with his accomplishments within those domains and his internship placement, seems to indicate that Bill felt he was not using his knowledge to the extent that he could, and even that he deserved to. Bill added that when he searched for a job, a regular physics class with mathematics would be one of the criteria required for him to accept the job.

I asked Bill to identify the student most like him in his 6th hour Conceptual Physics class, and he had more difficulty answering than Amy or Amanda. He said:

> It's definitely not one that's real close necessarily, the one that I would say maybe is most close would be Julia. She is, pretty on top of the game in terms of academics, um, she's involved in—she's involved in the school for the most part. I think she does like, the drama thing, you know? It's like, she's not like the jock/sport kind of thing you know? So, she is a person that might be kind of involved.... Like I was too but, was I always out on the sports fields so everybody would see me? No, you know, just that kind of thing.... Like I said she's pretty into academics, is involved but in more of the fine arts aspect, and um, she's respectful of everyone. You know, she's a pretty good kid, she really is, like I said, she's respectful of everybody and doesn't try to create any problems ever, you know. If she needs help she'll ask for it.

In comparing himself as a student to Julia he noted that she was a good student in a number of ways, such as generally being on top of her academics, one of Bill's top schooling priorities, and then described her moderate involvement in extracurricular

activities, similar to himself. He also noted she was respectful of others and did not create problems in class. This is in keeping with Bill's view of himself: he strove to be respectful of teachers, to shut his mouth when required, to pay attention, and do his work. Julia was white too.

Because Bill was ambivalent about identifying with Julia, I asked him in what ways she differed from him. He stated that he worked quite a bit harder than her and that over the last two tests, Julia had not done as well in the class as she normally did, noting that "she's bright and can do it all very well." Bill then continued to focus on her work ethic, citing that as the biggest difference, because she had gotten more involved in the drama production, and had missed a few classes and assignments, which led to her lower test performance. Bill said of the situation, "I wouldn't have let myself get to where she is right now," affirming a sustained commitment to doing his work as a vital part of his student identity. And this description was not limited to Julia, for when I asked Bill which of the students was most unlike him, he paused for over ten seconds and said, "That's tough, because I don't know which one is most unlike me. There's a lot that are very unlike me." So as a good math and physics student with degrees in both, Bill was at the head of some Stratford Conceptual Physics classes, where few students embodied the characteristics that he did as a student.

Amanda

Amanda took advanced classes at Eureka Christian School. She described how the math class strongly determined one's class schedule, basically creating two academic tracks, such that she saw many of the same people in her classes throughout the day:

> It wasn't like the dumb one. ... We didn't even know. It was just the smart class and the more advanced kids and then the kids who just didn't go as fast. And the only thing that you really got tracked in was math. That was it. Everything else,

> you were just categorized as dumb class, smart class, depending on what math class you were in.

However, the math class did not fully determine the placement, as Amanda remembered that other classes were more mixed. Juniors and seniors chose the type of English class to take, so those could be more mixed and Amanda stated, "Like history was always mixed. Always."

Amanda was always tracked in the higher math classes, which posed a challenge to her. In discussing some of the differences between Amanda and her peers, I asked her to rank herself in the distinction between bright students and hard workers. She answered:

> Yeah. I mean, I just don't—I remember maybe like a fourth of what I learned, if that. So I really don't remember a whole lot. But if they represented how hard I worked, that's a good indicator. But if they were just representing my natural ability, no. I always had to work hard for my grades, it never was just like <snaps fingers> easy.

When I revisited the idea that she worked harder than other students, Amanda gently protested, "It wasn't like I was slaving every night, but I just had to sit down and do my math homework. I couldn't do it five minutes before the bell rang." Upon further questioning, Amanda revealed that in her junior and senior years she spent about two to three hours nightly on math homework alone, in addition to work from other classes.

Amanda took math all four years of high school, through calculus. Calculus was not required and ECS had a policy allowing seniors to leave after their morning classes, but Amanda's parents would not allow her to do that. So rather than enroll in study hall again, Amanda chose calculus. For five of the years between seventh and twelfth grades, Amanda took math with the same teacher, who she regarded as one of her most influential:

> She was an awesome teacher just because of how much help she offered her kids.... You could always go in there at lunch time, after school, before school,

> anytime, she would go out of her way to help you. It also didn't help (sic) that I was good friends with her son who was in my class. So, I mean that was nice, you know, it was a little more relaxed between us since I was friends with her kid too.

Because of her parents, Amanda chose to enroll in calculus, even though math required significant time and effort on her part every night. A selling point for Amanda was that she liked the teacher and felt that she had a good relationship with her; having a good relationship with teachers is something that Amanda revered. Amanda described herself as a hard worker who had to spend a lot of time doing math homework.

Through the interviews, one gets the strong impression that Amanda was not only a hard working student, but very well behaved. We talked about some of the different groups at high school, and Amanda said that the most despised group in school was the teachers' pets, that group of students who always answered questions and did everything they could to please the teachers. Amanda clearly stated she was not part of this group, which differed from smart kids and consisted of "just annoying kids." Students in this category tried hard to garner favor and recognition from teachers, as well as to prove their smartness. When Amanda introduced the idea of annoying kids, she also added another group she held in low regard: "the kids that, a lot of the times, the troublemakers would be in the lowest category."

Amanda shared that she was a relatively quiet student in class, and did not have many verbal altercations with her peers, and never any physical fighting. As we continued the interview though, Amanda revealed that she was more likely to get into a fight with her siblings than with anyone else at the school, though most of this fighting took place at home. Amanda described living at home with her siblings where there was a lot of bickering going on, over stupid things that didn't really matter. Amanda went on to share that she hardly even spoke to her brother for a three-year period: "We just didn't

necessarily see eye to eye, like his lifestyle was completely different from my lifestyle and neither one of us would be open to the other's. He thought I was a little goody two shoes and I thought he should lay off the weed."

Although Amanda did not classify her brother as a troublemaker, he seemed to embody a lot of qualities that Amanda associated with the troublemaker group. This familial interaction allows us to make some sense of Amanda's worldview. Amanda mentions the paradigms each sibling used to view the other. Her brother saw her as a goody two shoes, a term Amanda had used unprompted twice to refer to herself in this and a previous interview. At the same time, Amanda saw her brother as a drug user, which she considered a troublemaker activity. This view of her brother is bolstered by tracing the interview thread: students in the school's lowest social categories, including troublemakers; fighting in school, which led to her siblings; and then this sharp disagreement over how one should live life. The goody two shoes / troublemaker binary seems important to Amanda's view of students.

The first time that Amanda referred to herself as a goody two shoes came in answer to my question on whether she had received many detentions at ECS. She said she had never received one and that ECS was a very strict place that made heavy use of detentions. Her discussion of the discipline policy at the school also made her temper her words about just how serious the troublemakers were in the school, because with the constant threat of detentions, students seemed willing to push the boundaries only so far, though Amanda recounted that four students were expelled and 12 were suspended after they had been caught drinking during her senior year. But Amanda stayed out of trouble.

I asked Amanda what type of student she was in her high school:

to

w

m

th

wa

st

di

wa

res

wa

Am

hap

rep

ECS

> In high school? I was the quiet kid. That's probably hard to tell. Yeah. Pretty much what you see is what you get, okay. You know, I'd put my two cents in every now and then, but, whatever, you know. I just went with it most of the time. I was quiet.... Just, whatever. That's how I am. You know, I don't feel the need to be talking every two seconds. That's not my thing. You know, I was always a respectful kid. You know, when the teacher's talking you don't talk, so I was very well trained.

Amanda's statement that I probably couldn't tell she was a quiet kid likely referred to the two different ways I witnessed Amanda act that year. In the interviews, Amanda was very talkative, and similarly in her classroom, Amanda often spoke confidently. Yet in my university course, Amanda did not contribute very often, and usually sat silently. In this segment, she referred to herself as "a respectful kid," and added that she "was very well trained." She described herself as respectful, that the ways she had behaved as a student displayed respect to the teachers and the school; she often spoke of respect while discussing students in her geography classes. Interestingly, Amanda described herself as well trained indicating a learned quality. We can say Amanda developed a habit of being respectful to her teachers, and that she was very good at performing her role in school.

Given the severity of ECS' discipline policy and her own behavioral past, Amanda was surprised by the behavior she witnessed at Stratford, most particularly with fighting:

> We knew you don't step outta line, at my high school.... You knew that there was a big consequence and so I was thinking, you know, kids are gonna know this, but I had no idea that kids were not afraid of what was going to happen to them at Stratford, I had no idea that if you, you know, got in a fight, I thought getting in a fight was just like random things, like it hardly ever happened, no, wrong.

Amanda said a number of fights occurred at Stratford, including the one that almost happened in her classroom, and that administrators did not necessarily punish students as required by the zero-tolerance policy.

Amanda focused on student behavior as a big difference between her experience at ECS and what she saw at Stratford, citing difficulty students in her regular tracked

classes had in understanding her directions and how behavior varied greatly from day to day. She also added, "I feel like, we respected our teachers a little bit more, than the kids do here." When I asked her what she supposed made the regular classes so difficult, she cited parental involvement and home life as important factors before continuing with the theme of respect:

> It's definitely about respect though, because the honors kids, they're talkative, and they'll give you a hard time but I don't really ever feel that they don't really respect me, like obviously you're gonna get some instances of disrespect in the class, and then you deal with it then, and its like, ok you dealt with it, we're moving on, whereas in the first and the fifth hour class, the regular classes, its more—they think that they can disrespect me because I'm disrespecting them type thing.

Amanda went on to clarify that it was not the case that she disrespected the students in the regular classes, but that they would sometimes interpret the things she said as disrespectful to them, noting that students sometimes misinterpreted her sarcasm.

Amanda prided herself on her relationships, once answering a question about what she believed herself to be effective at in her classroom:

> [laughs] That's funny, I don't know. I think I do a really good job of getting along with my kids, if anything. If I have to pick the top thing, it'd probably be getting along with my kids, because I could get along with the majority of my kids. Not necessarily all of them, but the majority of them I could get along with and sometimes, if you just get along with your teacher, that can help you, um, not think the class is as horrible as it is.

At the outset Amanda qualified her statement as relative, since she had to pick something at which she's most effective. Interestingly, one of her beliefs about the teacher-student relationship was that if the student can get along with the teacher, then they won't think "the class is as horrible as it is," referring to the classes she taught, which she regarded as boring and not necessarily useful or interesting for students. Consequently, one of her interests in establishing a good relationship with students was that through humanizing

interactions with them, she would more effectively get them to accept the situation they found themselves in.

Upon further questioning though, we find that what Amanda means by getting along with her kids is up for debate. She referred to "troublemakers," saying:

> I mean those kinds of kids I can't relate to but, I mean, you know, I try to relate to the things that they do outside of school (laughs) honestly. Or if they're a really good student I can relate to them working hard, or trying to make that good grade when you know you have so much ahead of you.

The troublemakers are the group that Amanda had the most difficulty relating to, a problem since a significant way she tried to relate to her students was by building rapport based on academic accomplishments. When I asked her which students were most like her as a student, Amanda identified both Raquel and Anna:

> Amanda: Because they're quiet and they, they don't really say too much in class but they know usually what's going on, I mean sometimes you can see when they're just, they're not with it, and you just, you don't hold it against them for it, but they honestly, they do their work, they're good students, they don't really cause too much trouble.
>
> John: Ok, hmmm. Where do they rank sort of in your liking of students in this class?
>
> Amanda: See, that varies, because I like kids for different reasons. So—I mean they're not, they are probably not my favorites in the class, but they're not my worst favorites either. They're probably somewhere in the middle.

Amanda cited Raquel and Anna as good students who don't cause much trouble, consistent with her own habits as a student. I noticed that both Anna and Raquel each made only one contribution to the class during my visits, and one time I was able to observe Anna a bit when she joined a group of girls near me for individual work time. Both students were typically quiet and well-behaved in class, though on the one day, Anna did her fair share of talking with another student as the others in the group worked. Though Amanda identified these two students as being most similar to her, moments

earlier she had not remembered that Anna had been in class when I asked her help to record names on my seating chart:

> John: Shannon. And then who sits to her right?
>
> Amanda: Um, oh I can't remember.
>
> John: A quiet white girl sits there.
>
> Amanda: She was here today?
>
> John: Yeah.
>
> Amanda: Oh, Anna.

It is striking that within minutes of having finished teaching her only class so far that day, Amanda could not remember if Anna had been present. When I asked how these two students ranked in terms of favorites for second hour, Amanda said they were in the middle, not her favorites or the worst. The middle is an interesting place to be. Amanda described her own family as solidly middle class and characterized a problem in planning lessons as determining the middle to teach to. In some ways, the middle represents the realm of mediocrity, as the place where the mass can be found, as being on either side sticks out from the middle. Indeed, Amanda's inability to recall Anna's having been in class earlier indicated that other than the fact that Anna and Raquel are good students that teachers would like to have in class because they are unlikely to be problems, and students that are easily managed, they are not necessarily stand-out students, similar to Amanda who seemed to avoid notice as a student. Finally, there is the added fact that the two students Amanda selected are white.

Student similarities.

The interns exhibit a number of similarities in their habits of being students, and some key points are highlighted in Table 3.6. They were all tracked in the most

Table 3.6: Summary of Important Intern Student Characteristics			
	Amanda	Bill	Amy
Intern academic preparation	Tracked in challenging math classes with the "smart" class. Majored in history.	Tracked in college prep, chemistry most significant. Degrees in physics and math.	Tracked in college prep. Majored in biology.
Placement classes	Two regular and two honors World Geography	Four regular-level Conceptual Physics; one high level math (FST)	Two regular Biology; two low-level Integrated Science
Intern student academic chars.	Hard worker. Took challenging classes. Always completed work and strove to get highest possible grade.	Wanted to achieve in high school. On top of his academics. Academically competitive.	Found high school a breeze. Efficient worker who took little home. Valedictorian.
Intern student behavior chars.	Very quiet. Hardly talked in class. A good, obedient student. Goody two shoes.	Knew when to behave and not a problem for teachers.	Well behaved. Used her class time to do her work. Tried to downplay achievement with other students.
Placement student most like intern	Anna and Raquel: Quiet, do their work, don't cause much trouble.	Julia: Bright and capable. Largely on top of her work. Moderately involved in school.	Autumn: Bright. Nice person, works well alone and with others. On top of her work. Does all assignments.
Placement student most unlike intern	Troublemakers. Mostly in regular classes.	Many of the students.	Those with poor attitudes. Don't complete the work or care about passing.
Racial views	Colorblind, but with increased awareness of race's role in her work.	Colorblind. Considers race largely irrelevant to learning or interaction.	Colorblind, with essentialist views of African Americans.

challenging courses that their high schools offered. While all found at least one class to be challenging, Amanda seemed to have to put in the most work to meet her challenge. The interns got very good grades and were in the top ranks of their classes, with Amy being a valedictorian. All three described themselves as very well behaved and as very respectful toward their teachers, acting as the model students they desired to have in the classes they were now teaching. However, they found that, particularly in their lower level classes, significant numbers of students did not share the interns' attitudes on the value of schooling, and did not necessarily behave as the interns desired. The students

that int

interns

middle

had all

importa

that ste

saw in t

students

with th

descript

accomp

of being

perform

The Im

Alt

students

importa

not a si

asked:

J

s

T

f

that interns chose as most like them embodied many of the characteristics that I found interns used to describe their student selves. These intern descriptions reflected their middle class upbringings, complete with an expectation to attend college, a value they had all internalized from sources they could not identify. All three constantly stated the importance of a college degree in order to live a good life, and all three had completed that step and were now preparing to enter respectable, middle class work. In addition, we saw in the last section that interns were largely colorblind, attempting to treat their students equitably and without regard to their race. The interns' affirmed their whiteness with their choices of the students most like them, and more importantly, in their descriptions of their own achievements, which they viewed as individual accomplishments and the result of their sustained effort and intelligence. It is these habits of being a good student that interns employed while evaluating their students' performances.

The Importance of Grades

Although there were differences in the ways that the three interns were good students, all clearly identified grades as very important to them and felt grades should be important to their students. With hints of frustration and resignation, Amy explained that not a single student submitted their final exam review assignment for extra credit. I then asked:

> John: So grades don't appear to be a huge motivator?
>
> Amy: No, they're really not, and that's, that's challenging for me because in my school grades were a huge motivator, everybody wanted to get a good grade. They don't care here, if it's a 'D' it's passing and that's good enough. It's hard to figure out how to motivate them when it's—obviously it's not a grade.

I pu

idea that

of excella

n in her r

sen of pr

would re

Jo
so

A
so
ba
kn

Jo

An

Grad

did not say

intrinsicall

greater ran

Without th

for how to

Proposal re

power to as

Amy n

always do t

task, about

teacher grad

I pushed Amy to think about what would motivate her students and she shared an idea that she had. Basically, Amy would recognize a student of the week for some form of excellence, related to behavior, attendance, or school work, take their picture, and post it in her room. Not only would she post their picture, but she would also give them some sort of prize for this achievement, although she was not quite sure what categories she would recognize students for or how to reward them. We concluded this conversation:

> John: So almost competition for recognition then, instead of like for grades or something.
>
> Amy: Right, right, rewarding good behavior, somebody's good citizenship, or if somebody participates every day, something like that you know? Yeah, it's basically the only, the only thing I've come up with so far, I don't know, I don't know if you have any ideas or anything you've tried.
>
> John: I'll be sure to watch and let you know when an idea pops into my head.
>
> Amy: Definitely, let them come my way 'cause, yeah, I don't know....

Grades were a very important motivator for Amy as a student. She said her parents did not say much to her as a child about getting good grades, but rather, she was intrinsically motivated to get the best grades she could. At Pinnacle however, she found a greater range in students' attitudes toward grades than she believed existed in Illitch City. Without the work-inducing power of one of Amy's strongest motivators, she was at a loss for how to motivate her students to do the work in her class. Consequently, Amy's proposal relied on extrinsic motivation just like grades, where she still maintained the power to assess student achievement, but in another form.

Amy never implemented this idea. And to top it off, even though students did not always do their work, Amy had to grade lots of papers and found herself behind on this task, about which she said, "I remember being in high school and wanting to help the teacher grade papers, I thought it was the coolest thing ever, 'so fun!' Jesus." The grading

task she undertook in high school was fun for her, probably because she always got such good grades, but now it was a pain for her, probably because of the time and work required, and possibly because each assignment she had to grade reminded her that students did not do their work with the commitment she expected and possessed herself.

One of Amanda's chief motivators to work in school was her grades:

> Yeah. I was pretty, I was pretty motivated by grades... I'd have to get good grades. It was kind of one of those things, it was like when you started off with good grades, it's like the teachers expected you to get good grades. Because if I slack at all, I mean, it just wasn't acceptable. 'Cause I mean, if you'd had the same kid for three years, now all of a sudden they're getting a C instead of an A, they're getting on your case.

Amanda tied her grades to the importance of fulfilling her teachers' expectations. There are two reasons for this. The first is that Amanda generally earned all As, and since the teachers knew about this, they came to expect that from her. She shared that one time when she had a C in her English class, the teacher "was really mad at me, really mad." Amanda said she had not done well on an assignment and that brought her grade down. A second reason was because as the second child in her family, Amanda followed her sister in ECS, who Amanda described as a better student. She sometimes felt unfairly judged, saying, "It was just assumptions, I mean teachers assume because my sister was a good student I'd be a good student, if I was a good student, my brother's gonna be a good student." And although it seems fair to say that Amanda was a good student much like her sister was a good student, it also seems fair to say that Amanda did not appreciate having to live in her sister's shadow.

But Amanda was not always content to simply earn an A in her classes:

> So it got to the point where I'm like, okay, yes, I had to get an A, but then it was, got to the point where I was like, well, I had to get not an A-. I had to get an A. And it got to a point, well, hey, you know, 95% isn't good enough. I need to get a

> 98%. Then I had to get 99%, then 100%. So honestly I was always stretching for higher and higher and higher.

How good of an A was needed? Amanda's talk is reminiscent of the idea of diminishing returns: after a certain point, exerting substantially more effort yields a smaller increase in the desired product (note the number spread); grades were so important that Amanda sometimes fought not just for the letter, but a higher number. Amanda described herself as competitive, and so getting the best grade she possibly could fits in with this characteristic. Interestingly though, Amanda shared on several occasions that she knew who the smart people in a class were, but didn't know their grades, adding to the competition's mystery. In fact, she attempted to conceal her grades from peers, a desire she translated into a teacher practice of returning students' papers upside down to hide the grade.

Amanda explained her parents' concern with her grades this way:

> We never, we never, my parents were never like, 'You have to get good grades or you're gonna die.' I mean, 'We're gonna kill you.' My parents were never like that. They didn't, yeah, they yelled at us if, you know, we would let our grades slip but it was never, you know, I never felt a whole lot of pressure from them.

In this quote, Amanda tells us that she did not receive a lot of pressure from her parents to get good grades, but how she does so is interesting. She begins by saying that her parents did not threaten death, which we can read as extreme pressure. Rather, they yelled at her if her grades slipped, which is some pressure, though much less. When we remember that Amanda rarely had low grades, like the C for which her English teacher yelled at her, then it seems reasonable that Amanda would not remember experiencing a lot of pressure from her parents to get good grades. The low parental pressure combined with Amanda's efforts to get not just an A, but a 98 percent in a class indicates that Amanda had high intrinsic motivation, symbolized in her grades, to do well in school.

She further added that she felt peer pressure to get good grades: "I mean, like once you hit the status of smart kid, you had to maintain that status."

Through "the status of smart kid," Amanda referred to part of her social identity while at ECS, an identity reinforced by both the school, primarily the teachers with which Amanda dealt, and her social group. In Amanda's mind, this status was threatened by one's work ethic. When speaking of others who lost the status of smart kid, she specifically referred to them as being lazy, emphasizing the necessity of doing the work. This is especially significant for Amanda because she was always enrolled in the top track of math, which was not an easy subject for her, requiring lots of time and assistance from her teacher. Given the difficulty of math for Amanda, it is quite possible that one of her chief concerns was that math could be the class that would take away the status of smart kid. Yet through her efforts, Amanda not only succeeded in the class, she was able to maintain her status.

Similarly, Bill was also motivated by grades, though we saw earlier that he described some intrinsic motivation to learn in math and science. I asked him what type of student he could relate to the least, and he named the "unmotivated student," continuing:

> For all my reasoning I guess, I could never see why a student would be totally unmotivated, because one: I was always, I wanted the good grades, I did, I mean, I liked, I did like learning and I liked—I mean it was nice to take a test and be like, 'Hey, I knew stuff,' it was an accomplishment, it felt good, so there's that. I mean, also, for nothing else, get good grades so that you don't get hassled by whoever, teachers or your parents, or just so that, you know, at least after, at some time in your life, maybe you don't want to go to college, but you have a, have a deg—have a diploma from high school, you know. It seems just like there should be some sort of basic motivation that some kids don't necessarily have and I just, I don't understand how they can be totally lifeless when it comes to want—you know, learning.

Bill described a process in which he tried to understand why students would not learn in school, but at the end he uses his frame of reference, as a person motivated by getting good grades, to explain why he cannot understand. In doing so, he noted grades helped to validate his sense of accomplishment and served another instrumental purpose: to keep parents and teachers from harassing him for poor performance. Bill found that his exhortations to students to do their work and improve their grades were ignored by quite a few, though before a test or at the end of the grading period several students would be concerned.

When Bill was comparing himself to Julia, he described some of the differences between Julia in Conceptual Physics and himself as a high school student:

> I mean because she's in the classes with the people that she's in, she tends to be the higher one all the time, where I was always too but I always had, it seems like I had more people that were at my level, and kind of like, I don't want to say I always was competing but, there was that little competition, especially with friends around, you know. You know, of course I'd want to get the highest score in the class you know, or try you know. It's fun to piss people off when you set the curve, "whatever, be mad, I got it."

Bill then enjoyed the competition within a class, and desired to achieve the highest score and set the curve. Although this would sometimes lead other students to be angry with him, he took it as a point of pride. Accordingly, we can surmise that grades were equally as important as his intrinsic motivation to learn. It also seems safe to say that Bill regarded his grades as a marker of his learning, such that the two were intimately tied.

Summary

This chapter considered the interns' encounters with teaching and their students in urban Grand Pillar high schools. The interns came from backgrounds encapsulated in whiteness and middle class values, consistent with the typical teacher candidate described

in much literature. These aspects of their lives mattered as the interns went about the business of figuring out how to teach their students, whom they regarded as opposite in significant ways. However, the interns were not just white, middle class, young men or women, they were also very good students, and had been for the majority of their schooling careers. All three expressed great difficulty understanding students' motivations, behaviors, and work habits; what they witnessed was outside their continuity, their range of the norm of possible actions and behaviors they could consider and undertake. Indeed, as they discussed their students, they did so explicitly through their own lens, hardly ever considering reasons for actions from the perspective of the actor, the student. Hardly aware of their own lenses, their own perspective, and hence that their views of the world were just that, one perspective, the interns were not well positioned to confront their students' perspectives. When long-time good students show up to teach in a school where the bad students are disproportionately black, is the intern reacting to the students' race or their student habits or both? Certainly both factors are at work here, and matter to these teaching and learning encounters, and both these factors are largely operating unconsciously, for the interns have always been white and developed habits of being white, and they also developed habits of being good students.

In this chapter, we have a description of the interns' upbringings, their habits and attitudes as students, and their reactions to the students they encountered in Grand Pillar. In the chapters that follow, we'll complicate the story even more, as we move from understanding the interns' reactions to their placements through these social categories, to studying their teaching practices. We'll see that in the subjects they taught, the methods they used, the mentor teachers they were placed with, and the daily work with their

students, their personal thoughts, attitudes, feelings, actions, and interactions all contributed to the interns' transitions during their urban teaching apprenticeship.

wh

ele

in

he

hig

Ci

dis

ste

res

par

the

tea

nex

int

CHAPTER FOUR

AMY

Amy's teaching

My research explored Amy's background and found that she was a white female who was born and raised as lower class, even poor, until her mother got a job as an elementary teacher, at which point Amy's family became middle class. Amy participated in three different sports each year, played in the band, worked after school, and most of her social relations involved people in these activities. Amy was also a very good student, highly motivated by grades, efficient in her work habits, well behaved, and the Illitch City valedictorian. Amy regarded African Americans as the group that gave her discipline problems, and that she held views bordering on essentialist, or highly stereotyped. Amy certainly exhibited habits of thought and attitude well described in the resistance literature.

In the last chapter I established that the resistance argument had some merit, in particular that the habits interns brought into Grand Pillar mattered to how they viewed their work in their placements. But the resistance argument tends to see the typical teacher population as a group and rarely examines them in the midst of practice. In the next three chapters I present a case study of each of the three interns to examine how they interact with students. This method will allow for an exploration of the similarities and

differences in habits and practices across the three interns, while telling each one's story so as to see how habits which are often attributed to groups, are manifested by individuals with their own histories and habits.

In this chapter, I seek to build a better understanding of how Amy's continuity helped and hindered her as she navigated the internship at Pinnacle. I concentrate on the interns' central of maintaining productive relationships with students, exploring the specific ways in which Amy viewed this problem. I examine some of the teaching practices Amy used to illustrate how her past student experiences guided most of her work as a novice teacher, and also look at her involvement in coaching volleyball and working. I also consider how Amy's experience doing a required "inquiry unit" affected her, and how the emotional and physical toll of the internship placed Amy in survival mode.

Her Typical Teaching Practices

I visited Amy's Biology class ten times and saw a variety of teaching practices over the course of the three units she taught: evolution, viruses, and bacteria. A brief summary of the content and practices used is provided in Table 4.1. During my visits, students spent over one-third of the time engaged in some form of independent work, which primarily involved worksheets and book work. Amy lectured and expected students to take notes about one-quarter of the time. Students engaged in lab work a bit over ten percent of the time and the same was true for group work time. See Table 4.2 for an accounting of the time spent with various teaching practices. It is important to keep in mind that my observations occurred weekly over about two months, and are not an exhaustive catalog of all that Amy did as a teacher.

Table 4.1: Amy's Observed Teaching Practices

Day	Activity type	Approx time	Brief Summary
Jan 23	Lecture	20	Amy goes through a review of the policies and procedures as set down on *Welcome to biology class* handout.
	Individual work	35	Students design an alien creature with appropriate adaptations for a solar system planet.
Jan 31	Lecture	12	Darwin and his work with finches, using PowerPoint.
	Individual work	10	Students compare four finch beaks and answer questions on *Relating cause and effect* worksheet.
	Lecture	15	Populations and survival of the fittest.
	Individual work	10	Questions about genetic equilibrium and change in populations on other side of worksheet.
	Simulation	5	Demonstrate effects of mutations.
Feb 10	Journal	15	There are billions of organisms on the earth, how do we classify them?
	Lecture	35	Classification of organisms.
	Individual work	7	Students use words from bank on board to fill in blanks on a content map about classification.
Feb 14	Test review	55	Students answer questions individually (20 min), Amy leads recitation (20 min) and lectures (15 min) on *Biology test review* handout.
Feb 24	Journal	7	How did the people in the stories contract HIV?
	Performance	7	Amy reads Billy's story.
	Discussion	13	Largely focused on what we can do to protect ourselves from HIV and peoples' responsibilities.
	Group work	30	Students plan or work on projects to educate their peers on HIV.
Mar 9	Journal	4	What makes a good lab report? What sections do you need to include? Who is your audience?
	Lecture	18	Directions to write lab reports and answers to student questions, with *Bacteria formal lab report* handout.
	Group work	35	Students gather into groups to examine samples collected yesterday and work on parts of their bacteria lab reports.
Mar 14	Lecture	6	Using microscopes, instructions for book assignment while waiting.
	Individual work	45	Answer 5 questions on bacteria from book.
	Lab	5	About two-thirds of students look at bacteria under microscope and draw section of slide on paper.
Mar 20	Recitation	6	Recall some information about protists; instructions for the day.
	Individual work	50	Work on protist packet (6 questions) and protist coloring book.
Mar 30	Lab	45	Observe planaria and hydra through microscope and make sketch.

In this section I first discuss Amy's presentation to the class on the first day of the second semester, then focus on two aspects of this unit: a lecture on natural selection and the test review. After setting up a picture of her typical teaching practices, I will turn in the next section to look at an unusual lesson, which will reveal more fully her views of students and the internship.

Table 4.2: Amy's Teaching Modes

Teaching mode	Minutes	% time
Individual work	177	36
Lecture	134	27
Group work	65	13
Lab	55	11
Journal	26	5
Recitation	26	5
Discussion	13	3
Total	496	

Starting Off the Second Semester

On January 23, the first day of the second semester, Amy greeted her students with a smile as she stood in the front of the classroom, between the students' desks and the lab demonstration table. After the bell, Amy distributed the *Welcome to Biology* handout, which began, "This is going to be an exciting semester filled with fun activities and great topics!" Using the handout as a guide, Amy told the students how to succeed in class: attend, be prepared, follow daily routines like picking up papers and folders, and complete assignments. The biggest change from first semester was at the bottom of the handout: "**Late Work**—...one word...LAZY!" Amy told the class, "The biggest difference from last semester is late work. Those of you who turned in half your work in the last two weeks—sorry Charlie." A student asked, "Who's Charlie?" Amy said that he's the invisible student who failed last semester, before explaining that assignments lose 25 percent each day they're late. Amy regarded grades as very important, and this day was no exception, as she mentioned them in several contexts: the types of assignments for students, especially those with "easy points," the late work policy, and the chart on the handout for students to record grades and track progress.

M
ad
re
its
de

B
ar
O
th
se
ge
A

w
si
to
of
in
te
m
co
he

After everyone did a short introduction of themselves, an activity suggested by Myron, the only black male in the class, Amy gave the students directions for the adaptive alien life form assignment: pick a planet and research it, using the provided reference books; write down "five things the alien can do," to show how it is adapted to its planet; draw the alien on a piece of butcher paper; and finally Amy stated, "and we'll do this tomorrow," is to give a short presentation on your alien life form to the class.

Students spent the remaining 25 minutes of class planning and drawing their alien. Both Amy and Mr. B, her mentor teacher, moved about the room talking with students and answering questions about the project, as well as prodding some to do the work. Once a teacher approved the plan, students received a piece of butcher paper on which they were to draw their alien. This opening activity illustrates the balance that Amy sought in her teaching, as she regarded it as an example of "fun little projects that are still getting them thinking."

A Lecture on Natural Selection

Although Amy said that she wanted to involve her students in fun activities that would also educate them, after that first day I observed only one brief five minute simulation, and Amy also told me about an activity in which students were giraffes trying to reach leaves high in the air, to demonstrate aspects of species survival. However, Amy often stated that she needed to lecture to students to ensure they received the basic information they needed about particular topics. It was her second most common teaching technique; she lectured on eight of the ten observation days, from six to 35 minutes in length. Amy controlled most of the lecture time, though sometimes students could give some input on a subject for which she had a predetermined, like the lecture here.

Two teacher-student exchanges.

On January 31, Amy gave her students a lecture on Charles Darwin, his work on finch populations, and about survival of individuals within populations. The first slide was called "theory of evolution by natural selection," and featured a picture of Darwin and the years he graced the Earth. When Amy turned on the slideshow, she told the class, "Study Darwin's picture, know it well," as she took attendance. Afterward she began the lecture by telling the class a bit about Darwin's life, saying, "He was a naturalist. What does that mean?"

Rodrigo answered, "He smoked weed. He was a hippy."

Amy gave a little laugh and said, "There were no hippies around then." Rodrigo asked how she knew that, because the hippies had to start at some point. Amy then suddenly reprimanded, her smile gone, "Bradley and Miguel! Having a good conversation over there?" One answered yes and the other no, leading to scattered laughter in the class.

Amy continued with Darwin as a naturalist, but instead moved to her next lecture point about Darwin's voyage to South America. Placing a world map on the overhead to trace the trip, she asked if anyone had heard of the Galapagos Islands. Rodrigo said he had heard of the Galapagos turtles, which Amy acknowledged. Amy explained that Darwin collected evidence that species changed over time, prompting Rodrigo to say that Darwin collected fossils. Amy did not respond to Rodrigo, but continued to explain how the evidence led Darwin to write his book, and that given the religious tenor of his time and place, "Darwin's work didn't go over too well."

Amy then moved to the next slide, which she told the class not to write down, about the Lamarckian view of evolution that preceded Darwin. She said that Lamarck

e

h

a

th

al

th

fo

ar

as

ch

na

wi

(X

int

wo

co

of

exc

a w

expressed a belief that "individual members could evolve." She added that is not the case, however, and asked the class, "What did we say yesterday?"

Several students answer, "groups."

Amy said, yes, "groups and populations evolve." Amy then talked about the giraffe, and how over time the group evolved and developed the characteristic neck.

In this segment, Amy drew on the previous day's activity, in which students played the role of giraffes, attempting to eat leaves hanging from the ceiling. Myron, who was also a student council member and Pinnacle basketball player, was the tallest person in the room at about 6 foot 4 inches. As a giraffe, his advantage gave him access to more food than others in his group, increasing the chance that he would be able to reproduce, and thus be more likely to pass on the genetic traits that enabled his survival. Over time, as more long-necked giraffes survive and reproduce, the population's dominant characteristics change. This fundamental conceptual point is a critical mechanism for natural selection over time.

This lecture segment illustrates one of Amy's dominant teaching modes, which I witnessed often: lecture punctuated by short stretches of recitation done in the IRE format (Mehan, 1979; see also Lemke 1990). Amy generally initiated most whole-class interactions by asking a question, one or several students responded with usually just a word or short phrase, and Amy evaluated the response, often adding more information or continuing the lecture. The two teacher-student interactions in this lecture are very typical of those that took place in the classroom sphere. A key difference between the two exchanges involves the content, where "groups" is germane to questions of evolution, but a weed-smoking hippy is not at all relevant to Darwin. Another difference is between the

lengths of the interactions. The Lamarck interaction was much more common as students rarely provided more than brief answers to content-related questions unless Amy asked another question. However, in the naturalist exchange, Rodrigo questioned the reasoning Amy used to evaluate his response. In general, students were more likely to follow up in exchanges in which ideas were not related to the content.

In these two exchanges, Amy was, in part, trying to control what occurred in the classroom so that she could cover the material she planned to teach. In the naturalist exchange, Amy did not discourage Rodrigo's statement by claiming, "that's not appropriate for school," or something along those lines. In fact, Amy playfully engaged with Rodrigo's comment, making a slight joke to dismiss it. We can be sure that Amy disciplined Bradley and Miguel because she noticed their talking and she did not want it in the room, but she might well have done that to prevent continuing dialogue about the idea of Darwin smoking weed. In an interview, she shared that students had asked her before about drinking and smoking, and she told them, "Well yeah, you know, I go to college and I've been through it, and I've tried things." Such a situation placed Amy in an awkward position, as she did not want to transgress moral boundaries in schools, which are places of zero drug and alcohol tolerance, even as she is fully aware that some of her students participated in such activity, and her university had a strong party reputation. In contrast, the Lamarck interaction is safe, and after getting an answer to her question, Amy can reinforce her point about groups.

Amy went through two more slides discussing some evidence Darwin collected in support of evolution, and asked if the information made sense, which elicited some mumbled agreement. Amy gave the students about ten minutes to work on the *Making*

inferences about observations worksheet with pictures of four different finches and questions relating their beak adaptations to the food they eat. During this time she moved about the room amidst a quiet buzz of conversation, telling a couple of students, notably Rodrigo, to get on task, and helping others answer questions. She spent about four minutes with a group of four ESL students. Then, without any recitation or discussion, Amy continued the lecture.

Groups and populations.

The next slide presented a definition of natural selection: "process by which populations change in response to their environment." Amy told students to write this down in their notes, and then told the class, "I want you to know what a population is. It's all the individuals living together in one place." She gave several examples: in the Everglades there exists a population of alligators; at this high school, we are a population of students who come to this building; in this room, room 127, we are a population of classmates.

Clarence asked, "I thought we were a group?"

Amy replied, "See, that's why I went over it," as she messed with some transparencies on the overhead, Clarence shook his head. Amy added that we humans are a population.

Here, Amy revisited the idea of the population, underscoring her understanding of this critical point as something that students needed to know if they were to understand natural selection. Yet there was some confusion about the difference, if she intended one, between groups and populations, leading me to write in my field notes, "now I'm not sure if there is supposed to be a difference between population and group either." We can't be sure, because Amy seemed to take Clarence's question as an opportunity to speak on the

importance of this distinction, and she seemed satisfied that she made the point clear. In general, I almost always observed Amy taking care in answers students' questions.

The allele.

Amy showed a slide with five processes involved in the process of natural selection. The volume of words spurred a student to ask, "Oh dang! I have to write all that?"

Amy answered, "Write it down, one at a time." The first point on the slide read, "Genetic Variation – individuals carry different alleles for certain traits." Amy asked, "Who remembers what an allele is?"

Several students replied, "huh?" No one came forth with an answer.

Amy said, "maybe if I write down alleles for eye color." On the board she wrote:

BB
Bb
Bb
bb

As she finished writing, a student asked, "Is that like one of those squares?"

Amy answered, "Yeah, remember we used those squares to solve genetics problems?" Rodrigo started complaining about Mr. Warren, his teacher last semester, claiming he was always dancing and didn't really teach them anything. Rodrigo added he had no idea what Amy was talking about. Amy invited Rodrigo and others to come visit her at lunch or after school to learn more about alleles, then explained more about what the different "b's" meant.

In this situation there is a tension between lesson pacing and ensuring student understanding. This class period occurred one week into second semester and Rodrigo was new to Amy's class. Amy mentioned in the interviews that other students told her they hadn't learned much from Mr. Warren. The importance here is that genetic variation,

captured in the eye color example that Amy shared here, is an important tool to understand how a population's characteristics change. Yet, the pace of the school schedule, internalized by Amy, reinforced by her mentor, Mr. B., bolstered by departmental efforts to cover a certain amount of material, and externally validated by the state test, did not allow Amy much time beyond the brief review of an allele and the corresponding variation between individuals. Amy opted to place the onus of understanding on Rodrigo and the other new students, who must take the initiative to come see her outside class time to learn this topic. Amy's reaction is consistent with her habits. She strove for efficiency, and since she taught most students last semester, she relied on the expectation they should know this past material. In addition, she invited Rodrigo to come in on his own time to learn about this concept, something she would have done as a student and identified as a characteristic in Autumn, the student most like her in seventh hour.

Survival of the fittest.

Amy continued the lecture to the central point, asking the class, "Has anyone heard of survival of the fittest?" About half the class raised their hands.

Rodrigo said, "Yeah. Myron used to say that when he took my lunch money from me." Myron laughed lightly.

Amy asked Myron, "Oh yeah. What did you say?"

Myron answered he was stronger than Rodrigo: "I used to beat him for lunch money."

Amy said, "I'm glad you said that. What does it mean?" Rodrigo answered, Myron's the strongest. Amy replied, "Not necessarily," it doesn't mean that one organism is

stronger than another. Rather, "it means that you are able to survive and reproduce in your environment."

Rodrigo, surprised, asked in a voice bordering on disbelief, "What?"

Amy brought up that Myron was able to eat the highest leaves, and asked the class, "Myron—is he the smartest giraffe?" A number of students call out "no" and there was some laughter.

Myron answered, "Yeah. And the sexiest." He then popped out of his seat and walked with a slow swagger and an exaggerated limp to answer the knock on the door.

Amy continued to explain that Myron's height provided him with the advantage to be able to eat the highest leaves, but that means he's "not necessarily the smartest or the strongest," only that he has an advantage in that environment.

As a field instructor I would characterize Amy's grasp of the content as solid. While she admitted she didn't know much about, and would have to research some upcoming subjects, like fungi, here she conveyed a correct understanding of what is commonly referred to as "survival of the fittest." Amy also did a nice job of relating the science concept to Rodrigo's joking example of Myron stealing his lunch money by allowing them to develop a fairly elaborate explanation of the theft and then pointing out differences with the science concept. Rodrigo's facial and spoken reactions indicated that he was surprised by Amy's explanation of the concept. Whereas Amy did not seem interested in engaging with Rodrigo's weed-smoking hippy comment, she not only engaged with students' joking, but encouraged them to develop it, indicating she may have anticipated the relevance of the joke to the lecture and felt safe that the joke would not stray too far from its pedagogical purpose.

the w

to rea

of sig

if yo

Some

muta

nipp

arou

slapp

them

told

five.

not t

sema

alwa

joine

Mutated Mark.

After finishing the lecture, Amy decided to answer the questions on the other side of the worksheet as a class, rather than have students work individually. Amy told students to read question four, "How might the gene pool of a population change if a large number of significant mutations occurred?" After a half-minute she asked, "What's gonna happen if you have tons of mutations? Is that a good thing or bad?"

Several students answer, "Bad."

Clarence joked, "Look at Mark." People in the class laughed.

Amy asked, "Mark, is that a good thing or a bad thing?" Mark answered, "bad." Some students were still laughing at Mark being mutated. Amy announced, "Mark is not mutated."

Clarence answered, "You don't know what's wrong with Mark. He has a third nipple." There was more laughter, but mostly from those in the front of the room that sat around Mark, primarily Clarence, Rodrigo, and Myron.

Amy said to the class, "Ok, we're done with Mark." Clarence and Rodrigo are slapping hands, laughing, congratulating each other on blazing Mark. Amy then told them, "You two aren't going to sit together anymore." They continued laughing. Amy told the class, "Some mutations can be good," before she directed students to question five.

Whereas Amy had used Rodrigo and Myron' lunch money theft scenario, she did not fully engage with the third nipple. In the interview, I told her that in my two second-semester visits by this point, as well as my one first semester visit, I had noticed students always seemed to pick on Mark, which Amy acknowledged was true, that she sometimes joined in to tease him a bit, and that she believed Mark was strong enough to take it and

enjoy

perha

and

Rodr

these

also

the b

muta

struc

be fo

exch

abou

Inste

movi

Amy

able

hour

enjoyed it. So she might have directed the question to Mark because of this, though perhaps she thought it would take the focus off the jokes. However, the jokes continued and Amy became more stern about messing with Mark, particularly with Clarence and Rodrigo. Two weeks later Amy implemented a new seating chart, mostly because of these two students.

Amy's participation might have encouraged the jokes to continue, however, and this also created the potential to lose control of the class, because the discourse shifted from the biology content to joke-making, and Clarence continued to push it further into the mutation of Mark. In fact, Clarence, Rodrigo, and Myron in both of these interactions struck me as high school guys who like to make jokes and have a laugh, students likely to be found in most every classroom. In my opinion, there was pedagogical value in the exchange, for Amy could have matter-of-factly used the third nipple as a way to talk about mutations, as a benign mutation that does not affect a human's ability to survive. Instead, Amy finished the question by simply stating some mutations can be good and moving on to the next question.

Amy's Reflection on the Lesson

Amy said that she found this lecture to be an enjoyable experience because she was able to get through it with little problem, and compared it with last semester's seventh hour:

> There's no doubt in my mind that I would have gotten, like, just to the point where they would have started writing notes, because it was just constant interruptions, constant distractions, just so much more work for—as far as management goes. Whereas to have them sit here and actually sit down and listen, just listen to me lecture and be interested and eyes on me, people looking at me, you know you can tell if they're interested or not, when you're looking around—just to have them have —be looking at me and be interested. It's an interesting topic too.

Amy detailed that the absence of one student who was a problem for her, Gary, meant he was not there to get into altercations with other students, some of whom now seemed to sleep through parts of the semester since they could not spar with Gary. Amy also referred to classroom management, a constant concern in every interview transcript.

Amy's description of lecture was definitely from her viewpoint: they are looking at me, they are interested, the topic is interesting. I asked Amy how she could tell that the students were interested in the lecture and she said:

> Eye contact, the Socratic dialogue, when I'm questioning or I ask for rhetorical questions and when 75, 80% of 'em are answering—yeah, just scanning over the, over all of 'em, nobody's sitting with their head down with the exception of Robert after about twenty minutes—but, um—it's just, it's that good feeling, the feeling of having good response, a good relationship with them, they're open, they're open to putting in their input, um—participating, which is really—it's a lot more fun for me. First hour is the same way, first and seventh both, they're just, they're a lot better about participating, it's just a much more—to me it feels like a much safer environment, which is good and which is what I always wanted to create but – it was really hard with all the, um, discipline problems and all the, all the different personalities that I had last semester, it was really tough. So I think, I think creating that safe, open environment where people can say what they want, they can feel, you know, they know I'm not gonna sit there and come down on 'em and I'm gonna have to be disciplining the person next to them every two seconds.

By the end of the statement, Amy moved from elements of discussion to the fact that she did not have to be in the mode of constantly disciplining students in class, of not having to deal with classroom management. The need for discipline though is dependent on factors outside of Amy's control, particularly scheduling, as any student can be assigned to this required class and disrupt the environment she desired to create.

Note that the actor of "creating that safe, open environment" is not specified, implying that it may be the teacher. But the context implies that scheduling by an impersonal bureaucracy slotting children into required classes may exert a stronger effect. The intern teacher desires a certain classroom environment, however many aspects of the

placement outside of the intern's control reduce her sphere of influence. In fact, it seems more likely Amy's students created the safe and open environment for her, since no one was particularly disruptive. This is not to say the intern is powerless. Amy had full responsibility over the two biology classes and claimed she could do anything she wanted. On this day she chose to have the students sit in rows and listen to a lecture on Darwin and some evidence for evolution, guided by PowerPoint, and broke the lecture up with a worksheet.

My reflection on the lesson.

If I had been Amy's field instructor, her mentor teacher, or perhaps a fellow science teacher who had a solid relationship with her, I would agree that Amy experienced greater success in delivering this lecture than others in the first semester and effectively demonstrated her content knowledge, but I would have to question her assessment of what occurred, inviting her to look more closely at the question of student engagement and interest. My notes would have enabled me to offer her some data, which mention only a few students. Within the span of nearly thirty minutes, students made 25 statements in 19 whole-class exchanges. Rodrigo accounted for 10 of the 25 student statements, while Myron made 3, Clarence 2, Mark 2, and other students made only one each. Of the 25 statements, students volunteered answers to Amy's questions 10 times and initiated a comment on their own, which was not related to the content, 8 times. Three students spoke because Amy directed her attention at them, three students made jokes related to the content, and Clarence asked a follow-up question. While it may be that 80 percent of students looked like they were paying attention to the lecture, and I noted that the majority of students wrote notes during the lecture, these 80 percent were not answering Amy's questions. In fact, the four male students account for 75 percent of

the stude

question

agreeabl

does not

how Am

Wh

McNeil

can help

up visu

track to

this day

method

front o

focus o

be sile

studen

openec

clearly

techni

also a

in the

stude

learni

the student statements. Perhaps the lecture was successful even with the content-related questions and several jokes that threatened Amy's control, because the students were agreeable enough to allow Amy to lecture them. While covering the content completely does not simply translate into good teaching, demonstrating her content knowledge was how Amy learned to be successful in school.

When I think as a researcher, Amy's use of lecture strikes me as an instance of what McNeil (1986) labeled defensive teaching. For this lecture, Amy used PowerPoint which can help to enhance the teacher's control. Amy said that PowerPoint allowed her to put up visuals so students had something to focus on, but she also liked that it "keeps me on track too. I'm like, 'alright, what do I have to cover, what do I want to talk about?'" On this day she used PowerPoint and on others, the overhead projector, but regardless of the method used to project the lecture notes, the effect was quite similar. Amy was at the front of the class, with all the desks arranged in rows so that students faced her and could focus on the bright screen of biology content. When she spoke, she expected students to be silent, as when she disciplined Bradley and Miguel. However, she also expected student participation within certain limits, generally when called upon or when she opened up the floor for them, like when she asked them if everything made sense. She clearly wanted such participation, naming it the Socratic dialogue, confusing that technique with IRE exchanges. Finally, Amy's assessment that the lecture went well was also a comment about her management of the class, which she kept under control, sitting in their desks, relatively quiet, taking notes, participating in procedural display. That is, students were complying with the teacher's requests and appeared as though they were learning, as she efficiently covered the content.

The Test Review

The day of the natural selection test review, Amy directed students to new seats for she had developed the promised seating chart. It was Valentine's Day and someone asked if Amy had a date tonight, and she answered, "I have a date with work tonight." I laughed. A couple of the students also laughed and Amy smiled. It turned out the date was with the test that Amy needed to write for the next day. In this section I describe the test review, both to give a flavor of the most common teaching practice Amy used, individual seatwork, as well as to give an idea of what the test in Amy's biology class entailed.

The four pages of review questions Amy took from the textbook's test contained 18 true-false, 25 multiple choice, 14 completion, and 6 essay questions. Amy took about six minutes to tell students they were going to work on the review, that they could use their own materials to find the answers to the questions, they would need to hand in their notebooks the next day, and they were to work individually, starting with the true-false questions, after which they would review the answers as a class. She said the test would cover a range of material, specifically referring to the list on the board, which read: "Ch 12 - history of life; Ch 13 - theory of evolution; Ch 15 – Classification." In 3 ½ weeks, Amy had covered extensive material about one of the most difficult and important concepts in biology.

The room was fairly quiet as students worked, interrupted only by Rodrigo, who Amy told to be quiet, and Jim, who asked a question. After eight minutes, Amy went over the true-false questions with the students, moving up and down the rows to call on students to share the answers. This process took about seven minutes, after which Amy directed the class to work on the multiple-choice questions.

While students were working on the multiple choice section, I witnessed the only serious discipline Amy enacted during my visits. Mark had moved to a different seat and was talking to another student near him. Amy said, "Mark. I'll count to three. You know where you need to be. One." Pause. "Two." Pause. Mark did not move. Silence. Amy looked very stern, like she dared Mark to defy her. She told him, "Your seat will be in the back." Pause. "Three. New seat," she said, pointing to the back section of the class as she walked out from behind the front demonstration table and moved his book and things to a desk in the unused part of the room, repeating "new seat." Mark grumbled as he slowly walked to his new seat, looking at his classmates, nearly all of who were working on the review sheet.

Amy was already displeased with Mark, because earlier when she was going to sharpen his pencil for him, as the classroom requirement was that Amy or Mr. B. sharpen students' pencils in an area off-limits to them, Mark told her to hurry up, which Amy replied was awfully rude. So when Mark changed his seat and was talking, Amy confronted him, a potential risk to her authority if he had decided to defy her—something Amy reported several students had done in the first semester. Amy later informed me Mark recently served a three-hour detention for insubordination. It seems that Amy's desire for a safe and open classroom environment involved students complying with Amy's wishes, and her second semester classes seemed more compliant than her reports of her first semester.

The rest of the multiple choice work time proceeded uneventfully, like clockwork, with students generally working, amidst light conversation throughout the room, and Amy moving around the room helping individuals. Amy ended up giving the students

about 14 minutes to work on this section of the review sheet, a time lengthened by Rodrigo's bargaining for a couple more minutes. This time, Amy decided to call on students randomly, warning the students to pay attention so they could answer if called upon, like in these two exchanges. Amy said, "Number 21. Natural selection is the process by which, what, Mark?"

After a few seconds, Mark answered, "B." Rodrigo clapped lightly as Amy confirmed the answer.

Amy said, "Natural selection could not occur without, what Clarence?"

He asked, "Uh, which one are we on?" Amy answered 22. Clarence then said, "B."

Amy replied, "Not B." Clarence then said the answer is A, and Amy agreed, "Yep, A."

Notably, Amy called on Mark for three of the 25 questions, possibly because she wanted to ensure he knew she expected him to do the work or she perhaps she hoped he would not know an answer so she could call him out for bad behavior again. Although Amy did not call on all the students, she did call on the majority of them, including some who hardly spoke in class. She used this IRE pattern throughout the review of the 25 multiple-choice questions, elaborating on the answer to only one question, mirroring the teacher-student interaction patterns we saw in the lecture, except that the worksheet put the questions into Amy's mouth. Students' answers tend to be quite brief, often just a letter. This part of class was well controlled and scripted, as Amy methodically moved through the questions calling on students to give answers.

Seven minutes remained after this second part of the review, and Amy described to students the rest of the review to prepare for the test on their own. She first told the class

to copy down the bank of words on the board so they could do the completion section of the review. She then told the class about the essays, notably that there would be two or three essays on the test, which should be answered in a few sentences. Amy continued, "Don't write out long, drawn out answers. Two or three sentences is good."

Rodrigo commented on the few sentences required, "Someone's being lazy."

Clarence immediately followed with, "Someone's being generous."

Amy said, "Thank you. It's the Valentine's spirit. I think I'm being sweet."

This review looked a lot like the majority of Amy's teaching. Students answered worksheet questions and then as a class, participated in IRE exchanges to determine if they had the right answer. This would prepare them for the test, which featured similar questions.

The Past in the Present

In this section I will relate Amy's typical teaching practices to her past experiences as a student. In particular, I will focus on her efficient use of time as a student, as well as two opposite learning experiences she went through: a dumbed-down high school curriculum and her own rigorous college curriculum in the life sciences. In exploring these aspects of her past, I will argue that the accounts of her teaching I presented above make sense given her experience as a student in schools, and in particular, that the tension between dumbed-down and rigorous curricula played an important role in Amy's teaching.

Using time efficiently.

Amy's efficient use of time was a key habit in being a good student, and similar efficiency was a pattern in Amy's teaching. Amy discussed the differences in doing the test review in first and seventh hours:

> I wanted them to do it in more of an independent manner I think, even though in, first hour I didn't—I changed a little between first and seventh, in first hour they were kind of sitting more in small groups and kind of worked through it together, and they weren't really working, they were chatting. And I was like, well then, I'm going to go around the room and just pick random people and make them give answers. And then after that they were like, 'Oh gosh,' and then they started working, it kind of freaked them out. [Seventh hour] had a warning, and you know, if you stay on top of it—it's more work to stay on top of it, but I don't think this is any more work for me than running a review game, you know if you do Jeopardy style or get them in groups where they are on teams and they answer questions like that.

In this quote Amy compared three different ways of running a review activity. The seventh hour review was a response to the first hour attempt, both of which differed from a Jeopardy-style review, which is the way Amy said she had conducted most prior review sessions. Let us first consider why Amy didn't do a Jeopardy-style review. When she discussed staying on top of her students, i.e., making them behave and do their work, she said doing so required no more work than running the Jeopardy review, allowing us to conclude that a major reason for doing things differently was that she would likely be able to do less work than normal, while still providing a review opportunity. Furthermore, she allowed her first hour to work in groups, which changes the teacher's management strategies since talking in student groups is permitted. But that very fact makes it more difficult to verify students are on task, since many groups engaged in conversation obscures the content. Using ambiguous language ("kind of worked through it together"), Amy indicated things did not go as desired, which led her to "just pick random people and make them give answers," making use of her authority to demonstrate students had not used their time wisely.

Because of first hour, Amy changed the review lesson, requiring her to work harder to manage the class. Amy seemed more satisfied with the outcome: students were relatively quiet and covered most of the review questions. It is certainly easier for the

teacher to monitor student behavior when students work on their own assignment, at their own desk in a row facing forward, than when students have rearranged the room into small groups and are talking. Management becomes about enforcing compliance with norms like quiet and pencils on paper, enabling the teacher to produce an image of student learning.

This was the first time that Amy did a review in this manner. Her normal way, Jeopardy, is an interactive competition between students, usually on teams, to answer questions. It seems quite possible that Jeopardy review questions would be similar to those Amy used for this review. Jeopardy is a common way to review material for tests, however, Amy chose not to exert the effort needed to implement the activity.

I noted earlier that individual work accounted for about one-half of the class time, and Amy usually allowed students some freedom to talk with others in the class, provided they did not get too loud and also appeared to be working. She would usually walk around the room both to help students individually and to keep other students on task. I also noticed that at the beginning of a period when individual work was the main event, Amy always mentioned that students have plenty of time during the hour to work on the assignment due at the end of the hour. Often, she mentioned that her first hour class had not taken that announcement seriously. Amy however took the completion of the individual work seriously and what she said of her mentor seemed to also apply to her:

> If they're in class and they're doing something and he has something that they're turning in to him that he can see that they learned something or they did the work for that day, they're going to be rewarded with getting participation points or getting points for that assignment.

The goal of the activity, for Amy, appeared to be to get students to put on a procedural display (Anderson 2003), by having them do some work that resulted in words

written on paper, to be checked by teacher's eyes, translated into a number secured in the grade book, and building a letter to be entered onto report cards. Though Amy wanted to engage with her students about the content, she typically did so by asking questions using the IRE pattern, which authorizes the teacher as the transmitter and judge of knowledge. For the most part Amy seemed to practice defensive teaching (McNeil, 1986) designed to conceal the tensions she felt in being a student teacher (Britzman, 2003). Besides having pragmatic value in running the classroom, her teaching strategies were also consistent with her images of teaching, as she efficiently covered much of three chapters in a 3.5 week-long unit, efficiently reviewed that day by alternating individual work time and group recitation.

Dumbed-down, basic curricula in high school.

Near the end of the review, Amy discussed the essay part of the test and told students that they only need to write a few sentences, prompting Rodrigo to say, "someone's being lazy;" Clarence immediately defended Amy. Although Rodrigo's charge may carry some weight, this is more likely an issue of expectations, since throughout the internship one of Amy's central concerns was about "dumbing down" the curriculum. For example, Amy said:

> I see the disappointed look in your face and you're just looking at me like, 'whoa' and I don't—I hate saying that, 'lowering the bar,' but I feel like, yeah, we have definitely dumbed-down the material, we've left things out, we've cut things out that he's done in the past because they're just—they're not, they're not catching on, so it's been different unfortunately. I would love to go into all of the real cool interesting things, but we're teaching, like, basics, basics that they need to know in order to pass the state test, you know.

The ideas of dumbing down the content and teaching the basics appeared in many of our interviews, as well as in Amanda's and Bill's. No doubt, the teacher has to make decisions about what to engage students with, as well as how to do so. Teachers deal with

the problem of making the content appropriate(able) for high school biology students, and risk dumbing it down, or making it too simple. Amy referenced her mentor Mr. B, who had taught for many years and apparently made some decisions about what not to do with this class. A month later, Amy shared about Mr. B, "I've heard him say that so many times, where he's like, "you gotta simplify that, that's way too much information for 'em, they'll never be able to get it," you know, little comments like that." His comments, informed by years of experience, capture the tension Amy faced, though she felt he encouraged simplifying the curriculum. His comments helped Amy develop lessons appropriate for the students, but they also limited what she expected her students to be able to do. Yet Amy felt unsatisfied since her students did not catch on to some of the material, for she'd love to do "real cool interesting things." Amy seemed to feel she had to dumb the curriculum to the basics so students could have a chance at learning something.

Amy rated the difficulty level of most questions from the review between 1 and 3 on a scale through 10, describing them as "basic difficulty." The essay questions, which are "not extremely hard, by any means," earned a six or seven. Although Amy felt the questions were relatively easy, she expected some students to fail the test. However, if too many students were to fail, then by her own definition, Amy would not be an effective teacher. One way to avoid this situation was to make the work easier, and her pedagogical choices allowed her to partially control her measurement of effectiveness. Such choices allow a good, compliant student well versed in the arts of procedural display to assume the role of a procedural display teacher, who creates student achievement on her terms, part of an exchange. By dumbing down curriculum, rigor is

reduced and with student compliance in the bargain, the appearance of learning is more likely to result.

In interviews, Amy repeatedly referred to "the basics," once saying ,"Like, are you gonna overwhelm them? Do they have the background knowledge to get it? And a lot of them don't." The logic is that without the background knowledge, the foundation, students will not be able to learn more advanced information, concepts, or skills as they will become overwhelmed. Teaching thus gets reduced to providing some basic background, which generally is not as interesting or valuable, perpetuating a cycle of low engagement and learning. And for this test, Amy acknowledged there was a lot of material for students to learn. When I asked her if this had been enough time to learn about natural selection, she sighed before saying, "Maybe they're not gonna master it." The test then gets reduced to the basics since so much was covered and Amy did not expect her students to master all of it.

In addition, the coverage of a great amount of material in a short time is reinforced by the state test to which Amy frequently referred to as a reality that she had to prepare students for. Her language suggests Amy would love to teach in an interesting manner, but students must be made to learn basic information so they can satisfy the test requirement. Consequently, Amy efficiently covered much biology material so students might be ready for the state-demanded display of their content knowledge for its own federally mandated grading system, to be displayed in the public media. We can't be sure though, that for Amy the state test was used as a rationalization for what she did, rather than as reason for planning what she taught. Individual work and lecture are practices most conducive to covering material, and given their prevalence in schools and Amy's

images of teaching, including her past as a student, appeared as natural choices for her to perform as teacher.

But things are not just dependent on the state test or Mr. B's assessment of student ability. Rather, Amy also talked about the difficulty students have in thinking, saying at one point, "I think they want so badly to be spoon fed." Amy knew she would have to do an inquiry unit during the internship, and in our first interview said:

> So hopefully, I don't know, slowly but surely building 'em up to doing it. Mm, we'll see, I know they do, they do get frustrated when they have to think on their own. They're so used to being spoon-fed and it's like, 'I don't get this,' you know, even doing research out of a book they're like, 'I don't understand this.'

And after making students do a concept map to review some of the key terms from the day's lecture on biological classification, Amy said:

> I remember doing them a lot and—and this one I thought was fairly straight forward, pretty easy, I don't know. They—some of them struggled with it, most of them get it, they just don't want to sit down and think about it. It's like, 'I gotta rush to get this done so I can get out of school.'

To Amy, students did not want to spend too much time thinking in class, rather, they wanted to be told what to do so they could get it done quickly, and with minimal effort. The dumbed-down curriculum represented relatively low expectations of students, who were constructed as barely equipped to learn the basics. Amy hesitantly described her classwork in high school as dumbed-down and described an academic program that she regarded as easy. As a teacher in a regular track Biology class, she enacted practices she saw from her high school teachers, with students she didn't necessarily see as being as capable as she was.

Challenging curricula in college.

While Amy found high school to be easy, she was quite surprised by how much more work was required of her at the university, and she consistently mentioned that she

had never learned to study in high school, since she did not need that skill there. She shared:

> Amy: Studying is just not my forte, I hate memorizing stuff.
>
> John: Plus you didn't really have to do it in high school—
>
> Amy: And I never had to, so I didn't know how to, and I was like—my first exam came and it was like, 'God I have to know all of this? And I was supposed to get that from lecture? Holy crap I'm used to having it taught to me like, 3 or 4 different ways, not once just spoken casually.'

Whereas Amy may have felt that high school should have pushed her harder, it became clear to her in college that she was not prepared to do the required work, even though she had been in the college prep track. In fact, Amy enrolled in a residential college program at Midwestern University that offered an intensive concentration in the sciences, with the intention of going to medical school to become a doctor. The rigorous and challenging college curriculum was one reason why she soon decided she did not want to continue attending college for many years, especially with many lecture-based courses, and chose not to pursue pre-medical studies. Within the first couple years, Amy learned skills, techniques, and the attitude that she needed to become a successful college student.

One likely reason Amy desired to offer more challenging curriculum to her students was because of her college courses, and particularly in the biological sciences, which induced a big change in her worldview. Amy told me her family was fairly religious and her brother was a minister, but said, "I'm definitely not as religious as I used to be, by any means, I mean I used to live, eat, and breathe that church all the way through high school, and now I go like three times a year if I do go." She described how her courses strongly influenced her views:

> I guess my views have changed over the past few years, just as I have grown, you know, scientifically, had tons of science classes and evolution classes, and it's just—Hasn't made me question my morals or necessarily whether there is a God, it's just made me kind of sit back and kind of question how I view how the world started. You know when I was little it was like, 'Oh God created the world.' Well, I can't honestly say I believe that anymore, I've got the scientific background now.

Through her college course work, Amy experienced a remarkable change, discarding some of her religious beliefs and the practice of going to church because what she learned about the natural world's mechanisms conflicted with her earlier views on the origin of life. This powerful learning experience was the sort of thing that Amy regarded as valuable, and something she wished for her students.

This view of knowledge emerged in several interviews, usually in contradictory form, as when Shih-pei repeatedly asked her what it meant for her to be an effective teacher:

> Amy: I think just for me to see a child succeed, and grow, and learn and really—I don't know, and be able to give the information back to me. You know I'm teaching them all of this information but can they get that back to me.
>
> Shih-pei: When you say can they get that information back to you, what type of information are you looking for from students?
>
> Amy: Usually it has to do with what I'm teaching them, yeah, I mean, that's kind of a weird question. You hope that they can retain what you're teaching them enough to relate it to other units, enough to pass a final exam like they are today. I can't narrow it down to one thing that I want them to learn, but the broad topics, the main—the big ideas. I want them to be able to hold on to the big concepts. They don't need to know every minute detail but at least get the big idea, the main concept. If they can understand that, then yeah, I think I've been effective.

The likely reason Amy found it difficult to answer the question is because of the contradictory elements in what she did say. In particular, there is a tension between the big ideas and procedural display. On the one hand, Amy refers to a number of ideas associated with procedural display such as giving the information back to the teacher and

holding onto it enough to pass the final exam. But on the other hand, Amy is also focused on the notion of the big idea, so that students can grow. In the above quote, there is a dash in each of Amy's two speaking turns, meaning Amy was saying one thing but stopped and then voiced a new line of thought. She started with the big ideas, switched to procedural display and aided by Shih-pei to continue, and ended up with the big ideas.

Much of Amy's definition of an effective teacher was wrapped up in procedural display. We've seen that her teaching was largely along the lines of procedural display, but her recollection of her biology coursework was focused on the big ideas. If we think about Amy's conceptual change from a creationist model to an evolutionary model, Amy had to demonstrate her understanding of natural selection along the lines that her professors demanded, such as explaining the role of vestigial structures, using a cladogram to map relationships, or explaining the role of mutation in producing genetic variation and driving evolution. And all that could have been procedural display. But through that process, Amy also developed an understanding that all of life is constantly changing, through the mechanisms of natural selection, a biological big idea. Furthermore, Amy related this big idea to her own understanding of the origins of life, consequently evaluating religion's role in her life. Amy was intrinsically motivated to learn the material, moved beyond procedural display, and was profoundly affected by the big ideas. In the process, her habits of being a student, already influenced by the move from high school to college, were further impacted by the big ideas. This experience is not easy to replicate in a public high school biology class.

Summary

Amy's teaching stuck me as average for intern teachers I had visited over the past two years. Like any new teacher, Amy had to implement and develop practices that

would allow her to meet multiple objectives: instruct students, appear competent, and make her situation as comfortable as possible. Most of her teaching practices were ones conducive to teacher control over students. But grades, Amy's most important academic motivator, proved to be an ineffective motivator for her students, stripping Amy of an important tool for student cooperation she sought to use at Pinnacle.

But Amy wanted something more for her students, something akin to her experience in college biology, but for which she lacked both images and techniques to implement. As a good student though, she was well versed in the process of procedural display, and in her new role, enacted many of the practices she had seen as a student. Thus Amy participated in dumbing down the curriculum to the basics, with the help and encouragement of her mentor. Although she did not create as challenging or interesting a class as she would have liked, the tradeoff was that the easier work allowed her to get more students to do the work.

The idea of control works in other interesting ways within her situation. Amy had shown herself to be good at doing what institutions wanted, and continued to do so as an intern. Amy frequently mentioned the importance of the state test as something that required her to keep up the pace in class so she could cover the necessary material. Mr. B suggested she cut certain content or activities to simplify things. The science department had a pacing guide that Amy was behind on. Amy felt pressure from all of these outside, some very remote, external authorities. Amy regarded herself as a leader in formal situations, but now found herself in a contradictory position, leading her students in class and following her mentor and others both within and outside of class. Her descriptions of the changes in seventh hour between first and second semester indicated how Pinnacle's

scheduling affected Amy's control over her situation, and how she was still developing the skills to be able to manage the class. Because she generally followed the prescribed curriculum and used common practices to satisfy the internally felt external pressures, her realm of control was limited to executing curricular coverage and getting students to comply with her wishes; the first semester group was not as cooperative on this last count.

Very little that I have written in this chapter lends itself to the resistance argument. One might argue Amy taught her students in this way because they were mostly nonwhite, from lower social classes, and in the city, which I considered in Chapter Three and will again in the next section. But Amy's teaching is not abnormal and likely to be found in all kinds of different schools across the country, especially within the regular and lower tracks, and is not a phenomenon unique to white, middle class teachers in urban schools. One can find a student behaving like Rodrigo at nearby suburban Hope High just as easily as at Pinnacle, and likely in a class taught in a similar manner to Amy's.

Alternative Views of Her Situation

Amy's teaching practices revealed how she taught rather traditionally, well supported by models from her past, but other situations further complicated her life as an intern. In this section, I will first discuss an inquiry-oriented lesson I observed, a lesson vastly different from all others I saw, and the potential for this to promote her learning. I then analyze the emotional aspects of the internship, focusing on several factors that brought Amy to the point where emotional and physical health suffered markedly.

The Required Inquiry-Oriented Unit into Viruses

Amy's secondary science teaching methods course required her to plan and execute an inquiry-oriented set of lessons with at least one of her classes. She did the unit on viruses in general, starting with pink eye and the common cold before focusing specifically on HIV, requiring students to read and discuss the transmission of HIV and its effects on the human body. Doing this unit also satisfied Mr. B's desire to cover viruses as part of the curriculum. However, Amy took significant latitude about how to teach viruses and their transmission, deciding to make HIV a central part of the unit.

Maturity to handle sensitive topics.

Although she was concerned with their maturity level, the smaller class sizes led Amy to do the required unit with her Biology students, rather than the larger Integrated Science classes. As a student, Amy thought of herself as mature, and during the internship, it was through this lens that Amy habitually thought about her students, how they acted, and what they were capable of; Amy frequently brought up the theme of maturity in our interviews. In her first interview, Amy characterized the students she taught:

> It depends on the class. The biology classes, they're tenth graders and they're really immature, unprepared, irresponsible, nobody does their homework.... If we do things in class they can handle it, you know. If they can have the time to get things done in class and we work with them they do fairly well.

In the next interview, Amy shared that she was required to do an inquiry lesson, and, unprompted, she again commented on student maturity:

> I think the bio students especially are still pretty, they're still pretty young, first semester, you can see it and even between the two semesters there's a pretty big change, I've seen 'em grow up a lot, mature in a lot of ways, so hopefully they'll be able to handle an inquiry lesson.

Since Amy was concerned with student maturity in doing the inquiry lessons with her biology classes, after the lesson I asked her to evaluate the students' maturity. She said:

> We had a talk on Monday, just about specifically that. Saying we're gonna be talking about things like drug use and sex and, you know, hard topics that I'm not embarrassed to talk about. You know, I just laid it out there and said I'm not embarrassed. You know, nothing, nothing you ask me is gonna embarrass me and I'm, you know, I'm not gonna laugh at you. I'm not gonna think your questions are stupid. But I said you guys gotta be mature about it, too. You know, you gotta realize that these are real issues, we're talking about real people, and I think you guys can handle it.

In order to preempt immature behavior, Amy began the unit by telling students about the nature of the subject matter they would explore and her expectations for how they should act. She encouraged them to ask questions, but exhorted them to be mature.

The HIV discussions.

As soon as I walked into the room for this visit, I could immediately feel things were different. Amy started the day with what she called a "pseudojournal," in which she asked students to think about how HIV was transmitted to the people in the stories the students read the day before. She told students not to write anything down, unlike the normal journal activity. On the day prior to my visit, Amy had the students arrange the desks into a circle and read aloud the stories of several different people who had contracted and lived with HIV. She reported that they discussed the stories, with a focus on how people could have protected themselves. After a few minutes, Amy asked for volunteers to summarize the previous day's stories, and Rodrigo immediately volunteered to summarize Stan's story, which he did in several sentences. When Amy asked him to summarize Anne's story, Rodrigo seemed to give little or no effort to that summary, prompting several protests. DJ volunteered to summarize the story, which she did fairly

accurately. Rodrigo's and DJ's answers were atypical in that they consisted of multiple sentences and fairly interested, confident delivery styles. Their sharing of the previous day's stories pleased Amy:

> So it was just, it's neat, and at the beginning, to have them recall that type of information from the previous days is so cool. 'Cause a lot of days I'll get up there and be like okay, what did we learn about photosynthesis yesterday, and they're all like—you know, and I'm like, I know you didn't learn nothing but, maybe you didn't.

Amy found the students' responses to be different, contrasting them with a typical situation in biology, in which students seemed unable to remember the previous day's lesson. She said they should have learned something, but then questioned the validity of that assumption. On this day though, students did seem to remember quite vividly what they talked about the day before, which I compared to the printed stories Amy provided me.

Amy then read the story of Billy, a man who found out he had contracted HIV and then went through the process of contacting all the women he had had sex with to let them know his status and that they should get tested. Early in the story, Amy read, "One in 300 people in the US is affected by HIV/AIDS."

Rodrigo reacted to this statement, saying, "One in 300 means that here, one in three— no in 10 classrooms has someone with HIV."

Amy said, "We figured it out earlier. There are about 1800 kids here," so statistically speaking, "there would be six people here who have it."

Rodrigo said, "Damn," in a subdued, contemplative manner.

After finishing the story, Amy asked the class what we can do to protect ourselves. Rodrigo immediately answered, "Always have a condom with you," because you never know when you'll need it.

Amy asked "Always?"

Rodrigo emphatically answered, "Always, always, always." Rodrigo then went on to explain his parents' differing attitudes toward his sexual activity, but Amy interrupted him to discipline Mohammed for throwing a paper ball at someone else in the room. Amy then asked several questions about Billy's decision to call his former partners, particularly along moral and ethical lines, which proceeded in IRE fashion. She then asked the class, "What do you think of it being the sixth leading cause of death among people aged 15 to 24?" After a quick pause she added, "I'm included in that group," as she walked down one of the aisles.

Myron had turned around to follow her and asked, surprised, "You is?"

Amy answered, "Yeah." Myron nodded, surprise still showing on his face.

This line of questioning led to a short digression about the leading causes of death for this age group. Amy built some affinity between her and her students by including herself in this group, something that surprised Myron. Amy emphasized in class and in the interview that everyone, including herself, is vulnerable to HIV and everyone must protect themselves.

Amy continued the discussion, asking, "What could Billy have done?"

Rodrigo quickly answered, "Not be such a man whore to get the virus."

Amy replied, "I don't think we have to call him a man whore."

Rodrigo quietly said, "Sorry."

Adriana then said, "I think with AIDS going around, they need to use protection. Everyone needs to carry condoms, no matter if you're male or female," adding that it is

everyone's responsibility to protect themselves when having sex. Isabella added that condoms should be changed after ten minutes of use.

Rodrigo then said, "I'm not saying anything, but it's easier for women to pick up guys in a bar than it is for guys to pick up women." Myron affirmed Rodrigo's statement, "Yeah." Rodrigo continued that because of this, it is the woman's responsibility to carry condoms because, "she needs to be protected." There were several negative reactions against this statement that I could see, most strongly from Adriana and Isabella, with tsk-tsk-ing, head shaking, and smiles more from amazement at Rodrigo's words than amusement.

Amy asked Rodrigo, "You think it's the woman's responsibility?" Rodrigo agreed.

Adriana asked him, "Why should the woman have the responsibility to protect themselves?" She said both people are engaging in the act, so both have to be safe. She continued, "Too many guys come up to me and try to talk to me, but I'm like, "Look, I'm too young for you."" She said since guys try to pick up girls, they bear some responsibility.

April backed up Adriana, telling Rodrigo, "We ain't goin' inside of y'all. Y'all comin' up inside of us," so it's your responsibility to have the protection. She further added, "Y'all should get to know her" before having sex with her.

Amy again asked, how do you protect yourself? Rodrigo continued with his point, standing up out of his chair and facing Isabella, who was seated to his right. He said, "If I came up to you and I'm like, you want to get it on, you'd be like, no." Isabella smiled and said "no" with an attitude, as if revolted by the proposition. Rodrigo continued, but if you

came up to me and asked me, "I'd probably be like, alright, cool." A few people in the class laughed. Rodrigo turned to April and essentially repeated these same lines.

Clarence asked, "Why would you take someone home you met in the bar anyway?"

Rodrigo started to say something in reply, but Amy told him, "Rodrigo, sit."

Adriana seized the opportunity to say, "If a girl comes up to you, you can say no," you don't have to have sex with her. She continued, "You don't know what she's carrying."

Rodrigo answered, "You have a boyfriend though." Adriana said that doesn't matter, that's not the point. Excited, others were talking as well, prompting Amy to loudly say, "Time out. My turn." The class quieted down. She then asked again about contraction and what could be done to stop the spread of HIV in the country. Near the end of the discussion, April asked how HIV kills people, and Amy reminded her of what they had learned earlier, that it weakens the immune system and another disease leads to death.

This interaction was vastly different from any other I had witnessed in Amy's class. Although the discussion began haltingly, proceeding in IRE fashion, Rodrigo eventually carried the discussion into a place where some students got actively involved, if only because they disagreed with him. I was certainly surprised at the level of student interest and engagement; the content-related energy level in this period was the highest of all visits to all three interns. Whereas Rodrigo, Clarence, Mark, and Myron tended to be highly visible and vocal in class, during this discussion there were many more female voices than usual. The discussion could also be viewed as risky as it involved human sexuality, and there were many directions students could take the topic. In fact, April's description of the mechanisms of the sex act might be the type of comment that would

make some teachers fear they were losing control of the discussion. This discussion stood out to me because it was the only time that I observed students making comments that were not necessarily a response to Amy's questions even though she repeatedly asked about how to protect ourselves, but were germane to the subject matter, and students spoke with a passion not normally heard.

Amy's reflections on the lesson.

Maturity.

Amy was quite pleased with the lesson and felt it was a different experience than anything else she had had at Pinnacle. When I asked about student maturity, she explained how she prefaced the unit the first day (quoted earlier) and continued:

> You know, just went in that route and they, they did amazingly well. I, today, seventh hour was the first time I was kinda like, all right, you know, let's, let's come back to this or just ask a different question, to kinda get them going on a different track, but for, for being ninth and tenth graders with raging hormones, I think they, they far surpassed my expectations of what I thought.

Amy was concerned the students would not be mature enough to study sensitive subjects like sex and drug use; her last statement indicates low expectations. Amy reported just a few instances of immaturity, as when Rodrigo told the class that he paused a scene in the movie *The 40 Year Old Virgin* and found that the star went through 16 condoms trying to figure out how they worked. Amy said that in class she had to get them back to the story. She commented, "But they know a helluva lot more than you ever imagined. And they're willing to put it out there. I'd be a little embarrassed to say some of the things that they said to Mike [the mentor] when I was their age." So even though the students displayed moments of immaturity, Amy was quite pleased, perhaps even surprised, with her students' behavior, which she evaluated through her lens of having been a mature high school student.

Student Interest.

I asked Amy to share the reasons for this topic and she said:

> I don't know. I think, I think for me, I knew it would be an interesting topic for them. I was trying to look at it from their viewpoint and say, "Hey, what, I'm 16 again, 15, 16. What do I wanta know about, what, what's on my mind right now?" And it's like hormones and sex and drugs and all the temptations that go along with high school.

Amy drew upon her own experience as a high school student in an effort to develop a unit of interest for her students, and believed that topics like sex and drugs would be inherently interesting for them. She also believed that she could relate these topics to viruses, the biology concept that provided the unit's frame. And although some teachers might think that these are risky topics to teach, or that they are the province of the school's sex education program, which at Pinnacle was abstinence-only, Amy could and did use the fact that she was teaching a biology class to justify teaching these topics.

In several different parts of the interview following this lesson, Amy mentioned that students did not have to take many notes and that the mode of interaction during the unit was different. Amy told me that at the beginning of the week, she had to work more to get students involved, saying, "Like, I think they were just expecting another, they were like, oh, more worksheets. You know, another boring week of bio." Amy voiced her students here, who likely welcomed the break from a routine comprised of mostly seat work, note taking, and occasional lab work. Amy never directly labeled her class, teaching techniques, or content "boring," but on several occasions made comments similar to the above. As the week went on, Amy said she did not have to do as much classroom management as usual. In fact, by the end of the week (my visit), she said that students were excited to work on their projects, something that I witnessed for several of the groups. Amy said of the projects,

> I mean, they, they wanta spend time on it and to see them excited about their projects and planning and talking about what they're gonna do this weekend and getting materials, I mean—you don't see that too often. Most of the time they're like, 'Can we leave, can we leave?' 'No.' They weren't sitting there asking, 'When's the bell gonna ring?'

So that Friday, when Amy said students would normally not be very involved and full of anticipation for the end of the school week, Amy saw that the majority of students were working on their educational projects. She told me that earlier in the week she talked with the students about Pinnacle's abstinence-only sex education program:

> And I'm like, 'What do you guys think about other people who just, who aren't in this class, who aren't getting this information?' You know, 'What do you think they're doing?' And so many of them, even today, were like, 'Can we make photocopies? Can we put this around the school? Can we, can we hand these things out? Can we go to other classes? Can we go talk to middle schoolers?' I mean, they're, they want this. They, they thrive off of it. They need it. I think, I think it's so important because they just, a lot of them just don't know.

The enthusiasm that Amy reported from her students was unlike anything else in the interviews. It seems safe to say that many students experienced more moments of interest, relevance, learning, or enjoyment that week than most other weeks. This stands in sharp contrast to students' typical reactions to the standard biology topics in the class. I asked Amy what were some important factors that differentiated this unit from studying natural selection, and she replied:

> Golly. I think—just goes to show how inquiry works. That it's not me spitting out useless terminology, like natural selection, evolution, Darwin, what does that mean to them? You know, it doesn't mean a whole lot of anything but this has really solidified the fact for me that inquiry, though it does take time ... and maybe it's not necessarily the whole biology behind viruses. ... I think it was a change of pace. That made it very different. They didn't have to come in and do notebooks and take notes and do worksheets every day. ... So they never, I didn't hear any complaints about doing work or, you know, they didn't have to do a lot of writing. It was a lot more just thinking and processing and coming up with the patterns by themselves and it really made it a lot more fun for them, made it a lot more meaningful.

Amy uses strong language by referring to the previous unit's content as "useless terminology" that "doesn't mean a whole lot of anything." At first glance, we might surmise that Amy was answering this question from the perspective of most of the students, many of whom did the work in class, but did not seem to be terribly interested in the content. However, Amy made several statements like this over the course of the interviews, indicating that she shared some of the same negative feelings toward the content as some of her students. In the above quote even, we see her specifically talk about the fact that she did not make students participate in the normal ways of doing work in class, and that class was generally more fun and meaningful, but it also involved serious learning, which Amy described as "disguised" and "hidden."

Amy questioned both if she spent sufficient time on viruses and if students learned enough biological content. In fact, because students did not have to take as many notes during this unit, it is quite possible they enjoyed the unit because it was a break from the norm, involving less writing and listening. However, she felt they had learned valuable information for life and that the way they did so was different than normal. To explain this, Amy made use of a concept from her methods course called "EPE": experiences, patterns, and explanations. If you imagine a pyramid where the base, the largest part, is composed of a number of experiences, a smaller part in the middle composed of patterns derived from the experiences, and an even smaller part at the top made up of explanations, then you have a way to think of the construction of scientific knowledge. Going up the pyramid is inquiry, involving reasoning from evidence, whereas going down is application, involving reasoning from explanatory models to interpret an experience. Amy explained that she tried to expose her students to a variety of different

experiences (pink eye, common cold, HIV), so that they could build the patterns within their heads and eventually develop explanations (of a virus' role in disease transmission and the effects). Amy connected the EPE concept with teaching:

> Where it's just like they don't have to come up with anything on their own. *It's just we feed them, we feed them the explanation.* Has to do with, I mean, you can have some ways that are application that are like—you do give them examples during, but it's basically you do a lot less formal teaching with inquiry. It's more like what you're providing them with, giving them the right tools so that they can come up with it. And guiding their thinking. ... There was a lot of questioning going on, a lot of Socratic dialogue. A lot of me trying to point them in the right direction by asking them questions.

I italicized part of the quote to emphasize that the normal mode of instruction in many science classes is that the teacher feeds the students the explanation, and then perhaps, may expose students to some experiences in an attempt to develop patterns that get back to the explanations. Amy described some of the things that make inquiry different, in particular the role of the teacher who provides students with the experiences and the questions to help them make sense of these experiences. In addition, Amy used the term "Socratic dialogue," which she had also used in describing the Darwin recitation. In this lesson though, we can see that there were elements of Socratic dialogue, in contrast to the earlier IRE interactions.

A real teacher.

Amy was ecstatic as she reflected on the inquiry unit, saying:

> And it's, yeah, it's rewarding. I finally feel like a teacher. I haven't felt that way. I haven't felt like I've been me or been doing things that I wanta do or that I'm getting through to them ever, you know, and I can see, I'm getting through to them. They're learning, they're, they're engaged. They're having a good time. They wanta be here. That's, that's rewarding. Thank God.

Amy was very emphatic about the interactions she had had during the week. Not only did she feel like a real teacher, the students responded favorably to the unit. She also

experienced a taste of her idea teaching self by doing her mandatory course assignment. She found students were on task, she did not have to do much discipline, and students seemed to be enjoying the work that directly related to their lives.

Amy described that her ideal teaching self got "shot down pretty fast," and added:

> I want to be looked at as a role model, someone they can look up to, someone that hopefully changes their life in a good way. That is always the ultimate goal. Even if, even if I can just help one student that would be amazing but I just want to, want to make a change in their life, make a difference hopefully. I know that every student's not necessarily going to love science but if it can be something other than that that's great too.

While Amy acknowledged that not every student would like science, she attempted to make a difference in her students' lives, lives she perceived as needing some help in order to improve, through scientific information she could offer in class. This unit provided Amy a glimpse that she could induce in her students learning that might impact their worldviews similarly to how she was impacted by her university study of natural selection.

This lesson at Pinnacle.

We've seen that there were a variety of reasons why Amy chose the topic of viruses and HIV as her inquiry unit: her professor required her to do an inquiry-oriented unit; Pinnacle's curriculum included viruses; Amy was interested in the topic as a teenager and felt her students would be as well; and Amy felt the topic was important for her students. We can imagine that if she had been at Hope High, she might very well have done this same unit for the same reasons. In this respect, Amy solved a problem, doing an inquiry unit that other science interns, in schools with differing populations of students, also had to solve.

dim

of

ha

d

c

Even so, I would like to suggest that another dimension mattered as well. This dimension was tainted by race and class, specifically the belief that these students, many of whom were not white and from a lower socioeconomic class, would be more likely to have sex than white, middle class people, and be less likely to protect themselves while doing it. Of course, Amy never stated this, but I will present some evidence for this claim.

During the natural selection lecture, Amy mentioned the necessity of sexual reproduction to propagate the species, including humans, but then told the class not to reproduce, that they're too young. "Babies having babies, don't do it," she said. "My little plug in." She might have said that at Hope, but when asked why she would prefer to do internship at a school like Hope, Amy mentioned that Hope students would be more her style and that in Grand Pillar, "You hear all of these stories that these kids have, most of them have kids of their own, its just, it just really takes away from the teaching aspect." While there certainly were a small number of students at Pinnacle with their own children, the vast majority of students attending the school were not parents, yet this stereotype, contrasted with suburban Hope, was part of how Amy understood her students. Consequently, the stereotype that her urban students of color were dangerously sexually active, a long-standing US stereotype, was also operating in Amy's thinking. This unit demonstrates the dual concerns of this study: that Amy was confronting the problems of teaching and learning that any new teacher would confront, but doing so in a location where racial and class-based characteristics mattered, but usually not broached.

Amy's experience.

If we follow Dewey and regard a central aspect of experience as taking up something from an actor's continuity and modifying the actor's habits in interactions that

follow, then we can ask if this inquiry experience was indeed a growth experience for Amy, which we could judge on the basis of her teaching that follows. We saw that implementing the virus unit strongly affected Amy. Whereas she normally questioned the validity of the content she taught her students and seemed to regard it as boring, fairly useless, and a chore to push students through, in the interview following the virus unit Amy spoke with passion and purpose, a marked contrast from most of her reports about her internship. It seems possible that such strong interactions might lead Amy to teach differently. However, in the three visits I conducted afterward, I saw no evidence of change. For example, students participated in several lab activities after the inquiry unit, the majority of which involved observing organisms and sketching them. The only continuity I could see with the inquiry lesson was that Amy allowed students to choose the surface within the school to obtain a bacteria sample. Other than that, Amy seemed to teach in ways consistent with those she used before the inquiry unit. In this sense, the virus unit was a limited experience: though clearly impacted by the virtues of teaching in a different manner, she did not change any of her other teaching practices for the rest of her internship.

The Internship's Emotional and Physical Toll

Amy was dissatisfied in her internship, which negatively impacted her views of the experience. In this section I look at Amy's role as an assistant volleyball coach, her primary way of experiencing something satisfying at Pinnacle, and consider events that affected her well-being, in order to consider the important emotional impacts of the internship.

Assistant volleyball coach.

Amy had volunteered to be an assistant coach for Pinnacle's JV volleyball team, which took about three hours every day after school for about three months. In the middle of February, I asked Amy if she was looking forward to the season's end, and she said:

> Um, I think the extra time will be really nice. ... But, you know, lately coaching was the favorite part of my day, so.... So it's been good but it's also been—it's been a big time commitment too so—I'll be sad to see it go, I know I will, but—it was time well spent in my opinion and I really, yeah I had a good time, I really enjoyed it.

Even though Amy's biology class composition changed, allowing for a classroom environment closer to what she desired, the two Global Science classes she co-taught with her mentor were a source of negativity for her as she did not like working with students she considered to be rude in those large sections. I asked Amy what made volleyball athletes different from her biology students, and she said:

> One, they want to be there, which makes a big difference, and they wanted to be there and they wanted to learn, you know. So, I'd say between the two, between coaching and teaching, that's the biggest difference, 'cause a lot of them don't want to be in class, they don't care or they don't want to learn about it so—we didn't have to provide them with a lot of motivation to want to do things, you know, because they know it's making them better, they're interested in learning new drills and things like that. Not the kids in your class, it's very hard to get 'em to be motivated to want to come to school and to want to learn new things.

There were a number of reasons Amy found volleyball so rewarding. First, Amy herself played volleyball in high school, and she specifically mentioned she had interest in coaching volleyball partly to relive "old glory days;" she was injured for much of her senior year season. Second, the volleyball students chose to participate in that sport, unlike her biology students who were mandated by law to attend Pinnacle, and the volleyball athletes found the content related directly to their interests and developed their skills, whereas many biology students did not share that sentiment for the content of their

class. Third, Amy mentioned that she had more meaningful interactions with her students, and that they could relate to each other more like friends. Thus, interacting with volleyball players gave Amy an opportunity to interact with students in some ways similar to the athlete group she knew in high school, and in ways very different from what was possible in Biology. I would be remiss if I didn't point out that the majority of the volleyball players were white. Amy had two different experiences of teacher-student interactions: in the classroom where she experienced great difficulty in providing students with experiences that would motivate them to do work in a required setting, and on the volleyball court where students wanted to be and enjoyed the activity. Volleyball served as an outlet to work with motivated students, but it was also a strong reminder of what was missing from Amy's classes, that feeling of being a real teacher.

Situations outside of school.

Volleyball was more like aspirin, providing just short-term relief from her ongoing frustration with the internship, which was compounded when Amy and her boyfriend, a science intern in a suburban high school, broke up at the beginning of February. She shared:

> It's so hard to like keep your personal life separate and outside of it and, not let it affect you, especially when—I can't say that I've been happy here with what I'm doing, it's not like this is a release or this is, you know, a break from life, this is like teaching hell and I've been trying to deal with that you know and the person who I thought would understand most was just like, all of a sudden gone, you know.

Amy found it difficult to place boundaries between the personal and the professional, something she indicated several times she had learned to do through life. But at the beginning of the most intense part of her internship, in a place she really didn't want to be, she lost her biggest support system. As is the case for many teachers, Amy

viewed school as a different and separate institution from her social life. However, her daily forays into the institution, the "teaching hell," did not provide an escape from her social life. Over the President's Day weekend, Amy experienced a breakdown in which she crashed in bed for three straight days.

Further compounding this situation was Amy's work schedule. The TE program discouraged students from working because of the time-consuming nature of the internship. Yet Amy, who had worked consistently for much of her life, worked 15 to 20 hours per week as an assistant manager for a retail store, in an effort to finance part of her education. She found the job easy to do, contrasting it with the work required to teach. But work, combined with the internship's full-time schedule, university coursework, and volleyball coaching, took time away from other necessary activities, most notably sleep.

Stab me in the eye.

The day of the inquiry lesson, I asked Amy what the experience of the inquiry unit made her think about teaching science. She replied:

> It gives me a lot of hope. I think these first few weeks of lead teaching really got me down in the dumps and just like, good God, why the hell am I gonna be a teacher? And really convincing me that this type of setting is not the place for me and, you know, making me feel like I wanta give up and I think it's really instilled kind of a new found hope.

The inquiry lesson provided Amy with some hope, with a feeling that she could make it through the internship, even though she viewed a lot of experience at Pinnacle negatively.

About three weeks later (the middle of March), we had our most emotive interview, in which Amy made several strong statements about her feelings toward the internship at Pinnacle. It was significant because Amy wore her tiredness on her face and in her actions. When in class as the teacher, Amy projected interest in her subject and energy to

help students, frequently walking around the classroom and talking with individuals while they worked. But to me, except for the first and inquiry visits, Amy seemed very tired. Amy's emotional state was fragile, her desire to be at Pinnacle low, and her responsibilities high. She was sick for several visits, and on a couple of occasions she looked unhealthy; her mental, emotional, and physical states all seemed to exhibit the stress and negative feeling toward the internship. Amy and I discussed her desire to be done:

> Amy: I just want to be done, to be honest, just—more than anything I just want to be done. Then I don't have to think about planning, and I don't have to think about —dealing with them every day. And you try and start every day fresh, but like yesterday didn't go well and that kind of carried over to today and—
>
> John: Um-hmm
>
> Amy: —and that whole 'you're supposed to be on your game every day,' and every day is a new day, but shoot.
>
> John: Sometimes it still feels like the same day.
>
> Amy: The same fricken' day.

While we talked, I thought of the movie *Groundhog Day,* in which the main character has to relive the same day until he does something right. Amy described how the current day builds on previous events, like a growing mass increasing its inertia. In fact, near the internship's end, Amy described the feeling of all of her uncompleted tasks at Pinnacle and MU as being trapped in a car that kept going faster and faster, which she couldn't control, and that would eventually run into a brick wall, leaving her wondering what the hell had happened.

Earlier in that interview, we had this exchange:

> Amy: It's hard to…I don't know…. Hard to stay positive.
>
> John: Yeah.

Amy: Well, you know, I didn't think it would be like this you know?

John: What did you think it would be like?

Amy: I don't know, fun.

John: Hmmm.

Amy: More fun than it is. Not like—stab me in the eye every day.

Amy began to cry as she talked of being stabbed in the eye. Part of the intention is that the students and others in the placement deliberately did things to her to make her life miserable, such as placing too many students in Integrated Science or students' refusal to cooperate with her desires. In addition, Amy brought up the idea that teaching would be fun, but clearly she was not experiencing that. The segment continued:

John: Stab you in the eye every day?

Amy: Well—(pause). I just wonder if it would be different if I was with a different teacher, or had different students.

John: Mmm-hmm.

Amy: I think I've gotten a pretty bad idea of what this school is like, I don't know, in general—'cause I've seen, I've seen a couple other classes that are just not like this.

Also in this segment, Amy was thinking about the degree to which all of these factors affect her quality of life in the school, but she feels so trapped she can't quite figure her way out; the almost daily stabbing left her blind. She did reiterate the notion that a different placement would have resulted in a different experience for her, especially if it took place in a suburban high school, which she strongly desired. And interestingly, she had seen that her experience was not true of all Pinnacle classrooms.

In our next interview, Amy summarized the increasing difficulty she had in finishing the internship, and her doubt that she could or wanted to do so:

> I just, yeah, every weekend it gets worse, I'm like, 'God, I don't want to go back. I don't want to go to school on Monday.' Every, every week it gets harder in a way but easier in a way, like, I want to do less and less and I'm like, God, I just want to be done.' You know, so close, but then I look at everything I still have to do and I'm like, 'Shit, I have a lot, yeah that's a lot.'

Amy just wanted to be done. She wanted to close this chapter, the internship, and look forward to a different setting, a different group of students, a place that might be more fun, certainly a school that was more familiar to her and similar to her background. Yet, she was also afraid of what lay ahead, since the internship had shaken her faith in her decision to become a teacher, leaving her in a vulnerable state. Her experiences at Pinnacle had showed her school was not all fun and games as she imagined the teacher's work would be.

The emotional impact of Amy's confrontation with difficult knowledge.

In her final paper she submitted late, Amy commented on her emotional state and the two weeks since the end of the internship:

> The prospect of searching for a job and moving across the country caused me immense anxiety and I slipped into depression. I no longer had to go to school and hide my emotions. Instead, I stayed in bed all day, either sleeping or thinking. I only left my apartment to go to work. ... The most important thing I needed to do was to get healthy again. The internship left me feeling run down, tired, sick, and emotionally drained from all of the feelings that I had been hiding. I had to pull myself together and get well.

Amy's internship experience was so powerful that it disrupted her normal student work habits of completing papers on time. More importantly, her case highlights the importance of one's emotional aspect in undertaking a new, complicated endeavor like learning to teach. Both Bill and Amanda found the internship to be an emotionally exhausting experience, with a range of feelings from elation to frustration. However, I chose to focus on Amy's case because her emotional state bordered on fragility and clearly illustrated the difficulties she faced. In particular, she desired to be in a school like

she had attended with students like her, motivated by grades and who did their work as the teacher requested, but did not get this experience at Pinnacle. We saw that her college biology experiences, particularly her thinking about evolution, taught Amy the importance of the big ideas, yet she did not believe that her students could handle the big ideas, and that they had to participate in procedural display to get down the basics. Her situation at Pinnacle, in particular her difficulty in constructing productive student-teacher relationships, left her emotionally vulnerable, exposed her conflict, and threatened to destroy her image of school teaching and learning.

Final Analysis

Amy was a good student who complied with her schools' requests and became valedictorian as a result. Although not exclusively raised middle class, she internalized middle class ways of living and thinking, and brought those with her to Pinnacle, where the adults valued such practices. Although Pinnacle students were not as academically successful on average as those at Hope, they were expected to learn the same content (not necessarily as much or as deeply) and were measured in the same ways (not necessarily as rigorously) and had many of the same school-based opportunities (though not necessarily encouraged to stay at the school). One of her greatest difficulties came from her past as a good student highly motivated by grades, characteristics many of her students did not seem to embody.

Amy's familiarity and previous success in school fit right in at Pinnacle. And so did her race. About 90 percent of the faculty was white and the white perspectives that Amy shared (students' home lives, etc.) with me were not unique to her. Her views of blacks in particular colored her interpretations of her students and reinforced her need to control

them. Even so, it is disingenuous to simply label her resistant and dismiss her, since this was her first encounter with black students; resistance is the way people protect themselves from the unfamiliar. Yes, she had much work to do with regard to these issues, tied to her use of controlling teaching techniques, but a novice teacher like Amy has many problems to deal with; one being she does conceptualize problems of teaching and learning as interconnected.

Amy would have found many of the complications she faced at Pinnacle at Hope as well. She engaged her students in procedural display, who displayed just enough interest in the class to get the grade they desired. Amy covered much material through lecture, and the extent of whole-class interactions involved short, IRE style recitations. Amy often required students to work on the content individually. These dominant teaching methods were ones Amy repeatedly observed as a student and which formed her dominant images of teaching and learning. She had glimpses of counter-images, such as her college biology coursework and her experience with the HIV unit, but they were not yet enough to get Amy to rethink her teaching practices and attempt new ways to conceive of the student-teacher interaction.

Amy experienced difficulties very similar to those nearly anyone would encounter in becoming a teacher. Adding to those difficulties was the fact that Amy came from a background that differed significantly from that of her students. What a complicated situation this is, for clearly both of these factors were important in Amy's situation, but difficult to distinguish and address. Did Amy teach students the basics because they were lower class and not white, or because they had few skills, or because with a limited, developing teaching repertoire, she could not do anything but the basics? While all three

suggestions are true, the important point is that Amy's long history of being a good, white, fairly middle class student with limited learning experiences outside of lecture and worksheets faced a difficult task in improving her practice. I am inclined to say, "yes," all of these things were at work, giving Amy a very hard task as an intern, and giving me, as her instructor, a very hard task of figuring out how to help her.

CRITICAL INVESTIGATIONS INTO INTERNS' URBAN TEACHING APPRENTICESHIP EXPERIENCES

VOLUME II

By

John Lockhart

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Curriculum, Teaching, and Educational Policy

2009

CHAPTER FIVE

AMANDA

For her internship, Amanda was assigned to work with Ms. Mary Cutter teaching World Geography to ninth graders in the Annex of Stratford High School; Amanda taught Honors World Geography during second and sixth hours and World Geography for first and seventh hours. We agreed I would observe her second hour class because her prep period followed that hour, allowing us to hold the interviews immediately after. In this majority-black school, her second hour honors class consisted of 14 Black, 10 White, one Asian, and one Latina students. Like Amy, Amanda brought to her placement a history that did not offer much guidance for some of what she would experience. Amanda had been a very good student and very motivated by her grades, striving to get the highest A possible. Amanda attended a religious school in a middle class, predominantly white suburb. During the internship, Amanda began to consider how the demographics of her placement affected her work.

Amanda's Teaching Practices

World Geography involved material that was largely foreign to Amanda, who earned a degree in history with a minor in psychology, and had taken only one geography class since middle school. Over the two months I visited, Amanda taught a number of different topics, divided roughly into two parts. The first part focused on Europe and

included topics like the Berlin Wall and the fall of communism, the European Union, and NATO. The second unit was focused on genocide, particularly the Holocaust, Yugoslavia, Rwanda, and Sudan. In Table 5.1, I provide a brief summary of Amanda's teaching practices and their content during my eight visits to her Honors World Geography class.

Table 5.1: Amanda's Observed Teaching Practices

Day	Activity type	Time	Brief Summary
2/2	Lecture	10	Ms. Cutter shares her experience of visiting the Iron Curtain while in the US Army.
	Journal	15	If the freeway was made into a wall dividing our city, our families, what would you do or how would you feel?
	Film	60	Watched CNN's *Cold War: Sputnik*. Paused during breaks so students could ask questions to make sure they get answers on accompanying *Sputnik* worksheet.
2/7	Lecture	25	Ms. Cutter lectures on the destructive power of nuclear weapons and their proliferation.
	Journal	15	Should we stop other countries from having nuclear weapons and by saying that to other countries, how does that make us look?
	Individual work	40	Students read *Life after the wall* handout and answer questions on *Challenges after communism* worksheet, some from perspective of a Eastern European worker.
2/13	Individual work	30	Read *Expansion of NATO is a bad idea*, write summary, and answer two questions.
	Lecture	20	Amanda explains the requirements for assignment, using *NATO argumentative essay requirements* handout. .
	Individual work	35	Students have rest of class time to plan and begin their NATO essay.
2/22	Journal	10	Write anything you know about the European Union.
	Recitation	5	Students share the things they know about the EU.
	Lecture	5	Amanda discusses the formation of the EU.
	Simulation	15	Students stand up in order that country is called, by date of admittance.
	Lecture	30	Amanda lectures on the EU forms of government, currency, purpose, and economy, as students fill in *United States of Europe?* guided notesheet.
	Individual	10	Use Venn diagram to compare EU & US.
	Recitation	4	Students share info they wrote in Venn diagram.
2/27	Assessment	40	Students have to write names of 50 countries on blank map.
	Recitation	4	Recall previous discussion on admitting Turkey to the EU.
	Individual work	35	Student read *The European Union* handout and then answer questions on *The European Union* worksheet, and develop some possible test questions.

Table 5.1 (cont'd)			
3/8	Lecture	6	Amanda comments on returned NATO essays.
	Lecture	6	Introduction to genocide unit.
	Journal	5	Write 4 or 5 questions you have about genocide.
	Recitation	4	Amanda has students share questions with class.
	Individual work	25	Students use *Genocide in the 20th century* handout to mark on blank map the countries where genocides occurred.
	Journal	8	Write things you know about the Holocaust.
	Recitation	4	Amanda has students share knowledge with class.
	Journal	3	Write things you want to know about Holocaust.
	Individual work	13	Read *The Holocaust* handout and write down things you learned.
	Recitation	8	Amanda has students share knowledge with class.
3/13	Lecture	35	Yugoslavia's history and genocide, using *In the beginning: Former Yugoslavia* data map.
	Group work	45	Students read *Yugoslavia* handout, summarize, and react to the text through roles assigned to group members.
3/22	Lecture	25	The Rwandan genocide.
	Individual work	25	Students read *Rwanda: how the genocide happened* handout and then answer questions on *Rwandan genocide* worksheet.

Table 5.2 provides a breakdown of the amount of time spent on each of the documented teaching practices. Amanda structured the class so that over one-third of the time was spent on individual student work based on worksheets and readings about the day's content. I broke out the teaching practices associated with film and journal, which differ from worksheets, but are associated with individual work as they involve students working with content individually. Amanda lectured for a bit less than one-quarter of the time. In addition, she did one simulation that required students to get out of their seats, administered a lengthy map quiz, held several short recitation sessions, and ran one group work session.

Table 5.2: Amanda's Teaching Modes		
Teaching mode	Minutes	% time
Individual work	213	36
Lecture	127	22
Journal	56	10
Film	60	10
Group work	45	8
Assessment	40	7
Recitation	29	5
Simulation	15	3
Total time	585	

In this section, I will describe Amanda's introductory lecture on the Rwandan genocide as well as the individual work activity that followed. In considering these teaching episodes, I will examine Amanda's level of subject matter knowledge, the majority of which was new to her. I will compare Amanda's classroom practices to descriptions of being a student, and to a prominent teacher from her high school experience.

A Lecture on the Rwandan Genocide

In a 25-minute lecture on the Rwandan genocide, Amanda proceeded much as she did in other lessons I observed, the exceptions being the lectures when she returned students' NATO argumentative essays and the introduction to the genocide unit, both of which were shorter than typical lectures. I will discuss only the Rwandan lecture so we can explore this teaching practice while still seeing her lecture pattern, efficiency in running the classroom, student-teacher interactions, and the important role of specifically chosen content.

Beginning the lecture.

March 22 was one of the four days that week when some students were required to take state tests, and class periods were shortened. On this day, students were dismissed about 10 minutes later than expected, and the PA's voice announced second hour would be shortened and the rest of the schedule would stay the same. When it appeared most students were in class, Amanda began class, saying, "All right, everyone listen up. We have about 45 minutes of class today." A number of students cheered and yelled out "Yes!" or something like that. Amidst the cheers, Amanda continued to speak without pause: "I'm gonna give…." But rather than continue, Amanda instead asked, "How are

you guys doing today?" Students were talking amongst themselves and no one seemed to answer the question.

Amanda repeated in several interviews her desire to greet her classes every day, such as when she answered this question about how she built good relationships with her students:

> Like every day I begin my classes with, "How are you guys doing?" I always stop and ask them about that, because if they're having a crappy day then I know they're gonna have a crappy day in my classroom and it's gonna show. So maybe I can take a couple minutes at the beginning of the class just to kind of, you know, see how they're doing. See if you can feel that out before you begin class.

Whereas asking the class how they are every day might help to build rapport, Amanda strongly viewed it as a pragmatic strategy to ascertain the class' mood, so she could better prepare for what may lay ahead during the hour, a concern because Amanda frequently reported great uncertainty about how any class would act on any particular day, dependent upon who was in attendance. On March 22, students did not answer this question, most likely because they were involved in conversations of their own or perhaps because Amanda was looking down at her attendance sheet after she asked the question.

After she completed the attendance, Amanda shared the day's agenda: "I'm gonna show you the beginning of Hotel Rwanda today, though we are not going to have all class for that. I'm gonna do three things today. First I'm gonna give you a brief version of the history of genocide in Rwanda. Then I'm gonna talk about the differences in culture there. Then I'm gonna give you back your tests and explain those to you." After a brief exchange with Evan about the test, Amanda used a common practice for her: she asked students what they knew about the topic they were going to study: "Before we start taking notes, what do you already know about Rwanda?" She paused briefly and added,

"Besides that a genocide took place." Three different students answered; two answers involved *Hotel Rwanda.*

Amanda told her students, "Most of you probably don't know that much about it. You would have been like four. Most of you didn't watch the news, I know I didn't. I was ten." Amanda first asked students what they knew about Rwanda and ended up saying that she did not expect most of them would know anything about it, a position confirmed by the three answers that she did receive. And by referring to her own state of knowledge at the time, she indicated solidarity with the students: neither she the teacher, nor her students knew much about Rwanda.

Amanda then moved into the lecture. She said, "In Rwanda, there are two major ethnic groups, the Hutus and the Tutsis. The Hutus make up 84 percent of the population, and the Tutsis make 15 percent."

Evan asked, "What's Hutus?"

Amanda answered, "That's the name of one of the ethnic groups there." As Amanda finished answering, Evan stood up out of his seat holding his pencil, and quickly walked over to the pencil sharpener, which he used before walking back to his seat very slowly. Meanwhile, Amanda continued the lecture, saying, "World War I took place. After World War I, Rwanda became a colony under the control of Belgium." She made another little comment about Belgium before continuing, "The Belgian rulers ruled Rwanda. However there were these two groups. The Belgians came in after World War I, took control, favored the Tutsi people, and allowed them to help rule."

The content of Amanda's lecture consisted exclusively of what we might label "facts," the supposedly undisputed, agreed upon descriptions of a particular topic or

event. For example, the Hutus and Tutsis are described as population statistics, and Belgium as the ruler of the affairs of these two groups. As facts, these pieces of information are delivered in relatively neutral language, in the first case the language of governmental statistical bureaucracies and in the second, a mix of verb tenses ("became a colony") and words laden with multiple meanings rendered matter of factly ("Belgians came ... took control ... allowed them"). This is the typical manner in which Amanda delivered the content to her students.

A second point here concerns Evan's question, "What's Hutus?," a question similar to the type students most often asked. Out of the 75 questions I heard students ask in class, 34 were of this type in which the student sought particular pieces of information, facts, such as the name of a group or person. Amanda usually provided the answer to such questions, but occasionally asked another student to answer, and one time, a student even answered another's question unprompted. Because these questions involved students obtaining particular pieces of information that might be useful for a future test, it reinforced the idea that the teacher is the source of knowledge, which one needed to get an acceptable grade.

Often I was unable to copy the information from the overhead slides into my notes, because I was focusing on Amanda's speech, and wrote much of it down. Meanwhile, the majority of the students dutifully copied the notes from the overhead onto binder paper, although on occasion, students in the back corner put their heads down or closed their eyes. There was rarely any talking while Amanda lectured, speaking deliberately and clearly, not too quickly. Especially when she worked with the notes projected, she tended to move at a fairly slow pace. Amanda varied her voice and was not monotonous; she

possessed a number of skills that led me to rate her as above average in delivering a lecture.

Unsolicited student interest.

Amanda continued the lecture: "You might be wondering what the difference is between Hutus and Tutsis? There's not really a difference. There is some difference in nose and facial structure."

Evan slowly said to the class, "I know the History Channel had something about this recently."

Donovan quickly followed, "Yeah. They said, like, the Tutsis had lighter skin."

Amanda said, "Yeah, that might have made them more appealing to the Belgians."

Kaylee asked, "Do they have the same culture?"

Amanda answered, "Basically, yeah. It's interesting that you ask these questions. In 1959, the Hutus revolted, and sent tens of thousands of Tutsis into exile. So by 1990, we're getting much closer to the genocide. The Tutsis formed a rebel group called the Rwandan Patriotic Front," which opposed the national government, led by Hutus at that point. "So the RPF consists of Tutsis. Then the RPF group invaded Rwanda and Uganda." Amanda briefly paused and then asked, "Any questions so far?" as she removed the overhead sheet.

A student called out, "I'm not done."

Amanda said, "I won't take it off, I'll just move it up some." She moved the sheet up and then placed the next sheet below it so that the top part of it was visible on the screen.

What makes this segment rare for Amanda's class was that students brought in knowledge received from other sources; Evan brought up something he had learned about the Hutus and Tutsis from the History Channel and Donovan was able to bring a fact of

interest to the lecture: the Tutsis had lighter skin. Given the context in which Donovan made this statement, as a young black man with dark skin in a country where lighter skin color is usually accorded more privilege and advantage, it seems quite reasonable that Donovan was making use of this concept in conjunction with what he had learned on the History Channel to make more sense of what Amanda was saying.

Amanda efficiently replied to Donovan's statement, acknowledging and discounting it. Amanda acknowledged Donovan's statement with her own observation that lighter skin color may have contributed to the Tutsis appeal, indicating her own knowledge of the advantage of lighter skin color, at the very least that the closer to white a person's skin color is, the more palatable it is for whites. At the same time, Amanda discounted the statement by not asking Donovan for further information or encouraging the class to think about this important dimension, especially given her earlier statements that the Tutsis were in the minority and Belgium chose Tutsis to conduct colonial administrative tasks. Amanda's engagement is enough to acknowledge the statement and continue the lecture flow.

Kaylee's question about the cultural similarities between the two groups is one that I labeled an "interpretive question," meaning that it cannot be answered simply by recourse to a date or a name, involving more in-depth understanding of the ways that a group of people work. Such questions made up five of the 75 recorded student questions during my visits. Even though the question would require a good deal of interpretation, certainly more than would be allowed by Amanda's intended pace for this class period, Amanda quickly provided a relatively certain answer that they are basically the same. The student contributions complicated matters and called into question Amanda's content statements.

Significantly, after having answered Kaylee's question, Amanda said, "It's interesting that you ask these questions." Perhaps Amanda was surprised students were providing information and asking questions about Rwanda, or caught off guard and did not possess the knowledge to be able to engage either Donovan's statement or Kaylee's question, or was eager to move on with the lecture. One important distinction is that this lesson contained explicitly racial content, albeit from another part of the world. In the end, the lesson became overshadowed by Amanda's needing to manage student input in order to get through the course material.

Historical inevitability.

Amanda continued the lecture, noting that fighting was already occurring before the genocide because the RPF invaded Rwanda between 1990 and 1993. After a brief pause she asked, "Any questions so far?"

Eric asked, "How many more pages is this?"

Amanda sarcastically said without hesitation, "Five." Amanda regularly resorted to sarcasm, which, by her own admission, would sometimes get her into trouble with her students. Eric's question is procedural, relating to the mechanisms of class and what students are supposed to do. Such questions accounted for 20 of the 75 student questions.

Amanda continued the lecture. "So 1993 rolls around, and August shows up. Since there was conflict, they tried to make peace. That did not work. The peace did not last. ... After the failed peace attempts, this is where things started to get really interesting. In April 1994, this is the event that sparked the genocide; the president's plane was shot down. The Hutus were not satisfied with this. This triggered a huge massacre. The Hutus blamed the Tutsis for killing the president." Amanda paused briefly and then said, "So

now we have a dead president, and a lot of killing happening. As a result, what do you think happened?"

Amanda's answer to her own question is that the genocide follows. Amanda's recounting of the events seems to indicate a sense of inevitability, which we can see when she speaks of time: "so 1993 rolls around, and August shows up." Amanda's last question is the natural consequence of all the previous ideas she had shared, which led to the inevitable genocide. Amanda's account of the events conveyed a strong sense of certainty. It reflected Amanda's desire to unambiguously deliver the content to her students. It is also the way that typical school history accounts of events are written.

As Amanda continued her lecture, she moved into the timeframe and numbers killed in the genocide before turning to the moral dimension examining the United Nation's response to the event. Even though Amanda seemed to have a sense the genocide was inevitable, destined to happen, she also seemed to have a sense of moral outrage toward the world's response to the situation in Rwanda. This sense of morality was strong enough that in a later lecture I saw on Sudan, Amanda told the class that they would do something as a class to address the situation and get involved. However, the students did not pick up Amanda's interest in the moral dimensions of the conflict, possibly because the earlier exchange about the Tutsi skin color had showed them not to participate, or they were simply in the mode of writing lecture notes for future use. Two students' asked questions seeking information.

Amanda ended her lecture by telling the students that she wanted to give them a general overview; that she wanted to provide them some background knowledge. Amanda often mentioned background or basic knowledge when talking about her

teaching. This was one of five times during my visits that Amanda specifically mentioned to the class that the purpose of a classroom activity was to provide the background information on a particular topic. It was also something we discussed at length in the interviews, both prompted by my questions and not.

Amanda's Content Knowledge

Amanda lacked knowledge of world geography, and although she would be certified to teach this class upon completing her internship, it was, along with economics, the area of social studies she felt least prepared to teach. Her unfamiliarity with the content seriously complicated Amanda's practice, and she reported her job required substantial planning time. In one interview, we discussed the source of the reading on the Holocaust she had handed out:

> Amanda: It was an adolescent encyclopedia.
>
> John: Oh, an adolescent encyclopedia?
>
> Amanda: For elementary kids actually.
>
> John: [laughs] For elementary, now I know why the pictures were too horrific.
>
> Amanda: So, yeah actually I get a lot of stuff there for them, because it explains it very simply.
>
> John: Ok, well, um, why do you choose that source for them?
>
> Amanda: Because sometimes, ok, if that's—a lot of the stuff that we're talking about, I don't really know that well myself. ... So if I can go to that and I can understand the basics of that, as just like, a general foundation, I'm like, ok, well they can probably understand the basis of this and it's probably not going to be over their heads, so if I can give that to them, then I can build off those, that simple foundation.

Amanda described what she needed quite similarly to how she described her students' needs: so that she "can understand the basics of that, as just like, a general foundation."

She spent a lot of her preparation time learning about the subject she was about to teach, building her own foundation from which she would be able to instruct her students.

Because she did not have the depth of content knowledge needed to teach World Geography, Amanda spent a lot of time learning the content. As she entered the lead teaching portion of the internship in early February, she discussed how this new intense schedule hampered her ability to work as she had before:

> I used to have time, I'll be honest. Now I don't have the time anymore. A lot of times I'm learning a couple days before, what I have to teach (inaudible) it's just really not my focus area so I'm like, ok, I have to learn about this for myself so I can go and teach it to my students and not tell them 'I don't know' when they ask me questions.

Clearly, learning the content was an important part of Amanda's preparation to teach, and had an effect on the planning process she used. During one interview, I asked a number of questions about how she planned for the class:

> Amanda: You can ask me what I'm gonna talk about next week and I can tell you what I'm gonna talk about next week.... Sometimes on the individual day basis, though, I don't necessarily know how I'm gonna execute that until like the day or two before, so...
>
> John: So you have like a general idea of what's gonna happen?
>
> Amanda: I have a general idea but then like, the day or two before, if I'm really on top of things I'm three days ahead, um, you know specific, individual, ok, this is the assignment that I want to give, um. But I mean a lot of times it's hard for me to plan some things because a lot of this I'm learning as they go along, so the night before I'm trying to go back and learn what I had planned a few days ago, and then I plan for a couple days ahead, so sometimes I do get behind with it. But it really just depends on the subject and how much I know about the subject and if I have enough resources ... because about 90 percent of the stuff in here, like I have to find myself or I have to make up myself, and so that takes me a long time actually.

Amanda's planning process consisted of two major parts. First there was a general, long-term, or unit-based view of the content to be taught. For example, Amanda had planned to teach a unit focused on genocide that studied four cases: the Holocaust,

Yugoslavia, Rwanda, and Sudan. The second part was to determine the specific content for each particular day within the unit. For Amanda, this was the time when she located the sources to read, learned the content, chose specific lecture content, and planned the assignments for students. Not only did Amanda have to learn about the content that she was going to teach, but apparently she had to do this process for a large amount of the content.

Intrigued, I asked Amanda if Mary Cutter ever shared any of her materials, specifically with regard to the unit she taught at the time on Europe, and Amanda replied:

> Um, like everything I did today I got myself, um, but. She gives me a folder and it's like this thick [motions about two inches] of her Europe stuff and I can use whatever I want in there, but it's not necessarily all that useful to me or always fits what I want to do, but I mean—and then obviously today when I told them there is a textbook, you know we never use the textbook. So I don't have, like a source I can go and get information from, I have to go and find everything myself which takes me a very long time, because that's what holds me up a lot, is finding things that they can understand, that they'll be able to read and on the topic that I want, and the point that I want them to get across.

Though Amanda's mentor shared of a lot of material she could use, Amanda did not feel those materials were useful. Amanda's decision to find her own materials suggests she faced a dilemma. On one hand, by using Cutter's materials Amanda would probably have saved time. But on the other hand, if she simply used those materials, then she wouldn't have planned the class the encompassed her vision of what students should learn. Perhaps through the process of research and planning her own lessons, Amanda came to learn something about such topics and how to teach them.

During our interview after the lecture on the Holocaust, Amanda told me about her future plans for the rest of the genocide unit, including Yugoslavia and Rwanda:

> Amanda: Ok, I know about Rwanda (laughs), I know about that. So that's why I kind of fast forward through everything else and kind of camp there for a while.

> John: How did you learn about Rwanda?
>
> Amanda: Um, I actually took an African class, an African geography class, one of the few geography classes I did take, and we talked about the whole Rwanda thing in there and obviously I need to refresh my memory a bit, but it's not as foggy to me as, let's say, what happened in Yugoslavia, Bosnia, and Kosovo.

Many teachers take time to plan what it is that they're going to be doing in class, and the majority of them have to refresh their memories about certain concepts, but it seemed as though the Rwandan genocide was one of the few parts of the unit that Amanda did not have to essentially build her own content knowledge from scratch.

The Reinforcing Worksheet

After Amanda concluded the lecture on the Rwandan genocide, she grabbed two stacks of handouts from her desk, and methodically moved across the front of the room, quickly distributing the correct number of handouts to the front of the rows with hardly a pause. The first handout was an approximately 850-word article titled *Rwanda: How the genocide happened*, and the second contained seven questions. Amanda told the class, "Take 10 or 15 minutes to do this. It goes over what we just talked about. It's a way to reinforce it." Amanda almost always followed a lecture with a reinforcing activity, usually a worksheet. Amanda was not alone in this practice, as Bill and Amy used very similar types of worksheets in their science classrooms.

After she distributed the papers, Amanda told the class part of her reason for making them do this assignment: to reinforce what she had just lectured about. Having spent a lot of time developing her own understanding of Rwanda, Amanda believed it would take a while for students to learn all of the relevant information she required of them. To facilitate that process, she had her students read something related to the lecture, followed by answering questions, to increase the chance they would learn what she wanted them

to. Since this was the first day of several studying Rwanda, it made sense to Amanda to make students learn the basics of the situation, to lay the foundation so that students could learn more about Rwanda and have some background information for viewing *Hotel Rwanda*, which made up the majority of the rest of the Rwanda subunit. Her choice of teaching sequence suggests that Amanda held the notion that the teacher was the expert who needed to transmit important information to students, and that would be done most effectively by first lecturing on the basics, and reinforced by the reading and questions.

The text Amanda distributed in class was similar to her lecture. It had an encyclopedic, detached quality, occasionally asking questions or pointing out unknowns, but largely stating the facts of the matter and avoiding controversy. Although not as strongly as in Amanda's lecture, the article also possessed a sense of historical inevitability, that it just seemed natural that such slaughter would take place between these two groups. The article also presented the case in the same sequence that Amanda did. There are a couple of things that Amanda mentioned in her lecture that do not appear in the article, but for the most part, this reading seemed to have been a major source for Amanda's own preparation to teach this topic.

In the interview after the class watched a video on the Cold War, we talked of the considerations that Amanda made in selecting readings. I asked her about the things that she did to help students understand the reading they did in the class, which led into the difficulty of the readings she selected for them, and finally to this question:

> John: Do you find that there's some things that it's easier for them to read than others? Like, for example, say an article from the [local newspaper] versus, you know like, an analysis article from Newsweek, or?

> Amanda: That would kill them. That would kill 'em, if it's very, very straightforward, and there's not a whole lot of detail, and it's blunt, to the point, and it's not very long. So we're talking about a two paragraph, little essay or whatnot that might take them five minutes to read, then they could probably comprehend that if it was very short, concise, and to the point. But if it's anything with lots of detail or if it's more, you have to infer the answers, or you have to think about it more deeply, they can't handle that, because some of those questions on there ... the answer wasn't gonna be directly there, you had to infer it and they had a difficult time with that.

It appeared that Amanda did not think most students were capable of inferring information, which prompted me to ask her if she didn't think students could infer in other contexts. She answered that she was sure most of them could, in the streets for example, which required different skills than those needed to understand geography content or write an essay. Thus, Amanda acknowledged students had the ability to make inferences from information, but implied it was not something they could easily do in an academic context. Another of Amanda's concerns was the pacing. She did not want the article to be too long or complicated because it would take students more time to understand the material, especially if they were then going to have to infer information from the article rather than having it matter-of-factly presented.

Simple presentations of information matched the questions that Amanda asked the students to answer on one of her "charts," a worksheet with questions to answer. On this day, students had seven questions to answer, five of which were recall questions such as, "What event marked the beginning of the genocide against Tutsis in Rwanda?" The other two asked for some interpretation or inference to be made as in, "Belgium ruled the colony of Rwanda after World War I. What effect did Belgium leave on the Hutus and the Tutsis? Use specific examples of the problems this caused." It is not the case that Amanda did not ask interpretive or analysis questions that required deeper thinking. But the materials she used, which she reinforced through lecture, did not delve deeply into the

subject or generally require students to put in more effort than necessary to find and regurgitate information. As in the exchange about Tutsi skin color, Amanda seemed interested in deeper exploration of topics, but did not allow or construct such possibilities to be explored. Nearly all of her charts asked questions like those illustrated above, and only one question from all the charts I saw stood out as unusual because students had to choose an occupation and use that perspective to answer questions about the significance of the fall of the Berlin Wall.

Students' basic needs.

Most individual work time proceeded in the manner described above: students read a short encyclopedic article and answered questions about the readings; I observed two exceptions: the time students marked countries on a map that had a genocide event in the twentieth century, and the time students were to begin work on their NATO essays. Amanda practiced a deposit approach to education as the best way to convey the basics to students, and conceived of the basics in two ways: knowledge and skills. For example, with regard to content knowledge, I asked what she thought students learned from watching the film on the Cold War, and Amanda responded:

> Hopefully they got, what I wanted them to get was background on the Cold War.... That's what I really wanted them to get out of it, and I know we don't have a lot of school time to spend on it, so I mean—we talked about it a little bit at the beginning of this week and then a little bit last week, but not really into a whole lot of detail, this was the most detail that we got into.

Here she specifically referred to information on the Cold War, because this information was helpful to contextualize Ms. Cutter's story at the beginning of the period about her visit to the Berlin Wall while stationed by the US Army in Germany. In addition, as the class studied the fall of communism, the Cold War provided necessary context to understand the change that had taken place with the fall of the Wall. CNN provided some

of the historical context. A key consideration of what basics to share depends on the class pacing, as there are many topics to cover, allowing only the minimum of background information.

Similarly, in a later interview I asked, "So what do the regular kids...what do they need academically?" Amanda replied:

> ... Are they going to need it ever? Probably not unless they major in geography or they go work for the United Nations or something, but – if they just have a general idea of what the subject is ... that's what I want them to get out of it. So, academic wise, they—a basic understanding of what we're talking about. If they can tell me what they have just learned that class period, that's good.

This exchange came in a conversation about her regular students, but the spirit of the answer is not greatly different from what she said of the honors students. It is focused on having students do more school, in preparation for work, with no hint of other purposes for learning. Amanda hoped the students would develop "a general idea" of the subject, measured by the students' abilities to share what they just learned. The two ideas are in tension, for something just learned is probably not enough to develop a general idea, since general ideas are made from a number of specific incidents that come to be combined in some way. Perhaps it is more likely that the general idea refers to the students being able to show that they learned something from what she had said in class. In this sense, Amanda set up her class for procedural display. First she would display her knowledge to students and then they would display their knowledge of what she had told them back to her, so it would appear that learning had taken place.

After an introductory lecture to the conflict in the former Yugoslavia, I asked Amanda how she conceived of the issue of breadth versus depth in selecting material. Her answer again demonstrated the tension between specific and general knowledge:

> But a lot of times I have a very difficult time, but I'm just doing a very general overview of a lot of things. I have a very difficult time sometimes, coming up with what exactly I want to teach and it's a huge topic. When it was the Holocaust, when I had a day, I made it to be a day and a half, but I was like, "I have no idea what to teach, this is such a huge topic that how can I pick out information? You know, have a very general lesson when there's so much specific stuff there?" So I do struggle with that a whole lot actually.

Once again, the pacing is a factor, a factor in favor of breadth, or covering a whole lot of topics. Siding with breadth meant Amanda chose to skim over a large number of topics very quickly. Some colleges offer courses entirely focused on the Holocaust, but the Holocaust is allotted just one and a half days in a class that is supposed to study the world's geography, and a host of complicated events, organizations, and interactions between people, in just 120 class periods of 85 minutes each. The reduction of complicated events like the Holocaust to two days also presented a different breadth problem to Amanda, for she had to often cull down available sources to a few basic ones she and her students could understand.

Besides content knowledge, basic skills also were important to Amanda.

> John: So what do—what do those kids need?
>
> Amanda: What do you mean?
>
> John: What do they need from this class? What do they need from you? The first and fifth hour.
>
> Amanda: I think they need to know how to study. I think, if anything, they need to know how to organize themselves for this class, even if they don't learn anything, if they learn how to organize themselves because – we don't have textbooks so they don't have a source that they can always go to. They have to keep whatever I give them, and I do give them a lot of stuff.

From Amanda's perspective, her students were not organized, an issue that she contributed to by giving them a lot of papers. Thus, Amanda's view of basic skills encompassed procedural skills necessary to succeed in her class, like keeping track of

one's papers or taking notes; behavioral skills like censoring what one shares; and academic skills, for example, how to take notes, study for tests, or write an essay. And because Amanda mentioned it as something important for them to learn, we can assume that she did not see her students as possessing these skills. That was why she worked on "basically their basic skills so they can build on that next year. That's what I try to make them get out of it, but it's not necessarily always successful."

These two sets of basics, knowledge and skills, are related in important ways. First, Amanda sees her regular and honors students as lacking the necessary skills needed to do the work in her class, although she saw the latter group as more competent. Because of this view, her primary job became to instill these skills within her students, to a lay a foundation for the possible future erection of more advanced knowledge by someone else. Her strict dichotomizing of the basics from more advanced knowledge and skills also foreclosed the possibility that students might learn more advanced content and skills, as that was clearly outside her perception of their abilities. Of course one factor in all this is the value and interest of the content for the students. The significance of that fact here is that because of low student interest and value in the material, the students' time in class became little more than procedural display, which is likely all that most were willing to invest, quite possibly because the work did not seem intellectually stimulating and was repetitive. Students expended relatively low effort, reinforcing in Amanda's mind that what most students were capable of learning and needed were the basics. Amanda was caught in a vicious cycle of low expectations and procedural display, a teaching problem one can observe in many social studies classes across the US. It may be true that Amanda held an unconscious belief that black students needed more basic instruction or that

students who were not as competent as her could not learn advanced content, but what's significant here is that Amanda is in the middle of another complication: how, within a limited amount of time, does the teacher convey the complexity of historical and current human events in such a way that the majority of her students will learn, and do so beyond the basics?

Ambiguity and Models for Teaching

Amanda shared the image that she had for her teaching self:

> Everyone wants to become a great teacher. Everyone wants to be the teacher that all the kids in the school talk about and they love to be in their class and, you know. When they start to talk the whole class stops talking because they wanna hear what that person has to say. You know, they come up with great assignments and great activities and they're so creative.

Yet, one of Amanda's foremost struggles through the internship was whether or not she wanted to be a teacher, and if she were to be a teacher, if she would she do a good enough job to deserve having her own classroom. At the end of the year, she explained the attitude with which she began, and the doubt that permeated her internship:

> Amanda: I think I was more skeptical...because last year in my senior year, it was just okay, and it wasn't something I felt very strongly about, it was like, 'Okay teaching, whatever,' like I didn't really lean one way yes or no towards it. I was very indifferent, and I was trying to use this year to gauge that indifference, reassess, meaning I don't like it because I'm not good at it and I just need practice and then I will like it, or does that indifference mean I really don't want to do it and I shouldn't do it? So, I used this year to see if that's it.
>
> John: And then what do you think now?
>
> Amanda: I don't know, I don't know.
>
> John: You're still indifferent?
>
> Amanda: It's not indifference, it's more like I have a better perspective on this year and how I think I did, and I don't know if, like I don't doubt that I can teach, but I do doubt how well I can teach, and that is why I'm still—that's still what I struggle with.

Amanda was one of the few in her cohort who chose to do the internship in an urban placement. Having chosen a placement that she knew people think of as very challenging, in a setting very different from her home community and schools, Amanda lived with the doubt that she was teaching as well as she could, that she was doing the job in accord with the image she held out for herself.

We talked about this doubt several times:

> John: Hmmm, so what experiences did you have that made you doubt yourself as a teacher?
>
> Amanda: Pick a day! Um—let's see—When I would talk about something, that I had, you know, learned two days before, the day before, a couple hours before, whatever, pick one. When some kid really couldn't get something and I couldn't explain it all, like I was out of ways, or I was very frustrated and had enough, I gave up, 'cause I was like, 'I can't do this anymore.' I never said that to his face, but I was like 'Ok, well…' I distracted him or her, whatever, and told them to go do something else because I couldn't deal with them anymore. I mean that's like—you can't do that, you know you can't just tell them, 'no, stop trying, you're never going to get it.'

Amanda's emphatic response to my question suggests there were a number of times when Amanda doubted her abilities as a teacher. She mentioned her difficulty in keeping on top of material she was just learning, focusing on the planning process. Interestingly, Amanda then described a parallel situation in which she would try to explain things to students, but they did not seem to understand what she was explaining. While Amanda took some responsibility by noting the limits of her content knowledge or ability to explain the knowledge, she also indicated not all students were equipped to be able to understand the concepts. Amanda's view as a transmitter of knowledge is quite strong in this statement, and the rigid ways she taught probably contributed not only to low student achievement, but also to doubts about her effectiveness. Her ideal teaching self involved having students wanting to hear what she had to say, to be interested in her content, but

she couldn't always get her students to understand what she wanted to teach them, causing doubt about whether she should teach.

The principal and the problem of translating knowledge.

I asked Amanda about influential teachers she had at Eureka Christian School. She seemed to be ambivalent about her relationships with them, finding it difficult to answer the question and saying if she didn't like the teacher, that could be a source of discomfort. She added, especially "because I would always feel like I would have to like [them], since they are my teacher...." She talked of an elementary school teacher before talking about her math teacher (see Chapter Three), and the government class she took from the ECS principal:

> Oh. Well he was this big, retired football player who wore his Rose Bowl championship ring on his finger to school ... every single day. And, he was a big guy but he was just, the kids respected him, it was like, you don't mess around in his class. And his class was actually really hard and it was one of the best college prep classes that I had. It was prepared more like a college class than a high school class because all of the seniors had to take it, it was a senior class, it was a government class. ... And, the content was quite boring, but it was just the way, the way he was with his kids, and his students, he had such a good rapport with his students that it didn't really matter what the content was.

It is significant that Amanda cited the principal who taught this government class as one of the best classes that she had taken, given her interest in teaching social studies. The class was taught in a largely traditional manner, lecture and individual work, and for Amanda it was quite boring. Yet at the same time, the principal taught the class as though it were a college class, a real challenge that Amanda enjoyed. The principal seemed to embody similarities to Amanda's image of a great teacher. And because she was sports-minded, it seems as though one of the things that interested Amanda about the principal was the fact that he himself had been an athlete, a fact he made known by displaying his Rose Bowl ring.

I asked Amanda what would be similar between a class she just taught and a class she would have sat through in high school. She answered, "Oh, the lecture part, that would be very similar, especially in a social studies class. I—I actually remember the most lectures being in social studies and science classes for me." It seems as though Amanda was not short of models on the use of lecture in class, and the ECS principal who taught her government class was one of her most memorable teachers. In what follows, I want to compare Amanda's recollection of the principal with my observations of her teaching, to understand the influences of her student habits while teaching at Stratford.

Amanda described the principal's class as boring, especially the content, and also believed her own class to be boring, a belief her students confirmed when she asked them:

> Amanda: Yeah, but just in general I can probably talk about [genocide] more than Europe. Plus I had a really hard time relating Europe stuff to them, like, I was like, 'Why are they gonna want to know about this?' Again it really—
>
> John: Why is it so difficult?
>
> Amanda: Because, I mean, ok, it's really bad when I start to yawn during class, alright. I'm like, 'oh crap,' you know, when I'm trying not to fall asleep. ... So if it's boring stuff for me, then I know that they're bored. Not saying that I hold the standard for them, but—you know, if I'm the one that's supposed to be excited about this, and I'm falling asleep, there's probably some problems with that. But, I don't know, it was just, and I knew, and I asked them, I was like, 'Do you guys even want to learn about this?' 'No, I don't care, I don't care about this.'

Amanda compared the topics of genocide and Europe and concluded that the former allowed her to talk more, presumably because she knew something more about that topic, and mentioned that she was planning an upcoming genocide unit in every interview. Yet we must consider the factor of interest as well. Although Amanda began by noting the difficulty of relating Europe to her students because it bored them, she soon told us about

her own brush with boredom caused by Europe, as she struggled to stifle yawns. Her honest appraisal of her class is striking, since Amy and Bill only hinted that their classes might be boring.

In a later interview, we discussed situations that made Amanda doubt her ability to teach, and she shared the facts that she had to learn the topic she was going to teach and that she would sometimes run out of ways to explain the topic to her students. After an intervening exchange in which we discussed a particular interaction with a student, she returned unprompted to answering about situations that made her doubt her ability:

> Or if I just planned a really crappy lesson or, if they just weren't listening to me one day, or if I couldn't get their attention, or, you know, it was boring— A lot of times it was just boring. You know if you're bored and you're the one doing everything, there's something wrong.

Amanda did not seem to suffer any illusions that her class was an exciting place, referring on several occasions to the fact that it was boring. Amanda did strongly desire to make the class more interesting, but often expressed that she did not know how to make that happen. While her image of great teaching did not involve boringness, the influential ECS principal taught boring content, but was still able to create in his classroom many of the aspects that Amanda saw as important to great teaching.

Related to this is Amanda's lament that she lacked creativity, which led to the creation and use of materials and content that reinforced the boring nature of the class. In a close examination of the transcripts, I cannot find evidence of anything from Amanda's prior schooling experience that would indicate having been a student in a creative classroom, with the possible exception of the Wednesday Weekly event, where the teacher asked current events questions to the class divided into two teams competing for points. Certainly, the principal's class seemed focused on procedural display and lacked

any creative teaching. Learning was subservient to getting the task done, and one could plow through it without any creativity. The evidence suggests the majority of Amanda's schooling experiences involved getting school work done, in keeping with the teacher's requirements, most of which did not allow for creativity. In addition, much of the teaching she saw as a student did not appear to her as creative, and she felt as though she needed to be creative to create a class that was not boring. It's almost as if school had taught Amanda un-creativeness.

The central problem of maintaining productive student-teacher relationships involves the content, the medium in which a significant part of the relationship is based. And intimately connected to the content is the teacher's problem of translating the content, or what's referred to as pedagogical content knowledge, into something appropriate for students. Amanda saw lots of lecture and did plenty of worksheets, and these images, when coupled with her strong belief in providing students with the basics, provided natural choices for how to translate the knowledge she had just learned into something for the students to learn. Even though Amy and Bill were both teaching classes within their majors and possessed a stronger grasp of their content, they both translated their content knowledge into similar teaching practices.

Tenuous Relationships

The interaction between the interns and their students was the central concern of the internship. Since the intern was a guest in the mentor's classroom, this more experienced person, the teacher of record, also mattered a lot to how the interns' conceived of their work with students. During class time of course, the interns interacted rarely with the mentor but extensively with their students. In this section, I focus on the importance of

these human relationships to Amanda, the difficulties she experienced within them, and how her understanding of the relationships affected her work, by first talking about her descriptions of her relationship with her mentor.

Amanda experienced uncertain relationships with both students and mentor. Amanda felt Mary Cutter, the mentor teacher, had too high expectations and watched her like a hawk, but also had difficulty describing the quality of their relationship. A key feature of that relationship was that Mary regularly reminded Amanda and the students that she was "the intern." Amanda stated that it was important for her to have good relationships with her students, and that was something that she perceived herself to be good at. Both the value and the self-perception were challenged as she attempted to relate to her students and had power struggles with some of them.

The "Intern" and the Mentor

When asked of the challenges she faced being an intern at Stratford, Amanda immediately focused on the status:

> Being known as "the intern," having the student teacher label. I've really thought about this a lot and I think, yes, it's good for kids to know that you're just starting out, but at the same time the whole 'student' part of the student teacher label gives kids an automatic thinking about you, which is a huge challenge for me because they think that they can goof off in my class and just do whatever, they think that they can run all over me and I know that they test me, sometimes even more than they test my teacher, just because I'm new.

Amanda seemed conflicted because she seemed to understand the label existed because her status warranted it, that is, as a novice teacher in some sort of apprenticeship into the craft, she was not "the teacher," the one with the credentials and experience to claim that status. Yet she also found it created problems for her, especially if students wanted to use the label. She reported students sometimes answered her requests for them to stop talking

with phrases like, "Oh we're not going to stop talking, you have to make us, you have to practice doing that."

Amanda also said the label precluded her from contributing much in staff meetings for example, where she felt she had to be careful with what she said because "I'm just the intern." This mattered even more in terms of who Amanda could trust to seek out advice:

> I also have to be careful about who I talk to about certain things, this may be one of the reasons I'm weary about asking for advice from different teachers because if I present myself as having a problem I don't know how they would react to it, different teachers, or I don't necessarily know who I can go and confide to—about, oh, let's say my mentor teacher, you know if I just need somebody to vent to, I don't necessarily have somebody in particular that I can go to and vent to, besides the other interns and now there's only two of us.

Although Amanda did get some advice from a Stratford English teacher in particular, Amanda's support system seemed limited to the other interns, who being of the same status as her, could not necessarily present all the types of advice she needed. Plus, in the second semester, Bill was the only other intern at Stratford.

Ms. Cutter had a strong personality and was significantly invested in Stratford High School. She administered the program that required students to read, write, think, or talk for twenty minutes every morning, receiving administrative leave-time to coordinate and meet with other teachers. She also had been an instrumental member of the district committee that developed the Geography pacing guide. She had just retired from twenty years of military service, having served in the reserves since becoming a teacher. Amanda said of Ms. Cutter:

> She is a good person to observe, a good person to learn things from and I will never take that away from her because she really has taught me a lot, but we have such different styles at times that that does interfere, but I'll never take away the fact that, I mean, she does offer me some good advice.... But she is very strong, and very opinionated, you know. Not afraid to tell you what she thinks.

Amanda commented several times in interviews that Ms. Cutter was a good teacher and she learned a lot by watching her. Amanda commented on Ms. Cutter's experience:

> She can offer more clarification sometimes, when I can't, because she's been teaching this class for 7 years, so she knows approximately what kinds of questions students will ask and she has more background in a lot of the stuff.... she can offer them more information than I would.

Over time, both as a teacher and a human, Ms. Cutter accumulated experience and was able to clarify the content better than Amanda could, and so as someone who could convey the content, Ms. Cutter seemed to be a potential positive model for Amanda.

Yet Amanda seemed vague about their relationship:

> We have a pretty good relationship. I mean obviously we do things that get on each other's nerves and there's things that she does that I don't like, but, for the most part it's good, it's not—I don't hate her, she doesn't hate me so. You know, it's a, it's a good professional relationship I think. I can talk to her about not just school stuff. We can have a conversation about football or basketball or sports or whatever. So it's not just strictly school-minded stuff. We have a fairly decent relationship.
>
> Shih-pei: How about her teaching philosophy and teaching style in comparison to yours.
>
> Amanda: (laughs) Well, that's different. She's more militaristic than I am. She, she actually just got done being in the military for twenty years, she just retired.

Amanda's answer seemed to evade the question, to talk about it but not necessarily answer it. This was a strong feature in many of Amanda's answers to questions about the relationship between her and Ms. Cutter. Here the answer seems to imply an uneasy but tolerable coexistence. I returned to questions on the topic several times, usually to get similar answers.

In addition to Ms. Cutter's grasp of the content knowledge and ability to clarify it for students, another major point of difference between Amanda and Ms. Cutter was the way Ms. Cutter managed her class. Amanda said:

> She's a freaking drill instructor so she can yell at them really good. I still get nervous when I yell at them.... I mean she can command attention more strictly than I can and I know there's a lot of different factors, the whole "student-teacher" thing a big one, they are constantly reminded that I'm just a student teacher.

Amanda's statement on Ms. Cutter's management ends with mention that Ms. Cutter reminded the students that Amanda's "just a student teacher," a concern Amanda frequently noted. Amanda, the intern, felt she often struggled to manage the regular classes, whereas Ms. Cutter seemed better able to manage the class. Her second hour class was hardly a management problem as those students were almost always quiet, with only occasional scattered whispering. The majority did their work when requested, but during group work times, students tended to move around and talk, and some worked while others did not.

But my one visit to fifth hour revealed just how different the classes were, since some of those students talked during lecture, demanded information, and spoke with hostility. Amanda yelled at the class several times to establish order. Amanda often spoke of the classroom management difficulties in her regular Geography classes, though they didn't seem as severe as similar situations I'll describe in Bill's seventh hour. Amanda felt somewhat of a disadvantage in managing the classroom compared to Ms. Cutter's style, which she attributed to her military background.

At one point Amanda said Ms. Cutter watched her like a hawk. She said she knew she'd be watched during the internship, but hadn't expected so much as it progressed. Amanda said, "I mean it's not like she doesn't trust me with her classes, I mean she totally does, there's not an issue with that at all.... but it's not—it's not a trust issue, it's just—I don't know." Amanda then went on to say how it is sometimes nice to have Ms. Cutter's help during fifth hour, because she could help answer questions or keep kids on

task during group work. Amanda reported Ms. Cutter was often in the room during class and except for one day when Ms. Cutter had to work on Stratford's early morning curriculum, she was present almost all of the class time I observed. Amanda felt that Ms. Cutter trusted her with the classes, but was at a loss to explain what made her uncertain, gave her a sense of uneasiness, made her a little weary of her relationship with Ms. Cutter.

Ms. Cutter had an intern from my previous year's course, and I asked Amanda if Ms. Cutter ever compared her to him. She replied:

> I know she compares me to other interns, and I don't think it's a conscious habit, I just think it's something, 'Well my interns in the past have done this, that, and the other, so I'm expecting you to do this,' or 'You don't have to do this because they didn't do that.' ... Sometimes because I don't—my teacher has very high expectations, which is, you know, completely fine, but sometimes I don't know if I'm meeting those expectations. ... So I feel well, her other interns have met those expectations and I can't meet those expectations, well what in the world is she gonna think about me? And, not that it completely matters what she thinks, but it does to some extent. A very large extent, as of now.

Amanda was very concerned about Ms. Cutter's impression of her, and questioned if she measured up to the other interns. And Ms. Cutter's opinion mattered, because it added to Amanda's doubt about if she should continue as a teacher. It also mattered because Ms. Cutter's opinion authorized the granting of the final credential necessary to secure the teaching license, the piece of cultural capital that could be exchanged for employment. She would fill out the mentor evaluation form and send it to the teacher preparation program office at Midwestern University. In addition, Ms. Cutter might be called upon to provide a reference, and Amanda wasn't sure what kind of reference she would provide. Ms. Cutter's mostly guessed-at expectations were a source of anxiety for Amanda.

Amanda described the most stressful aspect of the internship:

> Well, I didn't think it'd be as stressful, like I knew it'd be hard work but I didn't think it would be as stressful, because I mean you're always trying to please your teacher, you're always trying to please your students, you're always trying to please the administration, you're always trying to please your MU classes and it's really hard to do that all the time.

Amanda described her student self as "a goody two shoes," as a good student who did what she was told to do, "compliant," in short, a pleaser, so it's striking that her answer involved pleasing the evaluators – mentor, administration, MU professors – but also the students who sat in class. Amanda's response, focused on others, lacked any notion of pleasing herself, of her own learning, in whatever way that might be. Her answer is one consistent with procedural display, of doing the job in order to get it done, and to be evaluated as well as possible. But in the internship situation, it proved harder to get an A or a 99 percent, since such markers were meaningless and not used.

Amanda noted she had received positive feedback:

> The teachers at this school, they tell me I'm going a good job and my field instructor's telling me I do a good job, but sometimes, like I don't feel like I'm doing a good job, and I don't know if I have too high of standards for myself, or if I'm just thinking I know what a good teacher should be and I'm not there yet.

The positive feedback was not enough to convince Amanda she was doing a good job, and she wondered if the standards she held for herself were too high. In particular, she referenced two different teaching images for herself: an ideal image of a teacher students love to listen to, and one for this particular stage as an intern, a novice image, struggling to figure out how to be a teacher. Amanda seemed to want to push to become a better teacher, like as a student she strove for that 98 percent.

Despite her drive for improvement, Amanda's reality involved the daily work of learning the subject and how to teach it to students, which intersected with Ms. Cutter's evaluation of Amanda's teaching and left Amanda little time to become more creative or

knowledgeable. Amanda admitted her classes were boring and that she had classroom management issues with the regular students. Since Ms. Cutter was often present during Amanda's teaching, Amanda likely felt judged, and hence self-conscious and uncomfortable, because she didn't feel she met Ms. Cutter's high expectations. Amanda's images, models, and teaching repertoire got her through her days of teaching, and bore many similarities to her experiences in getting through high school, but they weren't sufficient enough to convince her she was qualified to be a teacher. Ms. Cutter's near omnipresence in Amanda's classroom contributed to Amanda's anxiety and doubt about entering the profession.

Students

While Ms. Cutter was an important factor in Amanda's internship, her relationships with her students also contributed to her uncertainty about teaching.

Power struggles.

On one occasion, Amanda told of an interaction with a particular student who kept talking during a movie she showed, and she told him she didn't want to fight with him:

> But I don't know, sometimes, if I'm just joking around and giving him a hard time, I like to kind of get it going with him, you know, just kind of fun getting under their skin, and they, and I know they do it to me so I can dish it right back, but when I'm trying to teach them something for real, I get so annoyed. I don't like wrestling with them and I don't like fighting with them then. That struggle when I'm actually trying to be productive with them and they're not, they're not being productive, I – that's one of the times where I have a very difficult time and I just, there's that whole power struggle between them wanting to talk and me wanting to talk and that just drives me nuts.

In a school, teachers act in differing ways with their students, and many work to enter into productive relationships with them. Amanda liked to joke around with her students, liked to use sarcasm, and would engage students in getting under each others' skins. Amanda wanted to have fun with her students and get along with them, once saying she

got along with the majority of them "and sometimes, if you just get along with your teacher, that can help you, um, not think the class is as horrible as it is." Amanda viewed getting along with her students as a useful practice in persuading them to put up with the class.

But Amanda also expected that when it was time for her to be productive and get the students to do work, they would comply with her image of student behavior, for which she had strongly formed habits as a quiet, compliant student who sought and generally got along with her teachers. Amanda was used to sitting through lectures, and expected that while the teacher productively lectures, the students productively write. Yet students sometimes executed their own desires and thwarted Amanda's teaching agenda. It seemed as though she would joke around with students, but that experience didn't necessarily translate into student compliance with dutiful note-taking during lecture, or calmly answering worksheet questions.

In my last interview with her, I pointed out to Amanda one of the common phrases that she used when she addressed the class:

> John: ...you would say, um, 'What I want you guys to do for me....' Notice the construction of that sentence.
>
> Amanda: Um-hmm.
>
> John: 'What I want *you* to do for *me*—
>
> Amanda: Um-hmm.
>
> John: —Indicating that it's not really for them.
>
> Amanda: Just me.
>
> John: Right.
>
> Amanda: That is very interesting that you bring that up though, because I was told, and I don't remember who told me this, but someone told me like, 'If you

> can't get them to do it for themselves, you should try to get them to do it for you,' and that's interesting that I did that because I didn't even realize that I was doing that.

Amanda had not realized that this was a phrase that she often used in class. It is interesting that she searches for the origination of the idea of getting them to do it for you, but cannot locate it, an illustration of what Britzman (2003) describes as the cultural myth that everything that happens in the classroom depends on the teacher. She notes that such cultural myths are widely shared and circulated in the public discourse and psyche, and Amanda certainly holds this in her own mind. Amanda strongly subscribed to transmission models of education, but through the use of the phrase "what I want you to do for me," which she said several times in each of my visits, also named herself as the chief source of student motivation. As a teacher I had told and continue to tell my students what I want them to do, but what really struck me about Amanda's phrasing was that she named herself as the object to be pleased by the students' actions. In doing so, and through this interview exchange, the power struggle between teacher and students is more clear: the teacher tries to get students to do certain activities for the benefit of their learning, but it doesn't matter if it benefits students, for the teacher has the authority to request it. One reason Amanda can't locate the origin of "do it for me," is because she had been trained to do just that as a student.

Getting to know your students.

Amanda said she realized, partly as a result of taking my course, that she needed to get to know her students better. One example involved greeting the class, and Amanda said that she tried to greet them everyday and ask how they were doing, so that she could at least feel out the class' mood. She said the most common way she got to know her

students was to identify a common interest between her and a student and use that to talk with the student:

> I talk about sports a lot. I really like sports and so if I find out a kid plays sports I'll talk about sports with that kid. Especially some of the boys who are apathetic, I really try to talk about that.... Yeah and then if I see a movie or something like that I'll ask them if they have seen that movie or I'll talk about music a lot, or—if they're depending on what, if they're in like choir, any anything that I can find out about their extra-curricular activities, I usually try to relate to that.

Sports were very important to Amanda in her own schooling experience and a subject she found easy to talk with her students about, as well as with Ms. Cutter. Beyond sports and some popular culture products, Amanda did not seem to talk with students about much more during class time, outside of academics.

In our last interview when I asked about what's the best way to learn about your students, she also mentioned a classroom community building activity:

> Talking, I think that's the best way, I mean if you never talk to your kids what are you going to learn about them? You know, it doesn't always have to be about school. I mean I spent—I think it was that stupid survey thing, it was like, 'Okay what's your favorite candy bar?' or 'When's your birthday?' 'What's your sport?,' something like that. And that's just surface level stuff to kind of break the ice a little bit but—I mean it's something to build off of, if I know some kid likes to go swimming, I can always talk about that, you know—drowning stories or something like that, I don't know—you know?

She identified some of the subjects she brought up as surface level; they were certainly safe topics to bring up within the institution. Although I agree with her that talking is the best way to get to know one's students, I have to say that I don't think Amanda's conception goes far enough, because it remains superficial. Outside of private discussions with students about personal problems, Amanda does not have an image of talking with students in a deep manner, especially one that can be linked to the class content, which could allow not only deep conversations, but also allow her to extend her teaching beyond the basics and develop students' voices on the content, rather than just her own.

In addition, a fascinating piece of this quote is the use of drowning stories to connect with a kid who likes to go swimming, a rather strange example that also speaks to Amanda's interest in sports. Her use of drowning stories is reminiscent of the "sink or swim" method of training new teachers, as though she were unsure about if she was making it as a real teacher.

Racial and gender considerations in student relations.

Getting into productive relationships with students proved somewhat difficult for Amanda. She tried to talk with them about superficial topics and also joked around with them, but students weren't always cooperative with her teaching agenda. That's a problem many teachers are likely to experience, and we saw that the problem exists apart from racial considerations. Yet, we must make them to better understand Amanda's situations. Even though there were students that Amanda liked and had fun with, there existed a number of cultural differences between her and her students, which I asked about:

> OK well, we all say, 'oh yeah, we have to find ways to relate to our students,' but I'll be the first one to admit that I came to the conclusion that there's no way I can relate to half of my kids. I can't relate to where they come from, their backgrounds, I can't relate to if they have a drug user mom or an alcoholic dad or somebody who's never home, no one's there to ever take care of them. I can't relate to that. I can't relate to their living situations lots of times, sometimes cultural aspects, I can't relate to that either. I mean, as much as yes, we all are Americans but, do we follow the same form of culture? No. They're 14-year-old African American boys, I'm a 22-year-old white girl, obviously there's gonna be some differences.

Amanda told me several stories that she learned from her students that embodied one of the characteristics she rattled off above. She also said she couldn't relate to half of her students, presumably for the reasons listed, specifically mentioning African American boys. While she expressed there were cultural differences between her and her students,

Amanda did so in a way that reinforced the notion that differences are natural givens, and given her strong demarcation of herself from her students, implied that such differences are virtually unbridgeable. This is a noted concern of resistance-style literature, and since Stratford was a majority black school, something to pay attention to. While it is true that teachers often cite students' bad home lives as the reason why a student is doing poorly in school, and often use that explanation to write off working with the student, it is difficult for the vast majority of teachers to relate to such situations outside of their own experience.

Amanda also talked about the relationships she had with some female students. In one interview, she said, "Girls-wise I can obviously talk to girls because I am one. So if they have probably, like a personal problem or something, I have a pretty easy time relating to them." In this particular interview, Amanda saw shared gender as a way to connect with other females, and in other interviews she shared a couple of stories about some of the specific interactions that she had with females. However, in our last interview, Amanda said:

> I definitely had more problems with the girls though, than the guys.... That's something I did pick up on very, very quickly though, because I noticed I would get, like I would'—a lot of the guys, I was like, 'Hey, be quiet, be quiet,' or whatever, and they'd be like, 'Okay.' But the girls, they are the ones that seemed to cop an attitude with me. And occasionally I would get some of the guys that did too, but the vast majority of the students that I had problems with were girls. But I always thought that was really interesting.

Beyond this, Amanda did not have an explanation of why she had more problems with females than males, and ignored the racial dimension in discussing gender. Did she find she could relate to black females easier than white females? She also ignored students' academic identities, important because elsewhere Amanda said she was best able to relate to good students, and she selected two white females as the students who

most reminded her of her student self. Regardless, the fact that Amanda was female did not seem to offer as much assistance in getting along with some of her female students as she hoped.

Racial issues in classroom discussion.

Amanda often referred to the pacing of the class and the amount of material that she had to quickly cover, so she did not feel as though she had time to be able to delve into issues like race, even though she shared how much her students got into the rare discussions that did occur in class. In the Rwandan genocide lecture no less (discussed above), race clearly played a role in the content, yet it remained a silent issue, briefly pointed out before Amanda continued with her planned lecture.

Amanda took issue with seeing race in black and white terms, saying, "But I think that there is this underlying tone that is gonna be very, very difficult for the United States to get rid of, because most people think of it in terms of white/black but it's not in terms of white/black." She went on to say that there is dislike between whites and blacks, but then mentioned that other ethnic groups, including European ones, also dislike other groups based on race. However, by saying that, she ignored part of the reality of her situation: most of her students were black and were most likely going to see the racial issue from their African American perspective, evolved over centuries in conjunction with and in opposition to the white perspective.

Amanda described one racialized discussion that took place in her class, in which she challenged her students to think about why they regarded racial (and gender) stereotypes as having to be true for groups. She reported her students said:

> I was like, 'I don't understand why those characteristics are solely for that particular group of people.' And then they were like, 'Well it's because we (inaudible)' or 'You know the white people are copying—'like they just gave me

> all kinds of comments, I was like—and it was extremely evident—and what I was thinking, I was like, 'Wow you guys are so naïve right now, like you just—'I mean half of them have never even been out of Grand Pillar, so I was like how can you make all these? And I told them, I was like, 'You guys are very judgmental.' I was like, 'I don't know how you can make these comments without expanding your horizons beyond the borders of Grand Pillar.' But, I mean they couldn't really give me a good answer in my opinion, on like why characteristics should only apply to one group, it was more—they just wanted to argue in my opinion.

Even though this is the only event like it from all three interns' interviews, it is worth analyzing because it is a description of Amanda's habits of being white in interaction with her majority black class. The criticism Amanda made of her students, being judgmental and naïve and working off of stereotypes can be applied to herself, beginning with her own professed ignorance of racial issues. Students may have said those things, though we hear them through Amanda's own worldviews, captured in the phrase "they just wanted to argue in my opinion." That phrasing dismisses the students' ideas, to say nothing about a possible purpose of a social studies class being a place for discussion of social issues. Another interpretation concerns how one learns about racial issues, which Amanda previously stated occurred best by talking with others. Yet such conversations were infrequent in her classroom, and how else will students or Amanda be able to confront their stereotypes and examine their worldviews if not through conversation with someone who challenges those views, which students and teacher could do for each other? Finally, although Amanda allowed students to talk about the issue, we cannot forget that because she knows little about it, and because she strongly believed she should only teach what she knew, she was hesitant to engage in such issues even though it was the best way for her to learn. She also probably had not yet developed the skills needed to effectively manage a racial discussion; I never saw her conduct a discussion, and this was one of the few times she shared about a discussion.

That discussion of stereotypes confirmed some of Amanda's own stereotypes. I asked her if the race problem was solvable. Her first answer, which she called her "teacher answer," was yes, because she wanted to portray the issue positively: "You know we can't make them hate life completely, they're in high school. Just to make them feel better, that it is possible, that they can achieve this racial utopia." I immediately asked her if the majority of her students would agree that the issue was solvable and she said most of them would not. Her personal answer was that the race problem would not be solved for a very long time: "I mean, just because of some of the conversations that I had with my kids alone, like they didn't want to give people a chance, they were so quick to label them, and that's supposed to be the younger generation."

Her interactions with her own students helped to solidify her belief that the race problem is unsolvable, an idea present in her language. Although Amanda knew of the racial history of the US and would talk about it, she tended to view race as a natural inevitability. For example, when we talked about if race was a white/black issue, and Amanda spoke of the dislike various groups had for each other, she started with "because white people say to the black people 'we don't like you,' the black people say to the white people 'we don't like you,'" before moving on to use the same construction for relations between other groups. Similarly, she said in a different interview, "black people say 'this is what happened,' and white people say 'it's not our fault anymore.' Well, then the debate starts." Both of these statements reflect a view that conflict is inevitable anytime the issue gets broached, leading to a debate, an argument, in which people will say things while not listening to each other. This distrust and dislike is as old and certain as the race problem itself, an unresolved historical artifact that inevitably infects the

present. Her views of race strongly dissuaded her from entering into such discourse with her students, even though she acknowledged the benefits, students sometimes brought the issue up, and she taught content with obvious racial themes.

Paradigms and Possibilities.

I want to share one event from class to complete my analysis of Amanda's case, to show how she was caught between conflicting paradigms which were not even options to her a year before. The event occurred the first day of the genocide unit. Amanda started by asking students what they thought genocide was, which led to an interesting exchange:

Donovan asked, "What about slavery in America?"

Amanda replied, "Actually, I was thinking about that yesterday. It seems like it could be because it was such a vicious act, especially in bringing people over to America" when so many were killed en route.

Ms. Cutter, who had been quietly sitting at her desk in the back corner of the room, spoke authoritatively, "Genocide is when you kill a group of people in a systematic way. Slavery involved property that they tried to protect, because they needed them to work." She added that dead slaves would not be worth anything for the owner, so the slave owners had an interest in keeping their slaves alive.

Amanda added, "Genocide is the systematic elimination of a group of people."

Evan then said, "But I think slavery was a form of genocide. They were putting people in the mindset to hate each other."

Amanda said, "But genocide involves killing."

Evan answered, "But they do kill," because they've learned to hate each other, his voice trailing off into silence.

This was the most sophisticated discussion I witnessed in all my visits to Amanda's class, was one of the few times students offered ideas not made available by the curriculum, though related to the class topic. Donovan, a black male who read very widely, who I heard ask several intelligent questions, barely got a D the previous semester, and yet was regarded by Amanda as "extremely intelligent," asked a question that expanded the sphere of horrific events in human history, though still focused on the role of cultural differences in the events. Interestingly, Amanda's immediate response was that she had also thought about it, indicating that she might have anticipated the topic of genocide might trigger thoughts within some of her black students about significant events in which a difference like race played a role, or that she shared inquisitiveness with Donovan. Significantly, Ms. Cutter spoke up to set the record straight, defining genocide and clearly demarcating it from slavery. Amanda added to Ms. Cutter's statement, possibly to demonstrate she is also a teacher. Then Evan, who was also quite thoughtful, but a much more playful and successful student, picked up the thread, trying to tie the effects of slavery to the present day phenomenon of internalized racism, most strongly manifested in black on black violence.

Amanda struck me as a very honest person who was at a loss for how to navigate teaching World Geography to ninth graders at Stratford High School. She said that education should be done differently not just at Stratford, but all over, yet she regularly asserted she had no idea how to do it. Amanda was quite uncertain about much of her teaching, in contrast to her certainty of being a good student. Amanda's standard for herself was that she had to improve her teaching, constantly get better, in which case she would deserve her own classroom. As a field instructor, I would say Amanda certainly

met the university's expectations for performance, should have been recommended for certification by the state, and was fit to teach. Her teaching performance was average. In my researcher role though, I came to appreciate the complexity and depth of her thought, and considered her ability to think about teaching as above average. It was only in the final interview and in analyzing the data after our time together that I came to appreciate that Amanda was trapped between paradigms, finding herself at the edge of the familiar that had gotten her through life so far, and faced with difficult choices about where to take her teaching self. She wanted an urban school experience and so placed herself in that situation. She knew that she had a lot of work to do in order to attain her image of a great teacher, and she started to form an idea that what and how she was teaching impacted her relationship with students.

Summary

As a student, Amanda got very good grades and did all of her homework; she very much valued school. In her new situation of learning the role of teacher, she seemed to create the reciprocal situation of her time as a student: she had received lectures and was now giving them; she had learned boring content and was now teaching it; she had not seen much exciting teaching and was now unsure how to create it; she had done all of her school work and was now expecting that from her students; she valued grades and was now valuing them for her students; she had gotten along with her teachers and now worked to get along with her students.

Amanda's lack of subject matter knowledge was a central feature of her situation, and she spent significant time locating and learning the information she needed to know to be able to show up to class with something to teach. Amanda seemed to set up her

class situation so that it would be a place to demonstrate that she had learned the information necessary to teach, akin to oral reports required of students. She would do some research to find out the facts of the case, assemble them into a presentation, and then lecture to the other people in the room about what she had learned. The extent to which she successfully displayed her teaching could be measured by how efficiently she covered the content, how she handled students' questions, in particular if she could answer them, and in appearing as though she competently performed the teacher role.

Having just learned the content herself and after displaying that through lecture, Amanda demanded her students to display they had learned the content from her, mostly through their completion of her charts with questions on the day's content, answers for which they could find in the reading Amanda had them do. The students' days usually consisted of writing notes from lectures, and sometimes films, of reading information that mirrored the lecture, and of writing answers to questions to be handed in and graded. The days that Amanda created in her geography classes were similar to those she got through as a student at ECS, where such practices were as commonplace. The result was a boring class, which reminded Amanda of boring classes she had taken as a student. Amanda desired something more for her classes, but with the complication of having to learn and then teach about subjects she didn't know much about, and with few models for doing something different, Amanda plodded through teaching in the ways that came most natural to her.

Explaining Amanda's Behavior in Her Situation

In this chapter, we explored Amanda's major teaching complications in executing the job. Her primary problem was her lack of subject matter, and she spent significant time learning the content she had to teach to her students. A related complication was

figuring out how to teach this content to students. Amanda stated that her class was often boring, to both her and her students, and this made her worry that she was not doing a good job. That doubt was reinforced by the almost constant presence of Ms. Cutter, who Amanda felt judged her with expectations she did not share. All these factors compounded Amanda's problem of maintaining productive relationships with her students. Now I will suggest some possible explanations of the ways I observed Amanda perform the role of teacher.

First, although Amanda had an image of a great teacher, she lacked models that adequately demonstrated teaching techniques beyond the realm of lecture, individual help, and occasional discussion. She had little exposure to creative models.

Second, Amanda lacked the knowledge and skills to be able to implement more risky teaching techniques, ones that release some of the teacher's control over the classroom. By definition, we should expect a student teacher is just developing the skills needed to teach students in various ways. For Amanda, her major struggle was to keep on top of the content and ahead of the students, making it difficult to concentrate on how to teach.

Third, Amanda's teaching practices were the reciprocal of her student habits. As a quiet, submissive, compliant, hard working student, she expected similar behavior from her students. Her teaching practices would have enabled her as a student to feel at home. There were many similarities between the classrooms of her youth and her internship, made most apparent when Amanda described Raquel and Anna as students most like her.

Fourth, Amanda was absorbing the operating norms and attitudes of her mentor teacher, the other adults at Stratford, and her students, adopting the teaching practices that

these experienced teachers used in the school, while being trained by the students who had interacted with other teachers in the district and had their ways of dealing with teachers. Lecture and individual work were teaching practices commonly used throughout the school.

Fifth, as a "goody two shoes" who did not like troublemakers, Amanda was concerned with not letting the troublemaker students in her class ruin the classroom environment, and so she worked to control those few, with support from her teaching practices.

Sixth, as a person venturing into very unfamiliar territory, Amanda, like many people, tended to be cautious, not wanting to make a fatal move about things which she did not feel confident about doing. She frequently expressed doubt about her teaching actions.

Evidence for all six of these explanations can be found in this chapter as well as Chapter Three. If I hadn't framed this study as occurring within an urban school, and hadn't explicitly raised matters of race, class, and gender, we would be content to accept these explanations for Amanda's situation and would probably be content to conclude that these teaching problems occur throughout the system. Because they do, that is what makes Amanda's case complicated, because the very fact that her students differ from her in significant ways is also operating. So Amanda's story is not just one of an intern learning how to teach, it's also about an intern in a position of authority learning how to get along with people she viewed as quite different from herself.

Consider the resistance argument, which would apply to the second, fourth, and fifth explanations. I found some evidence of a culture of resistance to race among the teachers

at Stratford, and her interactions with her mentor and other teachers may have influenced her to rely on controlling teaching techniques. As far as troublemakers are concerned, research reports document the connection between teacher's attitudes toward black male students in particular, and the differing discipline they exercise in class. Amanda found it most difficult to relate to apathetic black males, and that may well have influenced her beliefs about them and hence her interactions. It may also be the case that her racial views of her students meant that she didn't think of them as capable of engaging in higher level thinking; she did acknowledge that her teaching style prevented students from constructing their own knowledge. We should not be surprised to find that Amanda, a product of a Christian school who came from a primarily white, fairly affluent suburban town, exhibited some of the characteristics described in the resistance literature. And this became more obvious as we examined her teaching about genocide, a subject with explicitly racial content.

But Amanda's situation demanded a lot of her. She planned the day's lesson involving content that she herself had just learned. She struggled to come up with teaching activities that would better engage students. On the way to work, she was uncertain as to who would show up to class that day, and so the interactive dynamics were unknown until the bell rang. No matter who showed, Amanda would have to manage the students so that she could teach them in the way she determined. In making students learn the content, she set herself up to engage in conflict with them, as some would inevitably not want to comply with her requests. She constantly worried if her shaky grasp of the content would show through, especially when students asked questions. She worried if her mentor teacher thought she was incompetent. She had to

grade stacks of papers nearly every day. And then on top of the daily work of teaching, which amounted to a full-time job, she had to return to the university to take classes focused on the internship. Yes, Amanda exhibits some resistance, but there are many other significant factors at work here as well.

What would have to change for Amanda to be able to achieve the dual goals of survival and improvement? Survival will undoubtedly be most prominent for someone in new territory, like Amanda who wandered into the urban high school. By the end of the internship, Amanda could certainly play the role of teacher and look competent, so her survival was more or less taken care of. She already recognized that by controlling the talk, and forcing students to learn content she felt to be important, she limited student behaviors but also involvement with the content. In fact, she already described what she needed to do to forge ahead: engage students in topics that interested them, talk with them, and help them to create their own knowledge. Imagine if, rather than saying she had thought about slavery, she asked Donovan to explain why slavery should be considered in the context of a genocide unit? Evan probably would have shared his thoughts and perhaps other students would have been inspired. Time is a factor, but is it better to drill facts about the Holocaust into students or to allow students to explore similarities and differences between two horrific human events? When I think of how long it took me to come to terms with Amanda's situation, as an outsider, a veteran teacher, and budding researcher with the time needed to think through her case, I can only imagine Amanda's difficulty in doing so as a novice struggling daily to teach.

CHAPTER SIX

BILL

Bill's Teaching Practices

Bill Pinkney student taught at Stratford High School in Frank Shale's three Conceptual Physics classes and his Functions, Statistics, and Trigonometry class, an advanced math class, primarily for college-bound students. Stratford required its tenth grade students to take the conceptual physics class, which involved little math. I visited Bill's seventh hour physics class eight times, and his FST class once. In this chapter, I indicate how Bill became trapped in Mr. Shale's practice of lecture, and how Bill tried to creep away from that practice, both by changing his lecture practices and by integrating more use of demonstration in lecture. I will also examine Bill's perspective on the relationship with his mentor teacher, whom he partly blamed for the behavior problems in the class. Table 6.1 provides a brief description of the various teaching practices in which Bill engaged.

Table 6.1: Bill's Observed Teaching Practices

Day	Activity type	Time	Summary
Feb 2	Set up	15	Bill prepares for lecture he didn't know he'd have to give.
	Lecture	45	Development of the modern atom notes, on PowerPoint. Mr. Shale lectures briefly. Two minute demonstration with tesla coil.
	Individual work	20	Use periodic table to answer worksheet questions on elements and the number of particles they contain.

Table 6.1 (cont'd)			
Feb 7	Journal	10	How many ways can you think of to melt an ice cube?
	Journal	10	Students answer some prior knowledge assessment questions: what is heat, what is temperature?
	Lecture	40	Temperature and heat content of objects.
	Recitation	20	Bill leads students through *Chapter 12 study guide: Temperature & heat* worksheet.
Feb 13	Demon-stration	10	Ice cube melting rates in four different positions relative to candle flame.
	Lecture	12	Heat conduction and insulation.
	Demon-stration	10	A match is held above candle flame in four different positions to test how close to flame it must be to ignite.
	Lecture	10	Convection and radiation as heat transfer mechanisms.
	Individual work	30	Students supposed to work on *Temperature, heat, and expansion* worksheet.
Feb 22	Recitation	70	Bill goes over temperature and heat test with students, who can make and submit corrections to earn partial credit.
Feb 27	Lecture	15	Waves and the wave speed equation.
	Demon-stration	4	Jabari helps Bill demonstrate transverse waves with a slinky.
	Lecture	8	Longitudinal waves, frequency, and period.
	Demon-stration	5	Bill uses thinner slinky to demonstrate wave reflection when it reaches different medium.
	Lecture	10	How to use the wave simulator on the computer and where to find the files.
	Simulation	30	In different room, students answer questions on worksheet about wave properties using a computer program.
Mar 8	Lecture	6	Resonance (reinforced vibrations) in materials.
	Demon-stration	15	Demonstrated resonance with a wine glass and special boxes that amplify the notes of attached tuning forks.
	Recitation	20	Bill drew 2.5 wavelengths on board, labeled parts, and asked students questions about the wave and its parts.
	Individual work	30	Students supposed to work on *Wave superposition* worksheet.
Mar 13	Lecture	20	Sound waves and frequency.
	Demon-stration	8	Used speaker to move through sound frequency range from 20 to about 20,000 Hz.
	Lecture	8	Compressions and rarefactions in sound waves.
	Individual work	25	Students are supposed to work on *Sound* worksheet.
Mar 22	Lecture	10	Bill handed back tests from the sound unit.
	Movie	40	Bill showed *Coach Carter*.

Although over time, I saw Bill use more demonstrations in his class, and on average Bill either lectured or led a recitation about half the time, so that he was the center of attention during 60 percent of the time I observed (see Table 6.2). Students were asked to work individually on worksheets one-quarter of the time. In the second half of the chapter, I analyze the classroom management situation that Bill encountered, and his ideas about the role of respect, especially with regard to student behavior. I describe student behaviors in class and the ways they thwarted Bill's agenda. This ongoing conflict, in which respect was at issue, made it difficult for even procedural display to look successful.

Table 6.2: Bill's Teaching Modes

Instructional mode	Minutes	%
Lecture	174	31
Individual work	135	24
Recitation	110	20
Demonstration	52	9
Movie	40	7
Journal	20	4
Miscellaneous	25	4
Total time	556	

Trapped in the Mentor's System

On my first visit to his class, I watched Bill give an unanticipated lecture to his students using Mr. Shale's note-taking system, and also observed a brief lecture by Mr. Shale. Bill began class telling students he would first review any questions they had about the notes from the previous class and then take a quiz over the material. However, several students immediately objected. Keisha told Bill, "We didn't finish the notes."

Bill asked, "Shale didn't finish them with you?"

John answered, "We finished the first paragraph."

Other students began to speak up. Chang said, "No, we didn't finish it."

Bill asked, not to any particular student, "Are you serious?" a look of exasperation on his face. After a few seconds of contemplation, Bill asked the class, "Alright, can I have your attention please?" and told them they obviously could not take the quiz

because they were not prepared for it. He went over to his desk and after fiddling with some papers over several minutes, including some he handed out to students, Bill told the class, "Since we didn't finish the notes," I'll try to set up the computer and the projector so we can see them. Bill said he would do the best to tell students the notes, adding, "Shale likes his little anecdotes, so I'll try to do as many of them as possible."

Bill paused after the first clause and Destini asked, "Who cares?" When he finished his statement, she added more quietly, "No you won't."

Bill undertook the preparations needed to do the notes, connecting Mr. Shale's laptop to the computer projector he always had in the room. Then Bill had to locate the appropriate file, a PowerPoint slide show with notes on atomic structure. Both Bill and Mr. Shale expected that students would take notes from the slide show, and Mr. Shale's system involved a student note-taking handout. This handout contained words written out in sentences, with blanks interspersed indicating missing information, which students had to fill in for credit.

Having finally connected the laptop and opened the file, Bill found the remote to use with PowerPoint, which he played with, trying to get it to work. Observing that, Destini declared, "Y'all always need batteries. Y'all need to walk and get some." Most of the students were involved in conversations with each other, some had moved to other parts of the room, and still others had left the room briefly.

Jabari answered Destini, "Shut up."

Destini replied, in a loud, coarse voice, "You shut up before I bust you in your mouth."

Nearly twenty minutes passed since the period began and Bill finally began the lecture, having arranged with Kenneth to control the PowerPoint show since the remote did not work. He told the class, "Sorry about the slow start," announcing that we're ready to begin, as he turned off the lights. Bill then reminded the class how to take notes. "There's just a block where it says 'notes.' Fill the text in," he said. Bill then told Chesiree, Lishcelle and Tameka to be quiet. Tameka gave Bill a dirty look and hit her pencil on the desk and within seconds, Lishcelle resumed talking.

Bill lectures.

The lecture notes were about the structure of the atom, the building blocks of matter. Bill read the first slide directly off of the screen to the class, saying, "Matter is discontinuous." He paused for a couple seconds and continued, "Which means you keep splitting it down and eventually you get down to one atom." He further noted that as you keep dividing matter in half, it will be composed of atoms, but after one atom, any divided pieces are not the same as the atoms. There was a note on this slide about nanotechnology. Bill read the note, but didn't elaborate, saying, "This is a fun little note Mr. Shale put in here."

Lishcelle immediately said, "Skip it."

This episode illustrates the key feature defining Bill's internship: Mr. Shale's system of notes delivered from PowerPoint slides. Bill gave students directions on how to take notes in the class, something they had been doing throughout the school year. The roles were set in Mr. Shale's system: the teacher used the slide show to tell students what was important, and students wrote the missing information on the worksheet's blanks, without necessarily knowing if something was important. The note taking system clearly illustrated procedural display, by focusing students on delivered content, with which they

gained little practical experience and would be tested on; they only sometimes appeared to be engaged.

Even though Mr. Shale was not present for the first half-hour of class, his presence as teacher was reinforced in two ways. First, the slide show was his creation and a vital part of the system that he used to maintain order and deliver content in class, and by using the slide show, Bill continued Mr. Shale's system. The second way involved the content within the slideshow itself. For example, Bill used a slide to lecture to students about the fact that the Greeks believed nature was composed of the four elements: earth, air, fire, and water. A question on the slide asked if they were correct, and forwarding to the next slide brought the answer: "They were wrong." On the next slide was written, "Mr. Shale believes his hair will grow back." Then, "He is wrong." Some students laughed and several made comments about Mr. Shale. Whether or not Mr. Shale was in the classroom, his basic method of presentation continued in Bill's teaching.

Bill continued to the Democritus exchange, described in Chapter Three, in which Keisha asked if Democritus was white. A couple of slides later, Bill moved on to the early modern atomic models, and was explaining Dalton's model. As he did so, Lishcelle loudly stated, "Pinkney, you clickin' just a little too fast!"

Bill then restated the information about Dalton's model, and while doing so, Shaquira announced to the class, "I'm tired now."

Destini reassured her, "You ain't the only one."

After Bill restated his explanation, he asked, "Lishcelle, did you get that?"

She answered, "Yeah."

I heard Jessica, who sat next to me, quietly say, "This is boring."

In this part of the lecture, Lishcelle called on Bill to slow down the pace of his lecture, something she did several times during each class period she attended, and Bill re-explained the content. Lishcelle, Tameka, and Chesiree always sat by each other and always talked with each other, not whispering, but not very loud either. Lishcelle and Tameka in particular would alternately shift their focus from their conversation to the lecture, and would interrupt when they missed information for the note sheet, an action Bill reported frustrated him. While Bill re-explained Dalton's model, Shaquira, who almost always took notes and did her work, announced she was tired and Destini affirmed she was not alone. Students consistently made comments like these during note-taking sessions. Jessica, who I never observed make a statement like that to the whole class, then stated the activity was boring to herself and those close by, which seemed to summarize the feeling of most of her classmates. The students did not seem to enjoy taking notes, a dominant class activity, and they both stated their feelings about it and attempted to exert some control over the activity.

In the interview, I told Bill that he looked surprised when he found out the students had not yet been given the atomic structure lecture notes. He said:

> I was surprised, so, luckily his computer was there and it hooked up to the printer, er, the projector without problem and the projector worked, and it did it's thing, it was like 'yeah' ok, and then but, like I went through his notes which I've done before, but like I said I just don't like using his notes, 'cause they're like, ... what is he really trying to get at when he's talking about this bullet? I don't know. ... So that was, you know, I was not planning on that and we just went through it basically and when I saw how much that they didn't have done it was like, 'Oh, good golly,' because I was like—there's probably—there's like 2 and a half pages of notes left or something like that, which is ridiculous. I was like, 'That's great, this is gonna be horrible,' because I don't like doing it, the kids hate PowerPoint notes that they're shown, they don't like 'em.

Bill said he was surprised and then quickly moved to describe the steps he had to complete in order to teach the class. His answer almost seemed to indicate that this situation was perhaps not so far from the norm, that it was largely a technical problem to be solved—hook up the projector, go through the notes, and do the best job one can, given that he was not prepared to lecture on the subject matter or with the idiosyncracies contained within the notes, esoteric knowledge that might well be a part of the test. Indeed, Bill's description of the lecture practice almost seemed mechanical—the projector that "did its thing," —saying of the notes session, "we just went through it basically." As in Amanda and Amy's cases, Bill engaged in procedural display. In order to execute this day of teaching, Bill needed to get the pieces in order and then go through it; he would play the role of teacher, telling students what they needed to know, even as he was unsure of what would appear on the next slide and how Mr. Shale intended to deliver it. The students, part of the "we," did their part, sitting in their desks and filling in their worksheets, while at the same time, indulging their desires and thwarting Bill's attempts at a controlled, efficient lecture. Some students filled out their note sheets and submitted them for credit, at least appearing as though some might be engaged.

Mr. Shale returns.

Bill continued the lecture by talking about the electron and then performing a two minute demonstration with a tesla coil, after which Mr. Shale entered the classroom. Bill talked briefly with him a few feet from my desk about the surprise situation Bill entered into this seventh period. Mr. Shale immediately took over the lecture from Bill, which was now on the topic of the plum pudding model of the atom. Destini commented, "Mr. Shale, you loud."

Lishcelle added, "For real, you sound like you got a microphone." As Mr. Shale lectured, Mike kept repeating his words aloud. Mr. Shale got to the end of the slide and pressed the forward button on the remote but, of course, nothing happened. Mr. Shale asked, "What happened to my clicker?" He walked toward the projector, continuously clicking the remote as he got closer, but to no avail. Mike made fun of Mr. Shale, repeatedly saying "clicker," adding that people call it a remote. Mr. Shale noticed that the laptop was on Kenneth's desk and asked Kenneth to continue to control the slide show. Mike continued to laugh as he made fun of Mr. Shale. Mr. Shale then addressed Mike, saying, "It's my presence that causes bouts of hilarity within you."

Eric asked, "Can you repeat yourself?"

Mr. Shale answered, "Bouts of hilarity."

Eric asked, "Can you repeat it again?"

Mr. Shale repeated, "Bouts of hilarity," and then continued to talk about plum pudding, explaining that if you haven't heard of plum pudding, that's fine because it's from England, and that plums in pudding is a food specific to it. He added it might be better to think of it as tapioca pudding, while Mike continued to mimic him: "Plums in a pudding."

Within minutes of Mr. Shale's showing up in class and taking over the lecture, Destini and Lishcelle both made comments on his volume, while Mike spent most of the time mimicking many of Mr. Shale's words. When Mr. Shale used the word clicker, Mike made fun of him more loudly and laughed at him. Mr. Shale eventually addressed Mike, and Eric, one of three males in the corner that included Jabari, asked Mr. Shale to repeat himself twice. Within my first forty minutes of observing Bill, I observed more

student challenges to teachers than I observed in all my visits to Amanda's second hour or Amy's seventh hour classes. Not only did the students express their discontent with the class, they also made fun of the teachers.

As Mr. Shale continued, he mentioned the cyclotron at nearby Midwestern University, which prompted Chang to ask, "Did you go to MU?"

Mr. Shale answered, "No," adding, "I went there for my masters, not for my undergrad."

Another student asked, "Where did you go?"

Mr. Shale answered, "Brown University in Rhode Island."

Keisha asked, "Is that a good school? Do you have to be smart to go there?"

Mr. Shale replied, "It's an Ivy League school. Its one of the best."

Keisha responded with her face, with a look I read as, oh, excuse me, I didn't know.

In answering student questions, Mr. Shale revealed where he went to college, and did so in a confident, matter of fact, though polite, manner. I often saw him use that manner when interacting with his seventh hour students, which totaled only about an hour over the course of the two semesters. His manner of speaking was usually calm but firm, direct and quite confident. The way in which he answered the question certainly caused Keisha to react and caused me to speculate how the students perceived physics. Keisha reacted as though Mr. Shale's recounting of college, which took place in this physics class Keisha struggled to pass, reinforced the notion of physics as elitist.

Mr. Shale continued the lecture, but was soon interrupted by a student who entered with a card for teachers to sign for a sick assistant principal. Mr. Shale then lectured on the Rutherford experiment, detailing the apparatus setup, which involved shooting alpha

particles (helium nuclei containing two protons and two neutrons) at a thin sheet of gold foil, and measuring how the alpha particles were scattered by their interaction with the foil's particles. He told students the experiment was amazing and paraphrased Rutherford's famous quote, that having the alpha particles bounce off the gold foil and come back was as amazing as firing a cannon shot and having it bounce off a piece of paper back to you.

Jabari asked of the cannon pictured on the slide, is it "made of wood?"

Mr. Shale replied, "Yeah, smart guy," and continued with the lecture. He went on to talk about the structure of the alpha particles and went on to say that calling the central part of the atom a "nucleus" is unfortunate and asked students why? Someone offered something that didn't answer the question, and Mr. Shale then said it is unfortunate because "nucleus" is already used in biology to refer to a part of the cell, and since it is also used in physical science, it could create confusion.

Jabari asked, "Are you sure about that?"

Mr. Shale answered, "Last time I checked, yes," a slight smile on his face.

Jabari asked, "When was that?'

Mr. Shale replied with, "Let me ask this instead. Have you known me to be wrong?" Jabari did not answer and Mr. Shale continued the lecture for about another five minutes before two girls entered the room and asked Mr. Shale if he would like to participate in a fundraiser. In the center of the classroom, the girls talked with Mr. Shale about shaving his head or shaving his legs. He lifted a pant leg to show that his leg had some hair. Some students talked among themselves while others watched this scene. Mr. Shale then told the girls to come outside to talk with him. Without a word to Bill or the class, Mr. Shale

left the room and abandoned the lecture; he would not return for twelve minutes. Bill picked up the slack and within about twenty seconds, was ready to continue the lecture.

But before Bill started lecturing, Mike asked, "Where did Mr. Shale go? He just comes and goes as he pleases. I wish I could do that."

Another student answered, "You can."

I share some parts of Mr. Shale's brief lecture to illustrate the tone of the learning environment, which often felt indifferent and at times, hostile, and to show that neither Mr. Shale nor Bill found great success in using the note-taking scheme with seventh hour. It seemed as though Mr. Shale would rather be any place but in room 305, although upon entering the room, Mr. Shale did take over the note-giving practice. The three male students in the corner especially gave Mr. Shale a hard time, and the exchanges between Mr. Shale and the three students were hostile, with mimicking, questions intent on annoying him, and questioning the accuracy of his statements. Meanwhile, Mr. Shale replied in kind, especially toward Jabari. On my first visit I saw the dominant teaching practice of giving notes via PowerPoint executed by both practitioners, and student challenges to executing that agenda. This routine largely defined Bill's situation as an intern.

Relations with the Mentor Teacher

Bill described Mr. Shale as someone who had a reputation of being a good teacher, but was losing that reputation over the last couple years, specifically citing health and other personal issues as affecting him. However, Mr. Shale had had some problems accomplishing certain expected tasks, like submitting grades at the end of the first semester. Bill reported that Mr. Shale left the room constantly and his popping in and out of class frustrated Bill, especially if the front office called for him:

> Bill: Shale was still there, so like, so he came in late, like, 'Oh, ok, I'll do this,' which is fine, I wanted him to do the notes because I hate doing them and, you know. I was happy to hand them all off, I have no problem with that, but then you know, I get frustrated like, when somebody came to the door about, what, like head-shaving or something? I don't know, I'm like, 'Are you serious?' Like he'll deal with stupid stuff like that, at that like, I'm like, 'What are you talking about? Now? Are you serious?'
>
> John: And then he went outside, for ... about 15 minutes.
>
> Bill: Exactly, that's what happens a lot of the times, and it's just like—that would happen earlier in the year when I *really* didn't know what the notes were about, I was just like 'Uh, are you coming back?' and I learned to realize when he's gone, well, you buckle down and you might be there for the duration. ...
>
> John: So, is this a relatively common thing where he'll just leave during the class?
>
> Bill: Yeah, and that's just frustrating ....
>
> John: Like over half of the time or...?
>
> Bill: Oh yeah. I mean it could easily happen every class period.

Bill said that he took over teaching the Functions, Statistics, and Trigonometry class because it bothered him to see Mr. Shale leaving so much and not teaching the students. Since Bill had a degree in mathematics, would soon be certified to teach it, and expressed a desire to teach it, at least in the context of a mathematics-based physics class, taking over FST allowed him the opportunity to teach this desired subject and to prepare the college-bound students who Bill did not think Mr. Shale would well-prepare, because of his disappearances.

Bill went on to say:

> It's just frustrating 'cause like, he's supposed to still critique me and give me feedback and stuff, and like, you can't give me feedback if you're not here. Just my thought on the whole thing, you know. So that's, I mean that's another reason why I really wanted you to come and do this thing with us and, you know, you'll be here, and it's not everyday, but the times you'll be here, comes out—

In the first interview, Bill discussed the qualities of an ideal mentor. He began, "Well, I think it's one that you get to sit back and watch for a little while, just do what they do. One that's always saying, always telling you why they're doing what they're doing, because really there should be a reason for most everything you do, I mean really." Bill then went on to describe that being a mentor is good because you come into contact with new ideas, but added how it could be "tough to hand over the reins to something that you've tried to sculpt." Bill also said the ideal mentor "would just be there when I needed them, and that's hard to say when that would be," because it is hard to know when a particular situation might arise in which the mentor's advice could be useful. In addition, Bill wanted a mentor that provided "good constructive feedback," adding that the mentor:

> Would be able to give you bunches of different hints, I mean, ideas and suggestions, like you know, just suggestions, maybe not he's not saying, 'Do this,' but, 'You might want to think about doing this and maybe this is why.' I think that would be best. And it's always good when they look at you as more of a colleague than a, than a, 'Oh. You're a new guy trying to learn something.' I mean 'cause you know you always feel more involved and more welcomed when you're seen as more of an equal in a profession like this, so that's nice.

Of course, Bill did not find that Mr. Shale met all of his criteria for an ideal mentor. Bill explained that at first things seemed pretty good with his mentor and he thought their two styles were fairly close, but Bill said:

> I think he kind of likes everything sort of done that way, you want to deviate a little bit, it's ok, but I get this feeling where, if it's too far off he's not gonna love it or you're gonna really have to convince him that it's ok. He does make suggestions but, and you know if I ask why he's always happy to talk about it, so that's nice, but like I said he's out of the room a lot so I mean even if you do a lot of stuff what's he, I mean he's critiquing part of it as opposed to a lot of it.

Bill never described Mr. Shale as prohibiting him from doing anything, and Bill had already taken over most of the responsibility for teaching FST and was in the process of

taking full responsibility for Physics, yet Bill also had a feeling that Mr. Shale would not approve of all the things Bill wanted to do. Although Bill described Mr. Shale as willing to talk about teaching and its choices, he emphasized Mr. Shale's absence from the room as a limitation on the advice's quality. Bill continued to discuss the reasons and effects of Mr. Shale's absences: he was not always prepared for school, he sometimes missed school because of appointments for health issues, and "leaving the room frequently, sometimes it was, like I said, he's gone, he thinks of something he has to do, where did he go? I don't know, when somebody calls I don't know where he is, he's in the building, I can tell you that, where in the building? I don't know." When the phone rang and someone was looking for Mr. Shale, the teacher of record, Bill, as his subordinate, expected to know the whereabouts of his mentor and be able to communicate them; it seemed like Bill felt that Mr. Shale's actions made him appear irresponsible as well.

When I asked Bill if Mr. Shale offered him much feedback. Bill said:

> Sometimes, not tons, if I ask for it he'll offer a little more, you know, and—at the beginning it was all pretty good, pretty worthwhile in terms of like—it was more of like, more of the beginner questions like I would really do this or—you know, and he kind of passed a fair amount of that on, you know, and I still, I still want to ask him, like, 'How would you really deal with a kid like that?' you know, but—questions like that, but there's other stuff where, you know, you kind of gotta be there and witness the entire lesson or event in order to give me proper feedback on. ... And so, yeah, I mean that's—so—I kind of give it the big old whatever at this point, you know, I've got less than 3 months, I've hit the lead teach and—I know that I can make it on my own, you know, and I have support here in the school from a couple other teachers.

Here, Bill reiterated the importance of Mr. Shale's absence, that because he rarely observed the entire lesson, or even a substantial part of it, any feedback that Mr. Shale offered was likely to be incomplete, and hence not as valuable. In this answer, Bill further noted a change in the feedback over time; as the year progressed and Bill had fewer beginner questions for Mr. Shale, the quality of feedback decreased. One area that

continued to plague Bill was "how would you really deal with a kid like that?" Classroom management remained a concern for Bill's entire year, and was always an issue both in the teaching I observed and the interviews afterward. However, given Bill's deep concerns over improving his craft, he had also resigned himself to the situation and did not expect an improvement in the quality of his relationship with Mr. Shale, noting since he reached the lead teaching part of the internship he believed he had what it took to be a teacher. In addition, Bill mentioned that he had support from other teachers at the school, in particular, a chemistry teacher who he liked to talk with and who offered him advice. Bill reported a conversation he had had with his field instructor in which they planned how Bill would continue his internship, under the guidance of the chemistry teacher, if Mr. Shale could not finish the year.

The matter of classroom management played a part in Bill and Mr. Shale's relationship. Bill noted, "I was worried about it here just 'cause it is a little more rambunctious school, you know it just is in general, and that was my biggest concern and it still is a little concern because my mentor teacher is not—I am more strict than my mentor teacher." Significantly, Bill did not seem to view his mentor as a good model for dealing with behavior issues, as indicated by Bill stating that Mr. Shale was not something, and then switching to compare his strictness to that of his mentor. Whatever Mr. Shale's classroom management represented to Bill, it clearly was not enough, and Bill took steps to change how things happened in the classroom.

When I asked Bill about the strictness, he clarified that an important student behavior was silence during lecture:

> But I'm not, I'm not real strict though, he was pretty lax on a lot of things, he would often talk over students during lecture and stuff and I mean, I'm just not

> down with that, I mean, I'm trying to tell you something, if you don't, at least, I mean stop talking because it's going to interfere with somebody else. But he would talk over people a lot and just let it get real loud and a little crazy.

Bill's biggest classroom management challenge, in his view, was to get the students to be quiet and listen when he told them something. He mentioned that several students had come up and talked with him about the noise, and had made some attempts to address noise issues with the class. These experiences led him to create and distribute a new syllabus with more explicit rules that named the types of behaviors he expected to see in class, a document he hoped would bring into existence the desired behaviors.

Yet, Bill found that simply declaring the expected behavior through the syllabus and orally was not sufficient, not enough to counter the tone, environment, and routines established from the beginning of the year:

> But the tone that's been set for like the semester, is still difficult to deal with, like you know I can say, 'Alright let's do it this way.' But—and even then I'm still trying to like—I was gonna—a couple times last week I had them all pretty much kind of there, kind of looking at me sort of, kind of doing all right, but I mean, this past week I've haven't really been the lead the teacher the whole time because like, Shale loves this atomic thing, and I really hate, I'm getting to hate those lecture notes, they're just boring as hell, I mean, oh my lord.

Interestingly, Bill referred to a couple of lessons the previous week, which seemed to come closer to the desired interactions. However, his references to the previous week, including phrases such as "pretty much kind of there" and "kind of looking at me sort of," indicate that things still did not happen as he liked, but went better than the lecture I had just witnessed. And Bill traced part of the reason for the students' behavior to his mentor, juxtaposing Mr. Shale's love for content with his hate for practice.

Bill further described the notes:

> Bill: Yeah and they have them for the test but they don't even know how to use them half the time because it's stuff like formulas or something. And they're just kind of like...they're boring, they're boring. And like, the one with....he has a lot

> of things he likes to add in with them, 'cause he, you know he's done it and he has stuff he's really interested about—and he's really knowledgeable, a lot of knowledge and facts and stuff that he likes to throw in there but like—I don't know, I just don't—I mean I read 'em, which is what they can do if I'm just like 'Alright slide 1'.

As he continued to talk, Bill reiterated that the lecture notes were boring three times in the span of a few sentences. In the previous quote when he spoke of his feelings toward the lecture, he started by saying he really hated them, but then toned down his affect, continuing to say he was getting to hate the notes. These emphatic statements convey how much Bill found himself in a bind, which he made clear he didn't like in multiple interviews and in his university coursework. But why the change in emphasis as Bill spoke? Perhaps this is an acknowledgment of his situation: his mentor used notes and the students were used to them, yet Bill questioned how much learning occurred when he used them. It wasn't that Bill was against the use of lecturing, but rather against the PowerPoint method. This was illustrated when Bill had to do the impromptu atomic structure lecture and so found the information that Mr. Shale had in the slide show annoying, because Bill didn't necessarily possess the knowledge that Mr. Shale alluded to within the slides. This led Bill to a strong show of procedural display as described at the end of Bill's quote: he'll just read the notes, just like the students can, and he'll start from the first slide and just get through them.

Creep and Wean

Over the course of my visits, Bill took steps to creep away from his mentor's note-taking system and to wean the students off the PowerPoint slideshows and associated worksheets. Reflecting on the atomic structure day, Bill said that Monday, the next class, would be a better day. I asked him what he was going to do then, and he answered that he hadn't really planned for that day yet, but offered:

> But we're gonna start lecture but it's not gonna be like that stuff, I'm gonna have— I'll start with a lot of, well not a lot, but several demos and they're gonna have to predict and we're just gonna be busy, and again, we're not doing thermodynamics we're doing temperature, which I thought was kind of odd. And then we're also doing heat transfer so convection, conduction, radiation. But you know I'll just try to give them—I'm gonna talk about everything, and I don't know it I'm gonna give— I still haven't yet—I don't know if I'm gonna give them kind of a guided note sheet, along with the prediction areas on there, but like, 'ok, we're gonna talk about this next, you might wanna'— you know give 'em more of an outline to fill in as opposed to fill in the blank

At this point, Bill's plans were vague, but they embodied two components that he stated were important to him: doing demonstrations and doing lecture differently. Lecture still remained the central technique that Bill intended to use for the upcoming unit, and in this interview he was debating different ways of setting up the lecture, in which he intended to "talk about everything," but knew he had to somehow structure the session for students who would not just write down everything. In this context, Bill also made a side comment about the unit he would be teaching, which would only be on the concept of temperature, rather than the broader subject of thermodynamics. Although he would teach about the different heat transfer methods, his statement indicated that there was more he regarded as important in studying thermodynamics, but for some unstated reason, presumably Mr. Shale's plan for the unit, would have to ignore.

Notes on internal energy.

During my next visit to Bill's class, he did indeed try to wean his students off the note sheets they were familiar with, but did not creep very far from his mentor's system. Bill gave a lecture that day on the concept of temperature, specifically that the temperature of an object is related to the amount of internal energy that it contained, and his notes came directly from one of Mr. Shale's PowerPoint slide shows. However, before beginning the lecture, Bill had students take out a piece of paper and write down

the ways they could think of to melt an ice cube as well as their definitions of temperature.

After collecting student papers, Bill began the lecture by telling the class, "We're gonna try something new in this class. You're going to write notes on lined paper."

There were immediate gasps and protests. Several students yelled out, we don't take notes, or something to that effect.

Shaquira said, "I hate when y'all do that."

Chesiree protested, "No. I don't want to take notes like this."

As Bill put up the first slide, Kadeeja said, "Ah hell naw."

Bill said, "Kadeeja, watch your mouth." He then began the lecture, reading from the slide, "Matter is made of constantly jiggling molecules or atoms."

Shaquira immediately followed with, "I can't write."

About five minutes later, a student complained about how much they have to write, the note taking task made more difficult by the substitution of blank paper for blanks on note sheets. Bill answered, "You don't have to write everything."

Tameka retorted, "I do. That's how you take notes."

Bill then replied, "Ok," and waited a minute, while several students continued to write notes. Bill then put up the next slide and said, "The total kinetic energy and potential energy of all particles is the internal energy, which equals thermal energy."

Shaquira asked, frustration in her voice, "What are you talking about?"

As was the case the previous day, students voiced their opinions on the class multiple times and in several ways, focused on the act of note taking, prompted by Bill's new system. Bill ignored the majority of student comments, the exception being

Kadeeja's "Ah hell naw," not because of the content of her statement, but for its cussing form. Bill expected the students would react, especially because I talked with him about the difficulty of changing the standard practice, because students were habituated to it. What is interesting is how Bill changed the lecture, first by continuing to use Mr. Shale's PowerPoint slide show, but second by cutting the students off from the support system they were trained to use. Although student comments indicated their displeasure with the activity, the problem was made most clear by the student who complained there was too much to write. Although Bill didn't think they had to write everything on the screen, he waited rather than press his point.

In the interview, Bill reflected: "Well this wasn't great today. I didn't really like today." His displeasure came not from using Mr. Shale's notes, but because he had used a different set of notes for the earlier periods, since he had missed the notes about temperature on the CD and went straight to heat transfer. Before starting the notes, Bill actually asked himself aloud in class if he should go in order. I asked him if that comment was in reference to this situation, which he confirmed, and then continued:

> Yeah, and you know I shouldn't have because the other notes, now that I look back, lend themselves a lot better to—just kind of talking a little more during the notes, you know we didn't have to write down as much and I could be like, 'Ok that's heat, now let's talk about what temp was.' Temp may not have even been listed but I just told them and they write it down and—I have—I guess it's probably good that I did that though, because I realize that it's—using his notes in a very similar fashion, still doesn't work real well, but if I take, maybe even just chunks out and use parts of them and, you know just have them ... The other two periods were a little more into it and actually like we had a little more, I don't want to say discussion, but we had, you know, a little more participation, asked a little more things, we talked about the scales, the temp scales and stuff a lot more and it was ... It just flowed a lot better, and, I don't mean it was because I did this in seventh hour, I think it was just the way I did it. It wasn't as good, so I was kind of disappointed with it, but oh well.

There are two important points to analyze in this quote. First is the difference that Bill observed between doing the notes with second compared to seventh hour. He described the earlier periods as involving more participation, though not at the level of discussion, with students asking more questions. In addition, students did not write down as many notes, which Bill attributed to the different subject matter that allowed him to talk a little more during the notes. I interpret this to mean that Bill felt more at ease to be able to ad lib with the notes, rather than simply to read them directly from the screen. Either he felt more comfortable with the subject matter or the notes were written so that they were not so idiosyncratically Mr. Shale's, or some combination of the two. So his decision to lecture to seventh hour using the notes in the original order left Bill disappointed with the result.

The second point regards what Bill learned by using the notes. Most importantly was Bill's realization that using Mr. Shale's notes in a different form (blank paper) still did not work very well. This led Bill to an idea: perhaps he could incorporate pieces of Mr. Shale's notes into his own lecture notes. By doing so, Bill could continue to use the practice of lecture, could be aligned with his mentor's content, and could ease the burden of planning since he would start with the existing notes. However, although Bill intended to change his lecture style, he was still in agreement with Mr. Shale about the importance of notes.

Another way in which Bill was aligned with Mr. Shale on note-taking involved their beliefs that students needed structure from them, something that came out when I asked him how he might do the notes differently. Bill answered:

> Bill: I'm not sure about that yet. Because they do need some structure, they're not— they—a lot of them lack—those, some of those more basic skills of just,

> you know, taking notes or organizing notes, you know. So I'm still kind of debating on what to do. I would like to just be like—or even just put an outline on the overhead and be like, 'Ok, we're gonna go over these things' just so they get an idea, 'Ok, this is the big idea'—just like—
>
> John: Why do they need structure?
>
> Bill: Why do they need structure? Because I don't think—well—I guess they—I mean—they don't, for one, at least these kids I'm used to dealing with, they lack a lot of the skills to do it, quote, on their own, like we just sort of stand up and be like, 'Alright let's talk about this' and maybe put a couple things on the board and do like the college professor walk around front and dabble a couple things. Like—they're gonna probably stare at you, then after 40 minutes they'll be like, 'Are we supposed to write anything down?' That's probably what would happen. It'd be like, 'Oh great.' So they need, they need at least, like I said, they're—they lack some of those basic skills and I think that's—they need structure to guide them somewhere you know, and hopefully it's somewhere useful, you know, I mean obviously like I said, we had these PowerPoint notes, it does sort of guide them, you know, what words they have to put down, but they officially have a page full of filled-in blanks when they're done. I don't know if that took them anywhere but, yes I mean they need to be guided, I guess that's the main thing the structure taps into.

In this quote, Bill juxtaposed his classroom with a college classroom, with an image of how he preferred to conduct lecture, where the professor would simply talk about content and students would have to determine on their own what to commit to paper, and imagined that his students would be unable to take notes in such a situation. The reason: they lack those basic skills needed to do it, something affirmed in Tameka's statement in class that she has to write everything down, because that's how one takes notes. Tameka's reminder that there are multiple ways to take notes points out at least two complications for Bill to realize his vision of note-taking: students were used to taking notes in a particular way and to get them to do it his way would require training them to do it.

Although upon further questioning, Bill acknowledged that the students were most likely made dependent on the note-taking techniques he and Mr. Shale used. He also

seemed silent both about other lecture techniques and other teaching practices that would allow him to teach students and build up their basic skills. In answer to how students might have been trained because of the way things are done in the class, Bill said:

> Well, I think there's a fair amount of that, I mean like, if you, a lot of times you ask them to think on their own and they're like, they freak out, I mean you're like, 'Is this right? Is this right? Is this right? Can you check this?' It's just like, 'Hold on,' you know, 'Think a little more on your own, take some time,' and you know they're used to a lot of fill-in the blank, kinds of things, jumbles, (inaudible), yeah, they're used to a lot of fill-in the blank worksheet, look up the defin—find the boldface word, what does it say after it, you know.

Bill summarized the dominant teaching practice in this physics class. As teacher, his role is to get the students to just write this thing I've said that's important for you to know. And as students, their roles are to write these things down, a practice structured by blanks on worksheets, bold faced words, and teacher exhortations to record information.

Conceptualizing demonstration.

Bill was determined to creep from his mentor's system, primarily to a different way of doing the notes, for lecture still seemed to be an important part of Bill's teaching methods. He envisioned he could enhance his lecture through the use of demonstrations. Bill faced some difficulty in using demonstrations and lab exercises with his students, because the district was renovating Stratford's science rooms and labs that year and Mr. Shale had to move from his classroom with the lab next door, to a classroom that had only a counter along the room's back wall and some cabinet space. Bill cited the move as the primary reason he could not do many lab activities with the class, but acknowledged that he had access to the materials needed to conduct demonstrations.

Earlier in the year I had shared curriculum with Bill that relied on a technique called "interactive lecture demonstrations" (Sokoloff & Thornton 1997). The technique, which I had used in my own teaching, involves the teacher presenting a physical situation to

students, who then predict what will happen in the situation. The teacher performs the demonstration and students have to figure out why something occurred as it did. Because they recorded a prediction, they then had to confront their own conceptions of the natural world, which may increase the chances they will learn some physics content. Bill was intrigued by my descriptions and told me he had looked through the curriculum; however he was not privy to the training I had received.

On my third visit, Bill did two demonstrations in class designed to explore mechanisms of heat transfer, ways that thermal energy moves between objects. I also saw demonstrations on my fifth, sixth, and seventh visits. I will describe only the ice melting demonstration here, which was among the more successful that Bill did, in order to illustrate the conceptual difficulties of executing demonstrations, something common to all the demonstrations I witnessed. Although Bill mentioned in an interview that since this was a physics class, students should be doing things to explore physics, such as dropping weights to examine gravity, he conceived of demonstration primarily as a practice allowing him to break up the monotony of lecture. As we talked about the notes, Bill said of demonstrations:

> If you allow them to talk and just be like 'hey what do you think?' and get them a little more involved and give them something other than, you know, something a little more interesting to look at. I mean PowerPoints—nobody really likes a PowerPoint slide anywhere. ... So, I mean I think that alone will help, especially in this particular room with the stigma of lecture notes you know. I think if you, if we went through these, like went through the prediction stuff and I would bring up, 'Ok and this is because of this' and you know—'Let's define (inaudible).' ... And you know maybe tell them like, 'Alright you may want to write this down,' I think then when you get to the end of the period you're like, 'Hey, do you realize we just took notes today?' They might be kind of surprised, like, 'Oh we did kind of make it through this, this, and this,' but you know, it wasn't sitting, grinding out notes. And I think, I think that's gonna help a lot so. ... And maybe it'll only work once or twice, I don't know, you know it's something I need to try and see

> what happens. And then obviously you know, new ideas and revamp some of the ideas later.

Bill seemed to conceive of demonstration partly in opposition to notes, as it would allow him to engage students in a different way than having them look at the slide show and fill in missing information. He also thought that student-teacher interactions would differ. Rather than Bill talking and giving students the information, he would ask them questions so students could think about phenomena, particularly to have them predict a demonstration's outcome. At the same time, Bill imagined he could still cover the same material and have students write notes about it, as indicated by his suggestion that students might want to write this down, and emphasized by his question to students if they realized they had taken notes through this different practice.

Similarly, during the next interview as Bill reflected on lecture and his plan to do some demonstrations in class, he said:

> If you do enough, you do enough demos and it does get them actually looking at and thinking about what's going on, one, the time is gonna pass faster, so then when we do have to write more down, I mean it's, they're just gonna write it and I think they'll be, their focus will come back to like, 'Ok, it's another demo' or 'It's another—It's not writing notes,' you know, something that's not writing notes, and they won't have to be writing all the time, because the thing that they hate the most is just, we wrote for a half an hour straight, you know, it was horrible.

Although Bill hinted at the pedagogic value of demonstrations, his main focus seemed to be on making lecture more palatable and increasing student interest in the class. In this quote, Bill negatively evaluated the internal energy lecture session, which involved a lot of writing for students in his new system, and sought to continue revamping his lecture practice.

The ice melting demonstration.

In the third class I visited, I watched Bill conduct a demonstration in which he and the students observed how long it took for ice cubes in different positions relative to a candle flame to melt. Bill reported this was the first time he conducted a demonstration of his own devising in class. I share it because it seemed about average in terms of execution, student engagement, and content knowledge. Having taken about six minutes to set up the demonstration, Bill told the class they needed to prepare their paper in a way different from normal. He said, "Label your paper by writing prediction. Leave a space. Observation, leave a space. Explanation." Bill repeated the directions.

Chesiree asked, "What are we supposed to write?"

Bill told her, "Ask someone else." She looked confused and asked her question again. Bill asked the class, "Can someone help Chesiree?"

Jabari impatiently explained the directions, "Write prediction. Leave a space. Write observation. Leave a space. Write explanation."

Chesiree still did not write anything and Joseph looked at her, and then got out of his seat and walked back to help Chesiree get this on her paper, explaining what to write as he pointed to where to write it. Joseph then returned to his seat where his unopened bag sat on the desk, and did not prepare a paper of his own.

Bill told the class, "I'm going to explain the demonstration to you." He told the class he was going to light the candle and then put ice cubes in four different positions: one in the flame, one above the flame, one next to the flame, and one away from the flame. Some students asked what was going to happen, but most asked how things were going to be set up. Bill explained how he was going to execute the demonstration a second time, again pointing out the specific locations. After a pause, Bill asked the students to predict

which of the ice cubes will melt first. Quite a few students said, with little hesitation, "In the flame."

Bill replied, "Ok," and asked, "Which is going to be second?" Pause. "Joseph?"

Joseph answered, "The one above the flame."

Bill said, "Ok." After a short pause, he said, "Rashaad, come up, please, if you would." Rashaad said nothing, got out of his seat, and slowly walked the five feet to the demo table. Before he gave Rashaad the ice, Bill had placed ice cubes on the Styrofoam cups both near and away from the flame. Bill asked Rashaad to hold the ice above the flame and told the class that first we're going to check out what happens when the ice is held above the flame. Rashaad put the spoon with the ice cube directly above the flame, but then Bill asked him to raise it higher, as he moved Rashaad's arm so the spoon was about four to five inches above the flame. Rashaad kept it in that position, more or less, with some wavering, but made little effort to keep the ice completely steady, nor did Bill ask him to.

Bill asked the class, "Which one looks like its already melting?" The class was relatively quiet, and most of the students were looking toward the demo table; they appeared to be engaged in a way that I rarely saw in this class. More than half of them seemed permanently oriented toward the demo table and most of the others looked back and forth between their desk or friends and the demo table. No one was sleeping, and only a few were talking in hushed tones. A number of them called out that the one in the flame was already melting.

Keisha asked, "Is this above, or in the flame?"

Bill answered, "Above."

Keisha then said, "You can see the heat. Can't you?"

Bill asked, "How can you see it?"

Keisha said, "I don't know." After a short pause, she said, "It's squiggly," referring to what we might call "heat waves." The ice cube had pretty much melted by this point and Bill thanked Rashaad, who then sat down without saying a word.

Bill told the class, "Now we're going to do the ice cube in the flame." He asked for someone to volunteer, which Joseph and Keisha excitedly did. Joseph deferred to Keisha, who held the ice cube in a spoon just barely above the flame, like Rashaad had done. After a little time, the ice was nearly all melted.

Bill asked the class, "Which melted faster?" Nearly all of the students said the one in the flame melted faster. Bill said, "Good. Write it down." After a pause, he asked, "Which is melting the least?" A number of students said that the one farthest away was melting the least. Bill studied the two remaining ice cubes for about 10 to 15 seconds and then said, "It's hard to tell. We're going to have to wait a bit." He told the class that we're going to take some notes right now, but we'll come back to check on this demonstration.

The demonstration was experiential—its intention was to engage with and analytically inquire into the mechanisms of the natural phenomena under study, heat transfer. The demonstration involved concepts students had great experience with—a heat source, ice, distance between them, and melting—and so we might say that the demonstration involved familiar experiences that could be rendered in an unfamiliar, analytical, physics way and was a demonstration at the edge of most students' zones of proximal development.

I thought Bill did several things right in the demo. First, the demonstration was appropriate for the level of his students in this tenth grade Conceptual Physics class. Second, he provided students a different way to examine heat transfer than simply through lecture, and students responded with some of the highest levels of attentiveness I witnessed in all my visits to his class. Third, he set up four distinct situations, so that students could make clear contrasts between them, which could enhance understanding. Finally, Bill involved students in executing parts of the demonstration.

Although Bill paid some attention to controlling variables in the experiment by setting two of the ice cubes on insulating Styrofoam so that the candle flame and ambient air temperature would be the most significant variables, he did not specifically address experimental controls or use measuring devices like rulers or stop watches to make the demonstration more scientific, in the ways that physics often does. After Rashaad's cube melted Keisha held a cube in the flame. Although students agreed the latter melted faster, the class did not use any clock to determine the length of time required to melt the cubes, making it difficult to formulate a more rigorous comparison, a hallmark of physics.

When I asked Bill to reflect on the lesson, he said he had "to better prepare how I'm going to integrate those things into the lecture because, I didn't plan as well for this morning but it worked out really well." He reported that when he did the demonstration during second hour, he was able to do a better job of relating the demo to the lecture notes. But more importantly, he said that even though there were 35 students in second hour and their behavior was getting worse, a factor which didn't seem to negatively affect the demo:

> It worked out pretty well today, we even had a fair number of—a good chunk of the kids were contributing at one point or another, which was a little surprising,

> but, it worked out. That's why I was a little disappointed with last hour because I felt, it felt pretty good at second hour today, it really did and then it didn't happen in seventh hour and I was like, 'Oh man.' I could see it just kind of collapsing and I was like, yeah it's just not flowing and just not, things were just popping out at the wrong time, I had a plan, some stuff written down but like I said, I just have to diagram it a little more carefully and make it a little stricter in terms of exactly when I want things to happen.

Unfortunately, as the interview continued we ended up discussing other behavioral issues that arose during the period, and did not discuss the demonstration in depth. In reviewing the interview transcripts, I found we did not discuss demonstrations and associated techniques as much as I would have liked; student behavior often took precedence. One thing Bill mentioned several times was that demonstrations needed more planning, in particular sequencing activities and executing them as he imagined. While important, another critical dimension about which I felt Bill was silent, was how to set up the demonstration so the observed phenomena could be translated into a physical model, relating students' current conceptions to a plausible and understandable model for students.

This last point seemed to be a factor, especially when considering the interaction between Bill and his students during the demonstration, which followed the IRE pattern. Bill asked two questions before beginning the demonstration but did not facilitate any discussion about these predictions, possibly because the answers were obvious. During the demo he asked, which one looks like its already melting? Students quickly answered, bolstering the obviousness of the demo. After completing the demo, Bill asked the class, "Which melted faster?" and after students responded, "the one in the flame," Bill said, "Good. Write it down." What strikes me is the lack of discussion, with this IRE interaction forming the backbone of procedural display in class, and clearly illustrated in the missed opportunity presented by Keisha's observation that we could see the heat, an

observation pointing to the heat transfer mechanism of convection. The demonstration had taken up some class time, had proven to be more engaging to the students than most other activities, and indicated some learning had perhaps taken place. At least students wrote down the results.

Most importantly was the fact Bill attempted to execute demonstrations in his classroom. The several times I witnessed him attempt a demonstration were also the times that students were most engaged in class, and the closest that Bill seemed to get his students to do science work along the EPE (Experiences, Patterns, and Explanations) model described in Chapter Four. To facilitate a discussion of physical phenomena, to coax students to engage in that discussion, and to move that discussion beyond the IRE pattern would have been a considerable accomplishment.

Trying to Construct New Practices

Bill encountered several difficulties in executing his role as a teacher. He seemed to agree with Mr. Shale, his mentor, that students needed structure and the teacher's primary job was to provide information to students who had to record it for later checking. This assumption made it difficult for Bill to creep away from his mentor's PowerPoint-based lecture practices, which neither he nor his students enjoyed or found worthwhile. In his attempts to creep to different lecture practices, Bill made note taking more difficult for students, who consistently shared their negative evaluations of the new practice. Yet since Bill believed so strongly in the notion that his job as teacher was to transmit knowledge, his new approaches did not have the intended effect of making lecture more palatable or engaging students better.

Bill's introduction of demonstration was intended primarily to break up lecture, to increase student interest in a way that allowed Bill to continue to deliver content to

students, albeit in a more interesting manner. Although a step in the right direction, Bill had not much considered how to execute the demonstration in a way that engaged students in meaningful learning. The result was some respite from conflict with students over taking notes through the entertainment of a demonstration, a novel practice compared to lecture and recitation, but in a form that did not encourage deep thinking or appear to extend student knowledge. In his quest to effectively use lecture and demonstration, Bill still had much to learn, and Mr. Shale provided him with little practical help to develop those skills, especially since Bill seemed to internalize many of Mr. Shale's expectations for students, and conducted class at a low level, focusing on the basics.

Respect and Classroom Interactions

One of Bill's biggest concerns was classroom management, especially at Stratford, which "is a little more rambunctious school." When he took over the seventh period class in the second semester, Bill made a new syllabus that announced the rules he would enforce. In addition, he rearranged the student desks so that instead of long rows facing the front, shorter rows faced the middle, with its open space. With these steps, he tried to run the class differently, and viewed respect as a key issue in many of the challenges he faced.

Bill's Views of Respect

Closely related to Bill's classroom management concerns were his views of respect, of norms one should follow in how they treated others. When I asked him if Stratford was s respectful environment, Bill replied, "Naw, overall probably not, no, it's not," and immediately characterized the principal as getting little respect from the faculty. Bill said

this filtered down to the students, and was most exemplified in the hallway, the space Bill described as not "necessarily chaotic," but "pretty uncontrolled." Bill described a contradiction he identified within his students:

> In class they always talk about respect, you know, so-and-so's disrespecting me.... It's very ironic that we talk about that all the time because they show very little respect to many people, especially staff, you know, especially if they don't know you, like if you have a teacher that's coming down the hallway like, 'Yeah you guys have to get to class, come on,' I mean they'll turn around and who knows what they're gonna say to the teacher sometimes, I mean there's some pretty radical stuff they drop there. As opposed to 'Oh, I'm sorry, yep, I'm'—you know. I mean most of the time too, you just wish they were smart enough to realize at that point that, you know what, if I just say, 'Hey sorry' and move along, they're gonna have no problems most likely, but half the time they end up going to the office because they'll turn around, be like, 'Shut the fuck up,' ... or 'You won't tell me what the hell to do.'

In such statements, Bill displayed his habits of thought regarding expected speech from students, cooperation with requests, and deference to authority. The students wanted respect from teachers but did not necessarily give respect to them. Bill went on to describe that "even amongst each other" students were not very respectful, messing with each others' stuff, pushing each other around, dissin' each other, etc. Most interesting is that Bill seemed to expect students to display more disrespect toward the faculty than toward other students. This would suggest something about the relationship between teacher and students, with their different roles in the institution, might play a part in the competition for respect. However, Bill never reflected on the contributions of the teacher's practices to the situation unless I brought up the issue, and then he did so only briefly.

In the first interview when asked about how his being white in a predominantly black classroom might affect the situation, Bill said:

> I don't want to say it's not a big deal, but like, I think these students, I mean most any kid, but these, this culture that I see, respect is the big issue. They don't want

Bill we

and do

show in

T

indicat

greet c

sorced

to ada

learni

institu

intera

share

with s

should

in man

bind fe

studen

> to be disrespected, you know it's kind of a big deal, but so, one, simply, I show them respect for one, you know, which is kind of like the starting point.

Bill went on to say that some of the students think he automatically owed them respect and don't see respect as mutual. He suggested he showed respect to his students by showing them he cared:

> Then I show them through, I just like, that I care about, one, if you show them that you care about them, the little, like, 'Hey how you doing?' when you come in, standing there saying, 'See ya' when they leave, little, you know the little conversations here and there, just asking them what they're into and after a while it just happens, you don't even realize it. But I think when you do all that, and you show them that you care about them overall, that you respect them and that you care about them, at least I felt, I mean obviously I could be missing something, but at that point, the race, the fact that I'm white and most of them are black, not, really a big deal, I mean it doesn't seem, I don't see it playing much of a role right now. Now obviously I could be missing something, I mean I probably am, but—

The beginning of the quote is in the first person but soon shifts to the third person, indicating that Bill didn't necessarily do what he described. Indeed, I hardly ever saw him greet or tell seventh hour students goodbye as they left. More important is that Bill conceived of displaying respect through little, pleasant social interactions; he expressed no ideas about the importance of his practices as a teacher who could engage students in learning, which might be a way to show students respect, given the fact he worked in an institution ostensibly set up to educate teenagers. In fact, Bill's view of pleasant social interactions may have gotten him into some trouble with his students: "And then but, there are days where, I don't know, maybe just because you get a little too comfortable with some of the kids, they, yeah, they don't respect you maybe quite as much as they should." So when Bill said that race probably wasn't playing a big role in respect issues, in many of his habits of thinking it didn't, partly because he was stuck in the common bind for intern teachers about being friendly with students without being a friend of students.

Although Bill acknowledged race did matter with regard to respect, especially between teachers and students, he largely thought of respect as a characteristic of individual relationships. At one point he said that he felt "most kids show a pretty good amount of respect" toward him, adding, "there's a couple that you know in each classroom, or that big, that one big kid you're just like, oh, man, you know horrible attitude, just always giving me lip, you know there's those kids but I think you get those anywhere, I mean unless you're in the perfect school or something." Recalling his past, Bill shared that he remembered students with bad attitudes at Bergen who created problems for teachers, especially in regular tracked classes, so he expected to encounter such students. The perfect school was closer to Bergen than Stratford High, as Bill described how students then would be sent to the office and dealt with by Bergen's principal, behaviors Bill disciplined or ignored at Stratford.

Finally, this activity of getting students to comply, of getting them to be respectful in the ways Bill expected, was not just a phenomenon of seventh hour, but extended into the advanced math class (FST) that he taught:

> And that's the class where like, I'm, where I would expect to be like 'guys,' to tell them, if they were loud, I would expect like, 'Hey guys, could you just quiet down, we need to get going,' you know, I would expect that to really work in that class but, even in that class some days, it's almost like they don't necessarily take me seriously because I still have a decent tone in my voice like, I expect them to just come along when I ask them to, and every now and then I will have to kind of yell at the class, and then they'll be like, 'Oh, he's kind of mad, maybe, I guess he was serious, even though he said he was serious we didn't believe him.'

Bill expected his students to come along with him without contesting his authority, to do as he requested, in a polite tone that suggested rather than demanded. His students had different plans for their time and different systems and strategies for giving and protecting respect.

Students

Altho

classroom

present ea

breakdow

males. Eig

seats the e

lecturing c

expected.

existence c

participate

friends w

other hal

St

In

would

distu

stude

the b

rules

the room

that away

Keisp

Students Managing Class

Although the class was relatively small, the students presented Bill with a major classroom management task. In the seventh hour class, there were 18 to 21 students present each time I visited. There were 22 students on the roll sheet (see demographic breakdown in Table 3.4), so students seemed to come regularly, except for two white males. Eight of the students were never behavior problems, generally staying in their seats the entire period, with some interacting with other students only when Bill was not lecturing or leading a recitation. This group tended to use their class time in the ways Bill expected. In fact, several of them were nearly invisible to the point that I only noted their existence on the attendance I took every visit, while Julia and Chang regularly participated in class by answering questions. Two other students, including Eric who was friends with Mike and Jabari, presented behavior issues to Bill only occasionally. The other half of the class posed serious challenges for Bill.

Students' individual activities.

In addition to the option of participating in Bill's teaching practices, some students would engage in three activities to satisfy their individual needs in a way that did not disturb the class: listen to music, use cell phones, or sleep. During every visit I saw students listen to CD players or iPods, often using just one headphone in the ear facing the back of the room, reducing the chance that Bill would catch them. While visiting, the rules had changed. On the day of the ice demonstration, Bill was walking to the front of the room when he noticed Keisha about to slip on her headphones. He said, "Ladies, put that away."

Keisha replied, "Damn."

Bil

Seat of

all pho

Ke

ciaver a

Kidney

Th

Hear m

asked

notice

S

look s

allain

m. da

class

engag

accom

usual

signi

sleep

sleep

Move

Bill continued, "Don't take it out again. That's the rule." Right then, I noticed a new sheet of paper hanging on the wall across from me announcing Stratford's policy against cell phones, CD players, and du-rags.

Keisha asked, "Since when did we follow the rules?" She started to put the CD player away as she continued to complain, adding, "Didn't used to be a problem." Kadeeja told her, "That man's here, so we have to follow the rules," referring to me.

This situation indicated the extent to which students expected to be able to listen to their music. In fact, on other occasions, both before and after this event, Bill sometimes asked students to put away their music and other times to turn it down, unless he didn't notice or ignored it. Usually two to four students listened to music during a class.

Students did not display their cell phones as blatantly as their musical devices and took steps to conceal them from Bill's view, and always under cover of their classmates' talking. Bill made a comment about turning off phones both times a student's phone rang in class. He also told me a story about confiscating a phone from a student in a different class. It seemed to me Bill was strict about phones and students adjusted accordingly. To engage in the desired behavior of talking with someone outside the classroom, students accommodated Bill's rule on phone use, always during lecture and recitations, and usually took advantage of unstructured or individual work times, when students enjoyed significant autonomy, to make their calls. Finally, anywhere from one to four students slept during parts of class if they wanted to, and I never saw Bill do anything to wake up sleeping students.

Bill's operating principle seemed to be that if a student's behavior did not make it more difficult to manage the class, then there was probably no need to change that

student's behavior. While Bill said that so many of his students were unlike him, he identified Kadeeja as an exemplar and one of his biggest behavior challenges, and discussed his considerations in calling out her behavior:

> I do like the girl and I do try to joke with her more because, you know at the drop of a hat she can pull, I told you, the attitude can be, you know, boom. She will turn, she'll be angry and bring tons of attitude, like you will not win with her, there's just, you know, she's got that in her mind, she's stubborn. So, like, you know, if she has 'em [headphones] on and like, I mean, do I jump on her and worry about, I mean if she's just in the right mood that day, then everything gets far worse real quick, you know?

Here, Bill described why he thought it might be best to allow Kadeeja to use headphones in class in order to maintain relative peace. He spoke of Kadeeja in this and other interviews with explosive metaphors, once stating, "Kadeeja is a firecracker, I'll tell you. And you never know what fuse you got on it on any given day. Is it short, is it a mile long?" Bill felt that he had to treat Kadeeja delicately, for one wrong move could set her off, destroying the classroom environment he would prefer to experience, an environment he tenuously held together by gently prodding students and by letting some behavior go without his overt attention in order to avoid confrontation. In one interview he reported how he was about to confront Kadeeja for talking during lecture, but after pausing for a few seconds, realized she was talking about the content, and he was quite happy he waited, for she might have exploded on him for being disrespected when doing her work.

In some ways, Bill viewed behavior problems as tied to academic performance, a combination of a negative attitude toward class and lack of effort. He said of Kadeeja:

> Her effort is pretty bad most of the time, even though she isn't really, I don't see her as being that dumb. Is she crazy smart? No. But definitely could do at least 'C' work, at least with some effort you know. So I think with the just, the not caring, you know, the appearing of not caring about, you know, 'Ok, whatever, I guess we're gonna do this thing today, whatever.' You know it doesn't faze her some days. I'm not saying it's just her, it's just one of those characteristics where I'm gonna be like, I would not be down with that in any way. And they are just

> kind of like, she's one of the people that's ok with it, you know. And maybe she is kind of just like 'augh,' like, 'Holy crap,' you know for me I'd be like—yeah—I'd just be beside myself. Like, 'How did that happen?'

As Bill described Kadeeja, who he regarded as possessing average intelligence, he implied his description applied to others in the class as well, before moving on to describe how her work habits were vastly different from his own. In contrasting Kadeeja with himself, Bill highlighted several aspects of student behavior that bothered him: not caring about the class, not putting in the effort needed to do the work, the potential to explode and ruin the class, and what he described as unwarranted attitude toward teachers, meaning himself. Although teachers commonly say its important to "pick your battles," Bill had a lot of choices of battles to undertake, and seemed to prefer the path of least resistance— non-confrontation—if it meant it would be easier for him to get through seventh hour.

Student boredom, comments, and challenges.

In my estimate, students were frequently bored during lecture and group recitation activities. They expressed that condition in various ways and Bill indicated he thought boredom was widespread. Within minutes of Bill's starting the lecture on my first visit, Shaquira announced she was tired and Destini affirmed that she wasn't the only one, while Jessica quietly commented this was boring. Several students announced each class period, usually at the beginning or during lecture or recitation, that they were tired. I could almost always find at least one head on a desk during such activities. During worksheet or unstructured time by contrast, students did not appear bored as they moved around the room and talked with each other. It seemed that much of the students' behavior I observed could be attributed to the boredom they felt, inspiring them to act as they did in order to create a more amusing environment. However, the ways in which

students did so differed by gender. Whereas males and females made comments about being tired or disinterested in class, males, particularly Jabari, Joseph, and Mike, almost exclusively made personally disparaging comments toward Bill and Mr. Shale, and occasionally engaged in displays of aggression. Females tended to voice their challenges with regard to academic work during lectures and recitations.

Jabari, Mike, and to a lesser extent, Eric, frequently made comments to irk Mr. Shale. For example, during the atomic structure lecture, Mike made fun of Mr. Shale for calling a remote a "clicker" and mimicked Mr. Shale for several minutes as he described the plum pudding model, and Jabari questioned Mr. Shale's statement about the potential confusion of the term nucleus being used for living cells and atoms. Although Mr. Shale was hardly present during seventh hour, he was in the back of the classroom during a recitation involving a heat and temperature study guide, during which students constantly talked among themselves, making it difficult to hear the answers to the worksheet's questions. Mr. Shale was sitting on the back counter talking with one of his TAs when Jabari loudly said to Mr. Shale over the hum of classroom conversations, "Hey, can you guys be a little quiet back there?" Mr. Shale replied, "Sorry," and the two continued talking, though more quietly. Mike and Jabari in particular made comments toward Mr. Shale, messing with him.

When Mr. Shale was not present, other students, particularly Joseph, made negative comments against him. As he walked into class Mike said, "Shale, what up Mr. Shale? Shale-ro. Everyone can be smart today." Mr. Shale did not reply, and left the room shortly after. When Bill closed the door, Joseph announced, "Don't let Mr. Shale in here. That's the boringest mothafucka around." This interaction was rather typical, as Mike

directly messed with Mr. Shale, and Joseph waited until Mr. Shale had left to make comments against him. It also illustrated the different relationships between students and teachers. While Mike frequently messed with Mr. Shale through comments directed toward him, he only rarely made similar comments toward Bill, and usually because Bill called him out on his behavior. Otherwise Mike usually participated in Bill's class, though sometimes he would not pay attention or would opt to talk with Jabari or Eric. Mike was conscientious of his academic standing and maintained a B. Joseph behaved oppositely, never making a comment toward Mr. Shale, but frequently commenting on Mr. Shale, when he was gone, in Bill's presence. For example, during my first visit in which Shaquira said that her dad worked at Fermilab and Destini challenged Bill by asking if he was saying that because her dad was black he couldn't work there, Bill continued through the slide show. On the next page was a picture of Mr. Shale working at Fermilab. Bill pointed him out, leading several students to say, "That's Mr. Shale." Someone said that his hair was brown in the picture and that he had more hair.

Joseph then said, "He retarded, I swear to god." Bill attempted to continue with the lecture, but Joseph kept talking, adding, "And he always sit down."

Bill told Joseph, "He's got health problems."

Joseph answered, "He got AIDS. A – I – D – S."

Bill replied Mr. Shale didn't have AIDS and continued with the lecture, making no more mention of this exchange. Seventh hour was very challenging, and students frequently made comments, easily interrupting Bill's planned progress in his teaching practices. In the case of comments against Mr. Shale, Bill was probably quite conflicted, as he desired to have a better relationship with his mentor, especially for help in

managing the classroom, help that might have limited the very comments made against Mr. Shale, who helped to create this behavioral mess. Bill's only reprimand to students who made comments against Mr. Shale was typically a look.

Both Joseph and Jabari made threatening moves toward Bill during class, though at a distance away from him and in such a way that they could potentially disavow any real intent to cause physical harm. Before beginning the ice demonstration, Bill asked Joseph to watch his mouth because he constantly called Hakim a bitch for flinching. Joseph followed up with a quieter comment to Bill: "What, you want some too?" In another class, Kadeeja announced that she needed lotion and Joseph offered to go get some, but Bill didn't allow him to leave. After about a half-minute Joseph left the room, Bill noticed and quickly followed him out, telling Joseph not to leave. Joseph muttered something as he returned to his desk and Bill told him to sit down. Joseph asked, "You wanna go?" as he moved like a boxer, his fists formed and held up at chest level ready for use, his feet moving as if he were prepared to dance in the ring. Bill said nothing to him and Joseph sat down after about 10 seconds of this display. Joseph said something about Bill I didn't catch and added, "Wit yo dancin' Bo Jangles shoes." Rashaad, one of the quiet students, laughed. Joseph only engaged in such overt displays three times, while Jabari did once, although both frequently challenged Bill, moving around the room, talking, making comments to Bill. Joseph displayed his strength, his toughness compared to tall, thin Bill, in contrast to Bill's authority by virtue of the role, where physical strength was not to be exercised in managing students. Meanwhile, Joseph engaged in just enough of a display to be able to disavow that he meant it, playing with the boundary marking obvious violation of policy. In a classroom with frequent talking, student

movemen

students'

challenge

Con

Six

tempo o

controll

paper. I

Chesire

statem

temper

before

L

questi

B

L

even d

B

already

Li

notes."

Fo

the que

sometim

movement, knocks on the door, occasional wrestling, a mentor who came and went, and students' verbal challenges, such displays were only among the more overt in a list of challenges for Bill.

Controlling classroom operations.

Six students—most frequently four females—spoke out regularly to control the tempo of lectures or recitation activities Bill led. Lishcelle was the most aggressive at controlling the class tempo. On the day Bill required the students to take notes on blank paper, Lishcelle spent a significant portion of the lecture talking with Tameka and Chesiree, but spoke nine times in class. In seven of her speaking turns, Lishcelle made a statement designed to influence the tempo of both the lecture and the recitation on the temperature and heat study guide worksheet. Lishcelle started from the beginning, just before Bill began the lecture, yelling, "Pinkney. Let's go, get a move on."

Later, after Bill explained something about kinetic energy after a student answered a question, Lishcelle interrupted Bill, "Are we almost done Pink?"

Bill answered her, "Not yet."

Lishcelle replied that we should not continue taking notes, adding, "We shouldn't even do that, because those people are taking the test and not getting the notes."

Bill said he already addressed that with the test-taking students in the hall. "We already talked about that. They can get the notes from someone else in the class."

Lishcelle grabbed her notebook and held it up to her, saying, "We ain't sharin' our notes."

For the worksheet recitation that followed the notes, Bill called on a student to read the question, asked for any student to provide the answer, evaluated the response, and sometimes added additional comments. When he began, Lishcelle immediately

volunteered by saying "Number one," and reading the question. Bill stopped calling on students to read the questions after Kenneth didn't read number four because he didn't have a sheet.

At one point while Bill was explaining the different temperature scales, Lishcelle called out, "You want me to read it Pinkney? You readin' too slow." He spoke a couple more sentences before continuing.

A few questions later, as Bill was talking about something tangentially related to the topic, Lishcelle started reading question 38 in a loud voice.

Bill stopped what he was saying and told her, "We got five minutes still."

Kadeeja chimed in, "We're running out of time."

On this day, all six of the students made comments in an attempt to control Bill's tempo, and several of them were successful. When Bill would explain something in greater depth or talk about a tangential topic, Lishcelle interrupted him and was usually able to get him to drop the idea and move on to the next lecture point or the next worksheet question. Sometimes, Bill made a comment before moving on, indicating he didn't agree with her assessment he was moving too slow. Lishcelle was not successful at getting Bill to stop giving the notes for the benefit of her three peers out in the hallway making up a test, but she did get him to move along in the recitation and also successfully dissed him by pointing out that he was not effectively doing his job of getting through the activity.

Students' attempts to control the tempo, which involved sharp comments toward Bill instructing him to continue or do something, affected him emotionally, as he indicated in the interviews, and even displayed in a class period devoted entirely to a recitation on test

corrections, in which students got to write the correct answer to missed test questions and recover partial credit. About half of the students demonstrated their displeasure with their scores on the test by making comments, with several students crumpling their tests and shoving it away somewhere or throwing it on the floor.

The recitation started with marked hostility. Bill instructed the class, "Please listen. I'm not going to say things more than twice."

Jabari asked, "If we got it right, do we write it down?"

Bill answered, "No, only write down the wrong ones."

Tameka said with a loud huff, "Can we get going?"

Destini added, "Yeah, I'm gettin' restless."

Bill said to them, "Ok. Let's get started then." Bill read the first question and the answer ("Temperature is related mostly to the: (d) average molecular kinetic energy in a substance.").

Bill required students to write down the reason for the answer to any missed questions, and Tameka quickly asked, "Why is that right?"

Bill answered, "It's by definition."

Tameka said, "That's stupid," and let out a noise like a low, menacing growl.

Another student asked what the reason was, and Destini said, "By definition," her voice cutting through the class's talking, very certain.

Moments later, Bill asked, "How're we doing on number two?"

Destini answered, "Ready for number three."

Bill moved on to question three, asking, "If we have one liter, then we have two liters, how many more molecules do we have?"

Tameka said in a voice whose volume was matched by her level of irritation, "Apparently we don't know, can you tell us?" Bill answered that's what we are doing. Tameka was visibly frustrated, and said "It's taking us too long to do this."

Bill said, "I know its taking a while. Could you guys not shout at me?" He went on to answer the question.

Nine questions later, Destini said, "You going too fast, 'cause we gotta write the question and the answer."

Bill said "Alright," added he would move slower, and then moved on to question 13.

Destini sharply said, "You better wait."

Bill said to her in a fairly calm voice, "Can you not yell at me? 'Please' is a much better way to ask. I'd be happy with that." He got no answer from Destini, who was writing the answer to number 12 on her paper, and waited about 15 seconds before continuing.

During the test corrections, it seemed to me that frustruation ran high in the room. Although other students made tempo-controlling comments, Tameka and Destini were both visibly irritated, aggressive, and hostile. Their statements and actions indicate likely tensions within them about being in this class. While they did not want to participate in Bill's activities, and frequently talked with their friends, they needed to participate in order to complete the assignment, take the test, correct the test to retrieve some lost points, so they could get through this class, that is, pass it and continue through their schooling at Stratford. The facts of compulsory schooling and teacher education brought them into contact with Bill. But it was the repetitive and rote learning activities—predominantly note-taking and worksheets—that brought Bill and his students to this

particu

He pre

pushe

were a

questi

tasks t

In

St

was by

they w

Conse

Erie, a

the b

cent

qu

th

s

t

s

m

spec

moved a

much of th

particular situation, in which he demonstrated his habitus regarding the matter of respect. He practically pleaded with students to treat him with more respect. Students skillfully pushed Bill to the limit, controlling his tempo through hostile comments, comments that were also within the range of expected practices (doing the recitation, answering questions, allowing enough time, etc.), while getting what they needed to complete the tasks they chose to do.

Interactions among students.

Students also interacted with each other. By far, the most common way they did so was by talking with each other at their desks. Students were permitted to sit wherever they wanted to, although Bill moved Jabari to a different seat on two different days. Consequently, three dominant friend groups formed in distinct areas of the room: Mike, Eric, and Jabari occupied the front corner; Kadeeja, Jessica, Keisha, and John stayed in the back corner; and Tameka, Lishcelle, and Chesiree stayed on the opposite side of the center. The result was constant talking in the room, which was rarely silent or even fairly quiet. For example, about 30 minutes into the class in which Bill was attempting to get the resonance box sound demonstration to work, he asked the class to be quiet so he could hear, and I wrote that the class became silent for the first time all period. Student talking was a normal part of the classroom environment, as exhibited by the contrasting silence called for and granted in relation to a teaching and learning activity with potential meaning.

However, students also interacted with others outside their immediate circles, especially when Bill was not lecturing or leading a recitation. Then, students frequently moved around the room, talking, laughing, yelling, joking, and wrestling. Bill considered much of the interaction between students to be defensive and attacking:

> But the one thing I always, I find very interesting is how defensive the students are, I mean whether, just to, verbal, I don't want to say verbal attacks, but if one kid, if somebody says something about someone else, I mean, they'll snap back at 'em, I mean boom, you know, it's like, and then the other person snaps back because they said another comment, and then like, what was a small conversation just is, people are yelling, granted that's how—a lot of kids don't just talk, it's like yelling, they just, it's like, 'Hey, you're inside,' they don't understand that it's kind of loud to be inside in a room. But, again, like yeah, they just, 'cause you'll have a discussion, a lecture going on, everything's alright, people are kind of paying attention, kind of quiet, and then somebody might say something about the person next to them, even though they're a friend, I mean and it's not horrible but like, you know, they'll snap right back, they won't just be like 'ha ha' and laugh it off, they gotta throw something back and it's just like, it's like that, you walk through the hallways and it's like that, you know, it's kind of crazy how everybody has to defend and I've always found that kind of interesting. It's very defensive.

In this quote, Bill identified some of the mechanisms students used to garner and maintain respect. Hemmings (2003) writes that students in urban high schools tend to protect their reputations, entitling one to a certain amount of respect. If another displays an attitude that does not show respect, that is one feels they've been dissed or is told by peers that someone dissed them, then they often feel obligated to make up for the wrong. Although Bill had some sense of what went on, he seemed to be at a loss for why it occurred. I'm also not sure how much of what Bill saw in the halls for example, might not just be playin' around.

In an interview we discussed an interaction in which Jessica smacked Joseph hard on his arm as he walked out of the class and Joseph returned the favor by kicking her in the butt. Jessica, who was out of her seat on the way to the front of the classroom, asked Bill, "Did you see him kick me?" Bill answered, "I saw you smack him too." She laughed, as Bill continued, "You don't help your cause" by hitting others. Jessica said she needs to because "I gotta release my anger." Bill asked, "Is that the best way?" Jessica replied,

"He'll leave me alone for a little while." I asked Bill what he thought of Jessica's comment and he said:

> 'I gotta release my anger,' yeah it's like well what do their parents and siblings do at home when they—or the people they hang out with, I mean when they have anger do they lash out all the time? Is that how it works? I mean, do you not go take a run or play a sport or—go play something, you know, do something else that maybe you can release that in a little better way? Or do you just hit people? Is that how everybody does it around you? I mean, I don't want to say 'yeah,' but I bet — it's probably learned from somewhere or at least not—uh—like dealt with apparently. Somebody's not saying, 'Hey you really shouldn't do it that way, think about doing it somewhere else,' you know so—I don't know. But it is interesting, and a lot of people do the little—there's a lot of hitting that goes on, you know not like— normally nothing crazy extreme you know but—something that could easily grow to an extreme situation if somebody's in a truly bad mood that day.

Bill constructed Jessica's behavior as something undesirable that she brought to school from the home or her peer interactions. He did not see it was a mechanism by which Jessica could protect herself against Joseph's attempts to diss just about anyone in the class, a phenomenon Bill was aware of. He thought of how students should respond to challenges from others in terms of how he would have responded as a student, as someone who should shirk off the attack, release anger in sports, stay focused on school, get the diploma, and continue the path into the middle class.

The complexity of student interactions involving respect was captured in this interaction, when Joseph said something to Shaquira, who he had been messing with since they arrived in class, but was interrupted because Kadeeja sharply asked him, "Why do you always mess with her?"

Joseph answered, "Because she need a weave." A few of the students around me laughed, including Kadeeja, though no one really laughed too loudly. After a few seconds, John said, "That's messed up," as he continued laughing.

Jessica, sitting at the edge of her seat, energetically said to Shaquira, encouraged her to stand up to Joseph, "Whoop that trick. Whoop that trick. Whoop that trick. Whoop that trick." She almost sounded as if she was singing along with the song by that name popularized in the 2005 movie *Hustle & Flow*.

John told Jessica, "Shut up."

Jessica quickly countered, "Shut up before I whoop you," her finger pointing at John.

Joseph had been watching and exclaimed to John, "She bullied you." The interaction ended.

In this exchange, Kadeeja decided to say something to Joseph, who along with Jabari, often teased Shaquira, sometimes referring to her as "Alabama," indicating country status. Joseph was able to get Kadeeja off his back and continue to make fun of Shaquira by joking about her hair, which was short, no longer than two inches. Those involved in this interaction laughed at his joke. Kadeeja attempted to garner some respect for Shaquira, or perhaps more likely, for females, at Joseph's expense, but he was able to dodge that attempt through his joke. Jessica was one of Joseph's frequent opponents, and I observed them wrestle in class five times. So it was no surprise that Jessica continued Kadeeja's effort, by encouraging Shaquira to defend herself by going on the attack, to "whoop that trick." Often willing to comment on interactions, Joseph let John know he had been bullied by Jessica, scoring yet another diss as evidenced by John's silence.

The important dynamic here is that Joseph constantly messed with several students and Bill, and Shaquira was one of his regular targets. In this interaction Joseph seemed to maintain his reputation as a strong male who could bully others and not be bullied,

al

in

qu

se

st

ou

ca

all

mi

hig

fre

did

ene

call

phy

in c

mo

clas

beha

the c

the c

although there are multiple interpretations of his behavior. Bill regarded Joseph as very intelligent, and some days Joseph would participate and answer several of Bill's questions correctly, yet he rarely took notes or submitted work. To me, Joseph also seemed quite skilled at pushing the limits of acceptable behavior, frequently dissin' other students, going to the bathroom almost every period, and occasionally openly weighing out likely disciplinary responses from Bill.

Bill was aware that a few students made fun of Shaquira and especially that some called her "Alabama," a name she protested several times. Bill's teaching practices allowed for such behavior to occur. This particular interaction occurred for a little over a minute, ten minutes after the bell rang, as Bill attempted to begin the day's lecture, highlighting Bill's practice of not being prepared to start class immediately. Students frequently enjoyed the first ten minutes of class for their own pleasures, since Bill usually did not have work for them to do right away. Bill's behavior management practices encouraged such behavior to occur, for he was only likely to stop students from name calling or messing with each other when voices got very loud or students got too physical. He seemed unwilling to confront most behavior, and so students could engage in disrespectful behavior to enhance their own reputations and make their time in class more interesting.

One last point about Bill's quote is his answer involved a host of typical middle class assumptions about proper behaviors, how to deal with anger, and that these behaviors are common in the students' homes. Bill constructed the behavior occurring in the class as an external entity, from the home, that students bring with them and infiltrate the class with. Rather, I'd like to suggest Bill's teaching and management practices

contributed

class. Bill v

and studen

interesting

experienc

or aggres

which th

struggle

mentor.

have di

respons

during

desire

Frust

B

on his

teachi

quickl

provid

Bi

which

questio

Bill tol

contributed considerably to the multiple interactions like these that occurred daily in class. Bill was not ready to start class when the bell rang. The lecture notes were boring and students took steps to entertain themselves. The demonstrations were sometimes interesting, but usually required only observation with little thought, and other times Bill experienced difficulties executing them. Bill really only disciplined students for very loud or aggressive behavior, like talking back and wrestling. The result was a classroom in which the students exerted significant dominance over the classroom environment, Bill struggled to keep control, and students probably didn't learn much. Of course Bill's mentor, who set up PowerPoint lectures as the dominant practice and who seemed to have difficulty maintaining control over the same students, bore some of the responsibility for this chaotic situation. And so ten of the students were quite comfortable during seventh hour to express themselves in nearly any way and at any time they desired.

Frustrations with Procedural Display

Bill wanted the students to come into class, sit down, be quiet, take notes, perform on his tests, and respect him. However, students frequently thwarted his attempts at teaching, and sometimes Bill appealed to his students to just do the work he had planned quickly so they could have some free time. A lecture on the wave-speed equation provides an interesting look at the conflict between Bill's and the student's desires.

Bill began the lesson by leading a recitation on the wave-speed equation ($v=f\lambda$), in which Joseph answered several questions. However, students could not answer his question about what concept *lambda* represented and after about ten seconds of silence, Bill told the class very seriously, "I do need you guys to listen carefully because I will

say this one time." Pause. "How many times?" Students gave a variety of answers, including one, two, three, ten, and other numbers. Bill said, "One time."

Destini asked, "Why can't you write on the board?"

Bill did not answer her directly, but said to the class, "Because I want you all to look at me, so I can be the center of attention," bringing his hands together and clasping them as he spoke. Bill continued with the notes, saying, "Note that the product of *f* and *lambda* are the same for all waves in the same medium."

During Bill's lecture practice he engaged in telling students information they seemed to regard as irrelevant; indeed I knew the content as a former physics major and teacher, but could see that it sounded like empty terminology, especially since information kept coming in broken form, due to student interruptions. This time though, Bill punctuated the normal lecture practice by making clear his desire to only make a content statement one time, and students granted him about five minutes of relatively uninterrupted lecture.

Bill often was frustrated by these interactions. After the test correction session, I asked him how he felt about the constant student challenges:

> Well there is a range of emotions..... sometimes, just like, I mean physics is kind of similar to math where a lot of them build on, you know the topics just build on one another so sometimes you want to be like, 'Hey you goofball the next four chapters are to be based on this, you need to totally understand it or else you will get nothing after this.' You can tell them that with slightly different wording, and they're still like, 'whatever,' they just want the answers. So, I mean yes that just makes you mad.

Bill's emotions immediately took him to the content, the importance of paying attention in physics because later units would presuppose the current one as background information. However, Bill could not convince most of his students of the value of learning the content, and the result was pure procedural display: those students who chose to participate filled in the blanks and did whatever else needed to get the grade they

wanted

if there

That w

hour v

succe

as hi

De

co

hur

info

Bill a

dictati

but no

wanted and Bill found this unsatisfying. What occurred in seventh hour begs the question if there might be something even less productive and worthwhile than procedural display. That would seem to be total student noncompliance or teacher refusal to teach. Seventh hour wasn't quite there, but Bill certainly didn't experience much procedural display success with them.

As he continued to talk, he acknowledged that since student interest was not as high as his, then he had to resort to procedural display:

> I mean I can understand why they might not be totally interested in it, but, like, you know, 'Why do we have to know this (inaudible)?' I guess, I just, I don't know, it makes me mad because I, I've told him before, not frequently, but (inaudible) 'If it's important I'm going to tell you about it,' if not then I'll be like 'just kind of know this' or, I've done it before where, 'This is kind of a crazy topic and we only really need to know this from it for right now, so just kind of understand this part.'

Deep knowledge was not the goal, rather it seemed to be getting students through the content, with enough knowledge so they could do this little part.

I asked Bill what he thought of the fact that Tameka and Destini were vocal about hurrying up through lectures and recitations, but also frequently asked for repeated information. Bill said this led him to:

> ...Have the 'are you serious?' conversation in my head again. Are you serious, you just wanted me to go blazing through this and then you're like, 'Oh, can you tell me this for the eighth time?' like, ... 'Are you hearing yourself?' 'You're making yourselves madder. What, you're mad at me for it? Like, what are you?' Yeah, so I mean. I don't know, it's tough, and I would just, because again and there's still like, when, it's like, I don't want my explanation I want just something kind of in your own words. ... That's frustrating I guess, it's like I've given you the answer essentially but you can't really use it, you can only take like exactly what I've given you word for word.

Bill and the students seemed to be locked in a virtually unwinnable battle for respect, for dictating the terms under which the class would run. He wanted them to do what he said, but not exactly as he said, preferring that they be able to take what he said and put it in

their own words, or better yet, construct meaning from his statements. Students were interested in the path of least resistance, getting the information down so they could get points, on their own terms as much as possible. Many did their work, but at the same time kept Bill from doing his work the way he wanted. And although Bill could describe how Mr. Shale's PowerPoint notes were bad pedagogy, he was not able to connect his own teaching practices to the conflicts he experienced with students.

Near the end of the interviews, I asked Bill how he would deal with the issue of respect differently in his own classroom. He returned to the syllabus, stressing how important it is to have the expectations articulated, both in writing and orally. He envisioned the syllabus would state things that are unacceptable for students to say and the behaviors they are expected to engage in. He also imagined that students' parents would sign something saying they understand how their child is to act in the classroom. Bill said he would undertake these steps:

> Simply so that everybody's comfortable, and can learn, even if they, if they want to, and that's the way it's gonna be. That's the way I would like my classroom, and I feel I'm gonna have a pretty decent shot at doing that.... So that's why I'm kind of looking forward to starting anew, with my own room, my own rules, and, 'cause yeah, Shale just doesn't have those, you know? He allows a lot of disrespect to just go on from the beginning.

In Bill's view, it all came back to Mr. Shale, who allowed the disrespectful situation to occur from the beginning. While the syllabus idea had not panned out so well for seventh hour's second semester, Bill imagined it might be successful, especially because Mr. Shale would not be involved in setting up the classroom environment, and Bill could then implement his version of respect, creating a comfortable learning environment, presumably one in which students would conform to Bill's expectations for student behavior.

Final Thoughts

The premise of this study is that the interns exhibit habits consistent with the resistance argument, but that things are more complicated than that. In Bill's case, his mentor's lecture practices provided a serious constraint upon Bill that he found difficult to escape from, perhaps because Mr. Shale's notes made it easier to prepare for class and for Bill to cover the content Mr. Shale expected. Further, Bill's agreement with Mr. Shale about the importance of delivering content trapped Bill within a system of PowerPoint lectures and note-taking sheets that he didn't like. This left Bill in a complicated position, making it difficult to improve in the ways he desired. He did attempt to integrate demonstration, but mostly in order to reduce the boringness of lecture. This seemed to indicate the right impulse: varying teaching practices may help to make class more interesting and better teach students. However, Bill undertook a new and complicated teaching practice that he was not quite prepared to use effectively. The result was that the demonstrations were at a low level, when he succeeded in being able to do them.

It is quite clear that with regard to respect, Bill possessed a very strong middle class concept, one influenced by his parents who were teachers. Bill was in the contradictory position of disavowing the role of race in the grab for respect (class never explicitly entered the discussion), while identifying fighting for respect as a cultural practice, spurred by a question focused upon race. So Bill could not perceive that he was contributing to the difficulty he experienced managing this class, in three ways: engaging in uninteresting lecture practices, executing demonstrations ineffectively, and enacting a unidirectional view of respect that desired respect from students, but did not offer respect

back in the form of educational experiences that required thinking and were structured so that students could participate in what Bill wanted them to learn.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

In this study, I have labored to answer the question: How did three interns use the habits they formed as honors students in mainly white, monolingual, middle class, rural or suburban schools and communities with their characteristics, to forge conceptions and practices for teaching students in urban high schools and communities with characteristics that differ appreciably? I raised the question to develop some understanding of the interns' situations, to consider the validity and applicability of the resistance argument, and to learn about how the interns interpreted their interactions while enacting their roles. In particular, I have examined how the habits interns' developed as school students played out in Grand Pillar where they were teaching students different from themselves. In addition to race, class, and urbanity, it also mattered that the interns had been good students. As they faced their situations in Grand Pillar, they were able to draw on a range of familiar interpretations from their continuities to explain their students' actions, and seemed to have little need to consider race and class, as well as students' thoughts on school. Their habits of being students, which informed their images of teaching, provided the dominant perceptions with which they evaluated interactions with their students.

The classes and instruction that Amy, Amanda, and Bill delivered to their students, who often seemed bored and uninterested, was, in my estimation, mostly mundane, and

uninspiring—standard procedural displays. The interns themselves often said or implied that their classes were boring or relatively useless. They could point to student behaviors supporting that interpretation, and they even heard their students call the instruction boring or pointless. Nevertheless, they continued to teach in those unsatisfactory ways. All three interns were aware of problems in their teaching, but their past experiences in schools had laid a strong foundation from which they constructed their teaching problems, interpreted their experiences, evaluated their students, drew their practices, and pondered solutions.

In this chapter I will highlight the prominent features of the interns' situations, suggest interactions that could have affected the interns' conceptions of teaching and learning, and consider the conditions in which the interns might have changed their teaching habits. Throughout the chapter, and particularly in the last part, I will discuss this study's key implications for teaching and research in teacher preparation. To begin, I offer a brief general summary of the interns' stances and actions toward their students (see Table 7.1).

Working with Typical Teacher Interns in Urban Settings

When establishing and maintaining productive relationships with students is held as the central problem of teaching, then the human relations component of the job can be seen more clearly, as can other dimensions' influences upon the relationships. In the triangle of classroom work—teacher, students, and content—the content serves as a critical medium through which the relationship occurs. To grasp these interns' engagement with content, which usually comprises much of the teacher-student relationship, we have to more fully appreciate the interns' situations in Grand Pillar.

Table 7.1: Aspects of Interns' Situations			
	Amanda	Bill	Amy
Content knowledge	Teaching outside of her subject preparation. Kept a day or two ahead of students, researching what she had to teach.	Competent. Had to review prior to teaching.	Competent. Had to research certain topics, especially those not covered in college.
Translation of content knowledge	Research became lecture notes and worksheets.	Mentor's PowerPoint note system largely dictated practice.	Lecture with reinforcing activities.
Teaching practices	Mainly individual work time and lecture, some journal writing and film viewing.	Mostly lecture and individual work, some recitation, and attempts at demonstration.	Mostly individual work time and lecture, with some group and lab work.
Ideas about student learning capabilities	Her own process of learning the basics was how she constructed students' needs.	Thought students needed to be given both information and techniques to record it.	Dumbed down the curriculum in order to convey the basics. Imagined students not ready for big ideas. Questioned their maturity.
Ideas of productive student-teacher relationship	Wanted good relationship so students wouldn't think class was horrible.	Desired to teach class like a college professor, using lecture without guided notes.	Didn't like Integrated Science kids. Wanted good student behavior, like self.
Tests of continuity, possible experience	Acknowledged that race mattered in teacher-student interactions, but didn't examine personal role in interaction.	Attempted new lecture practice, though hybridized with mentor's; students reacted negatively. Tried to integrate demos, but struggled with execution.	Did inquiry-oriented unit on viruses. Felt like a real teacher and felt that students were learning. Continued to exhibit normal practices in subsequent visits.
Emotional responses	Uneasiness with mentor. Felt students played the race card. Felt trapped in her teaching practices. Agreed with students that class was boring.	Liked most students, but felt frustrated by their behavior. Dissatisfied with lecture practices and with lack of attention from mentor.	Experienced near breakdown when emotionally and physically exhausted. Strongly desired to leave Pinnacle. Found pleasure in coaching volleyball.

Crossing into Grand Pillar

The interns entered into Grand Pillar with preconceived notions of the city and its inhabitants, which affected their beliefs about their job and contributed to their choice of practices. The interns would likely have struggled in suburban Hope, as struggle is normal for those new to the profession; in Grand Pillar, interns experienced additional pressures for which they were wholly unprepared. In their placements, the interns encountered strangers, students different from themselves in several important ways. All three almost exlusively enacted a colorblind stance, meaning, while they saw race and understood, to varying degrees, that one's race did matter, they used practices with the intention of downplaying or ignoring race, often describing their practices in a rhetoric of fairness and equality. When they did point to race, they almost always shared their desires to exercise fair and equitable treatment, which in their views would be uninfluenced by race. One might say they were trying to ignore race, in a place where race obviously affected many interactions.

Most significantly, racialized descriptions took place in relation to student behavior and discipline. This was best exemplified by Amy, who reported that she had discipline problems only with black students. Two thirds of Stratford's students were Black; so in any case a majority of any teacher's disciplinary actions would involve them. For the interns, black people were an unfamiliar group, with cultural norms and interactions unlike anything they had experienced before. An appreciable majority of these black students exhibited attitudes toward school that differed greatly from the interns' own, a fact which Amanda began to recognize at Stratford. However, the interns were largely unequipped to hear and understand their students' attitudes, since in their prior experiences they had come to construct blacks as dangerous, lazy, less intelligent,

needing great direction, loud, and aggressive. They would never say this of course, for their colorblind perspective does not permit such explicit speech, but Chapter Three demonstrated that all of these elements were present in all three interns' thinking. It would be foolish to discount the effect of this lifelong racial training on the interns' thoughts and actions in the classroom, yet it is also imperative to see that race is just one of several important factors interns contend with as they try to gain and demonstrate competence.

My observations and discussions with other Grand Pillar employees, as well as intern reports, indicated that although the school system had a large nonwhite student population and mostly white teaching force, it seemed rare for most employees to engage in much meaningful racial dialogue. Colorblind discourses were normal, and the interns were right at home in this situation. In this sense, Grand Pillar's schools were comfortable places because the mostly white staff did not engage much with race, and neither did the interns, though all could plainly see race was present, and some might have imagined that it mattered beyond discipline and classroom control.

Although largely unacknowledged by the interns except as it involved economic standing, social class mattered as well. Interns' talk of parents not caring, students' home lives, their peers, and the students' culture were all important class-based markers of difference. In particular, they imply that these students were not being raised correctly, to be prepared for the world, as the interns knew it. While these descriptors were true for some students the interns encountered, the interns often seemed to make blanket, generalized statements about whole groups of their students. The interns were raised in middle class families and internalized the value of hard work in school for future gain.

Since they held that ideal for their students, the interns could not comprehend why some would see schooling, let alone the interns' own classes, as irrelevant, because one needed them for the next level of schooling.

Another critical factor involved the fact that the interns had been good school students for a long time and were now in an environment where a number of their students did not share their own attitudes toward and work habits within schools. The interns often viewed their students' work habits and abilities through their own perspectives, developed over years of doing school. Though Bill identified Julia as the student most like him, he was baffled by how she did not stay on top of her work and let herself get behind in his class. Amy found it unbelievable that only one student completed an extra credit assignment. Amanda had worked hard for a 98 percent, and was mystified that so many students hardly cared about the grades they received. In Grand Pillar, the interns' habits made it difficult for them to diagnose students' attitudes toward work, and provided them little guidance toward engaging their students in doing schoolwork. Having been through school, mastering its norms and operation, the interns expected to teach school in the same ways they had been taught, but found that their students often were not as amenable to such instruction.

Mentors and Power

The interns were guests in their mentors' classrooms, and this fact—the novices' being under the charge of the mentors—is critical for understanding the interns' relationships with their students. The mentors were the teachers of record, the ones who, regardless of the interns' performances, would be held responsible for the students' learning. The interns were in some ways aware of this fact, as shown in the pressures they felt to cover the material the mentors deemed important. Not only were the mentors the

institutionally-recognized heads of the interns' classes, but the mentors would also pass judgment on the interns' competence and fitness to hold the office of teacher. This power was in full view for all: Mr. B strongly suggested that Amy adjust her expectations and change her plans; Ms. Cutter stepped in to set the record straight on why US slavery was not genocide; Mr. Shale could leave the room as he pleased without consequence.

Britzman (2003) argued that teachers hold several cultural myths, one of which is that "experience makes the teacher." These three interns also held that belief, as evidenced by their reverence when speaking of the mentor's experience, and the subsequent questioning of their own practices in view of the mentors' practices. Part of the mentors' power came from the bare fact they had been working in classrooms for years. A mentor's experience may or may not be an indicator of teaching competence, of thoughtfulness, of ability to maintain productive relationships with students, of their ability to guide the novice, but in teaching, it is generally a respected attribute. The interns wanted to achieve the mentor's positions, to hold that power for themselves. While they often spoke respectfully of the mentor's experience, they also spoke of the desire to not be regarded as novices, but instead to be seen as real teachers, and hence capable of being the ones in charge, without anyone lording over them.

The interns were in a relatively powerless position. Not only did the mentors pass judgment on them, but so did their university supervisors and course instructors, other teachers, the principal, and of course, their students. Thus, the interns, powerless in comparison to other adults in the institution, worked with the students, also a relatively powerless group forced to acquiesce to the institution. While each intern-mentor relationship differed, the paid and certified mentor stood as the symbol of power for the

intern, the embodiment of the program's promise: if you get through this internship and display enough competence, then you too can have your own classroom and become the powerful teacher you desire to be. This strong incentive, being the teacher of record in a future classroom, also helps to partly explain why the interns undertook the practices they did. As the teachers of record and the visible reminders of the interns' future positions, the mentor teachers strongly influenced the interns to narrow the interns' options regarding both the topics to be addressed in class and the ways in which they topics would be taught to students. This limited the range of interns' potential range of interactions with their students, and possibly some of their creativity as well.

While the mentors may have helped by suggesting curriculum and providing materials and teaching ideas, they also put the interns in a place to be the conduit through which the mentor's material was covered with the class, thus shaping the interactions interns could have with students. For example, Amanda felt that the European Union was a boring topic, which she confirmed with her students, but she taught about it because Ms. Cutter required it. Since Amanda knew little about it, her teaching of the EU ended up consisting of lecture, reading a short article, and answering worksheet questions. There was much completion, but little educative value. Bill's situation was more restricted, as Mr. Shale's PowerPoint slide shows provided the dominant way of teaching, and the negative feelings it engendered within the students made pursuing productive relationships with students an extremely difficult chore. Mentors' systems can provide a guide for how to navigate the placement and the internship, but they also tend to limit the ways the interns can interact with the content and their students.

Enacting Content and Performing Roles

Within the limitations imposed by or perceived of their mentors, interns then set about the job of teaching content. This was one of the most important factors in the quality of the interns' relationships with their students, since so many intern-student interactions were centered around content. Secondary teachers often view covering their content as their primary job objective; these three interns were no exception. Miller and Goodnow's (1995) arguments about practices help us to understand the interns' situations: practices are the way one participates in a culture, a culture which one can reproduce or transform, or some combination of the two. The interns were working in schools to become teachers, and the primary marker of their success would be the ability to enact the role of teacher. Because teaching is so heavily focused on content, the interns could most easily display their competence by demonstrating a grasp of the content in front of their students.

When anyone enters into new work, they must learn and adopt some of the practices of those already immersed in the culture. Many teachers lecture. Many teachers hand out worksheets. And many teachers use these two practices more than others. The interns were subjected to such practices many times as students and so using them seemed a natural choice. Arguably, the culture of schools embraces, even extols, transmission-oriented teaching (Britzman, 2003; Cuban, 1993; Freire, 2000, McNeil, 1986), along with controlling the students in the classroom. Many teachers have tried to solve that dual problem by resorting to lectures and worksheets; the interns could be said to be joining that tradition.

Miller and Goodnow write that the practices one uses have social consequences, and this was repeatedly demonstrated in this study. When the interns made the choice to

lecture to their students, they adopted a particular role, as lecturer, and simultaneously assigned their students reciprocal roles: quiet, obedient, compliant note-takers who dutifully recorded the teacher's speech. The roles were clear and everyone in the classes I observed seemed fully aware—if not necessarily approving—of the expected roles. The interns entered into their Grand Pillar classrooms expecting to be able to lecture about the day's topic to students who would at least appear willing to listen. They expected to utilize common cultural practices, to stand in front of the room and competently display that they knew their subject. Their students, however, were not becoming new teachers, and did not necessarily share the interns' concerns. If they were to play the compliant students that the interns wanted, then they needed good reason to do so.

It appeared that interns gave them no such reason. For example, Amy led students through a recitation on how to use a cladogram mainly to answer logic questions, rather than to examine biological relationships, descent, and change through time. Amanda lectured to students about the reasons for the formation of the European Union and then had them read a short article on the same information and answer worksheet questions when she might have asked them to consider the economic and political consequences, in relation to the US. Bill led students in a difficult recitation on labeling the parts of a waveform, which mostly appeared to students as empty facts to remember for the chapter test. He did not engage student with waves as symbolized interactions recurring regularly, a useful tool in describing a number of natural systems and modern technological systems. The interns' minimal offerings, possibly along with the threat of punishment, were all they offered for student compliance. At the same time, there existed many other reasons for students to act in the ways that they did, since the content was largely

irrelevant for them. In this situation, with a limited repertoire of content and more significantly, techniques to render the content, how might the interns have been led to use practices other than these well accepted and useful ones?

Respect

The interns entered into Grand Pillar with preconceived notions of the community and the students they would teach. They were assigned to mentors whose practices and talk shaped the interns' practices, which, within these constraints, turned out to be fairly typical. Thus, two of the institution's least powerful populations—interns and students—had to work together in mentors' classrooms to, at the minimum, get through each class period. The interns attempted to get through their situations in ways that put them into battles with their students for respect, in which it appeared neither side felt respected.

The interns held views of respect that were intimately tied up with school, both as good students and as beginning teachers who had to get their students to do school work. They believed that teachers should automatically be accorded respect by virtue of their positions, because the teacher, especially if able to competently demonstrate content knowledge, had worked hard to obtain the institutionally recognized position of leading students' learning. But the interns were not quite teachers yet, and they endured events they saw as disrespectful, such as being labeled "intern," having to answer to others, and being challenged by their students in ways they said their mentors were not challenged. Since outside of their classrooms were many adults in more powerful positions, interns felt they could most strongly be respected in their classroom, in front of, and preferably only with, their students, for whom they determined how to cover the material. They had played the good, compliant student for their teachers, and they expected the same from their students, in classrooms where they hoped to enact their image of teaching.

It seems to me that most teachers place considerable importance on students' respect for them, so we can view the interns' concern for respect as a cultural matter. However, their students had different perceptions, which were rarely acknowledged or discussed. Bill's experience in one seventh hour class was so important because it was one of the few times that students generated explanations of what they viewed as disrespect. This suggests other reasons the event was important: it led to a lengthy conversation between Bill and me about respect, some diagnosis of the ways respect operated in the classroom, and provided Bill with an impetus to consider the elements of a respectful classroom and how to make the environment more respectful. It was important for me because it demonstrated just how strongly continuous were Bill's ideas about respect.

When Bill decided to have a discussion with his seventh hour class about respect, he did so primarily to address the students' behavior toward himself, the class, and their peers. He did not give any indication that he wanted to have students consider how his and his mentor's practices contributed to a climate of disrespect. After the discussion, Bill noted that his students were concerned with respect along two dimensions: acting respectful toward their elders or those in authority, including Bill, and in interaction with peers. All three interns focused almost exclusively on these two dimensions when considering respect. Students' attempts to demand respect from each other tended to become some of the interns' discipline problems, and contributed to the interns' perceptions of their students, particularly of being loud, aggressive, and defensive. They often asked why the students couldn't talk things out in normal voices, walk away from situations, or get out their aggression by playing sports or some other individual activity. It would certainly have been difficult for the interns to control the ways that students

interacted, especially where respect is concerned, and since it seems none of those interactions were related to the curriculum.

I formed the impression that few practices in the interns' classrooms demonstrated respect for the students, most importantly, as learners. The interns believed that their students lacked basic knowledge and skills and needed to be drilled in these so that students might eventually build up more advanced knowledge and skills on this foundation. And the interns did keep things basic: they gave lectures with straightforward facts, handed out worksheets with easy questions, and gave explicit directions on how to do almost everything, including tasks that required little more than paying some attention and reproducing facts. Very seldom did interns call for real intellectual engagement from the students; indeed, the interns seemed unprepared for anything resembling intellectual work from them. These deficit perspectives constructed students as marginally competent, and not as capable learners. In short, the interns disrespected the students' abilities to think.

This is not to assert that all the students were capable of deep, intellectual engagement. In my impression, many students often performed in simplistic ways that might be accounted for by years of exposure to deficit assumptions, low expectations, and dumbed down curriculum, which is what researchers tend to find in schools like Grand Pillar's (see for example, Anyon 1981; Anyon, 1997; Delpit, 1995; Kozol, 1991). The interns reported that some of their students were smart but not good at school, or were able to think critically in the streets but not in the classroom, or were curious in general, but not about the curriculum. To reverse the subtle and sometimes explicit training of students' intellectual inferiority would require a dedicated teacher with

nondeficit views to retrain the students to participate in school differently. The interns, by virtue of their own education and success in school, lack of teaching experience to figure out how to enact such changes, and their deficit views of their learners, were not capable of doing this. Indeed, until they could admit that they held such views and that the students' poor performance was partly a response to the interns' own practices, they would not be able to begin working toward such an intention in their practice.

While most of Bill's students wrote about student disrespect toward teachers and each other, four of them focused on the teaching practices as a primary vehicle for disrespectful classroom acts. When all you do is come to class, take notes, and fill out worksheets, why would you want to engage in class? More importantly, why wouldn't you view this as disrespect? In a course assignment, the interns found that almost all of their students wanted to graduate high school and the majority aspired to attend college, but to fulfill these desires students had to endure a lot of mind-numbing instruction, learning about things the teacher spouted off at a low level that didn't seem to make much sense to them. That the students—even Bill's hostile seventh hour students—were relatively compliant with teacher requests, suggests that these practices, disrespectful as they were, were the normal operating procedure in the Grand Pillar Schools, and accepted as such. Students had to endure the institutional disrespect, embodied in the interns' teaching practices, in order to obtain their credential. This is often the case in compulsory education. Amy, Bill, and Amanda utilized and affirmed long standing practices that disrespected their students, but really did nothing out of the ordinary. While the battles for respect involved dimensions such as youth culture, race, class, expectations of Grand Pillar schools, and teaching methods, the interns' habitual explanations for their

experiences did not involve any of those dimensions. Rather, the interns seemed to draw upon their own experiences as students to explain how their students should have acted and approached school, and to be stuck in a battle for respect, in which neither the interns nor their student found any. Again, we can ask whether or how things could have been otherwise.

Fleeting Experiences with Alternative Practices

Most of the interns' teaching practices were uninspiring and dull, and appeared to be the product of years of having been a student and of having witnessed the actions and speech of other teachers. What the interns did in their classrooms constituted the given, the typical and reproduced practices of teaching. The interns often expressed dissatisfaction with the given, mainly because they were not satisfied with the types of engagement they saw from their students, and so desired something more. What more they desired constituted the possible, practices outside of their current understandings and experience. But we must be careful in saying what they desired, for they really had two classes of desires. On the one hand, the interns desired compliant students who would allow them to perform the role of competent teacher by completing their lesson plans, and eventually measure achievement on class tests. This dimension is not really the possible, for it is a desire to have school take place as the interns themselves experienced it. It is a desire for a specific given, the given of the interns' own schooling biography. On the other hand, the interns desired students who could think and engage with intellectual ideas, who relished the big ideas, and who wanted to learn. It is this realm of intern desires that will begin to illuminate the possible.

In their teaching, all three interns tended to create the reciprocal of their experiences as a student. That is, as students they were generally compliant—Amanda goes so far as

to say she was well-trained—and good students, earning top grades. The interns took these habits they had learned as students into their new teacher roles, and attempted to create a classroom that strongly resembled those they described having been in, that is, classrooms with strong procedural display. In short, the interns created classrooms where, if they had been students in their own classrooms, would have been quite successful. The interns confirmed this when they described the students who reminded them most of themselves as students—those students were always white and good students. Bill had the most difficulty identifying a student that reminded him of himself, but he could see some similar characteristics in Julia: a respectful, good kid who was pretty much on top of her work, though she slipped as the semester progressed. Each of them identified both personality and academic habits that were similar to their own. And these students were generally successful in the interns' classes and when they came up in interviews, elicited positive affect from the interns; they presented proof that the interns could successfully engage some students in learning on the interns' terms.

In order to move beyond the given, people must have experiences that hint at other ways they can conduct themselves as teachers. All three interns engaged in experiences that potentially provided an alternative view of their situations, and left them with mixed feelings. For example, Bill tried new lecture practices and demonstrations, was not very successful, and felt that he was not performing up to par, but was relieved to be moving away from Mr. Shale's system. Amy took on the virus unit, which led her to finally feel like a real teacher, but was uncomfortable with and unsure how to handle students' discussion of some of the topics. And Amanda began to consider that race impacted her interactions with her students, but was unwilling or unable to fully acknowledge how her

role as a white teacher of mostly black students substantiated the societal order. Yet without these experiences, the interns would not be exposed to different practices, to different thought processes, and to the potential opportunity to change what they did. And although the interns vaguely described how their teacher preparation program had provided some instruction in these issues, it seemed that almost none of it mattered in their teaching; experiences that occurred in the placements mattered, but ways of approaching them and considering them were lacking, a lesson missed from the program. Even in the face of facts that seem so plain and obvious, how easy is it for one's continuity to provide explanation for interactions, and thus to miss the potential in situations?

Experience and Reflection

For an experience to be meaningful, one must give some thought to it, probe it, figure out its relevance, determine what it says about what one is doing and how to live. In short, one must reflect. This is the process through which the meaning of an experience is created and extracted, since the value of an experience is not self-evident, but emerges within the reflector's perspective. All three interns showed some degree of reflection, generally triggered by unsatisfactory interactions with students. For example, over five months Bill grew increasingly dissatisfied with his mentor's note-taking procedure and realized how it contributed to hostility from his seventh hour. As a result he started to plan, and then experiment with, different lecture and note-taking practices. Most of the instances of intern reflection I recorded, however, generally involved more tinkering with existing practices, as in changing the lecture style, rather than deep inquiry into practice and subsequent changes.

Dewey wrote that some experiences are miseducative, in that they tend to block further growth (Dewey, 1997). The interns taught basic, low level, content in stereotyped ways that could be regarded not only as miseducative but also as disrespecting many of their students. Partly as a consequence of this teaching, the students did not produce high quality work, and so appeared to the interns to have low ability. This interaction confirmed for the interns what they already believed: their low-level students couldn't learn anything advanced, because they could hardly master the basics. What the interns concluded through this experience might block their further growth as teachers.

The interns did reflect on this situation—at least, in my interviews with them. They reported that they talked with others about the situation and saw no way out of it. Reflection can lead to dead ends, particularly if one's past experiences and existing ideas readily account for the situation. In the interns' habits of thought, good students get A's and display their knowledge. But their students were not getting A's on easy content, and the interns could explain why their students weren't succeeding in the same way that they could explain why their peers from their own high schools, weren't succeeding. In the absence of plausible alternatives for action, reflection can be fruitless.

Reflection is held up as an important practice within the teacher education enterprise, and the interns had mentor teachers, field instructors, and two MU course instructors, as well as previous course lessons on reflection in teaching. And yet, reflection was not a strong part of these interns' practices. What would have to be different for the interns to be able to reflect on their situations and address their teaching practice?

Resistance and Continuity

Given habits of thought, reflection is difficult: it involves confronting the situation, trying to openly question and evaluate what is occurring and why, and looking for one's own role in creating interactions within various situations. But how can you solve a problem that your own habits of perception and thought have been instrumental in creating? The resistance argument starts to get at this problem, with the thesis that as middle class, white individuals, this group of new teachers has learned how to live in society, a society in which they enjoy substantial privilege and have been raised to believe their perspectives are the norm, and that others' are hallucinations, or more generously, misguided half-truths. This is indeed a problem, especially for people who will be charged with guiding others' learning. There's little doubt that their perspectives on students of color, particularly blacks, influenced the interns' pedagogical choices. The interns were resistant. But what exactly were they resisting? The teacher education literature tends to describe resistance as preservice teachers' avoidance of recognizing their privileged identity markers, how those markers translate into societal privilege, and how that impacts classroom dynamics.

In a sense, these interns were resistant, like many white people. They were taught to view society in a colorblind manner that discounts race's role, and as a meritocracy in which anyone who puts forward the effort to succeed, will. These three interns' speech patterns were quite similar to most of their peers, many other teachers, media descriptions of events, and governmental statements. In this sense, the interns are like most white citizens who believe that race is rarely a factor. But a difficulty with calling these individual interns resistant is that they were largely unaware of the ways that racism operates. It's easy to identify and denounce skinheads gathering for a white supremacy

rally. But as a white person in which the world seems open and one gets where one is because they have worked hard to gain something ostensibly open to all people, one is unlikely to recognize how the myriad subtle forms of racial discrimination operate in American society, and in school specifically.

Contemporary perspectives on race, among whites, emerged in the early- to mid-twentieth century during a time when blatant racial discrimination with overtly prejudicial acts was commonplace. This conception is the dominant way that most white people continue to conceive of racism, a schema with no need for a systemic view of racism that accounts for subtle patterns such as arrest rates, profiling, and residential segregation, to say nothing of the many personal interactions informed by stereotypes. Ignorance is not necessarily that different from resistance, and some whites want to remain ignorant, but ignorance implies a passivity that resistance does not.

When we speak of resistance, we should also consider the issue of social class, a dimension that is usually mentioned, but rarely explored in the literature, and which is probably at least as significant. One of the reasons these interns were attracted to teaching was because of its promise of steady, decent paying employment. This fits in with the interns' continuities, since they came from middle class families, had been raised with a certain level of comfort, and looked forward to continuing that trend. Even Amy, who described herself as being raised poor early in life, soon had many advantages of being middle class when her mother was certified and became a teacher. Social class became evident to me along several key dimensions: the students came from families with less money, and the interns associated that fact with a lack of caring by their parents; the interns saw college as expected and the norm, whereas many of their students had a

conception of it as some vague goal they had some understanding they were to get to; the interns had an unquestioned value that school was a legitimate enterprise, primarily to get to college, while some of their students saw little value in school.

This class-based continuity was hardly noticeable to the interns because school is primarily a middle class institution. Although Grand Pillar was largely a working class community, the schools regularly preached to the students the value of going to school, of continuing to college, and promising that as a ticket to a better life. In order to get there, however, the students would have to participate in the curriculum, which featured much decontextualized, mostly irrelevant information. One of the biggest indicators of the schools as middle class involved the interns' views of respect, which fit quite well with the way the institution tended to view it, in particular that by virtue of the teacher's authority, and with the promise of future gain, students should acquiesce to the institutions' demands, and engage in the busy work it provided. Social class expectations became another dimension of difference between intern and student, and one that interns remained woefully ignorant of.

Reconceptualizing resistance

Something like resistance was operating, but not in the way it is typically conceived. To begin, the word implies that a person is actively involved in trying to avoid information or interactions, but these interns tended to act out of ignorance, that is, in a more passive way. The intern's race and class views mattered to their interactions with their students, and they tended to act in colorblind ways such that they would acknowledge race if pressed, but nearly always described people and situations without referring to race. The interns' methods of operating were learned over years, first with the family and then reinforced in institutions like school and the media. However, the interns

did not just learn how to deal with issues of race and class, they were also trained over the years in how to do school, so much so that beyond the traditional techniques they used, the interns had little concept of other ways to teach. This is a critical point since two major forms of the interns' continuities meet up in the same place: their habits with regard to race and class, and their habits of being good students. So when the interns encountered difficulties in executing teaching, in particular maintaining productive relationships with students, both forms of continuity were important, but not helpful. Many of the students were not white or middle class, and the interns largely dealt with that situation as they had for most of their lives: they largely ignored these factors. However, these factors clearly mattered for the interns' interactions with students, but the interns evaluated most of these through their perception of the value of school and the expectation that their students would do school as they had. The important point here is that the interns mostly do not evaluate their situations in racial terms and that they do not have to, for they have another, more comfortable and school sanctioned set of criteria to evaluate and explain their students' achievement and performance: the extent to which those students are good ones.

The main purpose of the interns' resistance then, in agreement with Ringrose (2007) and Britzman (1998), is to protect valued parts of their identities, to protect the habits they've used to get through life. The interns were invested in their whiteness and did not want to be perceived as racist or the oppressor, but also wanted to not have their race commented upon, to appear as neutral. The interns were invested in middle classness, and used their class-based ideas in describing their students' attitudes and family characteristics. They described their students in ways consistent with what the resistance

literature indicates. However, the interns' habits had served them well through school so far, and they hoped those habits would continue to serve as a guide while teaching. At the least, many of the descriptions the interns gave about their students could easily be perceived as professional, that is, as teacher descriptions of student performance, and as neutral toward race. I would imagine that even in nearby Hope, the interns would have made many similar descriptions of their low-achieving students.

Resistance is itself a form of continuity, a way to keep out information that that could undermine a whole way of thinking, and the intern's conceptions of themselves in that way of thinking. While the interns' habits were not helpful for engaging students in authentic learning, they were helpful for protecting the interns' habitual ways of approaching school, helping them navigate the complex transition from student to teacher.

What would have to change?

Both as researcher and practicing teacher educator, I am now asking myself whether, or how, these internships could have proceeded differently, to better outcomes. I will start by considering what the interns might have done for themselves, and then go on to ask what their instructors and teacher preparation program might have done for them.

Desired Changes Within Interns

The interns experienced many difficulties as they learned their new occupation, and we've seen many of the factors that contributed to these three interns' struggles to do that. The interns had many desires: complete the program; do a decent job; get their students to behave; find steady employment; enjoy a certain standard of living; move on to the next phase of life. While these and other factors mattered, in their many classroom

moments, the interns had to engage in productive relationships with their students, and they constructed those relationships in their heads, complete with plans for how to engage and manage those relationships. Through these plans interns project desires for how to conduct classes and enact their roles as teachers, *vis a vis* the desired roles and behaviors of their students.

Some of the interactions threatened interns' desires and the habitual ways they viewed their own lives, especially their desires to be a competent teacher that got along with students, and the result was a strong emotional response. As Ringrose (2007) wrote, this emotional response is to be expected when one encounters difficult situations that threaten one's sense of self. Teachers are generally expected to care for their students and provide a fairly nourishing emotional environment that will allow them to proceed to the business of learning. Students may display care toward a teacher who cares for them. But a teacher's emotions are only permitted a limited role. If Amy had started crying in front of her students like she did in our interview, some may have been sympathetic, but others certainly would have smelled blood and felt emboldened that they had struck a nerve. Thus, interns' emotional states largely served the function of signaling that a desire was not being satisfied, a desire often at odds with what was actually occurring. This is the time when an intern needs to turn their attention to changing their actions and improve the quality of interactions.

For an intern to change habits requires openness and moving beyond the intern's own perceptions and the tendency to apply those perceptions in evaluating others' lives. When this occurs, the intern may then begin to confront and evaluate their habits of thought and feeling, and see the patterns guiding life. Consider that the interns

consistently evaluated their students from their own perspectives and could not understand why students wouldn't do the work, why they were not interested in school, and why they didn't see school as valuable. In contrast, interns could have taken a different approach, but the difficulty here is that an intern must listen to students in this situation, when they were trying very hard to tell students what to learn. If the interns had listened, they might have learned what their students thought about school and their classes. In particular, this openness may have permitted the interns to see that they, as the instructional leader who chooses the practices that organize students' classroom lives, are part of the classroom, and their own practices exert strong influence over what occurs.

In confronting one's habits of feeling and of thought, one may come to realize that one's perception is just that – a perception of how the world works that allows that individual to navigate it. The interns have to accept and mourn the loss of their ideal teaching identities, particularly that their students will learn and act like they do, in order to begin envisioning new possibilities for how to do the job differently, and perhaps better. Instead of valuing that ideal teaching self, a static identity built up through years of being a student and the imagination of what teaching would be like, one must instead value openness, variation, and growth, a very difficult stance to adopt.

Instructional Directions

Observing these interns led me to seek a conception of resistance that would more fully embrace the complexity interns faced in their relationships with students as they enacted the role of teacher. In what follows, I offer some preliminary thoughts on directions for teacher educators' practice. While many of the ideas have been shared elsewhere, I hope to end this study with some thoughts on how I am conceptualizing my

work with similar interns in order to increase the likelihood that I may impact interns' habits.

We saw that the interns displayed the characteristics described by the resistance literature, but they also used their habitual attitudes toward and understanding of best practices within schools to explain student performance in ways they could ignore themselves. For example, for Bill, his problem was not a class issue: it was about how individuals are supposed to act toward and treat each other. It was about how, since he was the teacher, the person in charge, the students were to defer to him. From my position, I see his class position within his statements and actions, but for him, it's how he lived. Thus Bill has a number of ways to explain the interactions described in this study, a fact I must take into account if I am to help him construct his experience in ways that aren't habitual for him.

If we want Bill to augment his perspective on his situation, then we need to meet him on his turf, even grant him that the issue is about respect between individuals, in concert with his colorblind views, rather than imploring him to examine how his position as a white, middle class, male teacher strongly impacts the teacher-student dynamic. He recognized and felt uncomfortable that the students had different views of respect and acted differently from himself, but he didn't understand why students behaved as they did, other than to say that it was because of their families, their environments, their peers, etc. It was alien, unthinkable. He could think of it as noncompletion, grades, test performance, low aptitude, and the list. The issue of respect didn't have to involve race and class, for example, since he could cloak himself in the role "teacher," one that relied

upon the authority of the position, authorized by the state through the university to instruct the youth.

Once we grant the interns their initial reactions and interpretations, we can begin the work of examining additional hypotheses to explain interactions. To do so before acknowledging the interns' starting position is to threaten the interns' strong continuity of habits of thought and interaction, and likely to have the effect of closing them to other options. The resistance argument exists for a reason: because many of the typical candidates operate from a colorblind perspective and are ignorant of the ways that social categories affect people's life changes. In addition, they may have learned that there is good reason to remain ignorant, for it insulates them from unpleasant realizations about their privilege, to say nothing about their emotional investments in maintaining habits that feel best for them. And while this is a realistic starting point, we must maintain the orientation that these future teachers are learners, and are capable of learning about how society generally works, how schools operate, and their roles within them. If we don't expect they can learn, then that attitude would likely permeate our teaching of them, just as their deficit views of their students permeate their actions in the classroom.

To best address the different ways to examine the problem, teacher education needs to be focused on matter-of-factness, of engaging with as factual an account of the situation that is possible, which may allow for the possibility of imagining other possibilities. This is especially important in helping interns to think about their practices, where as accurate and descriptive of an account is necessary to understand what might have been occurring, possibilities for managing that interaction, and ideas on how to create different interactions in the future. Reliance on matter-of-factness helps focus on

events that occurred and distinguish between actions and emotional reactions. For example, I made it a habit to ask interns about the races of the participants, even though I didn't always pursue a racial analysis, and over the course of the year more interns mentioned race unprompted. I wanted them to observe and state that race is present in the classroom, and to normalize that behavior, counter to their life long habits. I tried to force interns to verbalize a dimension of their situations they were trained to be mute about. Such moves aren't enough to change the weight of interns' longtime use of habits, but they do set the tone of how I expect them to describe the work of teaching and inquire into it.

With this tone of stating plain facts of the matter, underlain by the expectation that these future teachers are learners, I attempt to devise course assignments that will serve learning opportunities to challenge interns' perceptions of the situation. One common tactic discussed in the literature is to have preservice teachers in diversity courses write a cultural or educational autobiography, or a combination of the two, in which they consider how their experiences in school and life were influenced by factors outside of themselves, such as their race, class, or gender. However, such ideas need to be revisited during the internship where that exercise is more useful, as interns will be interacting with many students who would write very different narratives. Through the frustration of learning to teach, perhaps interns might begin to see how using their habits of getting through school to conduct class may limit some students. Since many interns simply go to and from their placement without experiencing any of the surrounding context, another opportunity requires interns to tour the neighborhood in which they teach, preceded by writing their expectations about what the neighborhood is like, so that they can search for

confirming and disconfirming evidence as they find assets and liabilities in the area. This opportunity at least forces them to observe where they are working and come to look at the context for at least a few minutes.

Finally, another opportunity I required of interns was to talk with at least one of their classes about students' impressions of school, what they see as valuable in school, why they come, what they desire to achieve in life, and how, if at all, school will assist them. Very often, interns returned to MU surprised by what they learned, including that students want to write better, go to college, see school as prison, and desire a better future. Since it is rare for interns to have that sort of conversation with their students, it typically makes a strong impact upon them. Well thought out and meaningful assignments that require the interns to explore a piece of their situation they wouldn't normally, may help them generate knowledge that could affect their habitual ways of thinking about their placements and students.

Using a device such as the triangle of classroom work (teacher, students, and content involved in interaction) may be a valuable pedagogical orientation for this work. Since many new secondary teachers think of covering the curriculum as their primary job function, and discipline as a process to order student compliance, it is important to get them to see that classroom management is more than discipline, and encompasses thoughtful instructional planning and execution. Good learning involves dialogue with others in person or through texts, and a teacher has to approach their work by considering how to engage students in the world under study. Part of this means to learn and consider what is of interest to students, and how to involve them in studying it. Through specific examples, interns need to see how their pedagogical choices contribute to the total

classroom environment. In addition, they are more likely to see how to apply the construct to their own teaching if it is used to describe and explain the teaching and learning situation at the university.

Social dimensions clearly matter, for in a US classroom there are many different roles: teacher and student, female and male, white and Latino, good student and bad student, intern and mentor, etc. And one doesn't just play one role, but many at the same time, and in exchange with others. For example, Amanda, a white, middle class female who was a life-long successful student taught Donovan, a black male student who loved to read on his own, but did little school work. Any of these listed attributes, as well as many others, might matter in any given interaction. Though Donovan was an individual, he was also a member of different socially significant groups in schools: student, African American, male, marginal student, etc. However, it takes significant time and training for a teacher to approach their work as a social problem, to consider how larger societal dramas of power and authority play out in the classroom.

One reason this is difficult for teachers, and many people in our society, is that we don't usually approach the work of schooling in systemic ways. At its simplest, school is an institution that employs certain individuals to manage another group. But given the legacy of racism in a social system built on unequal wealth and power, it matters when a white teacher from the middle class enters into a classroom of poor black students, and sees her work as simply covering curriculum. Things are then not just about teaching scientific facts, but also about how people's perceptions of one another, including the perceived intent of the other, contribute to how they will interact. That is, we learn information, but the primary benefit of learning information is because it is useful in

interaction with others, and an important function of schooling is to teach citizens how to get along with each other. A focus on the sociological dimensions of schooling makes it easier for teachers to confront issues like racism and privilege in their own lives, and view schooling as a process in which social dramas play out daily.

In order to increase the chances of effecting change in interns' strong continuities in habits of thought, feeling, and action, we need to view their education as systemic, and about the systemic. The former implies that teacher preparation programs need to develop and utilize a more holistic view of a preservice teacher's education, to attend to as many elements of being a future teacher in a coherent way as possible. Given the nature of teacher practice, it is not possible for a program to prepare interns for every interaction they will encounter. However, we do know that certain aspects of intern identity matter, and almost always affect interns' experiences. Paying attention to these leads to the latter concern, in which we invite interns to study schools as systems, as places with people utilizing habitual practices to engage with groups of people. Studying schools as systems means more than considering the situation of being a white teacher of black students, but also ordinary classroom routines, getting students to do work in particular ways, developing assessment systems, learning to differentiate students' needs and accommodate them, and getting students to reflect on their own learning, among a host of possible systems. Conceptualizing more school processes as systemic reinforces all of the processes, since it can help to develop a schema with which to interpret school, a familiar but strange enterprise. Perhaps then they might understand that they come from a particular cultural group, which had strongly influenced their perceptions. Systemic analyses are critical to developing a perspective that is more open to others.

Currently, such efforts are often limited to certain courses. In the diversity course, a preservice teacher will likely have a one-shot experience with structural ways of inquiring into teaching and learning within schools. Such current practice is marginally effective because it takes place in an academic course, is usually the only exposure, and seems unconnected to teaching practice. Revisiting topics, developing systemic thinking in other aspects of the teacher-student relationship, and doing so throughout the program is more likely to have an impact upon interns' habits and push them to look outside those habits in trying to address their problems of practice.

The work described here is not easy from the interns' or their instructors' perspectives. All of these players enter into the situation with their own continuous habits of life and attendant beliefs about how the world operates, that strongly protect a person from having to entertain suggestions that run counter to their habitual ways of living. When we grant someone their continuity as a possible explanation, and invite them to explore how other hypotheses and others' beliefs may explain situations, then we might impact their thoughts and practices. It is no easy task to work with human beings to learn about the world, especially when much of what one learns as they enter into the field of teaching is at odds with how one thinks things will work out.

Research Concerns

This study also has implications for conducting research into the preparation of urban teachers. Research in multicultural education often examines the attitudes and beliefs of preservice teachers within a course, usually the required diversity course. From this fact, in light of this research, come two major implications. The first is that such research needs to be broadened from diversity courses where research data can be easily generated, to other aspects of the program, particularly the student teaching or internship.

In different contexts, candidates are likely to express their views in other ways, perhaps more subtly, which allow for a fuller understanding of their worldviews. Such views may be more indicative of attitudes and beliefs because they will not be as influenced by the effects of the diversity course, in which ideas of difference, privilege, and discrimination are commonplace.

Broadening the research to the internship is a beneficial move for another key reason: researchers can explore interns' views in context, as displayed through their practices, since practices intimately involve a display of one's worldviews as one enacts their habits of thought, feeling, and action through the interactions in which they participate. It is more involved and difficult to discern the meaning of interactions and thoughts in such a research setup, but it is this complexity that helps brings us closer to the life experiences that new teachers have. That is, life is a complex endeavor, in which multiple ways of thinking are involved in interaction. When administering a lecture, what mattered: That the students are black? That lecture is the natural choice? That transmission-oriented teaching is the best way to make students learn the basics? That the mentor would barely allow anything else? That it's the most respectful way to treat students? That it's a great way to control students? It could be any and all of these things, and the complexity becomes clear when we observe people involved in the actual work they undertake rather than looking at their thoughts within a course before they enter classrooms in the teacher role. This is particularly important because although these three interns faced the same problem of maintaining productive relationships with students, they saw the problem differently, because of their previous schooling experiences and the

situations they were in. Careful research can help us to see similarities between the interns, as well as the differences in the ways they interpret their problems.

The interns' stories I told here came only after multiple visits to their classrooms and many months of reflection upon their situations. A lot happens when one teaches and there is not much time to reflect on the process. As I reflected on each lesson I observed, I thought of what I would do differently, what sorts of behaviors I wouldn't tolerate, how I would teach the subject in a way that would engage students as serious learners. As a teacher educator, I had to fight through my habitual ways of teaching high school students to conceive of the difficulties these interns experienced. We all have histories accumulated through living. When we enter situations in which we play particular roles, we enact those histories as we try to negotiate the present. While those histories allow us to make sense of the world and make our way in it, often without much conscious thought, those same histories also make it difficult for us to appreciate what people in other roles, with different histories, bring to and encounter in that same situation.

REFERENCES

Anderson, C. W. (2003, August). *Teaching science for motivation and understanding*. Retrieved from http://www.msu.edu/~andya/TEScience/Assets/Files/TSMU.pdf.

Anyon, J. (1981). Social class and school knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry, 11*(1), 3-42.

Anyon, J. (1997). *Ghetto schooling: A political economy of urban educational reform*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Appiah, K. A. (1996). Race, culture, identity: Misunderstood connections. In Appiah, K.A. & Gutmann, A. (Eds.), *Color Conscious* (p. 30-105). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Banks, J. (2002). *An introduction to multicultural education*. (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Britzman, D. (1998). *Lost subjects, contested objects: toward a psychoanalytic inquiry of learning*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Britzman, D. (2000). The question of belief: Writing poststructural enthography. In E. St. Pierre & W. Pillow (Eds.), *Working the ruins: Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education*. New York: Routledge.

Britzman, D. (2003). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Brown, E. L. (2004). What precipitates change in cultural diversity awareness during a multicultural course: the message or the method? *Journal of Teacher Education, 55*(4), 325-340.

Case, K. A. & Hemmings, A. (2005). Distancing strategies: White women preservice teachers and antiracist curriculum. *Urban Education, 40*(6), 606-626.

Chizhik, E. W. & Chizhik, A. W. (2005). Are you privileged or oppressed? Students' conceptions of themselves and others. *Urban Education, 40*(2), 116-143.

Cohen, D. K. (1988). Teaching Practice: Plus Que Ca Change.... In Jackson, P. J., (Ed.), *Contributing to educational change: Perspectives on research and practice* (pp. 27-84). Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Cuban, L. (1993). *How teachers taught: constancy and change in American classrooms, 1890-1990.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Dei, G., Sefa, J., Karumanchery, L. L., & Karumanchery-Luik, N. (2005). *Playing the race card: Exposing white power and privilege.* New York: Peter Lang.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom.* New York: The New Press.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: a restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process.* Boston: D.C. Heath and Company.

Dewey, J. (1997). *Experience & education.* New York: Touchstone.

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 119-161). New York: Macmillan.

Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Continuum.

Gilbert, D. (1998). *The American class structure: In an age of growing inequality* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Haberman, M. & Post, L. (1992). Does direct experience change education students' perceptions of low-income minority children? *Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 5*(2), 29-31.

Hemmings, A. (2003). Fighting for respect in urban high schools. *Teachers College Record, 105*(3), 416-437.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom.* New York: Routledge.

Hytten, K. & Warren, J. (2003). Engaging whiteness: How racial power gets reified in education. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*(1), 65-89.

Iannoccone, L. (1963). Student teaching: a transitional stage in the making of a teacher. *Theory into Practice, 2*(2), 73-80.

Jaworski, A. & Coupland, N. (Eds.). (1999). *The Discourse Reader.* New York: Routledge.

Jeanpierre, B. (2007). Becoming an urban school middle-level science teacher. *Journal of Elementary Science Education, 19*(1), 45-55.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2004). Why a book on urban education? In S. R. Steinberg & J. L. Kincheloe (Eds.), *19 Urban questions: Teaching in the city* (pp. 1-27). New York: Peter Lang.

King, J. (1991). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers. *The Journal of Negro Education, 60*(2), 133-146.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage Inequalities.* New York: Crown Publishers.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The Dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). It's not the culture of poverty, It's the poverty of culture: The problem with teacher education. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*. 37(2), 104-109.

Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal childhoods: Class, race, and family life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lareau, A. (2000). *Home advantage: social class and parental intervention in elementary education* (2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Levinson, B. A. & Holland, D. C. (1996). The cultural production of the educated person: An introduction. In B. A. Levinson, D. E. Foley, & D. C. Holland, *The cultural production of the educated person: critical ethnographies of schooling and local practice* (pp. 1-54). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Leland, C. H. & Harste, J. C. (2005). Doing what we want to become: Preparing new urban teachers. *Urban Education, 40*(1), 60-77.

Lemke, J. (1990). *Talking science: Language, learning, and values*. Westport, Conn.: Ablex Publishing.

Lipman, P. (1997). Restructuring in context: A case study of teacher participation and the dynamics of ideology, race, and power. *American Educational Research Journal, 34*(1), 3-37.

Lowenstein, K. L. (2009). The work of multicultural teacher education: Reconceptualizing white teacher candidates as learners. *Review of Educational Research, 79*(1), 163-196.

McIntosh, P. (1990). White privilege: unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Independent School*, Winter, 31-36.

McNeil, L. (1986). *Contradictions of control: school structure and school knowledge*. New York: Routledge & K. Paul.

McFalls, E. L. & Cobb-Roberts D. (2001). Reducing resistance to diversity through cognitive dissonance instruction. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(2), 164-172.

Miller, P. & Goodnow, J. (1995). Cultural practices: toward an integration of culture and development. *New Directions for Child Development, 67*, 5-16.

Moss, K. (2003). *The color of class: poor whites and the paradox of privilege.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

National Education Center (2002). *Tomorrow's teachers: Help Wanted: Minority Teachers.* http://www.nea.org/tomorrowsteachers/2002/helpwanted.html. Retrieved December 15, 2004.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1999). *Teacher Quality: A report on the preparation and qualifications of public school teachers.* U.S. Department of Education: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Nieto, S. (2001). *Language, culture, and teaching: critical perspectives for a new century.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Omi, M. & Winant, H. (1994). *Racial formation in the United States* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Pollock, M. (2004). *Colormute: Race talk dilemmas in an American school.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ringrose, J. (2007). Rethinking white resistance: Exploring the discursive practices and psychical negotiations of 'whiteness' in feminst, anti-racist education. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 10*(3), 323-344.

Rogers, R. (2004). *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in Education.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rosaldo, R. (1993). *Culture and truth: the remaking of social analysis.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Saffold, F. and Longwell-Grice, H. (2008). White women preparing to teach in urban schools: Looking for similarity and finding difference. *Urban Review, 40*, 186-209.

St. Denis, V. & Schick, C. (2003). What makes anti-racist pedagogy in teacher education difficult? Three popular ideological assumptions. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 49*(1), 55-69.

Schultz, K., Jones-Walker, C .E. & Chikkatur, A. P. (2008). Listening to student, negotiating beliefs: Preparing teachers for urban classrooms. *Curriculum Inquiry, 38*(2), 155-187.

Scott, J. W. (1992). Experience. In J. Butler & J. W. Scott (Eds.), *Feminists theorize the political* (pp. 22-40). New York: Routledge.

Sleeter, C. E. (1992). Resisting racial awareness: How teachers understand the social order from their racial, gender, and social class locations. *Educational Foundations, 6*(2), 7-32.

Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(2), 94-106.

Sokoloff, D. & Thornton, R. (1997). Using interactive lecture demonstrations to create an active learning environment. *The Physics Teacher, 35*(6), 340-347.

Solomon, P. R., Portelli, J. P., Daniel, B., & Campbell, A. (2005). The discourse of denial: how white teacher candidates construct race, racism and 'white privilege.' *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 8*(2), 147-169.

Tatum, B. D. (1992). Talking about race, learning about racism: The application of racial identity development theory in the classroom. *Harvard Educational Review, 62*(1), 1-24.

Thompson, A. (2003). Tiffany, friend of people of color: White investments in antiracism. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*(1), 7-29.

Villegas, A. M. & Lucas, T. (2002). *Educating culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Warren, J. T. (2001). Performing whiteness differently: Rethinking the abolitionist project. *Educational Theory, 51*(4), 451-466.

Wells, A. S. & Crain, R. L. (1997). *Stepping over the color line: African-American students in white suburban schools*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Wideen, M., Mayer-Smith, J., & Moon, B. (1998). A critical analysis of the research on learning to teach: Making the case for an ecological perspective on inquiry. *Review of Educational Research, 68*(2), 130-178.

Wilson, W.J. (1987). The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.