

OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT IN TEACHER EDUCATION:
CONTRADICTIONS, TENSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS
FOR EDUCATING PRESERVICE TEACHERS

By

Jim Samuel Furman

Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Vanderbilt University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Teaching and Learning

May, 2009

Nashville, Tennessee

Approved:

Professor Victoria J. Risko

Professor H. Richard Milner

Professor Robert T. Jiménez

Professor Donna Y. Ford

Copyright © 2009 by Jim Samuel Furman
All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe a great deal to the people who have supported my work. I would especially like to thank Vicki Risko, the chair of my committee. She provided invaluable guidance throughout the program. I am especially grateful for her willingness to focus intently on my work and support me through this process. She has taught me a great deal about being a teacher, a mentor, and a researcher. I would also like to thank the other members of my committee—Rich Milner, Bob Jiménez, and Donna Ford. They are all excellent examples of the potential of research and teacher education. Their focus on equity and their commitment to students has been a model of what this path can and should be. It has been a pleasure and an honor to work with such an esteemed group of scholars on this project. In addition, I would like to thank other faculty members who were instrumental in my graduate school experience, particularly Chris Iddings and Kevin Leander.

I would like to thank my mother and my sister, who have continually provided love and encouragement. I would also like to thank my friends. Those in the program with me have provided insight, guidance, and support. Those not in the program have done the same.

Finally, no one has been more important during the last three years than my partner, Elizabeth. The first three years of our life together have coincided with this project. Knowing that I had her love and unconditional support during this time was the most important factor in my success. I am thrilled to move forward from this point with her.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Exploration of key terms.....	5
Situating the study.....	8
The current context of education in the United States.....	8
The outcomes of teacher education.....	14
The student teaching experience.....	20
Framing the study.....	23
Previous research.....	24
Student teacher learning as sociocultural practice.....	26
Student teacher learning in hybrid spaces.....	28
Research questions.....	32
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	35
Components of quality field experiences.....	36
Type and quality of placements.....	37
Type and quality of supervision.....	41
Experiences of student teachers in practice.....	46
Sound instructional practices.....	51
Valuing the lives of students.....	51
Implementing pedagogies of equity and action.....	52
III. METHODOLOGY.....	56
Decisions about design.....	57
Site selection and description.....	60
Participant selection and description.....	62
Field entry.....	65
My role as researcher.....	67
Data collection and recording.....	68
Phases of inquiry.....	68
Interviews.....	70
Observations.....	71

Artifacts.....	72
Data analysis.....	73
Trustworthiness.....	75
IV. ANALYSIS OF CONTRADICTIONS AND TENSIONS RELATED TO THE INTENDED OUTCOMES OF TEACHER EDUCATION AT COOPER	77
Documents and events	80
Documents	80
Events.....	87
Contradictions and tensions	89
Conceptions of effective instruction	89
Division between teacher education and P-12 schools.....	110
Assessment at the programmatic level.....	139
Conclusion	167
V. ANALYSIS OF INDIVIDUAL STUDENT TEACHERS AND THEIR EXPERIENCES.....	171
Jack	174
View of self as student teacher	177
View of teaching and learning.....	184
Teaching <i>A Wrinkle in Time</i>	191
Summary.....	200
Kate.....	202
View of self as student teacher	204
View of teaching and learning.....	210
Teaching <i>Persepolis</i>	216
Summary.....	221
Conclusion	222
VI. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS.....	226
Limitations	228
Summary of findings and their implications.....	229
P-12 student learning	233
Divide between university and school contexts.....	238
Crisis of assessment	244
Implications and recommendations	247
Teacher education research.....	247
Teacher education practice	251
Conclusion	255
Appendix	
A. SAMPLE FIELD NOTES.....	258

B. POST-OBSERVATION CONFERENCE REPORT FORM.....269

C. STUDENT TEACHING TEAM CONFERENCE REPORT FORM271

D. TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING BETWEEN JACK AND MARY279

REFERENCES283

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Research Questions and Sources of Data.....	58
2. Indicators on Assessment Forms by Professional Growth Profile Area.....	85
3. Summary of Findings by Theme.....	90
4. Frequency of Comments by Category Related to Conceptions of Effective Instruction	98
5. Representative Examples of Feedback Comments Given by Mentors.....	99

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the preparation of teachers has been a central focus of researchers, teacher educators, policy makers, state and local agencies, and other organizations working to reform public education in the United States. Despite the shared focus, there has been little agreement on the details among these parties. Researchers have focused on the increasing diversity of student populations (usually in comparison to the lack of diversity in the teaching force) as a central rationale for attention to teacher preparation, often mentioning this contextual factor within the first few sentences of their reports (Anderson, 1998; Becket, 1998; Causey, Thomas, & Armento, 2000; Groulx, 2001; LaFramboise & Griffith, 1997; McFalls & Cobb-Roberts, 2001; Olmedo, 1997; Roberts, Jensen, & Hadjiyianni, 1997; Ukpokodu, 2004). Teacher educators, educational reformers, and policy makers have also focused on the achievement gap and other issues of equity. At the same time, concerns have surfaced about the shortage of teachers and the quality of the teaching force.

Within this context, the pathways available to those choosing teaching as a profession have become more varied. This diversity of preparation methods has also become a central focus of educational research and debates about reform. Alternative pathways to teaching have led to studies comparing the effectiveness of teachers who enter the classroom through traditional routes and those who enter without certification (Darling-Hammond, Chung, & Frelow, 2002; Gluzerman, Mayer, & Decker, 2006; Lackzo-Kerr & Berliner, 2002). The preparation of teachers has taken center stage in

national debates of educational practice and policy. States are conducting studies of value-added test data to determine the effectiveness of various traditional and non-traditional teacher preparation programs (Noell, Porter, Patt, & Dahir, 2008; Sanders & Horn, 1998), and the media are taking notice (“What Louisiana,” 2008).

In 2005, the American Educational Research Association (AERA) commissioned a panel to review the research on teacher education (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005). The volume contained 12 chapters, focused on areas such as methods courses, field experiences, teaching diverse populations, and teaching students with disabilities. Recently, *The New Yorker* published an article by pop sociologist Malcolm Gladwell (2008) about the preparation and selection of high-quality teachers, echoing the calls of others who have suggested deregulation of the teaching profession. It may be an oversimplification, but much of this attention is based on the idea that if we want better results, we need better teachers. It is not surprising that President Obama, who took office shortly after this study was conducted, emphasized the need for “exceptionally well-prepared recruits” and teachers who are “ready to walk into the classroom and start teaching effectively” on his educational policy webpage (“Education,” n.d.). Though the people talking about teacher preparation and effectiveness approach the issue from different perspectives and with different methods, they largely start with the premise that our schools are failing too many students and communities. Preparing, supporting, and retaining effective teachers has become one of the most discussed aspects of reforming the schools and ending that failure.

In this context, the ability of colleges of teacher education to demonstrate the effectiveness of their programs has come under increased scrutiny. One of the central

focuses of research conducted within these institutions by teacher educators has been the preparation of teachers for increasingly diverse student populations. Over 15 years ago, in one of the earliest reviews of research on preparing teachers for diverse populations, Grant and Secada (1990) argued, “There is much that we do not know about how to prepare teachers to teach an increasingly diverse student population” (p. 420). Other scholars in the field have responded to their call for research. The number of studies that considered issues of diversity and preservice teacher education greatly increased—from the 23 studies reviewed by Grant and Secada to the 101 (Hollins & Guzman, 2005), 119 (Sleeter 2001a, 2001b), and 153 studies (Cochran-Smith, Davis, & Fries, 2003) reviewed more recently. While attention to this area is growing, it is important to ask what progress has been made in terms of our understanding of preparing teachers for diverse populations and high-need schools. Hollins and Guzman (2005) concluded their recent review in a manner similar to Grant and Secada (1990) by stating, “There are many promising lines of research and important questions to be addressed about the preparation of America’s teachers for diverse populations” (p. 513). From the first call to the most recent call, this research has remained marginalized and characterized by the ideas of promise, hope, and potential.

One of the most consistent findings across the reviews that have been conducted is that there has not been enough research and that the research that has been conducted is either inconclusive or suffers from methodological concerns. These findings span the chronological range of reviews from 1990 to 2005. Whether it is Grant and Secada (1990) noting that there is little to no strong research (and what research there is appears in non-mainstream journals), Reynolds (1992) arguing that there is not enough research

to sufficiently define what constitutes competent beginning teaching, or Montecinos (2004) noting the lack of research on candidates of color, it is clear that the field is still characterized by a sense of potential and promise rather than a sense of accomplishment. Despite what could be deemed a lack of consensus or an insufficient research base, the expectations for preparing effective teachers are high and the need of programs to demonstrate their effectiveness is increasingly urgent.

Scholars have also noted the lack of research on specific aspects of teacher education, such as recruitment, diverse teacher candidates, and the outcomes of teacher education. Based on an analysis of the reviews on multicultural teacher education, I concluded that one of the most common critiques of research in this area is that the research is often conducted on a small scale and by teacher educators on their own classroom practices (Furman, 2008). In fact, most of the research takes place in the university classroom. Research that attempts to study the experiences of university students in P-12 classrooms (often seen as the most important part of the preservice experience) is much less abundant. Similar findings related to the quality of research and the lack of connection to P-12 student learning in the research were noted by the AERA panel and by multiple studies within the volume. In the executive summary of the AERA report, Cochran-Smith and Zeichner (2005) wrote, “The body of teacher education research that directly addresses desirable pupil and other outcomes and the conditions and contexts within which these outcomes are likely to occur is relatively small and inconclusive” (p. 5).

While it is much smaller in scope, the study presented here was situated within the larger context of debates and reform related to teacher preparation that are currently

central to discussions about education in many areas of the country. Specifically, it addressed questions related to one specific component of a program of teacher preparation (student teaching), the curriculum that was lived out in the experiences of preservice teachers during that experience, and the possible influences that various aspects of the program had on their learning and performance.

In this chapter, I begin by discussing important terms in order to explain their use and how they were operationalized within this study. Next, I outline the problem addressed by this study in more detail. Specifically, I look at the context of education in the U. S., the expected outcomes of teacher education within this context, and the centrality of field-based learning within programs of teacher preparation in order to make a case for a multilayered study of the student teaching experience. After establishing the rationale and need for this study, I outline a theoretical framework that provided a foundation for thinking about the problem and designing a study to analyze it. This framework draws on work in sociocultural theories of learning and development. By using previous scholarship, I framed the study as an examination of the multiple spaces and activities that shape the experiences of student teachers. Finally, I outline the specific research questions that I examined. These questions are directly connected to the expected outcomes of teacher education and the learning and assessment of student teachers in practice.

Exploration of Key Terms

Terms related to the preparation of teachers are used variously in different contexts and often carry ideological and political implications that are important to

consider and problematize. For this reason, it is necessary to briefly discuss some of the terminology used in this report. I specifically look at words related to schools, teachers, and students and elucidate my reason for choosing certain terms and my recognition of potential problematic aspects of their use.

In this study I use the phrase *high-need schools* to refer to schools that are not fulfilling their potential and in which students are not achieving at the desired level. Student teachers in this study expressed a commitment to work in high-need schools and defined these spaces in different ways at different times. I recognize that the term can indicate deficit notions of schools and communities. Schools in urban communities or rural communities, with large non-White populations, or in high-poverty areas are not, in my use of the term, necessarily high-need schools. My use of the term specifically references the need that some schools have for transformed practices, excellent teachers, and increased levels of student learning. Within the context of this study, a high-need school is not defined by its demographics alone, but rather by its ability to meet the needs of its students and ensure their success. My own use of the term differs somewhat from official uses, which often relate directly to the poverty rate in the surrounding area, to certification level of teachers in the school, or to standardized test scores that fall below national averages. While the term has been used in ways that equate diversity with need, I have explicitly chosen to use a term that is becoming more common in the public discourse on schools in order to use it differently.

Another politically charged term used in this study that requires attention is *student achievement*. In its most common uses this phrase often refers to the standardized test scores of students and relates directly to scores given to schools based on students'

performance on these standardized, norm-referenced assessments. My own understanding of student achievement is broader and encompasses a myriad of assessments and components of student learning. Achievement of students, in this study, means more than academic achievement alone, and academic achievement includes more than standardized test scores. I use the term student achievement in its broadest sense to refer to the learning of students in different domains as measured through various means. Student achievement is an essential outcome of education, but it is often defined too narrowly. My use of the term here should not be equated with this narrow definition.

I also use phrases such as *effective instruction* and *teacher quality* in this study and report of the findings. My use of these terms should not be assumed to connote the most conservative meaning that these terms can carry. In other words, as with student achievement, I use these terms in a broad sense. Effective instruction is not simply instruction that produces increased scores on standardized assessments, rather it is instruction that leads to student learning and developed as understood and measured in diverse ways. I also believe that teacher quality should be measured through a variety of means that include attention to student achievement, teacher performance in the classroom and school, and contribution to the community. Again, I believe it is important to use the language of the field, but to modify its use when necessary and discuss how these phrases are used in other places. While a further exploration of these and other similar terms could be an extensive undertaking on its own, I have provided these brief explorations to orient the reader to my own operational definitions of certain key terms and phrases.

Situating the Study

The rationale for this study was based on the current context of education in the U. S. This context demands attention to the outcomes of teacher education. Because student teaching (and, more generally, field experience) is a central component of learning to teach in traditional teacher preparation programs, it was chosen as the focus of the study. In this section, I situate the study by describing these three areas in more detail: the context of education, the outcomes of teacher education, and the centrality of field-based experiences in learning to teach.

The Current Context of Education in the United States

In her history of reading education in the United States, Nila Banton Smith (1967) argued that many of the most significant changes in reading research and instruction took place in the first half of the 20th century. I may risk overstating the case in the way I believe she did, but it seems possible that we are currently in the midst of many of the most significant changes in teacher education research and teacher preparation. We face new challenges in terms of the populations in schools, the attention to teacher preparation programs, and the shifting needs of students. These aspects of our current educational environment require that we pay serious attentions to our methods of teacher preparation and their outcomes. Specifically, I believe that research on teacher preparation is indicated at this time by the achievement gap and the demographic imperative; the attention to teacher preparation, recruitment, and retention; and the shifting nature of educational goals and outcomes. I describe each of these areas below.

The Achievement Gap and the Demographic Imperative

The discrepancies in achievement between Black and Latino students and their peers are now, thanks in part to No Child Left Behind actually, part of the public conversation on education but remain the most pressing challenge faced by the nation's education system. "While overall scores have increased in reading and mathematics, the differences in scores for black and white students in virtually every NAEP [National Assessment of Educational Progress] subject area and for every age group are greater than they were in the late 1980s" (Sadowski, 2001). In fact on NAEP reading testing from 1999, the average 17-year-old Black student scored the same as the average 13-year-old White student (Kober, 2001, p. 9). While scholars have questioned the terminology used to describe the situation (Ladson-Billings, 2007), there is little doubt that educational inequity pervades in our country and runs deeper than testing data.

The achievement gap exists within a system of education that continues to provide inequitable educational opportunities for students. In a 2004 report, the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future reported that, according to a survey of random teachers, "Children at risk, who come from families with poorer economic backgrounds, are not being given an opportunity to learn that is equal to that offered to children from the most privileged families" (p. 7). The report goes on to say, "Most disadvantaged children attend schools that do not have basic facilities and conditions conducive to providing them with a quality education" (p. 7).

While the achievement gap persists, the percentage of non-White students is on the rise. And as many have reported, the teaching force is therefore becoming increasingly unrepresentative of the population in schools, as it remains largely White, middle class,

and female. This situation has been referred to as the “demographic imperative” (Banks, 1995). These realities make attention to the preparation of teachers for settings characterized by high needs essential. And, as Grossman (2008) has argued, “We still know very little about what characteristics of teacher education make the most difference in preparing teachers to teach well, particularly in high-poverty schools with students who most need strong schools” (p. 15). In a survey of principals, for instance, only 28% felt that teachers who had graduated from schools of education were adequately prepared to address the needs of the diverse student population (Levine, 2006).

Attention to Teacher Preparation, Recruitment, and Retention

Over a decade ago, Darling-Hammond (1996) reported that “each year about 20,000 individuals enter teaching without a license, while another 30,000 enter with substandard credentials” (p. 7). Levine (2006) has noted that there are over 200,000 teacher vacancies each year in the United States. Researchers have argued strongly that the shortage of teachers is not solely attributable to teacher retirement and increasing student populations (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). A large problem is related to issues of attrition and retention. Between 40 and 50% of teachers leave the profession within their first five years, and of those who leave, close to two-thirds of them leave for another career or because they are dissatisfied with their jobs (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). Given the need for teachers and the increasing number of alternative pathways to teaching (often a direct result of attempts to increase supply), serious attention is needed to issues of teacher preparation, recruitment, and retention, especially as it relates to providing effective teachers for the students who need them most.

Critics of traditional approaches to teacher preparation are becoming increasingly vocal. In many cases describing programs of teacher education as irrelevant and out of touch (see Walsh, 2006, for example). In other cases, arguments are made that recommend serious reform of teacher education practices. A large portion of this criticism relates to the lack of attention to the outcomes of teacher preparation, specifically to P-12 student learning. Levine (2006) wrote, “Today’s teacher education programs...focus more on process than outcomes. They are more concerned with teaching than learning. They concentrate more on how skills are transmitted than on their mastery” (p. 105). The challenges faced by teacher education are certainly changing, and the ability of traditional programs to address them is coming under increased scrutiny. At the same time, issues of teacher quality are of the utmost importance, as research has demonstrated the ways in which teachers are a (if not the) dominant influence on student learning (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Sanders & Horn, 1998)

The Shifting Nature of Education

In addition to the needs of students and the increasing variety of pathways available to teachers, shifting visions of the outcomes of education also require attention to the issue addressed in this study, namely the preparation of teachers planning to work in high-need settings. The current context of education is one that is situated within the larger context of rapidly changing global relations. While the rationale for attention to the shifting identities of students, requirements of the workplace, and demands of the global economy could be made through many different examples, I will illustrate the point here by considering work in literacy education. I believe this work provides an example of the demands of education in the new century and therefore of the demands being placed on

teachers and those who prepare them. As attention in the field of teacher education has begun to focus on the complexities presented by the increasing diversity of the student population, research in the field of literacy has become increasingly focused on the complexities presented by the increasing diversity of texts and literacies.

In 1996 the New London Group (comprised of researchers from various backgrounds who met to discuss their common concerns related to literacy education) published a “programmatic manifesto” (p. 63) on the state of literacy in Western, English-speaking countries. The article begins by stating simply their shared belief in the democratic aims of education: “Its fundamental purpose is to ensure that all students benefit from learning in ways that allow them to participate fully in public, community, and economic life” (p. 60). From the outset, their work was an attempt to combine social theories of literacy with a critical approach and an explicit connection to public education and students in schools.

The group continues to establish their purpose for writing by presenting two central aspects of literacy that they want to address:

First, we want to extend the idea and scope of literacy pedagogy to account for the context of our culturally and linguistically diverse and increasingly globalized societies, for the multifarious cultures that interrelate and the plurality of texts that circulate. Second, we argue that literacy pedagogy now must account for the burgeoning variety of text forms associated with information and multimedia technologies. (p. 61)

These two interrelated agendas of multiculturalism and multiliteracies form the basis for the framework and pedagogy presented by the New London Group—a framework and pedagogy concerned with “the question of life chances as it relates to the broader moral and cultural order of literacy pedagogy” (p. 62). What is of most importance in this introduction is the clear connection between the idea of multiliteracies and the group’s

critical approach to multiculturalism and diversity, that “cultural differences and rapidly shifting communications media” (p. 63) require a radically different view of literacy.

The group outlined a pedagogy focused on the needs created by society. Teachers and students explore multiple texts and multiple lifeworlds together in community, they are introduced to a variety of discourses and their governing rules, they are able to view new knowledge in relation to its context, and they are able to extend their meaning-making to other situations. While most of their discussion is highly theoretical, the connections between multiliteracies and multiculturalism clearly run throughout their treatment of literacy pedagogy. In the end, their goal is “to make some sort of difference for real children in real classrooms” (p. 89). It can be understood, therefore, that the central projects of literacy education include investigations of changing communication, increasing diversity, and classroom practices. This study aligned with these goals viewed education (not just literacy education) as a social practice in the midst of adapting to the changing needs and demands of the society it serves.

I believe that the achievement gap, the increasing diversity of the student population in the United States, the quickly changing landscape of teacher preparation, the concerns about teacher recruitment and retention, and the changing landscape of educational practices and outcomes all recommended the need for studying various aspects of teacher preparation in ways that capture the complexity of the endeavor and focus attention on meeting the challenges faced by students and schools in the present environment. These realities formed the basis of the rationale that led me to address the preparation of preservice teachers intending to work in high-need settings. In the next section I describe the expected outcomes of teacher education within this context.

The Outcomes of Teacher Education

The idea of even discussing outcomes is sometimes challenged by scholars in the field of teacher education. Cochran-Smith (2001), for instance, has questioned the use of the terminology. As she has argued, “Input-output metaphors carry with them images of factories and production lines and suggest a linear view of the relationship of teaching and learning for both K-12 students and for teacher candidates” (p. 540). She, at the same time, has acknowledged that the question of outcomes is currently the central one driving discussions of teacher preparation (and education in the U. S. more generally). There is unfortunately little agreement over what the outcomes of teacher education are or should be. Despite the lack of consensus or sense of a coherent view of what it means to learn to teach, it was important to establish a set of common principles or conceptions of the potential outcomes for the purposes of my study. To that end, I discuss five specific areas related to the outcomes of teacher education in the sections that follow: impact on P-12 student learning; knowledge related to learners and learning; focus on inquiry, reflective practice, and strategic decision making; successful transition into the professional community; and attention to issues of equity and social justice. While my presentation here is by no means exhaustive, my goal is to present some agreed-upon notions of what teachers should know and be prepared to do. After discussing these five areas, I will also provide a brief description of how they might be assessed within programs of teacher education.

Impact on Student Learning

Questions related to student achievement, how learning and achievement are defined, and how they should be assessed are certainly contentious ones. However, the

idea that teachers should have a positive influence on student learning appears to be one of the few points of agreement among parties in the debate. The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), in its standards for new teachers (1992), listed ten principles that could be (and have been) used to guide the preparation of new teachers. Of the ten, seven had a central focus on and directly referenced student learning and development—understanding how students learn, creating environments in which students can learn, and assessing whether or not they have learned, for instance. The other principles had student learning or development as the implied goal. The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) requires that programs include a minimum of six assessments. One of the six required is an assessment of candidates’ effect on student learning.

Even those who are involved in debates over what the outcomes of teacher education should be have suggested that the “defining goal of teacher education is student learning” (Cochran-Smith, 2003) and that “the most important question is how what teachers have learned ultimately influences what their pupils learn” (Darling-Hammond, 2006). The idea of having an influence on student learning is a complex one. But, in teacher education, an expected outcome is that “teacher candidates are required not simply to demonstrate that their teaching has an impact on students’ learning, although they must do that, but also how and why their teaching practices impact student learning within particular contexts” (Cochran-Smith, 2001, p. 535). Again, what is meant by student achievement and how it is determined are certainly not agreed upon. It does seem to be the case, however, that there is agreement around the idea that effective teachers are ones who positively influence the learning of their students.

Knowledge Related to Learners and Learning

The INTASC standards and standards of well-regarded programs of teacher education largely consist of what teachers should know about learners and learning. For instance, the standards developed at Alverno College (cited in Darling-Hammond & Snyder, 2000) discuss knowledge related to student development, the subject matter, the community, and the curriculum. This aspect of teacher preparation involves ensuring that teachers are invested in learning about their students' funds of knowledge (Moll et al., 1992) and the multiple out-of-school literacy practices (New London Group, 1996) that they bring to the classroom, among other things. It also includes having an understanding of how students learn and how different students learn differently.

Focus on Inquiry, Reflective Practice, and Strategic Decision Making

Cochran-Smith and her colleagues (Cochran-Smith, 2001; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999) have argued that a central outcome of teacher education should be an "inquiry stance" towards the practice. In this construction, teaching involves "teacher research as a vehicle for generating local knowledge and challenging the status quo by linking inquiry, knowledge, and professional practice across the professional life-span" (2001, p. 537). There has been some consensus around the idea that teacher education should prepare teachers who are "knowledgeable and reflective practitioners willing and able to engage in collaborative, contextually grounded learning activities" (Yinger, 1999, quoted in Cochran-Smith, 2001, p. 541). One of the principles developed by INTASC (1992) reads, "The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow

professionally” (p. 31). Questions have been raised around how effectively programs of teacher education prepare preservice teachers to be reflective practitioners (Risko, Vukelich, & Roskos, 2002), but many suggest that it is a highly desired outcome.

Successful Transition into the Professional Community

It is a rather obvious outcome of teacher education in some respects, but preservice teachers must be prepared to move from their program to the world of P-12 schools. This outcome is reflected in standards through language such as, “The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues” (INTASC, 1992, p. 33). This particular outcome is perhaps most evident, however, in the questions asked by researchers. While the induction period is under-researched and under-theorized (Wideen, Mayer-Smith, & Moon, 1999), it has been a topic of some research. The questions guiding this research have often focused on the ability of new teachers to apply what they learned during their preparation in practice (Corcoran, 1981), or more often their ability to implement practices that align with what they have learned during their teacher preparation and often run counter to the common practices in their schools (see Grossman, Smagorinsky, & Valencia, 1999; Smagorinsky, Lakly, & Johnson, 2002, for example). “The ultimate goal of the enterprise of teacher education involves identification with the role of teacher, not with the role of university student” (Grossman, Smagorinsky, & Valencia, 1999, p. 25).

Issues of Social Justice and Equity

Researchers have demonstrated that preservice teachers do not always share the social justice agendas of teacher educators (Wideen, Mayer-Smith, & Moon, 1999). It might also be assumed that social justice agendas are not shared by all teacher educators. Despite these realities, teacher educators and researchers dedicated to issues of equity in

education have put social justice front and center as a desired outcome of teacher education. Cochran-Smith, Davis, and Fries (2005) have argued that the project of teacher education should involve:

Helping teachers understand the social and historical patterns that created the existing system (thus helping them understand how to produce change); teaching about the relationships between culture and schooling; getting teacher candidates to examine deeply held beliefs and expectations about children; and familiarizing teacher candidates with the latest scholarship about learning, pedagogy, and language. (p. 15)

These aims move beyond traditional ideas of multicultural education towards a critical multiculturalism (Sleeter & McLaren, 1995) that has social justice at its center and is concerned first and foremost with the social change that activist teachers will be able to bring about through effective and culturally relevant practices. Zeichner et al. (1998) have argued that one of the central aims of teacher education programs committed to multicultural education must be helping “prospective teachers develop the commitment to be change agents who work to promote greater equity and social justice in schooling and society” (Zeichner et al., 1998, p. 168).

Assessment of Outcomes

Cochran-Smith (2003) and Darling-Hammond (2006) have both written about the ways in which the outcomes of teacher education have and are being assessed. Each has examined assessment measures and their implications for teacher education. As Cochran-Smith explained, “Until very recently...few of even the strongest teacher education programs across the country could be thought of as assessment-based or evidence-driven” (p. 188). The context of education described earlier has had an effect on this situation, and teacher educators are giving more attention to the assessment of preservice teacher

learning. She has also categorized the outcomes of teacher education in three categories: P-12 student outcomes, teacher performance on tests, and teacher performance (2001).

Darling-Hammond (2006) looked at assessment measures being used within the three categories described by Cochran-Smith. She describes several measures used by her own program and argues for the use of multiple measures to track teacher education outcomes. She described, for instance, the use of a rubric connected to established standards used to assess the performance of student teachers. She points to issues, such as lack of sufficient formative assessment, as possible problems for these kinds of evaluations of student teacher performance. She also discussed the benefits of structured performance activities for assessment. In addition to providing evidence of learning and development, these sorts of assessments create opportunities for learning to occur as well. She also points out that “the use of such assessments requires intensive, explicit efforts to develop shared meanings if they are to be viewed as reliable assessments for determining recommendations for certification” (p. 129). In all, she described mostly performance-based assessments. While these often connect to P-12 student outcomes, it is only in “rare cases” that teacher education programs measure student performance or other outcomes as part of their assessment of teacher candidates.

The intended outcomes of teacher education are many, varied, and often contested, as are the means of measuring them. The possible outcomes listed above are not exhaustive, but will provide a lens for considering the data and findings presented in this study. The next section will describe the importance of the student teaching experience as a central aspect of teacher preparation focused on these outcomes, as well as the areas of research related to student teaching that are in need of further study.

The Student Teaching Experience

Effective programs of teacher education are expected to develop “carefully planned and varied field experiences” that provide opportunities for preservice teachers to engage in observation and practice (Zeichner et al., 1998, p. 168). Sleeter (2005) has described effective teacher education as a three-legged stool. One of the legs, she argues, is fieldwork. While literature on preparing teachers for diverse populations has largely focused on university coursework, multiple aspects of field experiences have been studied, such as reflection during student teaching (Borko & Mayfield, 1995) and the influence of student teaching experiences on beliefs related to multiculturalism (Deering & Stanutz, 1995; Valli, 1995). However, scholars have noted aspects of the field experience component of teacher preparation that are yet to be fully understood. In fact, Cochran-Smith, Davis, and Fries (2003) were only able to locate 10 studies (since 1992) that looked at what they called the “practice question.” This category referred to “empirical studies or data-based inquiries that describe or assess the actual practice of teacher candidates when they work in schools and classrooms” (p. 957). Other reviewers have also noted the lack of research on field placements in general and the shortcomings of that research. Hollins and Guzman (2005), for instance, point out that “more research is needed to determine the particular elements in school settings that support candidates learning” (p. 501). When the U. S. Department of Education commissioned Wilson, Floden, and Ferrini-Mundy (2002) to conduct a literature review of research on teacher preparation, one of the five focal questions they gave to guide the review was directly connected to the efficacy of field experiences and student teaching. Field experiences

generally and student teaching specifically are valued components of teacher preparation about which we seem to know alarmingly little and need to know more.

When studies are conducted, it is often the case that researchers focus on one aspect of a field placement, rather than examining multiple components or attempting to place the field experience in the context of the larger teacher preparation program. For instance, researchers have looked at the influence of student teaching on preservice teachers' beliefs, but have often neglected to account for other variables in their prior experiences or during student teaching (Cook & Van Cleaf, 2000). In another case, researchers focused on a seminar or course connected to a field placement, but this work concentrated on the university component of the experience more than the field component (Lawrence, 1997). Others have examined field placements within the context of a course, but have focused their conclusions on single components of the experience, such as the relationship with a university supervisor (Rushton, 2001). Several studies have attempted to examine the comparison between different types of field placements (Gipe, Duffy, & Richards, 1989; Ross & Smith, 1992; Cook & Van Cleaf, 2000).

In a review of research on reading teacher education, Risko et al. (2008) provided several interpretations that are applicable to this study and my approach to studying the field experience of student teaching. Specifically, they argued that research suggests that an increase in the number of field experiences may lead to an increase in desired beliefs. One of the reasons for this increase may be that, when in the field, "prospective teachers observe positive effects of teaching on pupil learning, indicating to them that instruction can make a positive difference" (p. 273). The field experience, then, is an opportunity for preservice teachers to see the connection between their own practice and

the important outcome of student learning. Findings from the review also indicated the potential for highly structured and guided field experiences to have a positive impact on preservice teachers beliefs and practices. These findings point to the need to further study apprenticeship models used in field experience and their impact, in addition to recognizing the importance of explicit guidance during student teaching as a valuable component of the learning-to-teach process.

Cochran-Smith (Cochran-Smith, Davis, & Fries, 2003; Cochran-Smith, 2005) has consistently noted the lack of attention to the outcomes of teacher education (what teachers do in classrooms and how it influences students). While this critique typically refers to what happens after preservice preparation (in fact, Cochran-Smith labels the “outcomes question” as a separate category from the “practice question”), I believe that the student teaching semester represents an important aspect of the question of outcomes in teacher education. If indeed this is the time when teacher candidates begin the process of real-classroom learning, it is essential that we more fully understand the experience and how it influences candidates’ beliefs and knowledge.

In the end, research has failed to present a multi-layered, multi-dimensional understanding of student teaching. While work has been done to examine different layers, we need to move forward in order to better understand how all of these layers interact. “Research on preservice teacher learning...must document learning on multiple planes to obtain a more comprehensive view of teachers’ transformation processes” (Artiles, Trent, Hoffman-Kipp, & Lopez-Torres, 2000).

The research on student teaching, explored in greater detail in the next chapter, makes evident the need for research that connects the various components and complex

activities of student teaching to one another and to the larger teacher preparation experience. While we have begun to build an understanding of various aspects of student teaching, we have yet to fully describe the ways in which these aspects interact. Since the question of outcomes has become one of the dominant concerns in teacher preparation policy and research, it is important to connect the experiences of preservice teachers in university settings with their practice in classrooms. This practice begins with field experiences. For these reasons, this study aimed to build on previous work in the field and to provide a broader analysis of the experience of student teachers planning to work in high-need schools. There is a demonstrated need for a better understanding of the development of teachers who plan to teach in these settings. It is clear that an understanding gleaned from examining multiple components of student teaching might be stronger than the conglomeration of many studies that examine components in isolation.

Framing the Study

I now turn to the theoretical framework that informed the view of learning and methodology adopted in this study. In developing this framework, I have relied on the work of scholars in various areas, but have sought to provide examples and a rationale for a particular way of investigating questions related to student teaching and preservice teachers' learning. In this section, I begin by presenting the work of teacher education researchers who have explicitly drawn on sociocultural theories of learning to teach. I believe their work provides a model for a study framed by this perspective. Then, I explicitly outline my own framework, which views the student teaching experience as a sociocultural practice that occurs in hybrid spaces.

Previous Research

While it is often implied that work in teacher education has undertones of sociocultural approaches to learning, these viewpoints are not always made explicit in the empirical research. It is important, in building my own argument, to consider some of the work that has taken these theoretical perspectives into account. The examples presented here are not exhaustive, but rather representative of research in this area that views learning to teach as a process that is socially and culturally mediated. One example is the work of Artiles and his colleagues (Artiles, Barreto, Pena, & McClafferty 1998; Artiles & McClafferty, 1998; Artiles, Trent, Hoffman-Kipp, & Lopez-Torres, 2000). These authors have argued, “Research on the education of teachers for student diversity has tended to ignore constructivist-based and sociocultural research paradigms” (1998, p. 71). For this reason, Artiles and his colleagues turn to work in sociocultural theory, specifically a cultural-historical theory that draws on the work of Vygotsky and his contemporaries, as a way of conceptualizing the learning-to-teach process. This theoretical rationale allows the authors to understand preservice teachers as more than passive receivers of knowledge, but rather as active participants engaged in a process of social learning that “is defined as the transformation of participation over time in a community of practice” (2000, p. 81). They use a case from their research as a way of illustrating how this theoretical approach might enhance the work of teacher education researchers and the development of teacher education programs.

Duesterberg (1998, 1999) has also done an excellent job of building a theoretical framework that takes various components of sociocultural theory into consideration. She argues that research needs to move from a concern over “the attitudes and beliefs of

student teachers about children from various racial and socioeconomic groups to the dimensions and dynamics of the sociopolitical contexts in which they/we” work (1998, p. 498). She uses Bourdieu’s work as a frame for analysis, arguing, “What people say—their language—exists in the form of discourses which are a function of the rules and relations of power particular to various social and cultural contexts” (1999, p. 754). Her approach to research views prospective teachers as embedded in social contexts and knowledge about teaching as socially constructed.

Another model can be found in the work of Ball. She specifically uses work in critical pedagogy (2000a) and activity theory (2000b) to contextualize her own research.

As she explains,

I draw on the work of Vygotsky (1978) and Leont’ev (1981) to build a theoretical frame that can help to explain teachers’ developing commitment and how those developing commitments are revealed in their oral and written discourses as they consider issues of teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students. (2000b, p. 493)

Her approach is well-reasoned, and her framework is well-developed. She specifically is concerned with aspects of activity theory related to “the study of human behavior and developing cognition [as] a dynamically organized system of activity through which humans seek to accomplish their purposes” (p. 493). This approach includes “understanding the tools and signs that mediate [mental processes]; and the use of a developmental or genetic method of investigation in activity theory which allows us to see, describe and explain the emergence of a psychological function” (p. 494). Like the work of Artiles, Ball’s framework moves beyond a static view of teacher development and seeks to “investigate whether teachers’ increased engagement with strategically designed activities in a teacher education course, could engender the transformation of

those activities into the means for developing commitment to teaching diverse student populations” (p. 493).

My desire to conduct the kind of study recommended by these researchers and used by them to effectively examine the learning-to-teach experience led me to design a study informed by theories that regard teaching and learning as socially-mediated, culturally-situated activities. Two specific areas informed my approach, and I address them here, attempting to draw connections between the work of various scholars to build an argument for the approach taken in this study. Specifically, I look at student teaching as a sociocultural practice that occurs in hybrid learning spaces.

Student Teacher Learning as Sociocultural Practice

In an article entitled “Teaching, as Learning, in Practice,” Jean Lave (1996) applies her earlier work on apprenticeship to research on teaching and learning in public schools. I believe that her conclusions should have a significant influence on our understanding of research on preservice teacher learning. Specifically she argues for a social practice theory of learning to be applied to any study of teachers and instruction. This argument builds on her earlier work with Wenger (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and views learning as “changing participation in changing ‘communities of practice’” (Lave, 1996, p. 150). Lave critiques research on teaching and learning by arguing that it typically “shows that questions about learning are almost always met by educational researchers with investigations of teaching” (p. 158). It is powerful to apply this critique to research on teacher education. In other words, is it the case that research on teacher preparation is typically focused on what teacher educators are doing, rather than on what student

teachers are learning? If this is the case, Lave argues that we need to focus our attention on the learner (in this case, the preservice teacher). “The only way to discover whether [preservice programs] are having effects and if so what those are, is to explore whether, and if so how, there are changes in the participation of [preservice teachers] learning in their various communities of practice” (p. 158). For this reason, this study was based on a framework and methodology that would allow for exploration of these various communities of practice.

The work of Gee (1996) was also helpful for understanding the social nature of language, meaning, and learning as they relate to this study. In particular, Gee’s use of cultural models and Discourses was instructive. In order to understand how meanings are arrived at and negotiated, Gee argues that we must understand “the cultural models that compose them.” Meaning, for Gee, is “ultimately rooted in negotiation between different social practices with different interests... Meanings, then, are ultimately rooted in communities” (p. 81). For the purposes of this study, it was particularly important to develop a methodology and conduct analyses that would allow for the uncovering of these meanings, for understanding the cultural models related to learning, teaching, and learning to teach that were evident within the student teaching experience. And, specifically, it was important to determine how those cultural models and meanings were established, enacted, negotiated, and contested (or not). Gee also emphasizes that one of the roles of an educator is to push beyond the cultural models and meanings that are the within the purview of various communities. As he puts it, “It is the job of the teacher to allow students to grow beyond both the cultural models of their home cultures and those of mainstream and school culture” (p. 89). In the case of this study, I was interested in

examining whether or not this stance was taken by a program of teacher education, whether they assisted student teachers in growing beyond the cultural models of teaching and learning that characterized the university space.

Gee's presentation of Discourses was also central to the conceptualization of this study. He describes Discourses as "ways of behaving, interacting, valuing, thinking, believing, speaking, and often reading and writing that are accepted as instantiations of particular roles... They are, thus, always and everywhere social and products of social histories" (p. viii). Learners, including preservice teachers, come to classrooms as members of many and varied Discourse communities. Part of the role of teacher education might be viewed as apprenticing preservice teachers into the Discourse of teaching. Student teachers, then, belong to many Discourses that are both directly tied to student teaching and less central to their experiences in student teaching. Gee argues that people spend a significant amount of time negotiating between Discourses, determining which Discourse is relevant, and performing according to the requirements of a given Discourse. All of these practices, particularly the sense that people appropriate and perform various identities and negotiate between sometimes conflicting communities, are central to the questions that guided this study, its methodology, and the analysis of data.

Student Teacher Learning in Hybrid Spaces

Within the student teaching system, there are different spaces where various activities occur. Space can mean both physical and social. My study focuses centrally on the space where the student teacher and the program of teacher education overlap. I think this space is automatically, by definition, a "hybrid space." It involves the interaction of

student teacher (with all they bring) and program (as represented by different people and representing different people). The space is multivoiced and at times includes other participants as well, such as classroom mentors. A view of the learning-to-teach system as encompassing multiple Discourses and as multivoiced and polycontextual led me to consider the work of scholars who have theorized “third space.” (Bhabha, 1994; Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, Tejada, 1999; Soja, 1996). Moje and her colleagues (Moje, Ciechanowski, Kramer, et al., 2004) similarly applied this work to their study of content area literacy instruction. Their approach to this work was informative and captured the various approaches to third space and how they have been used in educational research. For the purposes of my study, I used their work for considering different versions of hybrid (or third) space and thinking about their applicability to my study.

The authors present three versions of third space: geographical (drawing on the work of Soja), postcolonial (from the work of Bhabha), and educational (the work of Gutiérrez and her colleagues). They argue that third space “demands looking beyond the binary categories of first and second spaces...[which] might be the everyday and the academic [or] primary and secondary Discourses” (Moje et al., 2004, p. 39). While initial conceptions were more physical and geographic, Bhabha (1994) moved in a political and cultural direction, arguing for third space as the location of contestation, negotiation, and change: “The transformational value of change lies in the rearticulation, or translation, of elements that are *neither the One...nor the Other...but something else besides*, which contests the terms and territories of both” (p. 41). Moje argues that “Bhabha’s conception of third space might productively be extended to destabilize what counts as...knowledge practice in school” (p. 43). For my purposes, it can also be extended to consider what

counts as knowledge (and more specifically knowledge related to teaching, learning, and learning to teach) in teacher education. The view of knowledge and of spaces (composed of various activities, parties, tools, and Discourses) as contestable, as possible sites of disruption, and as spaces in which negotiation can occur was central to my study and led to an investigation of whether and how these spaces were contested, navigated, or disrupted. Negotiation, Bhabha argues, has the potential to “open up hybrid sites and objectives of struggle” (p. 37).

Moje and her colleagues (2004) move on to describe the use of third space in educational theory and research. They specifically describe three ways in which the theory is being used. After describing their categories, I will situate my own study within them. First, they argue, third space is used in education “as a way to build bridges from knowledges and Discourses often marginalized in school settings to the learning of conventional academic knowledges and Discourses” (p. 43). This approach to third space is present in the work of Gutiérrez. The underlying idea is that the Discourses of the student (which are often marginalized in classroom spaces) can be valued and used as a scaffold for acquiring more official Discourses. The second category presented is “third space as a navigational space, a way of crossing and succeeding in different discourse communities” (p. 44), here the authors use the work of scholars in new literacies as an example, arguing that adolescents (as evidenced in their literacy practices) are adept at navigating multiple spaces and Discourses and that educators should help them apply these skills in navigating more academic Discourses. Finally, they argue that third space in education is sometimes “viewed as a space of cultural, social, and epistemological

change in which competing knowledges and Discourses of different spaces are brought into ‘conversation’” (p. 44).

For the purposes of my study, I largely applied the second and third conceptions of third space described above. Since I viewed the various spaces of the student teaching system as immanently hybrid, I was interested in exploring and determining the extent to which they (especially the hybrid space where student teachers and programs of teacher education meet) were productively hybrid. From Gutiérrez’s perspective, a productive hybridity would mean that in the “third space” what the student teacher brings is used to scaffold their learning of the Discourses of the teacher education space. My own study was more driven by the idea of third space as a “navigational space.” This view is in its most simple form about border crossing. If this third space were to exist in the student teacher system, it would mean that the student teacher successfully navigates the various spaces of student teaching (the program-related ones and the school-related ones).

Finally, third space can be a space of change— where the creation of new knowledges and Discourses occurs and shift happens. Ideally, I believe, this is the kind of third space that teacher educators should seek. I think in many cases it is the kind of third space that educational researchers (in literacy especially) argue for in P-12 classrooms—where student discourses meet academic discourses and new “texts” are created. I was interested in uncovering where the P-12, university, and student teacher spaces came into conflict and the extent to which these hybrid spaces were productive.

The theory of learning and of the spaces in which it occurs described here led me to examine the outcomes of teacher education in the context under examination in a manner that focused on the activity of preservice teachers and their instructional leaders

(professors, university mentors, and classroom teachers) in the spaces they shared. It was designed as a multi-layered examination of the student teaching experience that treats the learning of preservice teachers as an activity that is socially and culturally mediated and informed by multiple historical and cultural worlds. As Cole (1998) points out, “it is by analyzing what people do in culturally organized activity, people acting through mediational means in a context, that one comes to understand the process of being human. Mediation of action through culture in social interaction is the essential precondition for normal human development” (p. 292).

Research Questions

For the reasons discussed above, I have designed this project to look specifically at the experiences of student teachers and to consider the interaction of the spaces and Discourses that are part of the system. It is important to emphasize that the unit of analysis for this study is the system of student teaching. However, the study is largely concerned with how student teachers develop within that system. As Artiles and his colleagues (2000) explain it, “The main focus is on the processes of how people develop as a result of their involvement with others while using and transforming cultural artifacts in historically and institutionally situated contexts” (p. 84). In addition, because of my desire to examine teacher preparation within a program of education, the study focused on the student teacher – program space and the activities, parties, and artifacts that comprised that space.

In their work, Gutiérrez and her colleagues (1999) reference the import of the “social practice(s) that include the norms, values, division of labor, the goals of a

community, and its participants' enduring dispositions toward the social practice" (p. 287). These authors use this approach to "provide a situated analysis of one classroom community" (p. 287). My goal is to provide a situated analysis of one program of teacher education. With this goal, as well as the context and framework described previously in this chapter, in mind the following research questions were established to guide this study:

1. How are the intended outcomes of teacher education enacted and assessed during the student teaching semester, what contradictions or tensions arise, and what are the possible implications for student teacher learning?
2. How are the contradictions or tensions navigated by individual student teachers planning to work in high-need settings and what are the possible implications for their learning and practice?

These questions relate directly to the needs of research outlined earlier in this chapter (those needs tied to the context of education and the need for a deeper, richer understanding of the student teaching semester). Specifically, they address the importance of viewing student teaching as a complex system of interrelated communities. Unlike many previous studies, they do not focus on a single component of student teaching (such as reflection or relationships with supervisors), but rather on the interaction of these components within multiple spaces.

The questions and the study were not meant to point to an analysis of how teachers move from a point of inexperience to one of expertise (or even beginning proficiency), but rather were concerned with how the experience affects the learning and development that occur. The goal was not to provide a simplistic recipe for student

teaching that would result in maximum influence on preservice teachers and necessarily make them better teachers in diverse settings. It was, rather, to begin a deeper exploration of the nature of student teaching and the multiple activities, settings, parties, and tools involved during this transition from university student to classroom teacher. By studying this process and reporting on the findings, I hoped to build richer knowledge about what contributes to and what hinders preservice teacher development.

This chapter has outlined the rationale for a study of student teaching and the preparation of prospective teachers intending to work in diverse, high-need classrooms. The next chapter will provide a more detailed review of the literature. My examination of the literature is divided into two major sections that align with the research questions. First, I look at research on field-based experiences and their influence on preservice teachers' learning and development in order to help situate the study in relation to the first research question. Then, I examine research on multicultural teacher education more thoroughly as a means of grounding the study as one focused on the preparation of teachers for high-need settings.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The student teaching experience represents an important phase in the preservice development of teachers and is often intended to serve as a bridge between two communities (the university and the P-12 school). It is during this time that preservice teachers have the most opportunities to build a repertoire of practice that will connect their university coursework and their future classrooms. It is also during this time that student teachers are able to learn in various spaces and through guided apprenticeship by mentors, peers, and others. The literature reviewed here is meant to provide a picture of what the research says about field experiences and address two main areas: components of quality field experiences and the experiences of student teachers in practice. While my main focus is on the student teaching experience (as opposed to early practicum courses), I do draw on literature that examined other field experiences and the induction years in large part because of the relative lack of research on this component of teacher education but also because I believe this literature is useful in considering various aspects of preservice teachers' work in the field and the transition to full-time teaching. Since early field experiences differ from student teaching and student teaching differs from the first years of teaching in important ways, I will make clear the type of experience being examined and the implications of the findings for field experiences more broadly. In addition to considering research on field experiences and student teaching, I also review literature related to instructional practices for culturally and linguistically diverse student

populations in order to situate the study as one focused on student teachers committed to working with diverse student populations.

Components of Quality Field Experiences

In examining the research on field experiences, my goal was to analyze what has been learned and areas that need to be further studied. These findings guided the design of this study and influenced the analysis of the data collected. The study attempted to add more nuance to our understanding of areas that have been studied, provide understanding that is lacking, and raise even more questions about the traditional way of organizing student teaching.

Unfortunately, studies that examine the influence of field experiences have often been one-dimensional. They look at one aspect of an experience and use one measure (journals or surveys, typically) to gauge whether or not students in the field placement sites make gains in relation to various outcomes, such as their cultural awareness and sensitivity. In addition, it is often the case that the authors do not include enough detail about the actual experience for readers to gauge what components of the experience might have led to or hindered the desired outcomes or determine the transferability of the findings. One example of this kind of work is a study conducted by Deering and Stanutz (1995). Their study showed that “significant changes in attitude occurred in some areas, but the field experience seemed to have no impact on the subjects in other areas, perhaps a negative impact in a few” (p. 392). While this finding is somewhat instructive, no clear description of the field experience under consideration was given. They conclude by saying that “raising the cultural sensitivity of preservice teachers is more difficult than

originally thought” (p. 393). I would also argue that “raising the cultural sensitivity of preservice teachers” is in itself insufficient. Studies of field experience must examine how this idea relates to the practice of classroom teachers and their beliefs about pedagogy, not only their level of cultural awareness.

Despite the fact that the research is lacking, it is possible to glean several components related to field experiences that are believed to be important and effective for preparing preservice teachers for the profession. Specifically, researchers present findings that describe the need for teacher preparation programs to pay attention to: the type and quality of placements and the type and quality of supervision.

Type and Quality of Placements

One focus of research literature has been on the need for early experiences to introduce preservice teachers to multicultural settings and allow opportunities for development of intercultural knowledge and experiences. Burant and Kirby (2001) studied the early field experiences of a group of preservice teachers enrolled in a university course with strong connections to an urban elementary and middle school. They found that many of the students demonstrated changing viewpoints regarding the children and families in the schools. Their study also revealed the difficulty of making strong university/school connections, but demonstrated the potential power of these connections. They “advocate stronger, more creative partnerships between schools and universities in which preservice teachers actually live in urban schools and communities with teachers and university faculty working closely together for extended periods of time” (p. 572). Understanding the intricacies of the relationship between these two

settings within the student teaching activity system is also important, and a focus of this study. While Burant and Kirby looked at the development of teachers in an early experience, their recommendations are relevant to student teaching as well. One of their conclusions about the need for future studies is directly related to the goals of understanding the complexity of the field experience: “We are [now] most mindful of the complex intersecting factors of a dynamic setting..., conversations among participants about their experiences, class discussions, and student dispositions that interact to create truly ‘educative practicums’” (p. 572). In the end they call for research that more closely examines all of the aspects of field experiences.

Another issue that has been debated in the literature related to the type of placement in which preservice teachers complete their field experiences and student teaching is about the schools in which preservice teachers complete their field experiences. Issues have been raised about whether candidates intending to work in urban settings should teach only in urban settings or have experience in other types of schools as well. Gipe, Duffy, & Richards (1989) found that “providing a wide variety of diverse experiences for prospective teachers” (p. 262) is beneficial in terms of their development in relation to reading/language arts instruction and teaching diverse students. However, like so many other studies, the description of the placement sites is lacking, and it is not entirely clear what is meant by diverse experiences. In addition, the study used a post-test only design to measure the learning of preservice teachers. This design does not allow us to consider the knowledge and tools that participants brought to the study or to determine whether progress can be attributed to the field experience itself.

The work of Tiezzi & Cross (1997) also provides insight about the field experience. Most significantly, their findings indicate that preservice teacher development during urban field experiences is directly linked to the prior knowledge and experiences of the candidates. Like others, their main recommendations are for early immersion placements that help to provide educative experiences for their students and for stronger relationships between the university and the schools where students work.

Research on professional development schools also provides insight into the aspects of student teaching supervision that can be beneficial for the learning and growth of preservice teachers. While these studies are located within a structure of teacher education that is very different from more traditional models and from the program examined in my study, the research provides insights and implications for various programs in terms of the relationship between university and preservice teacher during field-based experiences. Grisham, Laguardia, and Brink (2000) studied a yearlong field experience that took place in a professional development school setting. Through analysis of the data, they determined eight factors that contributed to a high-quality field experience for the students. Again, some of these factors are directly tied to the nature of the professional development school model, but they have implications for other programs as well. The eight factors were (a) the duration of the experience (an entire year, rather than one semester), (b) the use of clustering (placing more than one student teacher in a single site), (c) the holding of university courses onsite, (d) the enhanced supervision of student teachers, (e) the implementation of a steering committee (comprised of university faculty and school personnel) to oversee the experience, (f) the inclusion of a second, student teacher-directed experience in addition to student teaching,

and (g) the collegial status that was present among participants. They argued that all of these factors led to a “transformed field experience for beginning teachers, in which they work as contributing participants or co-teachers, instead of the rather subordinate positions they usually experience” (p. 9). While some of these factors hold promise and could be replicated outside of a professional development school, the authors did not do an adequate job of describing them in some instances. In addition, while they argue that the program had a “profound impact” on student teachers, they do not adequately describe what the impact was and their conclusions appear to be mainly justified by the self-report of the student teachers and how they felt about the experience.

In a chapter on the preparation of White teachers for diverse schools, Sleeter (2005) discussed three key components of preservice teacher preparation: coursework, fieldwork, and cross-cultural learning experiences. In reference to fieldwork, she emphasizes, “Classroom teaching experience is essential, although a challenge for teacher education is preparing teachers who do not simply replicate prevailing practices” (p. 20). Her conclusions, based on the research, confirm one common concern about student teaching: that our preservice teachers are in classrooms that do not always represent effective instruction for diverse students. Sleeter argues that we must not simply ask whether current field experiences have an influence on teachers’ beliefs and knowledge, but how we might “construct field experiences that do” have such an influence. I believe that in order to construct those field experiences, we must have a more thorough understanding of the various components that are involved in field experience, such as the relationship between preservice teachers and their cooperating teacher, university supervisors, and instructors. If we can begin to attribute success in diverse classrooms,

implementation of sound practices, and development of beliefs and knowledge to specific aspects of the experience, we may be able to better use that knowledge to create more effective field placements. In addition, if we are able to demonstrate aspects of the student teaching experience (or other field experiences) that may possibly be hindering preservice teachers' growth, we may be able to alter or remove those components.

Type and Quality of Supervision

It is typically the case, during student teaching, that many other parties (and the Discourses they represent and bring to the experience) have an influence on what student teachers do and learn, as well as how they view the experience. "Each represented perspective has different investments in positioning the ways in which one learns to become a teacher. Such investments complicate the stories of learning to teach" (Britzman, 2003, p. 32). Because my study was centrally concerned with the space in which student teachers and the program of teacher education overlap and interact, I have focused my attention in this section of the literature review specifically on the relationships between university-based parties that are involved with the experience and student teachers. At times, research in this area also examines the relationships that student teachers have with other parties located in the P-12 school space. Research on what the parties involved in student teaching do in practice and should be doing is inconclusive and often contradictory.

The work of Borko and Mayfield (1995) is one of the most often cited studies of the relationship between student teachers and university supervisors (cited 100 times according to Google Scholar). It is often used as a reference when authors or researchers

argue that the traditional approach to student teacher supervision (one based largely on evaluation rather than on inquiry and development) is ineffectual and needs to be reconsidered. In their work, Borko and Mayfield argued that supervision by university-based personnel tended to focus largely on the details of evaluation and on things like paperwork. They concluded that traditional supervision did not allow student teachers to change or challenge their own practice in substantive ways.

Given the findings of Borko and Mayfield, subsequent studies have sought to test their conclusion and to provide insight into how the relationship between student teachers and university supervisors might be of higher quality. In some cases researchers have documented relationships with mentors that were more valuable and moved beyond completing paperwork (Fairbanks, Freedman, & Kahn, 2000). If nothing else, the research indicates that there is “alarming variability” in terms of the sorts of relationships student teachers have with their mentors and the results of those relationships (Keogh, Dole, & Hudson, 2006). Hawkey (1998) has argued that the beliefs of mentors have a serious effect on the practices of student teachers. This connection implies that student teachers have varied experiences because the difference between mentors has the potential to be so great. She suggests that programs of teacher education need to provide a more structured introduction for mentors and train them in the processes desired by the program. Like many, she believes in the “centrality of the mentoring relationship as a source for student teacher learning about teaching” (p. 665).

In their study of a program of teacher education and the use of a particular framework for student teacher supervision, Blanton, Berenson, and Norwood (2001) found that it is possible for mentors to have a positive effect on the ability of student

teachers to change their practice. They used an approach to supervision that focused on challenging student teachers through the use of “instructional conversations.” The underlying philosophy of this approach was that the conversations between student teachers and their supervisors should be fundamentally rooted in the conflicts that arise and are observed in the practices of student teachers. Dealing with these conflicts head on and using them as the central focus of dialogue allowed supervisors to guide student teachers and provide useful feedback, resulting in attempts by student teachers to engage in changed practices.

In addition to examining the potential for more high-quality relationships and experiences with university supervisors or mentors, researchers have looked at other possibilities for providing feedback and support to student teachers, in order to help them become more reflective and effective practitioners. Several researches have examined the possible effects of peer coaching as an addition or alternative to more traditional forms of supervision. Peer coaching involves having student teachers observe one another and engage in reflective feedback and conversation on their teaching. Studies of these programs have indicated that peer coaching has the potential to improve the experiences of student teachers, especially when students are trained and given guidance in the process of peer coaching. Bowman and McCormick (2000) conducted a study in which they compared two cohorts of student teachers, one who was introduced to and used peer coaching and a control group that had only traditional supervision. Their findings indicated that student teachers who participated in peer coaching valued it and generally rated their experience as more productive. In addition, they argued that peer coaching

was beneficial because it prepared preservice teachers to collaborate effectively with colleagues during their early careers.

Anderson and Radencich (2001) have also studied peer coaching. They were particularly interested in examining how preservice teachers responded to receiving multiple forms of feedback (from peers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors). Some students in their study reported that peer coaching was an added time commitment and viewed it as unproductive, but overall the study indicated that feedback from peers was as valued as feedback from cooperating teachers and more valued than feedback from university supervisors. One caution given by the researchers, however, was that preservice teachers may have accepted the feedback of peer coaches and cooperating teachers uncritically.

Other researchers have examined the potential of the relationship between student teacher and university mentor to be transformative and productive even within a more traditional structure of student teacher supervision. This work is important for examining the ways in the relationship can be used as a means of moving preservice teachers forward and simultaneously engaging in transformative practice in P-12 schools and university programs. Bieler and Thomas (2009) reported on two self-studies in which they attempted to engage student teachers in transformation through inquiry. They present the example of one mentor who engaged her student teacher in examining aspects of the experience and appropriating the assignments and other requirements for his own purposes. The authors give the specific example of a portfolio that the preservice teacher was asked to complete. He, along with his mentor, was able to reimagine the portfolio assignment in a way that met his needs and the program's needs. The authors, based on

this and other examples, push for an approach to mentoring during student teaching that focuses on dialectic inquiry, where “new teachers engage in questioning that is individualized, self-reflexive, and embracing of the tension that so often characterizes the educational climate” (p. 42). The authors conclude that this approach allowed student teachers to “claim a powerful, important sense of agency” (p. 42).

Anagostopoulos, Smith, and Basmadjian (2007) provide another valuable example of how university-based mentors or supervisors can engage in practices that move beyond the pitfalls of traditional supervision. They argue that in order to help student teachers navigate between the university and public school spaces, mentors can use objects to serve as a pivot or connection between spaces. The authors give the example of a rubric for evaluating classroom discussion that was introduced to a student teacher by a classroom mentor, discussed and reformulated with input from a university mentor, and further refined during a university course before it was again used by the student teacher and the classroom mentor. The authors argue that the rubric served as a boundary object and allowed for horizontal expertise (drawing on the work of Engestrom). They indicate that this case provides evidence that transformed mentoring practices are possible, and that one of the significant outcomes of the event was that the student teacher was viewed as knowledgeable and made significant contributions in the school and at the university, which led to transformed practice with students. This kind of valuing of the knowledge of student teachers during field placements is too rare (Keogh, Dole, & Hudson, 2006), but might be more possible through experiences like this one.

While the research on supervision is at times contradictory and the role of the supervisor in studies of field experiences is often not explained in sufficient detail to

draw conclusions, there are a few suggestions in this literature that could provide guidance for programs of teacher education and researchers. Quality supervision involves challenging the student teacher. These challenges should come directly from the experiences and conflicts that the student teacher faces. Because of the variability that exists from one mentor to another, more formal training or the use of specific approaches to mentoring may be useful in helping students navigate between the multiple spaces of learning to teach and to help them meet their own needs and goals as learners.

Experiences of Student Teachers in Practice

Multiple studies have looked at the changes that student teachers (and new teachers) undergo at the culmination of their preparation (and in their early careers). These studies indicate important considerations for future work in the area. As discussed previously, the student teaching experience is one of the first stages of transition from university student to classroom teacher. The results of these studies indicate the importance of viewing this becoming-teacher process as a complex set of interactions during which preservice (or new) teachers are developing their identities and practices. In this section I consider work that has examined the experiences of teachers learning to teach at the end of their preparation and at the beginning of their careers. I focus specifically on what researchers have learned about the process and its effects on the learners. The research base for this section is largely qualitative and considers what happens to preservice and novice teachers during their early experiences in the classroom. As one set of authors points out, this research attempts to answer “Wolcott’s

(1988) question, ‘What’s going on here?’” (Grisham, Laguardia, & Brink, 2000, p. 4).

What happens to preservice teachers as they enter the field?

While the student teaching experience is meant to provide a transition of sorts between the university and the P-12 school, it often creates conflicts between what preservice teachers have been taught and what they encounter in the schools. As Wideen, Mayer-Smith, and Moon (1998) wrote in their review of the literature on teacher education, “Tensions appeared between the expectations of teacher educators on the one hand and the reality faced by the preservice teachers on the other” (p. 153). Traditionally, the student teaching experience has been viewed in the literature as a time when “an important shift in thinking among beginning teachers from idealism to practicality” occurs (p. 154). Smagorinsky, Jakubiak, and Moore (2008) have used the idea of the contact zone to describe the experience. They argued that a student teacher had to navigate four sets of sometimes competing interests: her own, those of the teacher education program, those of the curriculum and the cooperating teacher, and those of her students. The interaction of these interests and the experience of the student teacher generally, they argued, was “rife with paradoxes” (p. 452).

The transition from student to teacher, and the experience of being “marginally situated in two worlds” (Britzman, 2003, p. 36), is often characterized by a sense of shock, and sometimes by a move from idealism to practicality. Corcoran (1981) conducted one of the earliest studies on the phenomenon of “transition shock.” She looked at the experience of new teachers who still had strong connections to their university program. Her results indicated that during the initial stages of teaching full-time, teachers had difficulty accessing the tools that they learned in their university

coursework. In addition, they followed the advice of the personnel in their schools almost completely in the beginning of their careers. The author argues that a “six to eight week period of paralysis was a natural, necessary and appropriate part of [one teacher’s] professional development” (p. 23). After this point, the teacher was able to break from the advice of colleagues and draw on more of the resources in her repertoire. While this study focused on new teachers, they had a relationship with the university similar to the relationship between student teachers and their instructors and mentors. Corcoran’s findings have often been a concern. Despite the idea that this transition period may be necessary, it makes the student teaching experience seem insufficient. In other words, one semester of student teaching may not be enough for preservice teachers to move beyond shock and be able to implement the practices that they intend to implement with their students. It is important for future research to explore this question in more detail and examine the extent to which the traditional student teaching semester can prepare teacher candidates for the transition from university to school.

Other researchers have more recently considered some of the same issues as Corcoran, and come to similar conclusions. Smagorinsky, Lakly, and Johnson (2002) found that the instructional decision making of a beginning teacher was largely characterized by three possible approaches to the conflict between what they believed to be effective instruction (as learned in their university-based program) and the demands of their classrooms, which were perceived to be in conflict. These approaches were acquiescence, accommodation, and resistance. The teacher in the study most often accommodated, meaning she adapted her beliefs to meet the demands of the school and curriculum without completely abandoning them. The authors argued that towards the

end of her first year she was finally able to resist the aspects of the school space that she found troubling and in conflict with her constructivist approach to pedagogy. She was able to move from a didactic approach to a more student-centered approach in large part through the example of more experienced teachers.

Rushton (2001) examined the experiences of a student teacher in an urban school and found that this student teacher's time in the field was characterized largely by culture shock, conflict, and change. What remained most important, however, was the participant's determination to succeed. This particular narrative case study does an excellent job of recounting the development of a student teacher based on her own words. Unlike other studies, it allows for a close examination of the individual going through the experience of becoming a teacher. However, it does little to demonstrate the connections between this development and the teacher's experience in other settings (such as the university site).

While its focus was somewhat different, the work of Cook, Smagorinsky, Fry, Konopak, and Moore (2002) shared many of the goals of my study. It used a framework based on activity theory to understand the interaction of various people, events, and artifacts and their impact on a new teacher. Specifically, they presented a case study of a teacher and her difficulty in implementing constructivist pedagogy in her first classroom. They sought to understand the extent to which she had developed a sound conceptual understanding of constructivism and whether or not it influenced her classroom practice. They argue that her inability to teach in a constructivist manner had less to do with the position of her colleagues or the shock of being teacher, and more to do with her "lack of appropriation of the concept of constructivism" (p. 412) from the beginning. They

describe the case as a “twisting path of concept development that had insufficient definition at the outset and whose turns easily led to detours in the setting of the schools” (p. 412). This finding demonstrates the importance of understanding the development of teachers prior to their implementation of classroom practices. The few studies that have found mixed results related to implementation of practices may be too quick to jump to conclusions about the source or cause of these outcomes.

These studies that confirm and examine the difficulties that many teachers have in transitioning from their experiences in teacher preparation to their work in classrooms raise serious questions about the connection between university coursework and field experiences. There seems to be a serious and potentially detrimental divide between what teachers do in university-based settings and experiences and how they are able to translate this to P-12 settings and experiences. The results are mixed and it appears that we are indeed still at the early stages of understanding this important aspect of teacher preparation. Sleeter (1989), for instance, found that despite coursework in multicultural education and pedagogies, relatively few teachers actually implemented sound multicultural instruction in their classrooms. Others (Maloch et al., 2003; Hoffman et al., 2005) have demonstrated that teachers trained in strong programs have more success in avoiding the transition shock and implementing sound reading instruction in their early careers. In addition, it has been shown that strong support and mentoring during the first years of teaching can have an influence on teachers’ success in the classroom (Corcoran, 1981; Achinstein & Barrett, 2004).

While this phenomenon has been studied for teachers in their first few years of teaching (see Costigan, 2004; Mayes, Montero, & Cutri, 2004 for other examples), it is

also important to recognize how it influences student teachers. The research that has looked at what student teachers encounter in high-need school settings has shown that they sometimes are overwhelmed by the issues that they attribute to the students and communities in the schools (Goodwin, 1997). In order to more fully understand the “transition shock” and its influence on novices, we must more fully understand the initial stage of this transition: the student teaching experience.

Sound Instructional Practices

Determining what counts as quality instruction is a difficult and complicated task. In the case of this study it was important to look at research related to sound instructional practice in order to situate how teaching and learning were defined in this context. In this section, therefore, I review literature on sound instructional practices with a special focus on practices deemed most important for teachers working with culturally and linguistically diverse students.

Valuing the Lives of Students

One of the central principles of culturally responsive teaching relates to the background knowledge and out-of-school lives of students. This principle connects directly to the importance of the out-of-school or cultural knowledges and literacies of students, their primary Discourses. Sound multicultural practice must validate and rely on the “funds of knowledge” (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992) that students bring to school and the literacies that they use in their everyday lives. As Gay (2000) has argued, teachers must use “the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and

performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant to and effective for them” (p. 69). The goal of this kind of instruction is to build bridges between the in-school and out-of-school lives of students. In order to do this, teachers must not only be familiar with the cultural worlds of their students, but must be adept at recognizing how these texts can and should inform instruction in the classroom. Ladson-Billings (1994a) argues that culturally relevant teaching occurs when “students’ real-life experiences are legitimized as they become part of the ‘official’ curriculum” (p. 117). In a similar fashion, Gutiérrez and her colleagues (Gutiérrez, Baquendo-Lopez, & Turner, 1997) have described this process in action as the creation of a “third space,” where the world of school and the lives of students interact. Examples of this first principle in action can be seen in the work of Dyson (1993), Alvermann, Moon, & Hagood (1999), and Mahiri (2004), among others.

Implementing Pedagogies of Equity and Action

Another principle central to teaching in multicultural contexts relates more directly to teaching strategies and learning styles. This area includes attention to the ways in which students are taught and the content that they are taught. Instructional strategies that address the needs of various learners should be a central aspect of classroom practice. Students must be provided an “academically challenging curriculum that includes attention to the development of higher level cognitive skills” (Zeichner, 1996, p. 149). This instruction should be provided in an environment that emphasizes collaboration and apprenticeship, rather than didactic instruction (Ladson-Billings, 1994b). It is here that multicultural education moves from a “banking concept” to a

“problem-posing” approach and from viewing students as objects to viewing them as subjects (Freire, 2002). Banks (2006) refers to an equity pedagogy in which “teachers modify their teaching in ways that will facilitate the academic achievement of students from diverse racial, cultural, ethnic, language, and gender groups” (p. 15). Regardless of the specific terminology used, this approach to instruction has the “educational, economic, social, political, and cultural futures” (Ladson-Billings, 1994a, p. 117) of students as a main focus. In addition it is concerned with issues of empowerment and social justice, providing opportunities for teachers and students to examine and interrogate the status quo.

Since these ideals are somewhat abstract, it is important to consider the ways in which they might be manifested in classroom practices. It is not enough to hold the belief that pedagogy should be empowering or that curriculum must be transformed. Beginning teachers should have a sense of what this means in terms of practice when engaging with learners. Banks (2006) provides a discussion of several approaches to reforming the curriculum in order to meet the goals of this approach. First, he discusses the contributions approach, in which ethnic information is added to the curriculum in order to show the contributions of women and non-White people and groups. Next, he describes the ethnic additive approach, which adds “content, concepts, themes, and perspectives to the curriculum without changing its basic structure, purposes, and characteristics” (p. 60). Third, is the transformation approach, which includes the “infusion of various perspectives, frames of reference, and content from various groups that will extend students’ understandings of the nature, development, and complexity of U.S. society” (p. 61). Finally, the social action approach adds the component of activism in order to help

students participate in events that are emancipatory or will lead to prejudice reduction. Clearly, the social action approach is the goal. However, it seems unlikely that student teachers are able to reach this level, given the constraints that exist (or are perceived to exist) within their placement classrooms. Understanding where their instruction falls in this conception of curricular approaches is important, as is understanding the decision-making process and influences that lead to a given approach, or possibly to no approach at all.

To review, student teachers committed to working in diverse schools should progress in terms of their ability to incorporate the out-of-school and cultural lives of their students, the variety of strategies they use, their adeptness at incorporating multiculturalism into the curriculum in authentic and powerful ways, and their conception of learning as a political, cultural, and social practice. This list is certainly not exhaustive, but provides a beginning point for considering the development of new teachers. These principles emphasize the need to prepare teachers who “have the tools needed to address the narratives of accountability and standards that threaten to erase the particularities of individual students, their diversity, and the ways in which they live out the relationships among language, literacy, and power” (Rogers, Marshall, & Tyson, 2006). For the purposes of this study, they indicate the areas of concern that must be considered in the development of preservice teachers engaged in student teaching.

The goal of this chapter has been to outline the need for a study of the complexities of the student teaching experience and the learning and development of student teachers committed to high-need educational contexts. Through a review of the empirical and conceptual work on student teaching and field based experiences, as well

as consideration of sound instructional practices for culturally and linguistically diverse students, I have provided a framework for understanding the development of preservice teachers and have outlined the potential outcomes for teachers working in urban and other diverse settings. I now turn to the methodology of the study at hand, which built on the areas of research discussed here in an attempt to provide a more nuanced picture of student teaching by adopting the framework outlined in the first chapter.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study was conceived to examine the student teaching component of a teacher education program. Through the project, I investigated the contradictions and tensions that arose during a semester of student teaching; their connection to the outcomes of teacher education and the assessment of those outcomes; and the possible implications for educating student teachers, particularly preservice teachers planning to work in high-need schools. The study was guided by an approach rooted in sociocultural theories of learning and the view of learning events as hybrid contexts. Two central research questions were formulated and are repeated here for convenience:

1. How are the intended outcomes of teacher education enacted and assessed during the student teaching semester, what contradictions or tensions arise, and what are the possible implications for student teacher learning?
2. How are the contradictions or tensions navigated by individual student teachers planning to work in high-need settings and what are the possible implications for their learning and practice?

With these research questions as a guide, I considered the multiple contexts in which preservice teachers participate during student teaching. By examining these various, interacting communities of participation (e.g. mentoring groups, meetings with cooperating teachers, and the student teaching seminar), I hoped to draw conclusions about the extent to which teachers committed to working with diverse populations in

high-need settings develop during their final field experience before graduation. In this chapter, I first present my rationale for the design of the study. Then I discuss site and participant selection and my own position as the researcher. Methods of data collection are presented in relation to the questions addressed by the study. Next, I present my methods of data analysis. Finally, I discuss issues of trustworthiness related to qualitative research.

Decisions about Design

This study adopted a naturalistic approach to research. In order to examine the various contexts of the student teaching experience, it was necessary to look at the particulars of various events throughout the semester. In discussing their approach to studying literacy, Bloome and Bailey (1992) have argued that much “education research has been concerned with discovering universals” (p. 192). Like these authors, I argue that research must look at the particular and “focus on what makes an event different from other events” (p. 192). Rather than design a study with the goal of demonstrating generalizable conclusions about the student teaching experience, I set out to study the particulars of one context in order to elucidate the factors that influenced the development of student teachers in that context. I believe, however, that the design of the study, which includes triangulation of data sources and a thick description of the site (Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1993), allowed for the building of theory related to events under consideration. By providing a rich description of this context, the various communities in which student teachers participated, and the events and artifacts that mediated their learning, I begin building theoretical conclusions and hypotheses about the

ways in which preservice teachers develop their practices as educators and their identities as teachers. My understanding was rooted in a view of student teaching as a complex activity in which prospective teachers and the people with whom they interact socially construct knowledge about teaching.

Decisions about what kinds of data to collect were directly tied to the research questions (see Table 1). In addition to being driven by my questions, these decisions were directly related to the focus on the spaces in which the program interacted with the

Table 1

Research Questions and Sources of Data

Question	Sources of Data
<p>How are the intended outcomes of teacher education enacted and assessed during the student teaching semester, what contradictions or tensions arise, and what are the possible implications for student teacher learning?</p>	<p>Programmatic documents and artifacts (handbooks, website, assessments, syllabi) Observations of seminar meetings, small group meetings, and conferences with mentors Artifacts connected to mentor/student teacher relationships (observation and conference forms) Artifacts connected to assessments (rubrics, assessment descriptions, evaluations of student work)</p>
<p>How are the contradictions or tensions navigated by individual student teachers planning to work in high-need settings and what are the possible implications for their learning and practice?</p>	<p>Interviews with student teachers Observations of seminar meetings, small group meetings, conferences with mentors, and classroom instruction Artifacts connected to mentor/student teacher relationships (forms and reflections). Artifacts connected to classroom instruction and program assessments (unit plans, action research projects, and student teaching evaluations)</p>

student teacher and P-12 school space. These sources of data will be explained in greater detail below.

In order to collect data that were directly tied to my questions and represented the complexity of student teaching, I have relied heavily on the work of Artiles et al. (1998, 2000) and Grossman et al. (2000). As discussed in Chapter I, these scholars have used sociocultural theories of learning as frameworks to guide their study of teacher development. For this reason, I looked to their studies to determine how one might represent the multiple artifacts, people, and communities that influence student teachers within a program of teacher education. In a study of bilingual teachers in urban schools, Artiles et al. (1998) focused on three main outcomes: teacher pedagogical knowledge, teacher beliefs, and teacher interactive thinking. In order to capture the various influences on this development, the researchers used a concept map to measure teachers' understanding of pedagogy. In addition, they conducted surveys and in-depth interviews with participants. They also conducted recall interviews following classroom observations.

Grossman et al. (2000) conducted a longitudinal study of 10 new teachers. The researchers conducted extensive interviews with participants, as well as classroom observations. Their observations included brief interviews before and after each lesson. In addition, they observed meetings between teachers and university supervisors. They also interviewed other personnel at the school. They argue, "The design of this longitudinal study afforded us opportunities to explore many facets of the settings in which these teachers worked and to document how they learned to teach across these settings" (p. 5). My own study aimed for the same goal by relying on some of the

techniques used by these researchers (e.g. surveys, interviews, observations of meetings between student teachers and mentors, and classroom observations), as well as others (e.g. collection of artifacts related to the meetings between mentors and student teachers, lesson plans, assessment data, as well as observations of group meetings) that helped capture an even greater number of facets involved in student teaching and allowed me to focus on the events in which student teacher learning was assumed to occur.

Site Selection and Description

This study took place at a single university and sought to provide a contextualized account of learning to teach during student teaching within a program of teacher education—closely considering the curriculum of that experience, the way in which the curriculum was enacted, the contradictions and tensions that arose, and the influence those contradictions and tensions had on preservice teachers. While looking at these issues across the program and in relation to the 23 student teachers in the elementary education program, the study also focused in on two teachers participating in the program who were intending to work in high-need school settings with diverse student populations.

The study took place at Cooper University (pseudonyms are used for all sites and participants), a mid-sized, private university with a student population of approximately 10,000 (graduate and undergraduate) located in a city (population approximately 600,000) in the Southern United States. A college of education within the university is responsible for the preparation and certification of general education teachers at the secondary, elementary, and early childhood levels. The college also prepares special

education teachers, administrators, and counselors. While the university is located in an urban setting and many researchers there are focused on issues related to diversity and equity, the preservice education programs are not specifically designed for teachers planning on teaching in urban settings. Graduates of the programs pursue teaching careers in public and private institutions throughout the country.

The site of the study was appropriate for the problem and the research questions for several reasons. First, like many teacher education programs throughout the country, this program was largely composed of teachers from backgrounds that are not congruent with the backgrounds of students in high-need schools. Of the 19 (out of 23) elementary education student teachers who completed a survey and answered demographic questions, 18 identified as White or Caucasian and 1 as Hispanic. All 19 students identified as middle (4), upper middle (7), or upper class (8).

Second, because of the university's location in a medium-sized city, students in the program were placed in schools with culturally and linguistically diverse students for their student teaching and other field experiences. For the most part, these schools were part of the city's school district, which serves more than 75,000 students in 137 schools. Students in the district represent diverse racial, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds. Preservice teachers in the program have often worked in schools with large ELL populations, charter schools, magnet schools, schools with diverse populations, and schools that have not met progress goals set by the state and No Child Left Behind. Over 40% of the schools in the district are not in good standing according to the state.

Finally, my own familiarity with the program provided access to the various components of the program that were necessary to provide a thick description of the

context and the preparation of the teachers. My status as an insider in this particular program allowed for greater access and understanding of the multiple factors affecting the student teaching experience. Having previously taught courses in literacy and supervised student teachers in this program, I had a perspective that enabled me to provide the detailed information that “a reader may need to know in order to understand the findings” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, cited in Erlandson, et. al, 1993, p. 145).

Participant Selection and Description

One cohort of student teachers in elementary education (n=23) participated in this study, along with university mentors (n=4), classroom mentors (n=6), and seminar instructors (n=2). Of the 23 students, 3 were observed during classroom instruction and individual meetings with their mentors. Of those 3, 2 were identified as case studies according to the criteria described below. Since one of the case studies (Kate) was a dual major in elementary and special education, her special education seminar instructor (n=1) and classmates (n=11) were also consented in order to observe Kate during events in which they participated. In total, 34 student teachers, four university mentors, six classroom mentors, and three seminar instructors participated in the study.

The two case studies (Jack and Kate) were selected from the group of student teachers in the elementary education program during the spring semester. Criterion sampling was used to narrow the possible cases from the pool of student teachers. The selection for the more in-depth case studies was limited by two main criteria: the cases had to be undergraduate students and express commitment to working in culturally and linguistically diverse communities and in high-need school settings. There were post-

baccalaureate certification students in the cohort, but I selected undergraduate students because my study was focused on student teaching as part of the traditional approach to teacher preparation. The rationale for the second criteria was that prior research in the area of preparing students for successfully teaching multicultural students (e.g. Ladson-Billings, 2001) has demonstrated the importance of a commitment to teaching in these settings. As indicated by my review of the literature and my framing of the study, I was particularly interested in preparing teachers for high-need schools with diverse populations and believe that it was prudent to focus on teachers who expressed interest in working in these schools. The two focal participants, Jack and Kate were the only student teachers in the cohort who fit both criteria and consented to full participation in the study. To some extent, these cases are examples of what Erlandson et al. (1993) referred to as “politically important cases” (p. 83) because they allow particular attention to be focused on preparing students for multicultural settings who are committed to working in these settings—something different than preparing preservice teachers whose ideas about culturally and linguistically diverse students require a shift in thinking.

Jack and Kate also provided for variation in the sample as evidenced through surveys. Twenty-two of the elementary student teachers completed the Multicultural Efficacy Scale (Guyton & Wesche, 2005), which I used to compare Kate and Jack to other student teachers in the cohort. This survey is designed to measure teachers’ own perceptions of their ability to work successfully with students from diverse backgrounds. This instrument also measures experiences with multiculturalism, as well as beliefs and ideas about instruction in diverse settings. The survey contains 35 items, all of which are multiple choice, with choices representing gradations in response. The designers used a

rigorous process during a pilot study to validate the survey and reduce the number of items used. The authors reported internal reliability data for the instrument (Chronbach's alpha of .89). In addition they reported data from several studies to provide a guideline for evaluating results (score ranges for each subsection).

Based on the results of these surveys, Jack provided a typical case and Kate an atypical one. According to the survey, Jack and Kate both scored at the level of "very positive" in relation to their attitudes toward working with diverse populations (raw scores of 25 and 27 respectively, with an average score of 25.39 and a median score of 26 for the 19 student teachers who completed the survey). Their scores varied, however, in terms of their sense of efficacy for working with multicultural student populations. Kate scored 75, at the level of "high efficacy" according to the survey, the second highest score of the cohort. Jack scored 63—"average efficacy." The median score for all completers was 63 and the average was 61.48. The survey indicated that both Kate and Jack had positive attitudes related to working in high-need settings with diverse student populations, but that Kate felt much more likely to be successful in those settings. This difference is an important one and allowed for the consideration of two related, yet distinct cases. A more detailed description of Jack and Kate and their experiences will be provided in Chapter V where I analyze their cases. During the course of the study, I also observed another student teacher, Margaret, in order to conduct further observations and collect more data related to the important learning events of the semester. These observations and interviews were included in order to provide further evidence of findings related to the end-of-placement team meetings in particular.

In addition to the student teachers, university mentors, classroom mentors, and seminar instructors participated in the study. Classroom mentors included Ms. Fleming, Ms. Shaw, Ms. Schmidt, Ms. Butler, Ms. Williams, and Ms. Peters. These teachers had from five to over twenty years of experience in the classroom. Each had supervised a student teacher at least once previously. All were White. The four university mentors I observed were Alice, Mary, Christina, and Emily. Emily and Christina were both graduate students at Cooper and mentored student teachers as part of their funding. Each had prior experience as an elementary teacher. Mary and Alice were both veterans of the local school district. Alice had retired from her teaching position and Mary had left to work full time at Cooper. Mary was also one of the seminar instructors for elementary education, along with Deb. Irene was the seminar instructor for special education.

Field Entry

I had previous relationships with many of the gatekeepers whose permission was necessary for conducting this study. I had conducted a pilot study in the year prior to this study as well. At that time, there was a different director for the elementary education program, however. I asked permission during the fall semester to conduct a study of the student teaching experience at Cooper in the spring. Permission was informally given to design the study at that time by the director of elementary education. Formal access to the site was granted once my proposal was approved by my committee and by the university's institutional review board.

Once the study had been approved, I solicited participation from student teachers during a seminar meeting. At that time, I explained the study and the nature of my

investigation. Student teachers were given the opportunity to fully or partially participate in the study. Those who agreed to partially participate agreed to be audiotaped during seminar meetings and small group conversations with their university mentors, complete surveys, and allow access to other artifacts related to the student teaching experience. All 23 elementary education student teachers consented at this level (as did the additional 11 special education student teachers consented later). Those who gave consent to fully participate (Kate, Jack, and Margaret) agreed to (in addition to the items listed above) participate in interviews, be observed teaching in their placement classrooms, allow access to all of their reflections and other assignments, and have their meetings with university and classroom mentors observed and recorded. It was made clear to all participants that their participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study at any time.

After case study participants were identified, I went about obtaining permission from their mentors and obtaining access to the schools in order to conduct observations. All of the mentors working with Kate, Jack, and Margaret agreed to participate. It is important to note that I did not audio or video record my observations of classroom instruction and collected no data related to the students of participants. The only recording that occurred on school grounds involved only student teachers and mentors. Permission to enter the schools for my observations and to record meetings that occurred with mentors was granted by the principals of the six schools in which Kate, Jack, and Margaret taught during the semester.

My Role as Researcher

I came to study this particular social learning situation and the experience of student teaching as someone committed to preparing teachers for diverse student populations and to issues of equity and social justice in education. I brought to this inquiry prior experience as a middle school teacher in an urban school district, as well as experience working with preservice teachers as a mentor and course instructor. I knew three of the four university mentors from own work as a mentor. I had had no prior contact with any of the classroom mentors.

During the semester of this study, I played no official role in the student teaching experience. While this meant that I was somewhat of an outsider during the semester, I believe that it allowed me a certain kind of access to the student teachers—Jack and Kate particularly. I believe that because I played no official role related to the university or their seminar course at the time of the study, they were more open and honest than they might have been, knowing that the information would not be used in any official way by the university.

I remained on the periphery of the activity at most times during the semester, and functioned as observer-participant as opposed to participant-observer (Erlandson et al., 1993). There were times, however, when mentors and student teachers solicited my opinion or asked questions about the content they were discussing. For instance, after observing one of the student teachers in the classroom the mentor asked for me to give feedback to the teacher during the conference that occurred afterwards. Although I was certainly present during the meetings and my presence had some sort of effect, I believe that I largely limited my influence on the content of those meetings. My rationale for

choosing the role of observer-participant and being present largely to gather information related to the goal of studying the practices of others, rather than my own practices, as currently needed in the field of teacher education.

Being both an insider (in terms of my knowledge and previous experience working with student teachers) and an outsider (to this particular student teaching semester) during this study had its advantages and disadvantages. As described, I had a particular kind of access and familiarity. I also recognize, however, that familiarity can lead to making assumptions about what is observed. For this reason, it was important during this study to clarify my hypotheses and ideas about what was going on with the participants during interviews. In addition, I was able to verify patterns across multiple data sets and debrief hypotheses with peers and experts.

Data Collection and Recording

In this section I describe my methods for collecting and recording data related to the research questions. First, I describe the phases of the inquiry and how they developed. I then describe the sources of data (interviews, observations, documents and artifacts) in more detail (see Table 1 for alignment of data sources and research questions).

Phases of the Inquiry

During the initial phase of the study, I attended seminar meetings in order to familiarize myself with the expectations of the instructors during this semester, become familiar to the student teachers, begin developing a sense of how the outcomes of teacher education were enacted and assessed, and observe the role of the focal participants within

this space. My only participation in these meetings was related to explaining the study when consent was obtained. During this phase of the study I audio recorded seminar meetings, recorded field notes (and methodological and theoretical notes after the meetings), and gathered artifacts related to the site and the semester under investigation. I also administered the Multicultural Efficacy Scale at this time. During this phase I focused on gathering documents and artifacts related to the program and the seminar and began determining how the outcomes and assessments were characterized in the intended curriculum of the program.

After this initial phase, I moved to more focused observation and interaction with the two central participants. I conducted semi-structured interviews (approximately one hour in length) with each and gathered artifacts from their previous coursework and experiences in the program. I also began collecting their reflections (e-mail conversations with their mentors) and lesson plans. Initial data collection focused on the tools, knowledge, and beliefs that the focal student teachers had acquired prior to student teaching, their expectations for student teaching, and their view of the program. I also began focusing my continued observation of seminar meetings on their participation and observed each of them teaching in their first placement classroom.

The third phase of the study, after I had established a relationship with the participants and begun to have a sense of the environment and the important interactions that were occurring, involved more extensive data collection. I conducted another set of interviews with the participants, observed meetings between the student teachers and their mentors (post-observation conferences and end-of-placement meetings), continued to observe seminar and small group meetings, and continued collecting relevant artifacts

and information. Also during this time I began to focus more heavily on the program assessments and collecting data related to them.

The final phase of the study involved the final interviews with the participants and my exit from the field (at the end of the second student teaching placement). The only data collected during this phase related to the final interviews and subsequent follow ups. The final phase was more heavily focused on data analysis and will be described in more detail in that section. I now turn to describing the data that were collected during these phases in three broad categories: interviews, observations, and artifacts.

Interviews

I conducted three semi-structured (Rubin & Rubin, 2005) interviews with Jack and Kate, as well as two with Margaret. The three interviews took place during the first placement, between student teaching placements, and at the end of the second placement. The purpose of the first interview was to explore their commitment to multicultural education and to develop a sense of the tools and experiences that they brought to student teaching. The second and third interviews focused on their experiences teaching in their placement classrooms, working with university and classroom mentors, and participating in seminar and small group meetings. In addition, the second and third interviews focused in on various aspects of their teaching or relationships with mentors that I had observed in order to further refine hypotheses that were developing. All interviews were audio taped and transcribed. I recorded field notes by hand during the interviews and within 24 hours (in most cases) listened to the recording to add to and clarify field notes as I typed them. During that time, I also began recording methodological and theoretical notes

related to the interviews that described patterns and attempted to make connections to other sources of data (see Appendix A for sample notes). Audio recordings of interviews were also later transcribed.

Observations

During this study, I conducted observations of seminar meetings, small group meetings, post-observation conferences, end-of-placement team meetings, and classroom instruction. I provide more detailed descriptions of each of these events in Chapters IV and V in order to situate my analyses there. During most weeks of the semester, student teachers gathered in seminar meetings (with all other student teachers) or in small group meetings (with one university mentor and four to five student teachers). I observed these meetings weekly for 10 weeks. In addition, I observed 18 classroom lessons throughout the semester (6 each for Kate, Jack, and Margaret). My observations of their teaching were used primarily to situate my own understanding of their experiences with the program and to support other data sets. In cases (there were only two) where my observation overlapped with an observation by the university mentor, I also observed the post-observation conference. After the first few observations, I purposefully visited the classroom during lessons that connected to the student teachers' unit plans. This decision was made based on my desire to understand the relationship between what was going on in the program space and in the school space. These lessons were taught in the placement classroom, but were also submitted to the program as part of the formal requirements for the seminar and as one of the programmatic assessments (for NCATE).

I observed all of the end-of-placement team meetings that occurred for the two case studies and for Margaret, whose conferences I observed to help refine hypotheses and provide further confirmation for potential findings. Each student teacher had two end-of-placement conferences. These six events played a more central role in my study than initially anticipated. As the study evolved, I determined that these particular conferences were critical events for answering my research questions because they were official meetings that involved representatives from the program and the schools and because they were directly focused on outcomes and assessment for student teachers.

As was the case with interviews, I recorded field notes (and later methodological and theoretical notes) for all of my observations. In all cases except the observations of classroom instruction, I also audio recorded the events. Not all of these audio recordings were transcribed completely, but important episodes were later transcribed based on emerging ideas and themes.

Artifacts

Finally, the collection of documents and other artifacts was central to my study. During the initial phase of the study I focused on artifacts related to the intended outcomes of the program at Cooper and the prior experiences of the student teachers in the program. To these ends, I gathered program handbooks and information from the website. I also obtained copies of the seminar syllabus, descriptions of assessments, and rubrics for evaluation. In relation to Jack and Kate, I obtained artifacts (such as lesson plans, assignments, philosophy statements, and reflections) from their previous courses. As the study continued, I focused specifically on artifacts and documents related directly

to my research questions, such as the unit plan and action research project assessments that were required during the semester. I also gathered the evaluation of these assessments that were returned to Jack and Kate.

In addition to those artifacts connected to classroom instruction, I obtained artifacts that were tied to the meetings they had with mentors. I collected the written reports of all of the end-of-placement conferences. I also obtained copies of all of the classroom observations and post-observations of Jack and Kate conducted by their mentors. These records added to my understanding of Jack and Kate's teaching as well as the approach of their mentors and provided further evidence of meetings and events for which I was present, as well as multiple events for which I was not.

Data Analysis

Qualitative data analysis was ongoing throughout the study. I relied on the work of Strauss and Corbin (1998) as a guide for the analysis of qualitative data. Theoretical and methodological notes recorded after interviews and observations served as the main way to begin developing concepts, labeling phenomena, and making sense of data during collection. These notes also guided subsequent observations and interviews. After all of the data had been compiled, I began to generate an initial set of concepts and ideas that had been derived during data collection. I then returned to my field notes, transcripts, and artifacts and used open coding to identify concepts within the data as a way of explaining what occurred in the various events under consideration. As categories and hypotheses were derived systematically, my analysis occurred across the multiple data sources to locate evidence that supported or contradicted developing themes.

In addition, more fine-grained analysis of transcripts from interviews and observations was conducted. The goal of this analysis was to reveal the social languages and cultural models (Gee, 1999) evident in the various events and uncover at a micro-level the contradictions and tensions that were present. In addition, this analysis was used to understand how student teachers were positioned (Davies & Harre, 1990) by and within various communities and how this positioning influenced their own learning and development. I also used data analysis techniques from research on the analysis of learning in actor networks (Clarke, 2002; Hamilton, 2001) in order to refine hypotheses I developed, especially in relation to the end-of-placement team conferences.

During the semester of the study, I continually reviewed field notes that had previously been collected (approximately every two weeks and particularly at important points, such as immediately before interviews or observations of team meetings). During these reviews, I recorded notes in the margins in order to focus my observations and to highlight questions that might be asked during student teacher interviews as a form of member checking. I used functions of Microsoft Word and Hyper Research software to aid in data analysis, the coding of data, and the development of themes and categories. Throughout the process, I also wrote notes about my emerging ideas and hypotheses. I engaged in conversations with two peer debriefers about the project and also discussed my ideas informally with Deb (the seminar instructor) and two of the university mentors.

After data collection was complete, I again reviewed the data set and my initial categories and possible findings. I also reviewed all the raw data, including artifacts and recordings of meetings and interviews. At this time I transcribed pertinent portions of conferences that had not been previously transcribed. I also began to, using computer

software, create hyper documents that allowed me to draw connections between various sources of data and compile examples (and potential non-examples) of important themes. I continued to discuss with peer debriefers and held periodic meetings with my dissertation chair to discuss my emerging hypotheses. I also conducted a formal member check with one of the university mentors toward the end of data analysis and reporting related to this report. This member check was conducted by phone and audio recorded. She agreed with my findings related to the end-of-placement conference and the form that was created as a record of that conference.

Trustworthiness

Borrowing from the work of Lincoln and Guba, Erlandson and his colleagues (1993) describe four main qualities of a naturalistic inquiry that serve to establish its trustworthiness: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. In their estimation, a study must “demonstrate its truth value, provide the basis for applying it, and allow for external judgments to be made about the consistency of its procedures and the neutrality of its findings or decisions” (p. 29). In order to critically reflect on the strengths and limitations of my study, I will discuss it in terms of the four qualities that can be used to demonstrate trustworthiness.

Multiple methods were used to ensure the credibility of data and conclusions. The procedures for data collection described above indicate the triangulation of data sources, events, and methods. Peer debriefing served as a means of checking hypotheses and building the reliability of conclusions. Initial analyses were shared with the chair of the dissertation committee and with other colleagues who were capable of asking questions

and providing alternative interpretations. In addition, member checking was conducted. The interactions with my chair, peer debriefers, and member checking also helped to establish the confirmability of my findings. In addition, the extensive collection of artifacts provided the opportunity to include evidence of my findings in any analysis of the data.

Prolonged engagement and persistent observation are also techniques used to ensure credibility. This study has both strengths and limitations in these areas. While the study only lasted a semester, engagement with participants took place throughout the semester. Observations of university based seminars and small group meetings occurred throughout the semester. Classroom observations were also ongoing. Data collection continued through the end of the second placement. However, this study is limited in that some of the data collected represent learning and experiences that had already taken place. The study could have been stronger if it followed teachers from the beginning of their preparation through to student teaching or if it compared multiple semesters of student teaching.

By relying on techniques for purposive sampling, I have helped to ensure the transferability of this study. While it is a study focused on a particular site and two case studies, subsequent chapters provide thick descriptions of the participants and sites in order to form conclusions that might have importance in other similar settings and contexts outside of this teacher education program.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF CONTRADICTIONS AND TENSIONS RELATED TO THE INTENDED OUTCOMES OF TEACHER EDUCATION AT COOPER

During the student teaching semester under examination in this study, the nature of learning to teach was complicated by the complex, interacting systems associated with the experience. In analyzing the multiple relationships that developed, events that occurred, and artifacts that were created and circulated, the extent of the complexity of student teaching and factors that might have influenced student teacher learning became evident. Within this context, analysis of the data pointed to several tensions and contradictions related to the intended outcomes of student teaching that have potential implications for our understanding of the experience, the preparation of teachers more generally, and the assessment and evaluation practices of teacher education programs.

The findings and analyses presented herein address the first research question: How are the intended outcomes of teacher education enacted and assessed during the student teaching semester, what contradictions or tensions arise, and what are the possible implications for student teacher learning? The next chapter will address the second research question, considering how the findings discussed here may influence the experiences of student teachers committed to diverse, high-need school settings.

In this chapter, my analysis centers on documents and interactions that were crucial for examining what occurred during the semester. Documents circulated by the program are used to describe the intended outcomes of teacher education and student teaching at Cooper. Analysis of data collected from my observations of the important

events of the student teaching experience that included preservice teachers and representatives of the program (seminar instructors and university mentors) are used to support the findings.

My observations and analyses indicated that the program at Cooper was, in many ways, aligned with the outcomes of teacher education discussed in Chapter I. For instance, attention was focused on what teachers knew and were able to do; the repertoire of practices that they had appropriated; issues of difference, diversity, and social justice; and on teaching as a reflective practice driven by inquiry. As the study progressed, however, I began to observe contradictions and tensions related to certain intended outcomes of teacher education and the actual experiences of student teachers as they were lived out during various important learning events. This chapter explores those themes, as they were refined through further observation and analysis. The three themes that provide the organizational structure for this chapter are:

1. *Conceptions of Effective Instruction.* Given the current context of education described in Chapter I (specifically the focus on student outcomes by policy makers, researchers, and teacher educators), I was not surprised to find that influencing student learning was an intended outcome of Cooper's teacher education program. The ability to systematically assess student learning and make decisions based on analysis of learning situations was a part of the student teaching curriculum and multiple measures were designed to assess the student teachers' competency in this area. In observing and analyzing transcripts of important events during the student teaching semester, however, conversations related to P-12 student learning were conspicuously absent. In the spaces where

student teacher learning should have been supported and instructional conversations between preservice teachers and their mentors could have occurred, there was little evidence of systematic inquiry related to student learning in placement classrooms. Instead, conceptions of effective instruction were more typically based on activities, affective student outcomes, and professional dispositions.

2. *Divide Between Teacher Education and P-12 Schools.* Because it has been widely documented, I would have expected to find attention paid to the disconnect that often exists between university teacher education programs and elementary and secondary schools. In addition, adjusting to this separation and successfully transitioning from one space to the other is an expected outcome of teacher education. Indeed, Cooper acknowledged the divide and discussed the need for student teachers to navigate it. Unexpectedly, I observed several ways in which the program reinforced the divide by privileging the program over the schools, positioning student teachers in certain ways, and establishing a culture of critique related to P-12 teachers and classrooms.
3. *Assessment at the Programmatic Level.* Given the attention to the outcomes of teacher education generally and the NCATE review process in this particular case, it was not surprising to see serious attention given to assessment measures and evaluations at Cooper. The presence of these measures lines up with the calls of researchers in the field to do a more efficient and complete job of measuring the outcomes of teacher education in multiple ways. A tension was evident, though,

in the way the university approached assessment and in how it was disconnected from the actual learning of preservice teachers.

Before exploring these three themes in more detail, I provide a description of the documents and events under consideration in order to orient the reader.

Documents and Events

While many face-to-face interactions between the student teachers and various representatives of the program occurred throughout the semester in different forms, the program-related, textual artifacts that were part of the system were particularly relevant in considering how the program explicitly defined student teaching and set its goals and expectations. The juxtaposition of these documents with the lived curriculum (as it was evident in the important events that included student teachers and program representatives) was enlightening as to how it revealed findings that were counter to expectations. In the analyses included in this chapter, data are drawn from documents and circulating artifacts as well as fieldnotes and transcripts of important events. Because the data set includes so many types of texts, the descriptions that follow are intended to clarify the sources and context of the data. I present a description of documents followed by a description of important events.

Documents

There were several documents that established the policies, procedures, guidelines, and intended outcomes of the program of teacher education at Cooper. These documents also provided information about the assessments used within the program and

the manner in which those assessments would be conducted and evaluated. The documents varied by author(s), intended audience, use, and specificity of purpose. Those that included information relevant to teacher candidates who were student teaching in the elementary education program during the semester of this study and were distributed to them by the director of elementary education are described below. First, I describe the “Teacher Candidate Policy and Performance Assessment Handbook” (referred to as the candidate handbook from this point forward). This document was distributed to preservice teachers in the early childhood, elementary, and secondary programs at Cooper. It focused on guidelines and expectations specific to field placements. Next, I describe the “Elementary Education Program-Specific Policies & Assessments” (referred to as the elementary education supplement from this point forward). This document contained information relevant to elementary education majors at all stages of the program. Third, I describe the syllabus for the student teaching seminar (referred to as the seminar syllabus from this point forward). This syllabus was distributed to the student teachers in this study and contained specific information about their seminar and its requirements. Unlike the previous two documents, the seminar syllabus was intended only for this cohort of student teachers during this particular semester. Finally, I describe in more detail some of the forms and documents related to program assessments and the evaluation of preservice teachers that were referenced and included in other documents, but were especially important for considering the aspect of my research question relating to assessment.

Teacher Candidate Handbook

The candidate handbook was circulated and discussed at a two-day orientation for student teachers in the elementary education program on the days immediately prior to the beginning of their first placements. This handbook was developed and written by the three program coordinators in the Department of Teaching and Learning (early childhood, elementary, and secondary). The handbook contained information directly related to field-based experiences (both student teaching and earlier practica). It described the journey of the new teacher, explained the role of the program and its representatives, discussed professionalism, and included a copy of all of the forms used by the university in field-based experiences (e.g., lesson plan templates, sample rubrics, mentor observation forms, disposition forms, improvement plan templates). The candidate handbook was written as a guide to all field placements, not just student teaching, but was a newly created document. For that reason, teacher candidates who were student teaching during the time of this study saw the candidate handbook for the first time during the semester of their student teaching. The candidate handbook was distributed to teacher candidates prior to this point for future cohorts.

Elementary Education Supplement

During the year of this study, the director of elementary education provided a packet specifically designed for elementary majors. The elementary supplement contained some duplicate information, but also included information about the goals of the program that was not evident in the teacher candidate handbook. The supplement began with a letter from the director that discussed the power of education and the strength of Cooper's program. She said, for instance, "This vocation is, indeed, a

powerful one, with long-reaching influences into the lives of students and families...I welcome you to this unique program.” The supplement also laid out the eight NCATE assessments that were used by the program (including the PRAXIS tests, a content assessment, and a kid-watching project) to “track Teacher Candidates.” Three of the assessments were identified as occurring during student teaching (the unit plan, professional growth profile, and the action research project). Since assessments varied by program, one of the main purposes of the supplement was to describe “some specific requirements unique to the Elementary Education program.” The supplement also gave an overview of Cooper’s programmatic goals and the levels of competency used to provide feedback on the assessments.

Seminar Syllabus

Deb and Mary, who co-taught the seminar course, distributed the syllabus during the semester of this study. As many syllabi do, it outlined the goals of the course, the assignments required, the expectations, how assignments would be evaluated, how grades would be determined, and a calendar of events. Although it might be assumed that portions of the course and the syllabus were repeated in subsequent semesters, this document was particular to the semester of this study. The first page contained contact information for the instructors and a list of the course objectives. The next 11 pages contained information about the assignments (assessments related to NCATE and other seminar specific assignments such as weekly reflections) and their evaluation. The final four pages were monthly calendars that contained course topics, important events, and assignment due dates.

Assessment Forms

In addition to the handbooks and syllabus, other important documents that were used extensively during student teaching were the assessment forms (also called reports). The candidate handbook identified three formative reports that were used in student teaching: the field-based weekly feedback forms, the post-observation conference forms, and the student teaching team reports. In addition, two forms were identified as summative reports of student teaching: the end of student teaching placement report and the final licensure report. Classroom and university mentors completed the three formative reports throughout the semester. The two summative reports were completed by the university mentor, signed by the student teacher, and approved by the director of the program.

The directors of the teacher certification program developed these forms based on Cooper's "Professional Growth Profile" (PGP). The PGP was explained and referenced in the teacher candidate handbook, the elementary education supplement, and the seminar syllabus. While the handbook itself was new and some of the forms had changed, student teachers during this semester were familiar with the PGP. The PGP was divided into four main areas: (a) subject matter knowledge for teaching, (b) understanding of learners and learning, (c) conceptions of the practice and profession of teaching, and (d) initial repertoire in curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Each of these areas included indicators meant to measure student teachers' learning and development, a total of 44 indicators across the four areas (see Table 2). Assessment forms explicitly centered on these four main areas, with varying levels of detail provided. The post-observation conference form and the student teaching team conference report included the four main

areas and the 44 indicators (see Appendices B and C). During the course of this study, these forms were completed at the post-observation conferences held between university mentors and student teachers and the team conferences held between university mentors, classroom mentors, and student teachers. The forms themselves, as well as the completed forms connected to student teachers in this study served as sources of data.

Table 2

Indicators on Assessment Forms by PGP Area

PGP Area	Indicators
Subject Matter Knowledge for Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Posses a solid command of the subject matter Focus on the big ideas (core conceptual structures) and their interrelationships Make connections across subject matter knowledge Create opportunities to teach for interdisciplinary study Design and organize subject matter knowledge to make it accessible to students Recognize landmarks in the development of student understanding Scaffold subject matter knowledge as related to students' trajectories of development
Understanding of Learners and Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan for learners' unique strengths, resources, goals and motivations Envision developmental learning trajectories and plan learning experiences that support students' progress along these trajectories Understand and draw appropriately on learning theory to support their investigations and analyses of student learning and Identify and seek to learn about students' linguistic, social and cultural histories and repertoires Enter into learners' thinking/reasoning as reflected in learners' talk and work and use these insights into learners to inform planning and instruction Focus on engaging students in understanding big ideas Aim to utilize student strengths as resources for teaching and learning
Conceptions of the Practice and Profession of Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrate enthusiasm for teaching and learning Develop rapport with all students Encourage student attendance Support students in developing a positive self-identity

Table 2 (*continued*)

Indicators Included on Assessment Forms and Their Connection to the PGP

PGP Area	Indicators
Initial Repertoire in Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment	Demonstrate respect for all cultures, learners and families through collaborative relationships with parents and members of the broader community
	Attend to individual differences, interests and capabilities as reflected in differentiated planning, teaching and/or assessment
	Exhibit professional poise and confidence
	Demonstrate respect for their teaching colleagues planning for instruction
	Align teaching and learning practices with professional standards
	Comply with school, district, and state and federal guidelines for professional conduct
	Adhere to the Professional Code of Ethics
	Cooperate with school staff and administration
	Accept and act on constructive feedback
	Engage in self-assessment
	Initiate opportunities to extend their understanding of teaching and learning
	Display resourcefulness and creativity in constructing a rich learning experience within the context of the student teaching experience
	Develop a full complement of planning, preparation, and teaching practice that reflects their solid command of subject matter knowledge for teaching and their ability to understand learners and learning
	Plan curricular and instructional tools based on their deeper function in supporting learning by matching tools and approach to a variety of learning goals and needs
	Give clear sequences, directions, and/or expectations
	Implement effective questioning techniques
	Include appropriate wait time following questions
	Facilitate group discussions relevant to and supporting learning goals
	Monitor learners' responses and adjust teaching accordingly
	Use a variety of formal and informal assessment strategies to inform specific procedures for reteaching, if necessary, and to refine future lessons
Align assessment strategies with state and national standards	
Allow for alternative means of achieving learning goals	
Create a classroom environment that optimizes learning activities	
Develop relationships with students that motivate and engage them in the learning	
Conduct instruction and maintain teaching momentum	
Manage student work as a measure of accountability	

Another essential component of the assessment forms was the levels of proficiency that were used to track preservice teachers' progress in the areas of the PGP. These levels of proficiency were also used on evaluations of other assessments, such as the unit plans and action research project associated with student teaching. The levels were: not evident, emergent, proficient, and accomplished. Full descriptions of each level were included on the team conference report form (Appendix C). These descriptions were meant to apply to a variety of standards and indicators used at various points in the program.

Events

The circulated documents provided important information about the intended outcomes of teacher education at Cooper, but my analyses will also draw from how these intended outcomes were enacted during the major events that constituted the relationship between student teachers and the program. These events included small group and seminar meetings, as well as conferences between mentors and student teachers. Both are described in this section.

Small Groups and Seminar Meetings

While interaction between mentors and instructors from the program and the student teachers happened in a variety of settings, both formal and informal, the student teaching seminar and small group meetings were perhaps the most regular of these occurrences. During these meetings, there were varying purposes, objectives, and activities. But in a clearer way than elsewhere, it was in these meetings that the

curriculum of learning to teach (from a programmatic standpoint) in the student teaching semester was lived out. For this reason, I believe that these meetings present a powerful window for viewing the definitions of teaching and learning enacted by the program and its representatives, considering issues of power present in the space, and examining the positions that student teachers took (and were allowed to take) in relation to the program. A seminar or small group meeting took place weekly during the semester. Seminar meetings were led by the two instructors (Deb and Mary). Small group meetings were led by university mentors and included the multiple student teachers who were working with that mentor.

Conferences with Mentors

Throughout the semester, student teachers also met with their university mentors individually. These meetings included post-observation conferences that were intended to take place weekly following an observation of a lesson taught by the student teacher. In each placement, there were also official meetings held in which the university mentor, student teacher, and classroom mentor were present. I draw on fieldnotes and transcripts from these official team conferences. While these end-of-placement team conferences constituted a small portion of the time dedicated to student teaching and the discussion of student teacher learning in terms of the actual time spent in each, they were culminating events and perhaps the most formal events that occurred during the semester. I believe that they served a crucial purpose in the system and that what occurred during the meetings was a snapshot of the relationship between three key realms of student teaching: the teacher candidate, the program, and the public school. It was one of the few times where all three of these entities came together in a formal manner and in the same

physical space. For this reason, the end-of-placement team conference is an important interaction to analyze. Along with the other events and documents described above, it will serve as a central text for considering the tensions that arose during the student teaching semester which are described in the next section.

Contradictions and Tensions

As discussed previously, contradictions and tensions that were observed during data collection were grouped around three themes. These three themes are repeated here for convenience: conceptions of effective instruction, the divide between teacher education and P-12 schools, and assessment at the programmatic level. Findings related to these themes are summarized in Table 3. My analyses will be presented in three sections related to the themes. Each section will include a discussion of the intended outcomes of student teaching evident in Cooper's program, how the outcomes were enacted during various events during the semester, and the possible influences on student teachers' learning and development.

Conceptions of Effective Instruction

At the heart of any program's approach to teacher preparation is its definition of teaching and learning. In some instances, such a definition is expressed through a vision or philosophy statement and displayed prominently in the program's materials and on its walls. These statements can represent a condensed or visible form of a much more complicated set of values and beliefs. For this reason, the definitions of teaching, learning, and learning to teach that are embedded in and discerned through the program's

Table 3

Summary of Findings by Theme

Conceptions of Effective Teaching	Divide Between Teacher Education and P-12 Schools	Assessment at the Programmatic Level
<p>The intended outcomes and assessment measures of the program emphasized P-12 student learning, but a contradiction related to the distinction between potential and actual learning became evident</p>	<p>Programmatic documents simultaneously emphasized the centrality of field-based experiences in learning to teach and privileged the university over the P-12 schools.</p> <p>Programmatic documents positioned preservice teachers as caught between two worlds and as responsible for navigating the divide.</p>	<p>While the program emphasized diversity and difference in its curriculum, it used a set of decontextualized principles for evaluating student teacher learning and development.</p> <p>Programmatic materials related to assessment positioned student teachers as the objects of assessment and disconnected the process of assessment from student teacher learning.</p>
<p>Effective teaching was operationalized as the implementation of practices and activities believed to create an optimal learning environment.</p> <p>Effective teaching was evidenced by largely affective student outcomes, such as enjoyment, engagement, and motivation.</p>	<p>A culture of critique dominated the discussions of teaching and learning that occurred various events.</p> <p>Team conferences, potential sites of negotiation and transformation were dominated by the purposes of the university.</p>	<p>The document created by the program for purposes of guiding the meeting took on agency in conferences and delocalized the events.</p>

curriculum and goals are perhaps an even more accurate portrayal of what the members of the program believe and attempt to instill in their teacher candidates. In terms of how these definitions were enacted during learning events, they often related directly to how effective instruction was conceived. What I observed and explored through further

analysis was that there were several mismatches between the intended outcomes of the program related to effective instruction and the learning of student teachers in practice. Most importantly, I argue that effective instruction was conceived of as the ability to create learning situations and environments, implement practices, and conduct assessments that *could* lead to student learning and evidence of student learning. In other words, student teachers were assessed on their ability to create situations in which learning should *theoretically* occur. The *potential* for learning was the outcome, rather than actual learning. Findings related to this tension are explored by considering the programmatic intent at Cooper and its relationship to the intended outcomes of teacher education more broadly, how these outcomes were enacted during important events, and what the possible implications were for student teachers.

Conceptions of Effective Instruction Evident in Intended Outcomes

My first finding related to the tension around how effective instruction was conceived and enacted during the semester is that while the intended outcomes and assessment measures of the program emphasized P-12 student learning, a contradiction related to the distinction between potential and actual learning became evident in the description of student learning and its assessment. I present how the outcome of P-12 student learning was emphasized and then examine the possible tensions that I uncovered through analysis of the documents.

P-12 student learning. As was described in my discussion of the intended outcomes of teacher education in Chapter I, P-12 student learning was an intended outcome of the program at Cooper and something that was addressed by no less than three of the program's seven assessments (all three of which occurred during student

teaching). According to the teacher candidate handbook, “The cornerstone of [Cooper]’s conceptual framework states that the main goal of its preparation programs is to prepare graduates to design, plan, enact, and refine instruction based on continuous investigation and analysis of student thinking and skill development.” This cornerstone is directly connected to P-12 student outcomes (their “thinking and skill development”) and to the outcome of inquiry-based, reflective practice (“refine instruction based on continuous investigation”). In this overarching statement, the practice of teaching is decidedly connected to the knowledge and development of students. And more specifically, the view of teaching is driven by assessment and knowledge of student development. Instruction is based on what students know and can do. And, by extension, what students learn and are able to do as the result of instruction is a central measure of teacher effectiveness. When Cooper described its purpose for preparing teachers it had an end goal of student achievement, learning, and skill development. The presence of this focus in the handbooks is not surprising and aligns with the expected outcomes of teacher education.

After the introduction, the candidate handbook goes on to detail the specific purposes of student teaching and other field experience. It lays out four areas in which preservice teachers will grow during their field-based experiences: practical teaching skills, appropriate personal qualities and professional attitudes, personal philosophy of education, and reflection on practice. In the first of these categories, the focus is squarely on the P-12 learner. The handbook describes the opportunities that preservice teachers will have to diagnose, analyze, plan for, and evaluate the progress of individual students in their field placements. The “practical teaching skills” that are described are framed by

the demands of individual learners and their academic needs. For instance, the handbook states that preservice teachers will have “the opportunity to continuously evaluate the progress and learning of the students one serves.” The lesson plan template used by the program asks the question, “What do you want students to learn?” at the top of the template. In addition, the first question on the post-teaching analysis portion of the template asks, “To what extent did your students learn what you intended?” Student learning is front and center. Not only is student learning front and center but emphasis is also placed on intent and outcome, not simply on what teachers do to create environments in which students might learn but on the idea that effective instruction includes demonstrated learning.

These ideas are also reflected in the three NCATE assessments that were part of the student teaching experience: the unit plan, the action research project, and the evaluation of student teaching based on the PGP. Like the lesson planning template, the unit plan assignment included a specific component to address what students learned. Not only did each lesson plan within the unit require reflection on student outcomes, but the unit plan itself, described in the seminar syllabus, required an addendum that included “outcomes and grades recorded, student work samples, and a brief statement of the impact the unit had on student learning.” The goal of the action research plan, according to the seminar syllabus, was to “identify core challenges to [teacher candidates’] teaching practice which interfere with their potential to impact positively student learning.” In the elementary education supplement, the action research plan was identified as the assessment used to demonstrate the candidate’s effect on student learning.

Tension around the outcome of student learning. Even though it was evident that student learning was a valued outcome of student teaching at Cooper, tensions related to this idea began to arise even within the documents themselves and the forms used to evaluate them. The evaluation of the unit plan included 18 standards, each of which was scored according to the levels of competency (not evident, emergent, proficient, or accomplished). While student learning had been a central goal of the assessment as it was conceived, only three of the 18 standards addressed it directly. The first said, “Candidates know, understand, and use formal and informal assessment strategies to plan, evaluate and strengthen instruction that will promote continuous intellectual, social, emotional and physical development of each elementary student.” Two others included language related to supporting the academic growth of students or the learning of students.

In addition, the 44 indicators connected to the PGP were indirect at best in their attention to student learning. While the ability to assess in a variety of ways, the importance of understanding students’ development and learning trajectories, and the value of reflective practice and critical analysis were all reflected in the indicators, the language used to describe them reveals a contradiction between the potential for learning and actual learning. For instance, one indicator states that student teachers should be able to “envision developmental learning trajectories and plan learning experiences that support students’ progress along these trajectories.” Envisioning the trajectories and supporting progress falls short of actually making progress or demonstrating that progress was made.

In another instance, the indicator stated, “Aims to use student strengths as resources for teaching and learning.” Aiming to do something, doing it, and

demonstrating that it had some sort of influence are all different goals, and only the first is addressed here. A third example of the tension was evident in the indicator that most directly addressed systematic assessment of student learning: “Use a variety of formal and informal assessment strategies to inform specific procedures for reteaching, if necessary, and to refine future lessons.” Even here, where the assumption is that teachers should be able to design instruction based on the results of assessments, there was no indication of eventual success. Knowing how to assess and reteach if students are not learning should theoretically push their learning in the future, but may not necessarily.

The seminar syllabus provides a final example of this tension. In the section describing the course, the instructors wrote that one of the goals of the course was to “give participants a better understanding about how to integrate their knowledge of theory into classroom environments, to optimize student learning opportunities.” The words *optimize* and *opportunities* are further evidence of the contradiction I have been describing. Namely, the focus is on possibility and potential, rather than actual impact. There was a tension around the relationship between effective instruction and student learning. This tension between possibility and actuality was further exacerbated and became increasingly problematic in the learning events that took place during the student teaching semester, as I will demonstrate in the next section.

Conceptions of Effective Instruction Enacted During Learning Events

I derived multiple findings related to how effective instruction was defined in operation during learning events. I present these findings here as further evidence of the tension related to the outcome of P-12 student learning. My analyses indicate that the ways in which ideas about effective instruction were enacted, described, and discussed

during learning events connected to the program led to a conception of effective instruction disconnected from the outcome of P-12 student learning. In order to demonstrate how this was the case, I describe both what was present in conceptions of effective teaching and what was absent. Specifically, I discuss two findings: (a) Effective teaching was operationalized as the implementation of practices and activities believed to create an optimal learning environment and (b) Effective teaching was evidenced by largely affective student outcomes, such as enjoyment, engagement, and motivation. After presenting analyses of data related to these findings, I discuss several episodes in which opportunities to scaffold learning around and have instructional conversations about impact on student learning were missed.

Implementation of practices and activities. Throughout learning events that occurred during the semester of this study, conceptions of effective teaching related to the practices that teachers (and student teachers) implemented. While the focus was very clearly on practices and activities that were thought to produce optimal learning environments, the conceptions did not extend to include the actual outcomes of the practices as they related to student learning. Researchers have found that evaluations of teaching often focus on observable behaviors or on a list of practices that represent effective instruction (Korthagen, 2004). Indeed, various measures of teacher effectiveness have focused on just these kinds of practices, seeking to measure the extent to which student teachers ask higher order questions, organize their students in collaborative groups, or model effective reading comprehension strategies during their lessons, for instance (Markley, 2004). While these kinds of measures of performance are based on an assumption of student learning and in many cases on research linking them to student

learning, the manner in which they were discussed and assessed during the semester at Cooper did not make these connections explicit.

In order to determine the extent to which the implementation of practices was a central focus of instructional conversations between student teachers and mentors, I analyzed the content of the conference report forms (both post-observation conferences and end-of-placement team conferences). The assessment reports used in this analysis included three student teachers, three university mentors, and five classroom mentors.

Specifically, I looked at the comments that mentors recorded as feedback and coded them according to several different categories. The categories consisted of commendations or recommendations based on specific measures or outcomes of teacher effectiveness: (a) activities, procedures, or strategies implemented; (b) impact on student learning; (c) the learning environment and classroom management; (d) knowing and valuing students; and (e) professional behaviors and dispositions. Table 4 provides an overview of the number of comments in each category. The first two categories are most directly connected to the finding being discussed here, that activities implemented were more central to the discourse of effective instruction during the important events of student teaching than impact on learning. Representative examples from these two categories are provided in Table 5.

The distribution of comments (at least in terms of the formal record of conferences) suggests that activities and their implementation were commented on over seven times as often as student learning overall. There is very likely a connection between the 44 indicators on the PGP and this distribution. In other words, professional

Table 4

Frequency of Comments by Category Related to Conceptions of Effective Instruction

Category	N(%)		
	Post-Observation (n=15)	Team Conferences(n=5)	Total
Activities, Procedures, or Strategies Implemented	45(38)	141(47)	186(45)
Student Learning	2(2)	22(7)	24(6)
Learning Environment and Classroom Management	49(42)	25(8)	74(18)
Knowing and Valuing Students	5(4)	33(11)	38(9)
Professional Behaviors and Dispositions	17(14)	78(26)	95(23)
Total	118	299	417

Note: Totals and percentages are based on the total number of comments coded according to one of the five categories. They do not represent the total number of comments recorded on the form, as some comments were coded in multiple categories and other comments did not fit into any of the categories.

behaviors and dispositions are commented on frequently because the report forms require that comments be written in this area. The frequency of comments demonstrates, however, that mentors followed the forms and what was valued in the forms was discussed, what was not was left out of the discussion.

There was also evidence of a focus on activities over learning outcomes in the conversations that took place during the conferences. For instance, Margaret (student teacher) recounted one of her lessons in a conversation with Alice (university mentor).

Table 5

Representative Examples of Feedback Comments Given by Mentors

Activities, Procedures, and Strategies Implemented	Student Learning
Materials laid out and ready ahead of time	Knows when students have fully grasped the concept
Use partners instead of groups	Looks at actions from students to determine how well they are grasping concepts
Could have used a real introduction of lesson. Review (recap) what you have been doing.	Assessments were designed to answer the objectives—whether the students got it.
Effective questioning techniques	Uses a variety of formal and informal assessments to analyze and drive instruction
Activates students' background knowledge	He is able to know when the students have understood the objectives
Pulls resources from a variety of places	Helps students build understanding of the big ideas

The manner in which Margaret framed the lesson in this exchange demonstrates how her decision about instruction was based largely on the assumption that a certain set of practices, related to writing instruction and group discussion in this instance, is necessarily beneficial for students:

Margaret: I like getting them writing. And I haven't seen them do any writing.
Alice: Oh. They need to write. I believe in writing.
Margaret: We've done two writing assignments. They were very different but I haven't seen anything before that and I've been teaching here for two and a half months.

...
Margaret: There was so much discussion [at my first placement school], which I loved. I mean I'm fine with that. I don't think most teachers here that I've seen would be ok with that. (fieldnotes, 3/7/07)

Margaret noted the absence of writing and of collaborative discussion in this exchange with her mentor. Alice affirmed Margaret's desire to implement writing instruction, and later in the conversation she praised her attempt to get students engaged in discussion. The lesson that Margaret had taught, which included both writing and discussion, was largely viewed as successful at least in part because it included these practices. There was little discussion, however, about the success of the lesson or what the students learned. Margaret's instructional decision was primarily based on which practices were initially absent from the classroom. While these practices may indeed be beneficial for students and result in increased achievement or engagement, those aspects of the lesson and instruction were ignored in the exchange. In this conversation, both Margaret and Alice defined her effectiveness as the ability to choose specific content and strategies and the decision to implement them.

Another example of the emphasis on activities or practices over student learning occurred during the final seminar of the semester when the student teachers shared one of their favorite lessons from the semester with their peers. Deb led this session and had asked each student teacher to bring one of their best lessons to share with the other student teachers. One of the purposes of the session was for each student teacher to walk out with a stack of quality lesson plans and ideas, activities and approaches that they could replicate in their future classrooms. This seminar session was particularly interesting because it revealed a great deal about the student teachers' perceptions of what Deb (and others associated with the program) valued in a lesson plan and it put the

student teachers in the position of performing for the program in order to demonstrate what they had learned and that they knew what Cooper valued. In other words, it was not surprising to find that none of the student teachers brought lesson plans that involved reading from the textbook or completing worksheets that the teacher had not created him or herself—though every student teacher I observed did just that on more than one occasion. In many ways this session was a performance in which student teachers put their best teaching foot forward.

In the course of this seminar meeting 14 student teachers described, in fairly great detail, a single lesson that they had taught in their classroom. Many of them gave (or hinted at) specific reasons for choosing this particular lesson to share. The exemplar lessons were student centered, involved collaboration, employed discovery learning techniques, used manipulatives, were interdisciplinary, differentiated according to student needs, resulted in high levels of engagement, and addressed multiple learning styles. One student teacher shared a discovery lesson on the value of Pi. Another talked about a lesson on right triangles that was “very student centered” and included lots of discussion. In a few instances, the student teacher presenting his or her lesson spoke specifically about assessing student progress, but in almost all cases the contention that these were high quality or successful lessons was based on the fact that they involved some easily identifiable trait that represented best practice according to the program’s standards.

Several students throughout this meeting did mention the assessments they created for their lessons. What was interesting, though, is that even with the attention on assessment, few students discussed actual results. In other words, as was the case with other aspects of teaching and learning, assessment was valued as an activity and an

essential component of effective teaching, but it was largely the act of assessing that was valued. There was little attention paid, during this learning event, to student learning or to how assessments informed instruction. The message here was that good teachers assess their students, not that the assessments of good teachers demonstrate learning.

In the assessments connected to student outcomes (the unit plan and the action research plan), there was also surprisingly little attention paid to what students had learned. The focus was again on the process or the form of assessment used, rather than on what learning had occurred. For instance, the unit plan evaluation standard related to assessment (“use formal and informal assessment strategies to plan, evaluate and strengthen instruction”) became more about the forms of assessment than about the strength or evaluation of assessment. The feedback received by one student teacher for this standard said, “Some confusion about what is a formal assessment. Is it formal because it’s written?” Later in the general feedback section, a similar comment was written: “There is little evidence for authentic formal assessment...How was the timeline a formal assessment?” While the unit plan included an addendum in which student teachers were supposed to indicate what their students had learned, the comments on this unit plan related to assessment were about the kind of assessment and whether it was labeled correctly. In another case, the general comments on the unit plan included, “Creative, organized, every step in the unit is intentional towards meeting specific, clearly stated objectives. Exemplary.” No mention, however, of whether the objectives were met.

Focus on affective student outcomes. Throughout the course of the semester, there were many instances in which effective instruction was identified by the creativity

of a lesson and the extent to which children enjoyed it. This finding is particularly interesting because it was a common frame of reference for describing successful teaching, but it was not one of the intended outcomes of teacher education derived from the literature or from the programmatic documents at Cooper. Some of the indicators on the PGP did reference aspects of instruction related to engagement and motivation. For instance, one indicator read, “Focus on engaging students in the big ideas.” Another, “Develop relationships with students that motivate and engage them in learning.” It was also the case that indicators gave attention to affective student outcomes (e.g., “Support students in developing a positive self-identity”). While all of these were evident as part of the PGP, they were not the sort of affective outcomes discussed. Seminar instructors, university mentors, and student teachers all focused on conceptions of effective instruction related to creativity and enjoyment. In terms of how the outcomes of teacher education were enacted during program-based learning events, effective instruction as fun and creative was a common theme.

During the seminar meeting in which student teachers shared their best lessons, enjoyment and creativity were common rationales for choosing particular lessons. One student teacher, for instance, said, “I have older, jaded students. They don’t respond unless you sing and dance” (fieldnotes, 5/2/07). She then preceded to describe a lesson on the fall of the Roman Empire, going to great lengths to explain how she attempted to make the lesson as entertaining as possible by describing public health concerns in gruesome detail and talking about “death, war, destruction, and plague” (fieldnotes 5/2/07). Another student described her lesson as follows:

We were doing a lesson on the respiratory system and their teacher taught it very by the book. I mean from the book you bubbled in the answers. She never taught

science ever. And so this was an experience for me and I wasn't sure how to handle it. I picked a really awesome unit. She let me do a really awesome unit...The lesson on this day was on oxygenated and deoxygenated blood and where that switches and the coloring of the blood...It was awesome. I went in there thinking this is going to be a madhouse. We're in the auditorium, they're fifth graders. I was at [middle school] which was kind of a crazy school but I loved it. They went in there and had the best time. (transcript, 5/2/07)

She describes very few details about what actually happened during the lesson.

Her initial concerns related mainly to managing the situation (worried it would be a “madhouse”). Her success was that management was not a concern in the end largely because they had fun and enjoyed the lesson—and perhaps, as she implies, enjoyed it especially because it broke the mold of textbook teaching that they were used to. The success of the lesson was in the fact that “they had the best time.”

Other student teachers also drew a connection between enjoyment or creativity and their sense of a lesson’s effectiveness. Margaret wrote in one of her reflections, for instance, “Personally, I think there needs to be more creativity with regard to lesson variations and more opportunities for group work” (reflection, 3/3/07). She also wrote, “There are not many creative and fun activities that I have seen. With such a large class however, it is difficult to create fun and productive activities” (reflection 3/3/07). These descriptions of her second placement classroom were in stark contrast to how she had viewed her first: “[The students] have fun but she definitely has control of them” (reflection, 1/14/07). In each of these situations, Margaret is drawing a connection between doing fun lessons and managing student behavior. Management is often an impediment for student teachers (Margaret discussed it often in her reflections), but here it is getting in the way of fun and creativity, not in the way of student learning.

During a conversation between student teachers at a seminar meeting in the middle of the semester, a discussion about how to break from the monotony of worksheets and textbooks took place. Here again there was a connection between management and creativity, with creativity being held up as the end goal. One student teacher said,

And so I probably should have spent more time trying to do creative things and like really structuring and trying to get them to do it, but I just gave up and said you know what if this is what they're used to and if this is the only way that they can be controlled in the classroom- (transcript, 3/28/07)

The decision-making in this case was driven by his understanding of quality instruction (and specifically of quality instruction being creative); the actual decisions, however, were the result not of student achievement (or even engagement or enjoyment), but of classroom management. As he described elsewhere, he believed that a different approach would be less “mind numbing” and would probably lead to greater learning, but because he was unable to use this approach and simultaneously “control” the students, he adopted an approach that he believed was ineffectual.

It was not just student teachers that equated learning and enjoyment. University mentors often gave feedback such as “Creative activities planned,” “Good job generating excitement,” “Students were hooked,” and “Lessons have been engaging.” During one of the team conferences, Ms. Shaw (classroom mentor) said of Kate, “Everything was made by her. She went to a travel agent, went on the Internet, got things off the side of the road even” (fieldnotes, 3/1/07). Her point was that Kate rarely used the textbook, that she made things more exciting by creating her own materials and being extremely resourceful. Throughout these examples, creativity is linked to engagement and student enjoyment. The underlying belief is that students who are having fun and are engaged are

more likely to learn the content, but whether or not they learn the content has once again been left out of the conversation.

Missed opportunities. On several occasions, student teachers made reference to student learning and either indicated that they were having difficulty assessing it or that they knew students had not all mastered the content. During the sharing of effective lessons during the final seminar meeting, Deb (the instructor) asked follow up questions of student teachers after they described their lessons. Her questions sometimes focused on assessment but were most often about challenges or aspects of the lesson that the student teacher might change (not necessarily because of learning outcomes). For instance, after one student shared the discovery lesson on the value of Pi, Deb asked, “What were the challenges?” The student responded by saying, “I would have loved more time for the groups to do several circles so they could notice the pattern in their groups. [There were] still kids that didn't connect the discovery to the formula” (fieldnotes, 5/2/07). The student teacher actually related the challenge to the students’ ability to master the concept. Her challenge was not discussed further, though; the next student began sharing.

During several end-of-placement team meetings there were also missed opportunities for instructional conversations related to assessment and student learning. The team conference report form played such a powerful role in these meetings that it actually, at times, cut off lines of conversations raised by student teachers. In some instances, when a comment or topic did not fit within a given section of the form, the conversation was redirected. In this case, Alice was preparing to assign a level of competency rating:

Alice: ((to Jack)) You- If you wanna argue about this you may.

Jack: ((laughing)) About this initial repertoire?

Alice: Um huh.

Jack: Um...Well for the most part I'm basing my units on textbook- you know they end up taking textbooks or taking textbook assessments or I looked at the textbook rubric-

Alice: Oh- you are talking about assessment- that doesn't go here.

Jack: Oh. Are we looking at something else?

Alice: Mm huh. Maybe. We're right down here.

Jack: Oh at the bottom. Ok. (transcript, 2/27/07)

In this transcript, Alice directly solicited Jack's input. It is important to note that the manner in which she accomplished this task reified the importance of the form. She did not ask Jack if he wanted to talk about something else or engage a topic further, but asked him if he wanted to contest any of the ratings they had given or the evidence that had been provided so far. The invitation was not an open request but was directly linked to the form. Jack took up the invitation and began discussing the assessments he had been using. Based on interview data, it can be inferred that Jack was going to critique his own reliance on the textbook for developing assessments and open a conversation about how to develop better assessments that provided more information about what students had learned. However, because the topic of assessment was not relevant to the current area on the form, the conversation was redirected. Jack accepted the idea that assessment "doesn't go here" and did not return to the topic. Alice continued to give her evaluation in this area, and Jack was effectively silenced. A possible avenue for discussion related to student learning was missed because of the sequence provided by the team conference report form and Alice's insistence on following it.

Later in the same meeting, Jack refocused the conversation on assessment (when it was ostensibly more appropriate):

Jack: I'm not a hundred percent comfortable assessing things that aren't- that

don't have a clear right and wrong answer. um. It took me a long time to think about what I was going to give students on this writing assignment for instance. Even- even making a rubric because some of the- some of them were so different that I didn't know. Um. I didn't know how to fairly assess something that seemed to be pretty ob- or subjective. I don't know. I'm still working on that. I'd give myself maybe an E plus [Emergent]. Um.

Alice: Uh. I'm gonna put- cause actually just the fact that you're aware of it. I'm gonna put E plus plus.

...

Ms. Fleming: I'm still working on that. Assessments is an area-

Alice: I taught creative writing for seventeen and a half- seventeen and a half years here. You talk about something that's subjective. That really was and so- Ok. And so- and on the last one- that is your classroom management. But you're coming right along and I'm putting E plus plus on those too. (transcript, 2/27/07)

While Alice gave Jack credit for being aware of this area for improvement, very little discussion related to his development actually took place. The topic was not explored in detail, nor was Jack's own view of this area as a need or a goal given much time. Both mentors responded by echoing his frustration about assessment and thereby validating his concern, but in the end Alice argued that the area was not a great concern and that Jack was "coming right along" and "really working at it." Their response to Jack's perceived weakness not only led to a missed opportunity for learning to occur but reinforced the idea that assessment is largely about the type or form of assessment implemented, when the conversation could have been turned into a more strategic one.

Summary and Possible Implications

It would be difficult and complicated to evaluate student teachers based on what their students learn, and it was not surprising to find that this did not occur effectively during student teaching at Cooper. What was more surprising, however was that the principle itself, that effective instruction should lead to student learning, was less prevalent than other conceptions of effective instruction. Student teachers were being expected to measure student learning and make instructional decisions based on their

analysis; they were being assessed on their ability to do so. However, in the spaces where learning, with support of the program, should have occurred it did not. Mentors did not engage with student teachers in this process. Of course, there were conversations between mentors and student teachers that I did not observe. Nonetheless, it is troubling to find that P-12 student learning was not the focus of instructional conversations that occurred during the learning events organized by the program as part of the student teaching experience.

In fact, in the one place where learning involving the three most important parties (university mentor, classroom mentor, and student teacher) could have occurred, the topic was absent. The team conferences became more about report and evaluation than about learning or systematic investigation. Christina, one of the mentors, argued in a follow-up interview that mentors and student teachers approached the meeting and the form with the assumption that student learning had occurred (fieldnotes, 2/16/09). Perhaps, student learning is so central to the outcomes of teacher education that it is overlooked. This possibility had particular implications in the case of Jack, who actually attempted to indicate that he was unsure about what his students or how to effectively measure it.

Because the focus was on the implementation of practices and activities and on affective outcomes, conceptions of effective instruction were largely disconnected from student learning. There were multiple opportunities for student teachers to measure the success of their own instruction by pointing to these conceptions. Student teachers could (and did) argue for their proficiency by citing the creativity of their lessons, the engagement and enjoyment of students during learning activities, or their ability to teach using resources other than the textbook. They rarely, at least in the official settings of the

program meetings where they might be assumed to engage in these conversations often, cited student learning as the rationale for their proficiency. While there was a focus on creating an environment in which learning might take place, there was little discussion of whether or not learning had taken place. It might be argued that student teaching is not the occasion to measure the impact of teachers on student learning. Perhaps, student teachers should not be expected to have demonstrable effects on student learning. Whether or not this is the case, however, the connection between teaching and learning should be a more central part of the conversation, especially in the official learning contexts connected to the program where student teachers might be supported in their learning about and practices related to student learning.

Division Between Teacher Education and P-12 Schools

Grossman, Smagorinsky, & Valencia (1999) have identified the “disjuncture between the values and practices in the different settings that comprise teacher education” (p. 3) as a central dilemma of learning to teach. They present the problem as one in which, at least partially, teacher educators are concerned by the fact their philosophies of education and agendas of reform are not shared by the public schools—as they point out, “even by their own program graduates” (p. 3) who work in those schools. As previously noted, other researchers and reviewers of the literature have made similar observations about the disjuncture or division that exists between university-based programs of teacher education and P-12 schools (Corcoran, 1981; Smagorinsky, Lakly, & Johnson, 2002; Wideen, Mayer-Smith, & Moon, 1998). The disjuncture is viewed as a serious problem, in part, because of the value that is placed on field experiences as part of learning to

teach. As Darling-Hammond (2006) posits, “The guiding idea is that if prospective teachers are to learn about practice *in practice* (Ball & Cohen, 1999), the work of universities and schools must be tightly integrated and mutually reinforcing” (p. 122).

The findings in this section are related to this tension between university and P-12 spaces, specifically to questions about why and how these spaces were not “tightly integrated and mutually reinforcing” in the context of this study. The tension itself is not a new finding, of course, but this section explores the ways in which the tension was reinforced and enacted through programmatic documents and during important learning events. While researchers have suggested varying rationales for the divide and the fact that teachers often abandon the pedagogies emphasized during their coursework, including the possibility that preservice teachers never actually aligned themselves with the beliefs of their teacher education program in the first place (see Grossman, Smagorinsky, & Valencia, 1999 for a discussion of this and other rationales posited in the research), my findings may suggest a more complex view of the divide and the way it was introduced and approached within the context of this teacher education program. In the case of this study, the privileging of the university space over the P-12 school space had possible implications for the experiences of student teachers. Related findings are explored by again considering the programmatic intent at Cooper and the manner in which student teachers were positioned within the space, how the outcomes were enacted during important events, and what the possible implications were for student teachers.

Division Between Teacher Education and P-12 Schools Evident in the Intended Outcomes

There are two findings related to the two worlds divide that were derived from the intended outcomes of the program of teacher education at Cooper. First, programmatic

documents simultaneously emphasized the centrality of field-based experiences in the learning-to-teach process and privileged the university space over the P-12 schools. This contradiction raised important questions about the value of the field. Second, programmatic documents positioned preservice teachers as caught between the two worlds and as responsible for navigating the divide that existed.

Valuing field experiences while devaluing the field. At Cooper, a great deal of emphasis was placed on quality time spent in local classrooms. Observation and participation in local classrooms was one of the first features of the program listed on the website. The elementary education webpage began by saying that the program was “field-oriented.” The undergraduate handbook stated, “Beginning in the freshman year students observe and participate in a variety of educational activities in local schools, public agencies, and experimental schools on campus.” The student teaching semester was viewed as the culminating experience. In general, these field-based experiences were presented as a fundamental component of preservice teacher learning. In other words, the program indicated that time in P-12 classrooms is an essential piece of quality teacher education. It is the mode of support for teacher candidate learning that was emphasized more than any other.

Throughout the materials produced by the department the field experiences incorporated into the curriculum were described as the meeting of theory and practice:

We believe the strongest professional preparation requires a merging of the theoretical ideas and knowledge about teaching with the development of practical ideas and skills applied in teaching. As a result we recognize and value the critical role that early field experiences and student teaching will have on your development as an educational professional. (teacher candidate handbook)

One goal of the program was to “produce teachers who are recognized...as among the best in the nation” (elementary education supplement). In multiple ways, Cooper emphasized that time spent in P-12 classrooms is essential to becoming a successful classroom professional. It is evident that Cooper presents the learning-to-teach experience as something that happens neither totally through university coursework nor wholly through experience. In her work, Britzman (2003) warns of the danger of viewing learning-to-teach as something that is based only in classroom experience. She argues, “the deeply held myth that one learns to teach solely by experience works against teacher education, because if teachers learn by experience, why should they attend classes in schools of education?” (p. 55). Her statement is particularly relevant in our current teacher preparation climate because of the attention on alternative pathways to certification, and is not ignored in the structure of the program at Cooper, which, at least in theory, valued experience in the field, not as the sole component of learning to teach but as an important and essential accompaniment to the education of teacher candidates in the program.

It was not surprising to find that this program placed an emphasis on field experience, and even set itself apart from other programs by focusing on the amount of field experiences included in preparation. It is interesting, though, that despite the emphasis on connecting the theory of the university classroom with the practices of P-12 classrooms there was little mention of the schools, students, and teachers that compose those spaces. In fact, these experiences are presented as something provided by Cooper. This presentation ignores the tension that is created in this approach; namely that, while Cooper and its representatives may organize these experiences, the experiences occur

almost completely in physical spaces controlled by other parties. The actualities of classroom practice occur outside of the space inhabited solely by Cooper and its teacher candidates. There is surprisingly little recognition of this reality in the discussion of field experiences presented to student teachers. Even for experiences and learning situations that occur in other physical spaces, it is the program of teacher education and its values that are privileged.

In addition to defining the role of the program as providing field experiences and ensuring the quality of candidates, the documents provided by Cooper place an emphasis on the program's role in improving education more broadly. The candidate handbook discussed the distinction between the world of the university and the world of the schools. This distinction is important because it established a tone for student teaching and communicated an important message about how the space of public schools is treated in the context of the student teaching system. Again, this message was communicated through the language of the handbook, but additional analysis will demonstrate how a similar message was present in the lived experiences of student teachers within the university context. The candidate handbook stated:

The active research agendas of university contexts reflect a radically different orientation to teaching and learning than school contexts. In general, university research focuses on the *modifiability* of classrooms, thus bringing a “future-in-the-making” perspective to educational contexts. Schools, however, have a greater dependence on the present, day-to-day activities and often rely on past occurrences to make predictions and decisions about a course of action.

This section of text creates a sense of dualism between the schools and the university.

The goals of the two spaces are not aligned and very possibly contradict one another.

This dualism is established through the association of terms like “future” and

“modifiability” with the university context and “past,” “present,” and “day-to-day” with

the school context. Perhaps the use of the term “radically” is no accident. This argument posits that universities are about change and that schools are about the status quo. By saying that universities and schools have a generally different perspective or approach, the text works to naturalize the divide between the two worlds.

In the above excerpt, the separation between “university contexts” and “school contexts” is attributed to the larger educational landscape. Any responsibility that the program might have for the existence of the divide or for navigating it is diffused. The text is in the third person rather than the first; the subjects are “research agendas” and “university research,” not our agendas or research at Cooper. The “radically different orientations,” therefore, are not specific to Cooper and the local schools that share the same geographical space, but rather a problem that exists for colleges of education and public school systems generally.

The idea that the university and the schools are two separate, incompatible spheres becomes one of the myths of learning to teach in a university setting. The idea that these two spaces are contradictory ones, and that the university alone is capable of seeing the potential for transformation, is akin to what Gee (1996) refers to as a master myth. He argues, “These myths hide from us other ways of thinking... They come to seem inevitable, natural, normal, practical, common sense” (p. 86). The idea that the university is separate from the schools and that the university has the responsibility of working to reform the schools becomes an accepted part of the discourse of teacher education in university settings. The handbook also, fairly clearly, privileges the work of the university over the work of the schools. While that privileging may not be the intent, the message is communicated through the use of terms of possibility and change in

describing the university and terms that call to mind the mundane and ordinary when describing the schools.

The text further creates the sense that the role of teacher education is to think about the future for the schools, to aid the schools in making change and modifying practice in ways that they are unable to accomplish on their own. In fact, the candidate handbook goes on to state that one focus of the university (a generic university in the language again, not Cooper specifically) is to “provid[e] teacher candidates with a critical awareness about school context and a mission to promote change.” While it may be the case that schools are in need of a change agenda, the language used in the handbook presents the agenda as something sponsored by and only possible through the university, rather than as an agenda shared by the university and partner schools. Change is the program’s mission. In the final description the difference between the worlds of schools and teacher education is presented as the difference between “what is” and “what could be.” Throughout this section, the privileging of the university and its work are evident, and the goal of critically (perhaps more with the sense of critique than thoroughness) examining the schools and their practices is established. What is perhaps most ironic about this particular goal of the program is that it is established by a program that emphasized the importance of working in the field during the preservice experience as central to the learning-to-teach program. The program argues that valuable learning must happen in the field and that the field is a place in need of reform. The goal of reforming educational practices, because it is presented as the program’s alone, contradicts the value placed on field experiences.

Despite the discussion of change and the program's perceived goal of reforming the practices of local schools (again, an admirable and appropriate goal in and of itself), there is little discussion in these materials or the curriculum of what exactly needs change. In some sense the documents position the schools as incapable of change (given their need to rely on the past and the present and their inability to see the future). While the dualism that the language creates is problematic, the lack of attention to the specifics is equally so. If indeed the idea that public schools need reforming and the university has to play a central role in that reform (and therefore, by proxy, teacher candidates have a role in that reform), it is important to establish what the goals of the reform are, the role of teacher candidates in that agenda, and why the reform is needed in the first place. The handbook makes the teacher candidates part of the university agenda by association, but does not establish their role or provide space for the negotiation of that agenda. Presenting that change agenda as a given, then, may be counterproductive.

Again, it is not the presence of a change agenda that is troubling, but the chasm that it creates between the space of the university and the space of the public schools. This chasm is even more troubling, as I will explain next, because it positions the student teacher in the space where the goals, discourses, and realities of the other two spaces are contested. In addition the goal of reforming education and the practices of local schools works to define quality teaching in opposition to what is happening in those spaces. In other words, it creates a definition of effective instruction that is as much the absence of certain practices (those viewed as traditional or unproductive) as it is the presence of others.

Positioning student teachers as caught between two worlds. The documents that were circulated within the program at Cooper not only served to establish and legitimize the goals of the program and its intended outcomes, they also functioned in certain ways that positioned the various participants. I continue to use the circulating documents as a central source of information because, as Luke (1997) has asserted, “Texts have a constructive function in forming up and shaping human identities” (p. 53). In this section, I provide evidence of the ways in which these texts helped to establish and shape the identity of the student teacher.

Given that they are beginning their intensive field-based careers, it would not be surprising to see student teachers positioned as newcomers to the social world of teaching. At the same time, they are completing their tenure as students of the university, and therefore still carry the identity of student. In multiple ways, the program and its representatives made clear that these two identities (novice teacher and student) are in conflict. The conflicting identities are reflective of the construction of the conflict between the university and school agendas discussed above. Britzman (2003) described this conflict of identities by saying, “Marginally situated in two worlds, the student teacher as part student and part teacher has the dual struggle of educating others while being educated” (p. 36). Again, the idea that student teachers are in some way caught between two worlds is a common one in the research literature and in the discourses of teacher education and P-12 schools. It is also not uncommon to hear student teachers themselves refer to the conflict or to their position as not-just student, but not-quite teacher. The conflict is often presented as one that student teachers must navigate or that programs of teacher education must help them navigate. My findings indicate, however,

that student teachers are quite capable of navigating between the spaces on their own, but that their ways of navigating are driven largely by pragmatic concerns. In this section I will describe how the identity of between worlds was revealed in this particular case, discussing how this positioning influenced opportunities for learning and created the potential for the student teacher to disconnect from the program.

The first sentence of the teacher candidate handbook (after the table of contents and title pages) stated, “Colleges of Education often face the challenge of preparing their students to develop the skills, knowledge, and dispositions they will need to succeed both as students in their university courses and as professionals in the field.” In the opening paragraph the phrase “caught in the middle” (with quotation marks around it) is used twice. On the first page, there is a graphic representation of the student teacher’s predicament—a Venn diagram with the circles representing the university and the field and a stick figure representing the student teacher in the space where they overlap. The introduction goes on to say:

[There are] two very different roles played by the pre-service teachers as they move back and forth between the two contexts within which they live and learn. The successful Teacher Candidate is able to navigate these contexts and these roles by understanding the demands and norms of both contexts.

The language and the images used in the introduction to the handbook are striking in how they locate the student teacher squarely between the two separate worlds of the university and the schools. The handbook repeats what has been documented in the research. My contention, explored in more detail later, is that student teachers are actually quite adept at “understanding the demands and norms of both contexts” and of navigating between them, just not in the way that a program of teacher education might value.

The candidate handbook goes on to further solidify the dual roles of university student and teacher in a section titled “Understanding and Accepting your Roles.” The title itself presents a picture of the roles as established, fixed, and immutable. The message of this particular section is less about the distinction between the student teacher as student (i.e. learner at a university) and teacher and more about the distinction between student teacher as student (i.e. member of the social world of college) and professional. The underlying message of this section is that student teachers must either separate their college-student identity from their professional one or completely leave it behind.

Whether or not the discussion is necessary, the way that it was presented to student teachers at Cooper is instructive. Within this section, there is a figure that includes the top ten things that a college student should never do as a teacher candidate.

The ten items are:

1. Eat breakfast in class
2. Sleep until noon
3. Tell your students to check your blog
4. Wear flip-flops
5. Wear a t-shirt that says “Party Animal”
6. Call your mentor teacher, “Dude”
7. Show a tattoo that says, “I’m a Wild Cowgirl”
8. Text message your friends between lessons or while observing your mentor teacher.
9. Seek advice from students’ about your love life
10. Party late on Thursday night and have your roommate call you in sick.

Undoubtedly, this list was intended to be somewhat humorous, given the use of the top-ten list format. In addition, it is possible that most of these items are at least loosely based on reality or situations that teacher educators have encountered. The list presents and reinforces the idea of a binary or dualism when the reality of student teachers is much more integrated, much more fluid, and much less clear. It also assumes a

certain kind of identity and set of behaviors that may be evident at times in student teachers, but is in no way a fully accurate portrayal. The assumption is that the life of a student is full of behavior that is inappropriate for teachers. The focus on the differences between the two worlds and how to navigate the conflict in this instance is squarely on behaviors and attitudes that are not directly tied to teaching and learning. In its attempt to assist the student teacher in navigating between the two worlds, the program has defined the differences as related to wardrobe, what you do in your free time, and attitudes, not in relation to issues of pedagogy or educational philosophy.

The idea of the student teachers as ignorant of expectations is reinforced elsewhere throughout the handbook. Dress codes are included for each school district in the area. Possible field-based concerns are listed and consist of things such as inappropriate dress, chewing gum while teaching, tardiness, and inappropriate communication.

While student teachers are being labeled as unprepared (or unable or unwilling) to navigate between the worlds of university and P-12 classrooms, they are also, ironically, being positioned as individually responsible for this navigation. The language of the handbook's introduction places the responsibility for navigating between the two worlds squarely on the student teachers themselves. In fact, it puts the onus on them as individuals (by saying "Teacher Candidate"), not even on them as a group. While the university clearly acknowledges the disconnect that has been found and lamented between universities and P-12 schools, its purpose in so doing is to warn the student teachers and advise them of their responsibilities. The language of this introduction does not present an attempt to bridge the divide or even to assist the student teachers in

navigating it, but rather to insist that they do. And again, it characterizes this particular conflict as one of behavior and dispositions, not one of philosophies and pedagogical approaches. Despite the university's attention to collaboration and social aspects of learning, the dilemma that is the initial focus of the introduction to student teaching is left to the student teachers to solve. This finding reflects the ideas of previous work on teacher preparation: "Learning to teach is a social process of negotiation rather than an individual problem of behavior... Yet the normative discourse of learning to teach presents it as an individual dilemma that precludes the recognition of the contradictory realities of school life" (Britzman, 2003, p. 31).

Throughout my consideration of these documents, the program privileged the aspects of learning to teach and teaching and learning that were most clearly tied to and observable within the Cooper space. This privileging happened at the expense of both student teachers and public school systems. Because certain aspects of learning to teach (even major ones such as P-12 student learning) were more readily observable in and connected to the public school space they become less central in the Cooper space, while things like punctuality become increasingly emphasized. The aspects of the curriculum that were established by or reflected in the documents distributed to student teachers at Cooper worked to establish a separation between spaces, privilege the program space, and relegate the goal of student learning to a subordinate position. For these reasons, the hybrid space that exists where student teachers and other parties meet is established, through the documents at least, as a fixed one—a space in which excellent teaching is defined by a set of 44 principles and student teachers are positioned as unprepared for the challenges and expectations that lie ahead of them. The implication is that these

documents and their approach to teaching, learning, and learning to teach within the student teacher system may work to ensure that the space will not be a contested, generative, or productive one.

Division Between Teacher Education and P-12 Schools Enacted During Learning Events

In a previous study of the discourse of student teaching (Furman, 2006), I found that conversations in seminar and small group meetings were often characterized by the juxtaposition of seemingly opposing viewpoints or realities. It was common for student teachers to talk about their experience in dualistic terms. For instance, they often talked about their contrasting experiences in urban and suburban school settings, the differences between their own lives and the lives of their students, the contrasts between the lives of their students in school and out of school, and the competing pressures of the “Cooper way” and the realities of schools. These conversations were often characterized by deficit notions of the students and their families. I argued that the practice of discussing experiences and problems in binary terms was rarely productive, and in fact often reinforced stereotypes or generalizations that the student teachers had about their students, public school classrooms, pedagogy, and other components of their student teaching. In this study, similar patterns were evident, and the practice of comparing and contrasting, at the expense of thoroughly examining, was again common. I focus my attention here specifically on the practice of placing the program and its agenda in contrast with the schools and their work and the implications of this practice for the space inhabited by student teachers and the program. First, I look specifically at the finding that a culture of critique dominated the discussions of teaching and learning that occurred during various events. Then I consider the end-of-placement team conference, a site in

which representatives of the program and the schools were present, and discuss the finding that these potential sites of negotiation and transformation related to the divide between the two spaces were dominated by the purposes of the university.

Critiquing the classroom. Conversation during program meetings often focused heavily on critiquing the practices present in the placement schools. This practice furthered the divide between the program and the schools and continued to privilege the program over the schools. Often times these critiques were at a school-wide level (such as how discipline was handled by administrators and the effectiveness, or lack of, of school-based professional development). In one case, for instance, an instructor commented, “One of the saddest things we do in education is move bad people from place to place. I had a principal who had nine jobs in ten years...Kids don’t deserve that” (fieldnotes, 3/26/07). During another seminar meeting she said, “We don’t have [students] work together. Takes a lot more work and energy to do that, but it is important that we try” (fieldnotes 4/16/07). These comments were representative of many others made about the general state of education and the schools; but in my analysis, I concentrate on those moments where the focus was more centrally on instruction and classroom practice. University faculty emphasized the critiques as a way of teaching about good pedagogy and student teachers often struggled with how to navigate them. In turn I will examine some particular events related to the culture of critique that were connected to classroom instruction and practice for the student teachers.

In multiple instances, student teachers and mentors from Cooper discussed pedagogy and instructional practice by directly referencing mentors from their placement classrooms. Typically in these exchanges, the student teacher would describe what the

classroom mentor was *not* doing. For example, student teachers often noted the lack of cooperative learning in their placement schools and the heavy reliance on textbooks and worksheets. With this absence of certain practices as the backdrop, student teachers were able to frame their own instructional choices as the presence of those practices. They were being successful by doing things that teachers in the field were not doing.

For example, I previously discussed the seminar meeting in which student teachers shared their best lessons. I repeat one of those comments here because it also provides evidence of the ways in which the culture of critique was an essential part of conversations and furthered the devaluing of the field during events in the Cooper space. This lesson was a science lesson taught in fifth grade:

We were doing a lesson on the respiratory system and their teacher taught it very by the book. I mean from the book you bubbled in the answers. She never taught science ever. And so this was an experience for me and I wasn't sure how to handle it. I picked a really awesome unit. She let me do a really awesome unit... They never did teamwork ever. They never even really talk in science. So it was just nice. (transcript, 5/2/07)

When asked to choose one of her best lessons and describe it, this student purposefully selected a lesson that was creative, interactive, and completely in contrast to the way of teaching that was typical in the classroom. We can probably assume that had she been describing this lesson in a faculty meeting at her placement school, she would have left out the details about this being the first time they had done teamwork or even talked in science, or the fact that her classroom mentor taught science (when she even taught it) by the book. Effective instruction was defined here primarily as the absence of typical or by the book instruction, not necessarily according to the components of effective instruction as defined by the program's rubric or any other source. The student teacher labeled what

goes on in the classroom as bad and proceeded to demonstrate that her teaching looked different.

In one of the final small group meetings of the year, one of the student teachers, Lily, also discussed a classroom situation by describing the ineffective practices of her classroom mentor in response to a question posed by Alice, the university mentor:

Alice: What's the hardest thing in your student teaching experience?

Lily: Well if you don't have a good- not that- I have good relationship with my mentor, but if your teaching styles are completely different. You know, especially being a student teacher you do have to back down. I mean you just do. You know.

Alice: Cause they're the boss.

Lily: Yeah so um. It's hard and challenging to kind of readjust your teaching style. You know to incorporate theirs a little bit at least. And so that was hard. (transcript, 4/18/07)

Lily referred to a genuine difference between her approach and the classroom mentor's approach. In at least some way, these differences were connected to the instruction and experiences that Lily had had at Cooper. Her comments demonstrated that the differences in the way instruction is approached are indeed real—the disconnect is not wholly fabricated—but because of the way the disconnect is approached, Lily had very few strategies for navigating it. Like Lily, Claire, another student teacher, shared her inability to know how to proceed during this same exchange:

I think also like along with that when I caught myself in the first placement. Like right when I walked in I was like ok that's the teacher. I won't do those things from immediately watching. And then, like a week and a half later I caught myself doing those things and it was just like you hit that moment when you're just like, I know better. And you've been taught other things but when that is what you see and that is what's going on I just caught myself in this downward spiral of handling situations kind of the way that she was and trying to back out of it. This is not working. (transcript, 4/18/07)

Claire's comments reinforce the idea that while teachers are prepared to critique classroom practices, they feel ineffectual when it comes to changing them. She expressed

clear judgments of the way her teacher handled situations and clear regret that she adopted those methods at various points in her experience. Again, though, she seemed to have had no strategies for dealing with this dilemma.

Having established the ways in which the opposition of university and P-12 schools is a regular part of the discourse in seminar meetings and how student teachers were able to navigate the conflict in that space (by critiquing their mentors' practices, for instance), but less so in the school space, I want to present a particularly revealing episode that occurred in the middle of the semester in a seminar meeting. During this meeting, the instructors were pulling student teachers one at a time to discuss their assignments from the first placement. While these meetings were taking place, the student teachers met in small groups with peers who were teaching the same grade or similar subjects. The goal of the small group time was to discuss their unit plans for their second placements. Despite my presence, the group did not focus extensively on the task at hand. They spent most of the time discussing topics related to their teaching (such as parent interactions and a new district-wide uniform policy), but not their unit plans specifically. At one point, the conversation turned to the issue of deciding whether or not to teach the way the classroom teacher teaches. This conversation is particularly relevant to the issue of dealing with the divide between university and school because the student teachers (in honest terms) discussed how they navigated the expectations of university and school. Though five student teachers were present, the exchange was largely between two of them, Lacey and Jack:

Lacey: I'm trying to figure out what to do in this placement because they are so worksheet oriented. And I wanna like do what she wants them to do.

Jack: Right.

Lacey: But at the same time it's all worksheets. So I don't know if I should just

like continue. Or like-

Jack: I was-

Lacey: Or like try to teach the way I wanna teach. (transcript, 3/28/07)

Again, in the way Lacey presents the dilemma, it is evident that the practice of critiquing the classroom mentor was at play. The conversation began with Lacey criticizing the practices of the classroom teacher. Her conundrum was not an uncommon one in this landscape. She was witnessing a classroom practice (using worksheets) that she has been told is representative of bad pedagogy. Here, Lacey did not want to follow the lead of the teacher but was unsure about how to break from the teacher's model without offending the teacher and while maintaining "control" in the classroom (revealed later in the conversation). The dilemma itself illustrates how good and bad classroom practice often gets essentialized. Throughout this conversation good teaching was equated with engagement and creativity and bad teaching with worksheets, textbooks, and test prep. While there may be some validity to these categories, they are, at the very least, oversimplifications.

As the conversation continued, the way that various student teachers navigated this dilemma became evident:

Jack: Right. I was in a very similar situation last placement where the only thing they did was book work and worksheets...And- I think it was a copout. But at the beginning- So- The way that I justified it to the teacher, I said my supervisors want me to be doing these think outside of the box sort of things.

Lacey: Hm hmm.

Jack: I mean you kind of lay it off to your supervisors and to your mentors and your teachers. (transcript, 3/28/07)

Jack recounted how he himself navigated the conflict in his first placement classroom. In order to attempt some form of instruction other than worksheets, he explained to his classroom mentor that the program required it. His formulation further

divided the two worlds in actuality, by labeling the practices of the university as “new ideas” that were “outside of the box.” However, when his attempts were unsuccessful, he returned to doing things the way that the classroom mentor did them, still recognizing that this approach did not align with his (or the program’s) view of best practice.

It is also important to note that this conversation took place between student teachers. It was raised in the absence of any parties from Cooper. It is possible that the conversation would not have been raised or discussed in this manner had an instructor been present. This possibility and the context of the conversation raise two concerns. First, student teachers viewed this particular dilemma as something to problem solve together. It was not something that they felt as comfortable sharing in the presence of mentors or instructors in this case. Second, Cooper failed to provide the space that would have allowed them to more successfully problem solve with their mentors. It reveals once again that the program focused on the critique over the solution. This focus played out in the exchange above. The student teachers discussed the problem and how to avoid it or get around it, not how to alter it or work with the teacher to move forward. The problem, from the standpoint of their teacher education program, is that they were quite capable of critiquing and recognizing what might need improvement in their classrooms and schools, but had not appropriated the tools and resources necessary to make changes. The moment above should have and could have been a powerful moment for thinking about teaching and learning with student teachers, but it was reduced largely to a conversation about techniques and short-term fixes.

Student teachers were also sometimes challenged when they did follow the practices of their cooperating teachers. During a seminar meeting that Irene facilitated,

she raised the issue of differentiation in the classroom. Through the course of the conversation she explicitly questioned one of the student teachers, Liz, who had adopted the practices of her classroom mentor. This exchange is representative of other similar exchanges that occurred in seminar and small group meetings. Again in this episode, issues of the disconnect between what was valued by the program and what was happening in the classroom was evident.

Liz: If there's one or two kids in our class that aren't finished with the assignment then we send them across the hall and they hate being isolated. Being isolated is-

Irene: But so, then are you punishing kids for not getting their work done? What do you do-

Liz: No. It's encouraging them to work faster.

Irene: But what if they can't work faster?

Liz: I don't know. That's just how my teacher does it. (transcript, 4/16/07)

Irene raised a very legitimate question and implied criticism about the practice of simply removing students who have not finished their work on time. She challenged the practice of the student teacher, who admitted that she engaged in the practice because her classroom mentor does it. After this exchange, the conversation moved to a different topic. While Irene challenged the practice and asked the student teacher to consider her rationale and whether or not this was the best decision, there was no discussion of alternatives or even of the rationale behind Irene's criticism. Liz was questioned for aligning with the practices of her classroom mentor, but was not given solutions or a different approach for navigating the situation with her mentor.

Controlling conversation during the end-of-placement team meetings. The team conferences (involving student teachers, university mentors, and classroom mentors) were the only official time in which the program and the school met formally during the semester. These meetings were intended to be formative assessments according to the

teacher candidate handbook—“assessments for learning.” Two of the key components of this type of assessment were laid out in the handbook. First, the team meetings were to include “the active involvement of teacher candidates in the assessment of their own learning and in articulating goals and strategies for continued growth.” In addition, the meetings were to include “university and field mentors, along with teacher educators responding to results of formative feedback by modifying their teaching and support structures to enhance teacher candidate learning.” In other words, these meetings were meant to be not only a chance to assess the progress of student teachers, but largely a chance for learning to occur as well. In practice, as observed during this study, however, these meetings became largely about evaluation and focused on the program’s need to demonstrate its effectiveness. While it was imagined to be focused on the needs of student teachers and to include collaboration between the program and the school, the meetings further privileged the thinking and approach of the university space and in some cases silenced the needs and knowledge of the student teacher and classroom mentors.

The team conference report form provided the structure for the meeting, often scripting the conversation. While there was variation in the way meetings were conducted and the approach used by different university mentors, there was a typical progression for the meeting that was evident. The three participants usually gathered and spent some time engaging in small talk or discussing items of business (such as when assignments were due). At some point, the university mentor would end this conversation and focus the participants on the official business of the end-of-placement team conference. For instance, in the conference involving Christina (university mentor), Margaret (student

teacher), and Ms. Peters (classroom mentor), Christina focused the conversation about three-minutes after everyone had gathered:

Christina: Is that all of our...stuff?

Margaret: Think so.

Christina: Um so we're meeting for our end-of-placement conference. Hard to believe it is the last week that you're here.

Ms. Peters: Really.

Christina: And what you're going to see is that I've written much less than I did the first time.

...

Christina: So we're just gonna kinda run through. ((Christina turns the conference report form towards Margaret and Ms. Peters.)) I'll see if I can read upside down today. Could be a difficult task. (transcript, 2/26/07)

Christina demonstrated that the main purpose of their meeting was the official business of the end-of-placement conference and report. She immediately focused their attention on the form. Although she was the only mentor to do so, she actually turned the form around so that the other participants could look directly at what she would read to them. She focused the talk on their task, and through her actions she drew attention to the written document specifically.

After the mentors began the meetings and turned everyone's attention to completing the form, they dealt with each of the eleven areas in sequential order. In most cases, the university mentor would read the description provided on the form, give their own comments on this area, ask for feedback from the classroom mentor and/or the student teacher, add additional comments, discuss the rating, and then move on to the next area. The end-of-placement conference, in many ways, became a performance; the form provided a script, and the mentors directed the action.

In a follow-up interview, Christina confirmed that this was her impression of the meetings as well. In her view, the classroom mentors and student teachers rarely

participated to a great extent in the conversation. Christina felt that their lack of engagement was in large part due to the form itself and the language of the form. In essence, she argued, the form was very clearly a program document being implemented for program purposes; it was viewed as separate from the actual classroom realities of the teacher (fieldnotes, 2/16/09). During one of the conferences, the following exchange took place related directly to the language of the form:

Ms. Peters: There's still gotta be a way to make that language easier to-

Christina: Well. Yes.

Ms. Peters: I understand.

Christina: I didn't pick the language.

Ms. Peters: Oh I know you didn't. That's-

Christina: I think NCATE has some influence on that language. You all have accreditation here too. I'm sure you go through that process occasionally and know how you have to- kind of-

Ms. Peters: Oh absolutely.

Christina: Work through that. (transcript, 2/27/07)

By criticizing the language, Ms. Peters was indirectly questioning the usefulness of the form. She said that it made her laugh. She noted a disconnect between the way the program approached the student teaching process and the way that teachers approach it. Christina directly mentioned the influence that she believed NCATE had on this form. She also said that it was something that people in the local setting have to “work through.” This construction indicated her view of the form as something to be filled out but also worked around. This exchange labeled the document as something that was not helpful, and perhaps was an obstacle, to the growth of student teachers and the conversations between student teachers and their mentors—an object whose main purpose was outside of the local.

The report form, then, imposed the intent of the program on the local space and made productive hybridity less possible in the team meetings. Another example shows

the ways in which it was the goals of the program (and again the language) that was valued in these meetings. In this exchange, Mary (university mentor), Kate (student teacher), and Ms. Shaw (classroom mentor) discussed the area of subject matter knowledge during the meeting at the end of Kate's first placement.

Mary: ((Reading from the form)) Kate has a solid command of the content. Kate plans in a way that is appropriate for first grade. She understands how the objectives fall within the framework of the standards. ((Stops reading)) Is there anything else we want to add? What can we add to that?

Ms. Shaw: I know that as time went on her- um- her lessons were uh- more uh- sequenced. More um fuller in every way. Uh- they just got better and better.

Kate: Hm hmm. Yeah I feel that way too.

Mary: Wonder if um...Do we wanna put that?

...

Mary: ((writing)) Ok. So with experience. Um...Uh...

Ms. Shaw: I mean I think initially she might not have known what the previous skills were to tie into.

...

Mary: ((reading what she has written)) With experience Kate was able to weave lessons together more effectively.

The pattern evident above was often repeated. At various points Mary asked if the information should be included on the form, wrote it on the form, and read back what she had written. Once there was agreement on a rating, Mary moved on to the next area for evaluation. It was the case here, and in other instances, that the university mentor translated what was said by a student teacher or classroom mentor into the sort of language that fit more appropriately on the form as evidence of one of the 44 indicators.

In the team meetings, when classroom mentors did add feedback and attempt to address the student teacher, they also attempted to keep their feedback tied to the purposes of the conference dictated by the form. Often mentors used the language of "does this fit?" They recognized that it was information that provided evidence of the 44 indicators that was valued in the meeting and tried to keep their comments within those

confines. For instance, Ms. Shaw often spoke directly to Kate in their meeting, but caught herself at one point and asked if her comments were relevant to the current indicator being discussed:

Ms. Shaw: I noticed improvement in your timing.

Kate: Yeah.

Ms. Shaw: Cause it is really important. [...] ((to Mary)) I don't know if this is something to address here or not but it's also about the change up of activities that got better and better.

Mary: The transition?

Ms. Shaw: It's not just about- I don't mean just about transition but within a group. (transcript, 3/1/07)

By saying, "I don't know if this is something to address here or not," Ms Shaw recognized that what she said needed to be able to go somewhere on the form. Mary attempted to simplify it for the purposes of recording it, but Ms. Shaw actually expanded on her discussion at that point. In this instance, the classroom mentor was not as tied to the form as the university mentor. In some ways, she contested its authority, though not forcefully, and ultimately with little success.

Another classroom mentor, Ms. Peters, made a similar comment when providing feedback:

And giving uh- something I wrote on the observations. I don't know where this fits in but [Margaret's] done a really good job of having- getting everybody involved instead of just having one person share. If they're not sharing with the whole group they're at least sharing with someone at their table. Or. So everybody's in a way being held responsible and not feeding off of everybody else. (transcript, 2/26/07)

She commented freely, but like Ms. Shaw, referenced the form and couched her praise by asking if she was providing it at the right time or in the right place. These two examples are representative of ways in which classroom mentors felt potentially constrained by the form and the kind of information that it required.

Although it was not necessarily intended to be (and potentially could have been otherwise), the three-way conference became another instance in which the program and its purposes were valued over the public school space (and even the needs of student teachers) in the enacted curriculum of the student teaching semester. The report form that served as a record of the conference actually functioned to script it and to dictate its purposes.

Summary and Possible Implications

The culture of critique that was evident and the inability of team conferences to actually serve as a bridge between program and P-12 spaces both have potential implications for how programs of teacher education approach the disjuncture. The language of the intended curriculum potentially exacerbated the divide. In addition, it put the onus for navigating between the two realms squarely on the shoulders of student teachers. Given this situation, student teachers sometimes saw the navigation as simply a choice between two worlds and met the expectations of the program while in that space. This possible implication was evident in an exchange between student teachers during a seminar meeting. Janet raised the unit plan assignment and a concern she had about it. The concern was largely about the requirements of the assignment, meeting the needs of the program, rather than implementing the kind of quality instruction that those requirements were meant to reflect and document.

Janet: I'm running into a problem with my unit plan...I'm teaching a book by Avi...And since I only teach language arts all day do I plan the science and math lessons that I'm never really going to get to teach. Or do I only plan things I will actually teach. It's not that I can't slip in a little science and math.

...

Allison: I didn't actually teach science or math or anything when I was just in social studies. I put in like science standards. So we followed the scientific method as part of an inquiry. Or math we used math skills when we did our

Olympics. Like measurement and time and comparing and stuff. So that's how I hit all of mine. I didn't actually teach it.

...

Janet: I could try to squeeze it in, but I can't do like a full out science lab lesson.

...

Janet: We are doing characterization [and all the characters are animals], so I wonder if I could slip it [animal classification] in there. And certainly I could plan a math lesson based on this but I'm not gonna have enough time-

Allison: I throw in like really discrete places. Like in my centers. (transcript, 3/28/07)

Here the student teachers were engaged in collaboratively solving a problem, but the problem was less about instruction and more about meeting the requirements of the unit plan assignment—in this case, ensuring that it included interdisciplinary connections. Confusion over what exactly constituted a sufficient interdisciplinary lesson was evident. More interesting though, is the continued use of phrases such as “slip it in” and “squeeze it in.” Janet and Allison were approaching the problem as one of how to get one over on the school (by teaching science while they are supposed to be teaching language arts) and/or the program (by including another discipline without actually “teaching” it or dedicating too much time to it). The problem was once again about navigating between the two spaces, and the student teachers approached it as a problem of meeting expectations and fulfilling requirements rather than doing what was best for students. Once again, as they did when thinking about how to not replicate the use of worksheets so dominant in their placement classrooms, the student teachers demonstrated an inability to successfully problem solve the situation.

As demonstrated above, one of the other ways that student teachers responded to the dualism between university and school that was a central part of the learning-to-teach discourse in the program space was to differentiate themselves from their classroom mentor or the practices of their school. In other words, while in that space, the student

teachers were quick to align themselves with the views and values of the program and against the practices they witnessed in the field. Interestingly, this practice was common in seminar and small group meetings, but less common in interviews where students were at times critical of the university, its practices, its goals, and its philosophy. A plausible hypothesis is that part of their method for navigating the competing worlds and agendas was to side with the party they were in the company of. While I do not have data that would confirm that a similar practice took place when no one from the program was present, I would guess that student teachers often sided with their classroom mentors (and against the program) in other settings and at other times.

In the university setting, when student teachers critique the practices in P-12 settings, we must consider what occurs and what the effects are. Are they rewarded for critiquing their classroom mentors? How are they taught to respond to what they report as negative interactions or practices? What is learned or gained through these conversations? To some extent, by preparing student teachers to be highly critical of the practices in their placement schools we may be setting them up for failure. They have rare glimpses of success at changing the practices of their mentors or including absent practices but are more often left feeling guilty for adopting the practices of their classroom mentors. They enter student teaching with a sense of good pedagogy and when they do not see it happening around them they want to implement it. However, we must ask if this predicament creates a situation in which student teachers apply simplified aspects of good pedagogy (including more discussion for instance) for the sake of inclusion, rather than for the sake of student learning. If that is the case, it may be partially because while they are being prepared to critique classroom practices they are

not being prepared or supported in implementing alternatives. For student teachers, the outcome may be viewed as what gets taught or how it gets taught and how that differs from the practices of their mentor. And it appeared that this might be the expectation. The findings presented above not only privilege the university space over the school space, they also indicated a focus on posing problems without offering solutions and a lack of opportunity for learning to occur within and through the conflicts that were experienced.

Assessment at the Programmatic Level

As described in Chapter I, issues of assessment related to the outcomes of teacher education are a focus of the current educational context. As colleges of teacher education work to become more systematic in their evaluation of teacher preparation and more assessment-driven in their program development, issues of assessment and its influence on student teacher learning should be an important consideration for researchers and teacher educators. It is my contention that student teaching, in the case of this study, was being defined by the assessments associated with the experience in ways that were not in line with the goals espoused by and the identities taken up by student teachers themselves or sometimes even with the goals of the program. In fact, student teachers were being located and positioned within this system in counterproductive ways. The positioning of student teachers and the manner in which documents worked to reify these positions in the context of mentoring led to a situation in which certain aspects of teaching were valued and others were ignored as a result of the competing and often contradictory programmatic purposes of evaluation and support. I believed that the findings discussed

in this section raise important questions for thinking about the assessment of teacher education programs and preservice teachers and indicate possible ways in which the crisis of assessment at the programmatic level may influence the learning of preservice teachers and their understanding of P-12 student outcomes.

At Cooper, the program emphasized the importance of knowing learners and differentiating instruction; my findings indicate that it was not practicing these principles. That, in fact, perhaps because of NCATE requirements and pushes for accountability, it moved in the opposite direction and viewed student teachers as a nameless, faceless set of candidates. This move is from process to product and ignores the larger context in many situations. Evaluations looked and felt summative, even though they were meant to be formative, and they treated student teachers as objects, rather than subjects.

While the program at Cooper focused on the complicated nature of the classroom and the complex set of factors that influence teaching and learning, it distilled what it means to teach into a set of principles that could be evaluated on an eight-page document. In many ways, this is an example of how “institutions privilege certain kinds of knowledge—and how, in this process, they devalue or re-define the local and the vernacular for their own purposes” (Hamilton, 2001, p. 178). But also, it indicates the kind of mixed messages that are sent to preservice teachers and relates to the finding about the lack of attention to P-12 student learning discussed earlier.

In order to explore the tensions and contradictions related to assessment at the programmatic level, I use the same approach employed in the previous two sections. First, I describe the programmatic intent related to assessment. Next, I consider what

occurred in the spaces where assessment was enacted during the semester. And finally, I again look at the possible implications for student teachers.

Approach to Assessment Evident in the Documents

Here I present two important findings related to the approach to assessment revealed in the programmatic documents. First, I describe the contradiction between the program's focus on issues of diversity and difference as essential to creating and sustaining productive learning environments and its simultaneous use of a set of decontextualized principles for evaluating student teacher learning and development. Next, I present the ways in which programmatic materials related to assessment positioned student teachers as the objects of assessment and disconnected the process of assessment from student teacher learning and developing. These findings are essential for situating the description of the actual assessment of student teacher practices that will be subsequently analyzed. Prior to presenting analysis in these areas, I provide a brief description of how assessment at the programmatic level may have been influenced by the NCATE accreditation process during the time in which my study was conducted.

Responding to the requirements of NCATE. It is important to note that the program that served as the focus of this study was in the midst of preparing for a cycle of accreditation by NCATE during data collection. Various changes were evident as a result of the attention to an accreditation review. These changes were reflected in the materials produced and disseminated to student teachers and other participants. For instance, the teacher candidate handbook was introduced for the first time during the semester preceding this study. In previous years the director of each program provided a handbook for student teaching, and the practicum instructors or supervisors provided relevant

information to students engaged in those experiences. The inclusion of the words “policy” and “assessment” in the title of the new candidate handbook was indicative of several of the changes that went into place and will be explored, as was the fact that the new material encompassed the entire span of the program (and all three programs) rather than just student teaching.

Because my goal here is to emphasize that the program was in a transition at the time of the study and to examine the goals and purposes enumerated by the program during this particular semester, I will not include a thorough analysis of the specific changes that were made or what was added and left out. I believe, however, that this contextualization is necessary in order to fully examine the findings and think about their implications. Some aspects of the student teaching experience that occurred during the semester of this study may have been influenced by the increased attention to assessment and data collection and the relative newness of some of these procedures.

Emphasizing diversity in theory. In analyzing the program’s main documents, it was not surprising to find multiple mentions of diversity and difference. This focus was reflective of the program’s curriculum in other areas (such as course requirements and offerings), the university’s location in an urban setting, and the work and research of faculty involved in teacher education at Cooper. Diversity was often categorized as attention to issues of culture and language, but frequently referenced other factors such as learning styles, individual strengths of students, and diversity of interests, for instance. The theme of diversity ran throughout the handbooks and was incorporated into the many goals and expectations that were outlined therein.

Reference to diversity was made within all four areas of the PGP. Within the area of subject matter knowledge for teaching, successful preservice teachers were expected to demonstrate proficiency by scaffolding instruction in a way that reflected the individual “trajectories of development” of students. The section on learners and learning begins by stating, “Teacher candidates recognize the ways in which learners’ academic, behavioral, cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic histories and repertoires inform learning and so also teaching.” As part of this strand, preservice teachers were expected to “identify and seek to learn about students’ linguistic, social and cultural histories and repertoires.” As part of their conceptions of the practice and profession of teaching, “attend[ing] to individual differences, interests and capabilities as reflected in differentiated planning” was included. Within the strand focused on curriculum, instruction, and assessment, the expectation was to develop “alternative means of achieving learning goal[s].” These four strands were used as the basis for evaluating preservice teachers when they were engaged in practica and student teaching. They make evident the value that the program placed on attention to student differences and the implications of these differences for classroom instruction.

While the attention to student diversity was clear, it was somewhat contradicted by the use of these criteria, as they establish the sense that “excellence in teaching” can be described by a set of principles that are applicable across contexts. In other words, the strands and their indicators simultaneously emphasize both the importance of attending to difference and ignoring the differences that exist in teaching placements and classrooms. The recommendations suggested by the indicators include attending to difference and individualizing instruction based on the needs of learners, yet this same document was

implemented for use with all preservice teachers, in all teaching situations, across all grades and content areas. These areas of knowledge and practice are introduced as if they apply to all teacher candidates in all programs offered by the department, which necessarily means that aspects of teaching and learning that are particularly relevant or potentially unique to certain grade levels or subject areas are not included here. The implicit message is that teaching Calculus to twelfth-grade students is, at least at some basic level, no different than teaching phonics in first grade and that teaching students in rural Texas involves the same 44 indicators applied in the same way as when teaching students in New Orleans.

The criteria for excellence established by the program are so general that they lack detailed attention to their applicability. There is not enough specificity to allow a student teacher to understand what the area or indicator looks like in practice, let alone in a specific context. Defining and evaluating excellence in teaching is a difficult task, and the best way to do it is an open question. The program has done it here through a comprehensive set of standards, but by seeking to apply them to all situations has failed to provide the level of specificity that might be most useful for preservice teachers. For instance, “Possess a solid command of the subject matter,” is certainly a goal for effective teachers. But how is the “solid command” defined or determined? How does it differ for kindergarten teachers and high school math teachers? As a preservice teacher, how would I know whether or not I had met this standard? Certainly, it is more complicated than the statement suggests. Because these indicators are used as the main form of evaluation during student teaching, these questions are particularly relevant to this study. It is also relevant that they are presented as a definitive set of principles without reference to how

they were determined, whether they are backed by research, or if they are shared by educators in the public school system. The implication of these strands and their constituent parts is that effective teaching involves all 44 of these beliefs, practices, or dispositions (and perhaps only these 44), that they are easily observed during the course of student teaching, that they are all the same regardless of the context, and that they represent the definitive answer to the question of what makes a high quality educator. As I pointed out, this approach contradicts the fact that these indicators are themselves so heavily focused on difference and context. In addition, the approach also normalizes effective teaching, making it important to consider what is included and left out.

Positioning student teachers as objects of assessment. One very utilitarian yet essential goal of any teacher education program is to ensure that its teachers are qualified and deserving of certification. Of course, determining what that means is not as straightforward. This goal relates to providing the appropriate courses, ensuring that candidates are successful on professional tests, and aligning their curriculum with the requirements of the state, among many other things. In addition, for many universities, this goal requires meeting the expectations of other groups, such as NCATE. One of the responsibilities of the university, then, is to verify that its candidates are indeed ready to become full-time teachers. While this purpose was less directly stated and advertised than goals such as providing extensive field-based experience in Cooper's materials, it was nonetheless present. Within the context of working to demonstrate its effectiveness at preparing high-quality teachers, Cooper appeared to create an approach in which the practice of program assessment was separate from the learning of individual preservice teachers. One of the resultant effects was that student teachers were positioned as objects

of assessment and sources of data used to demonstrate program success rather than active subjects engaged in learning processes.

The general approach of the program, as outlined in the teacher candidate handbook, was a collaborative one. Despite a more extensive focus on formal evaluation of the student teachers than in the previous handbooks (prior to the changes made in anticipation of the NCATE review), the program still emphasized the “active involvement of teacher candidates in the assessment of their own learning and in articulating goals and strategies for continued growth.” Even though there was a shift towards evaluating the candidates, there was still attention given to self-assessment and a focus on growth. Because evaluation of teacher candidates was one of the goals (one of the more implicit and most utilitarian ones) of the program, it was not surprising to find information relating to the assessment of students in the program. It is important to consider, though, how preservice teachers are positioned within the system of assessment and evaluation and what, if any, agency they have in the process.

In discussing evaluation, the previous student teaching handbook began with the assertion that “assessment of the student teacher’s growth will be cooperative and centered around their own honest and critical self-evaluation.” In its earliest reference to the program’s goal of monitoring the development of teacher candidates, the teacher candidate handbook from the semester of this study stated, “These descriptors cannot articulate every dimension by which one would judge a beginning teacher’s level of competency but they provide general insight.” The shift here is from an emphasis on self-evaluation to a focus on judging the quality of teacher candidates. The judging or assessment is no longer being done by the teacher candidate or by the teacher candidate

in conjunction with mentors connected to Cooper. Instead the criteria for judging could presumably be used by any “one” examining the candidate from the outside. Other changes in terminology also indicated a different approach or mindset related to assessment. What had been referred to as a “team conference” in the old handbook was at times referred to as a “three-way final evaluation” in the updated version. The form provided for this meeting was called a “Professional Growth Profile” and became a “Team Conference Report” in the new handbook. These minor changes in language represent shifting priorities for the final meeting between the student teacher and mentors from Cooper and the schools. While the focus had been on growth, it seems, at least in terms of labels, to have shifted to evaluation and report of findings. My forthcoming analysis of the actual end-of-placement meetings also indicates that this shift was reflected in practice.

The emphasis on assessment and data collection created a situation in which individual student teachers were positioned as representatives of Teacher Candidates at Cooper. They were no longer individuals on a path towards expert beginning practitioner, but become data points, instances of learning or of the effects of university preparation. In many cases, individual student teachers were referred to as teacher candidates, rather than by name or with the pronoun you. This occurred on the evaluations of their work that they received and on the observations that mentors completed. The notes, for instance, often said things such as, “TC begins lesson.” In observation notes it may be done for convenience. On assessments, it may have been done because these are NCATE assessments and needed to be de-identified. Regardless, the term could create the sense that the preservice teachers were just one of many, and that the main audience of the

feedback was not actually the student teacher. It worked to potentially separate them from their own learning and place the emphasis on evaluation. In actual face-to-face meetings, student teachers were often positioned as bystanders. Ironically, the increased emphasis on evaluation (intended to measure the progress of teacher candidates) was, perhaps, disconnecting them from the process and their own learning, minimizing the prospects for collaborative evaluation that were espoused by the program. Student teachers shifted from being learning subjects to knowing (or not knowing) objects. This approach may have functioned to transform the student teacher from active participant in learning to passive receiver and evaluatee.

In the elementary education supplement, Deb wrote concerning the assessments collected for NCATE and programmatic evaluation purposes, “This data is not a reflection of you as an individual student, but rather a means to assess the effectiveness of our program as a whole.” This statement encapsulates this finding. It explicitly states that the data and evidence being collected are not about student teachers, but rather that student teachers are simply representative of the program’s effectiveness. Data collection was not about the student teachers and their learning. The focus was on demonstrating the effectiveness of the program. The data were collected for that reason, which served to separate the assessments from what student teachers were actually learning and what the students in their classroom were actually learning.

Approach to Assessment Enacted During Learning Events

In addition to the tensions and contradictions just described that became evident in the documents of the program, there were several tensions and contradictions that became evident in the enactment of the assessment procedures. While I have already

referenced certain tensions related to the unit plan and action research assessments, I focus here on the student teaching evaluation and the team conference that was meant to be part of that process. The final evaluation required the determination of a level of competency in each of the four areas of the PGP. University mentors were to “consider the challenges posed by each placement, the performance within each placement, as well as the development across placements” in order to determine the appropriate level of competency for each preservice teacher. These final ratings were to be directly connected to the Student Teaching Team Conference Reports that were completed in collaboration with student teachers and classroom mentors in each placement. Those team conferences were intended to be formative assessments, but served as the source of information for completing the final evaluation.

In this section I focus on the end-of-placement teams meetings and the report form used as a record of assessment in those meetings not because they were the only or main form of assessment, but because I think the meetings constituted important events during the semester in which what should ideally happen during student teaching had the potential to happen. These events were the moments where guided apprenticeship related to the merging of theory and practice could have occurred with representation from both the program of teacher education and the school. That is, the meetings represented the best opportunity for “the work of universities and schools [to] be tightly integrated and mutually reinforcing” (Darling-Hammond, 2006, p. 122). It was here that an immanently hybrid space had perhaps the most potential to become a productively hybrid space in which new knowledges and ways of thinking around teaching and learning could have been formed in ways that were transformative for student teachers, classroom teachers,

and teacher educators. Unlike written assignments (such as the unit plan or action research project) that were turned in and evaluated, these meetings could have been the kind of assessments in which important instructional conversations related to preservice teachers' learning occurred, where conflicts that had arisen were investigated and discussed, and where the impact on student outcomes was explored.

As alluded to in previous analyses, the end-of-placement meetings that I observed were dominated by the purposes of the program. I want to explore this finding in more detail here as it directly connects to the tension related to assessment at the programmatic level. Specifically, I present an exploration of the way in which the document provided by the program for purposes of guiding the meeting took on agency in conferences and delocalized the events. I believe that this analysis demonstrates the way in which the process of assessment as it was implemented in these cases was disconnected from preservice teacher learning and raises questions about how we measure and assess this learning during the student teaching experience. In order to demonstrate how this was the case, I first describe the specific framework I used to analyze these events. I then present findings related to the visibility and agency of the team conference report form—paying close attention to how it operated and the kind of work it did.

Approach to analyzing the conferences. As described earlier, the conference report form provided a basic script for the meetings that was followed fairly closely by all of the university mentors I observed. There were certainly moments in each conference where participants deviated from this script. However, the examples presented previously provide a glimpse of the basic structure and sequence of the meetings. Here I examine the themes and issues that were derived through close analysis of the events. This meeting, in

its multiple instantiations, provides evidence of the ways in which the interactions between program, school, and preservice teacher created a certain kind of space with prescribed positions and goals, which in turn limited possible outcomes. Central to my analysis is the manner in which the document became a central actor in the meetings. The findings presented below make evident the presence of these forms and their influence on the student teaching experience and how these objects “function to delocalize or even disrupt local life” (Brandt & Clinton, p. 338). As Barton and Hamilton have argued, we live in “textually-mediated social worlds” (cited in Reder & Davila, 2005, p. 182). The social world or the event that was the three-way conference was indeed mediated by the textual form used as a guide for and report of that conference. The resultant implications are important to consider for the effects that they may have on the individual student teachers involved in the conferences and our thinking about programmatic assessment of preservice teachers.

It was evident in multiple ways and at multiple times that the conference report form mattered to the interactions that occurred between the student teachers, their university mentors, and their classroom mentors at the end-of-placement conference. In fact, in some ways, the form was the most important actor in the room. While it may seem strange to label and treat the conference report form as an actor and thereby imbue a non-human object with the ability to position participants and push agendas, researchers using Actor Network Theory (ANT) have conducted analyses in which they do just that. The underlying understanding of their approach is that both animate and inanimate participants have agency. Within the network of the student teaching program, there were multiple human and non-human actors, four of whom were physically present at the final

meetings and others of whom were in some way represented in the form of the document that served as the fourth actor.

In her effort to apply ANT to studies in education, and to literacy studies more specifically, Hamilton (2001) emphasized that the theory and the method associated with ANT “suggest that a project of social ordering generates and embodies characteristic forms of representations (including texts) and that it ‘scripts’ the performance of those involved” (p. 182). As a network (a project of social ordering), the student teaching program acted in this way by providing written documents that served to dictate the actions and utterances of human participants.

The typical script for the conference indicates the ways in which the key actor in the meeting (the university mentor) defined the other actors and drew them through the “obligatory passage point” (Clarke, 2002, p. 115) of the end-of-placement team conference, using the conference report form as a guide. By dictating the sequence of the conversation, the “text dictates the terms of its own consumption” (Brandt & Clinton, p. 340). It is important to consider the ways in which the text became present at various moments, reinforced the prominent position that it held in the meeting, and served to remind the participants of the task at hand. Ultimately, however, these instances of visibility are important for their potential to drive the meeting and to create a certain kind of relationship between student teacher and mentors and a certain kind of position for student teachers as learners.

Visibility of the document. One of the most common instances of the text being revealed occurred when one of the participants directly referenced it by asking whether or not their comment correctly fit into the area under consideration. Although this particular

question was asked in different forms, it often went something like, “Does that go here?” In one example, Alice (university mentor) wrote something on the form and then wondered if it was recorded in the correct location. This exchange occurred after Ms. Schmitt (classroom mentor) had shared feedback she received about Jack (student teacher) from other teachers in the school:

Alice: And I have written that down. I'm never quite sure if I put it in the right places. But. Do you all have this form or anything filled out on it or anything additional.

[...]

Ms. Schmitt: He's doing that unit you know- that plant unit. And he's used um- the- the theme for that to do spelling and math.

Alice: ((writing)) Used...((Stops writing)) I'm putting that in the next section because it says. Well- It probably could have gone up there but. Has used theme of plant unit for spelling and math. ((Begins writing again)) (transcript, 4/26/07)

Alice's attention was on the form throughout this exchange. Her comments were related to finding the appropriate place to record Ms. Schmitt's observations. These comments were written under the section on subject matter knowledge. Alice felt the need to record the comments, demonstrating the importance of the record of the meeting on the form, but recorded it in a section where it actually did not fit. Later she again questioned where to put the information.

This type of exchange was common in the meetings. Classroom mentors would often provide information and the university mentors would do their best to record it in an appropriate location on the report. There was rarely a discussion of the content or implications of the feedback. More often than not, discussion focused on how to make the feedback part of the official report. In the following exchange, Ms. Shaw (classroom mentor) gave feedback on Kate's performance, specifically her improvement in

recognizing the different levels of students in math, and Mary (university mentor) worked to place the information in its appropriate location:

Mary: Focus on the math piece. ((begins writing)) So over time Kate's ability to. Uh. Sequence the math skills and concepts improved.

Ms. Shaw: Hm Hm.

((35 seconds of silence while Mary writes))

Ms. Shaw: I think you kinda learned to overplan too. Which was good. Cause you can always not do something.

...

Mary: Well. Let's put that in here for the practice. ((begins writing)) The- Kate was always well- consistently well-prepared

...

Ms. Shaw: And you're really multi-tasking while you're teaching you're also watching all the kids and trying to pull back all those guys. It's more complicated than it looks.

Kate: Uh huh.

Mary: So under implementing plans can we address the piece of um. Uh. Class awareness. Multi-tasking and class awareness. Uh. Keep the lessons moving.

((20 seconds of silence while Mary writes)). (transcript, 3/1/07)

During this episode, Ms. Shaw discussed three major areas. In each instance, she spoke directly to Kate, providing feedback and suggestions. Even when Mary was writing and absent from the verbal exchange, Ms. Shaw continued to provide praise and feedback to Kate. In each instance, Mary re-emphasized the need to place all of this information in an appropriate location on the report. While Ms. Shaw was discussing items that she found relevant and important for Kate, Mary was guided by the form and spent most of her time either writing something or figuring out where to write it. While Ms. Shaw was, in some ways, operating as if the form were not present, Mary continually reminded the other participants that it was. Its presence was felt most forcibly when there were extended periods of silence. Eventually Ms. Shaw no longer spoke; she waited for Mary to finish writing.

In addition to the question of fit, the text was often revealed as a participant in its own right when the act of writing became obvious. Visibility due to the act of writing often occurred when there were prolonged periods of silence as was the case in the episode with Mary, Kate, and Ms. Shaw above. In Jack's first conference, the act of writing became evident when the university mentor was unable to record what the classroom mentor was saying.

Ms. Fleming: And the really good example this past few weeks was integrating the Black History Month into both language and social studies and it involved researching a prominent African American as well as uh. Writing an expository uh-

Alice: Wait. You're going too fast for me. ((laughs))

Ms. Fleming: Sorry.

Alice: You know what happens. I start writing what people say. (transcript, 2/27/07)

Alice asked Ms. Fleming to slow down so that she could record everything. The need to have a written record of the comments actually slowed down the process and the conversation. The amount of time spent confirming and repeating what was said is evidence of the central role of the text in this interaction. The exchange indicates that Alice's main concern was having the correct information, not necessarily understanding or engaging with that information. After this exchange both Ms. Fleming and Jack moved to simply repeating what had been said for Alice's sake and the sake of the form. Once the information was confirmed and recorded the only task remaining was to assign a rating. Once that task was accomplished, the conversation moved to the next area on the form.

Agency of the document. If indeed the end-of-placement conference form is doing work in these meetings as a participant, it is important to examine the kind of work that it is doing. This work and its purposes became evident in several episodes that occurred

during the conferences. In this section I will describe the various ways in which the document acted: representing non-present participants, mobilizing information, and controlling conversation.

There were moments during the conferences in which the influence of non-present participants was verbalized. These moments are important to note, because they indicate awareness of the fact that these meetings have an audience beyond the local participants who were engaged in this conversation. The report of the conference became the way in which the goals and purposes of the program were made obvious in the meeting and the way in which the discussion that occurred at the meeting was communicated to others who were not in attendance. On more than one occasion, a participant (typically the university mentor) referenced the fact that this report would be given to and looked at by someone else at the university—usually the director of the program.

As noted previously, student teachers were rated on a rubric (Not Evident, Emergent, Proficient, and Accomplished). In all cases with the three student teachers whose conferences I observed, the student teacher received a rating of Emergent or Proficient. Several of the mentors used a plus to indicate that the student teacher was moving from Emergent to Proficient. In one such instance, this practice led the mentor to refer to Deb (the director of the elementary education) program who would be collecting these forms:

Alice: I'm gonna put E plus plus.
((everyone laughs))

Alice: I'm gonna put my double pluses. [Deb] doesn't know what to do with me. That's the- She's always talking about trajectories. To me that shows that you're coming up there and almost here. (transcript, 4/26/07)

Alice acknowledged that she was doing something outside what had been asked and that giving Jack an E++ might raise the eyebrows of the director, perhaps because it was problematic for data collection. This moment served as a reminder (though not an overt one) that the form being completed would move beyond Jack and his mentors.

At other points during the meetings, an outside audience was more indirectly referenced. Many of the mentors would begin each new section of the report by reading the description and providing their own commentary on what was meant by the indicators. In discussing one of the indicators, Christina expanded on what was needed to show proficiency in this area.

The bottom part deals with how have you modified the instructional materials and actually after our conversation in our last observation I went ahead and moved that to proficient as well because um. One of the things. They're looking for you not to be so textbook bound and kinda dependent on just the curricular materials that are here but trying to find ways to make that work for everybody. (transcript, 2/26/07)

Her use of the phrase “they’re looking for,” provides a glimpse of what was occurring in these meetings. It is not unlike the student teachers’ own awareness of the program’s expectations discussed earlier. Although there is no direct referent for the pronoun “they,” it is clear that it referred to some outside audience who would be looking at the form. Importantly, the mentor labeled this audience as apart from the physically present participants. Even though Christina was a representative of the program in this setting, she did not use “we” to describe what sort of evidence fit this category. What is important, then, in this conversation is what kind of information needed to be written on this report for the outside audience to read. This understanding trumped any local definition or construction of what was meant and how it might be evident in the student teacher’s practice. This passing comment made evident that the meeting had become less

about what is useful for the participants to discuss and more focused on what the form (acting on behalf of the non-present participants) required. In addition, it distilled the common theme of doing things differently than public school teachers do down to a simple, easy to observe behavior—not relying on the textbook.

One of the key concepts in ANT is translation, which happens when a “social object circulates through networks on a definable trajectory” (Hamilton, 2001, p. 182). In the case of the conference report form as a social object, the document was largely created by the directors of the certification programs in consultation with the faculty of the department and other members of the community. Its creation was influenced by the review process for which the program was preparing. Once the content was agreed upon, it was translated into the handbook, added to the university’s website, and placed into the hands of teacher candidates and those engaged in their preparation. The goals of the program and the need to document the success of its student teachers had been translated into a written form and put into motion. There is little chance that this document contained all of the information discussed in the meetings that took place prior to its creation. It is equally unlikely that the document represented all of the views of the faculty and other stakeholders who played a role in creating and shaping it. However, the document as a textual form played a significant role in shaping the institution, the teacher education program, and the program of student teaching in the case of this study.

When it came to the end-of-placement conference, the document provided a means of translating the events of that meeting into a written form that could make its way back to the hands of the director of student teaching and into the file of the teacher candidate. The observations and information recorded on the form translated, or

attempted to synthesize, the entire learning and progress of the teacher candidate during the placement into a set of rubric scores and comments. These scores and comments became a record of the student teacher's semester. What they learned, accomplished, and struggled with was supposedly encapsulated for others to see (and use as a judgment of the candidate's preparedness and thereby the program's success). That the forms used at the final conference served this purpose was perhaps most notable in the instance of Kate's second conference, which her classroom mentor did not attend. After a few minutes of waiting for the teacher, Kate went to search for her. When Kate returned, the following exchange occurred:

Kate: I don't know where she went.

Emily: Ok. Um. Well I mostly just needed the forms so.

Kate: (laughs). Yeah.

Emily: We're good. I think you're gonna be- I think you're gonna be just fine in our own classroom. I think you're-

Kate: I'm excited. (transcript, 4/30/07)

Obviously, this was an abnormal situation. During the rest of this study (and in my own experience mentoring student teachers), no other classroom mentors were absent from a scheduled final meeting. It is not surprising that Emily, the university mentor, was slightly taken aback that the teacher would not be attending. Despite this observation, however, her response is still illustrative. While the meeting clearly had other purposes and its main goal was, at least presumably, to discuss the progress and goals of the teacher candidate, Emily reduced the purpose of the meeting to gathering forms and summarized Kate's work by saying, "You're gonna be just fine." Her responses indicate not only the presence and force of the documents, but their purpose. The meeting was not about the teacher candidate's performance, but about the record of that performance—specifically the record that could travel.

Recognizing that the document makes non-present parties visible in the meeting and that it serves the purpose of translating the discussion held at that meeting into a condensed and portable form for those participants, it is important to demonstrate what occurred as a result of these realizations. In other words, having established that the end-of-placement conference report form is present in the meetings and has agency, that it serves to sequence and dictate the content of the conversation, and that it represents the interest of participants not physically present in the interaction, it is now essential to consider what exactly happens in the course of these meetings and how. What are the results of the form's agency and how do those results play out in the local setting?

As discussed somewhat already, an aspect of the agency of the text that became evident through analysis of the end-of-placement conferences was the ability of the text to control the conversation that occurred. Throughout the meetings the report powerfully acted as a means of directing the content of the discussion and the information that was exchanged. At times, the text and its actions made evident the purposes of the program. It could be argued that dictating the content of the conference was the intended purpose of the form. It was provided to ensure that all of the issues of relevance were discussed and examined. The university required a record of the conversation in order to verify the competence of the student teacher. Requiring the use of this form by its mentors ensures that such a record exists. If indeed this was the case, the form was successful. However, whether or not the form was specifically intended to limit the conversation to relevant assessment information or to ensure that all the needed information was covered is not pertinent in my analysis. The form's success or failure in accomplishing these purposes is not my concern, rather I am interested in exploring the consequences of the use of the

form as a script, intended or not. In addition to dictating which topics are covered, it also worked to silence some conversations by grounding the interaction, or stabilizing its focus on the task at hand and the definition of teaching and learning to teach laid out in the document. There was also evidence that through this stabilization process, multiple conversations were misrepresented or ignored. Although these conversations were important to participants, they were not translated onto the form. These episodes provide evidence of the ways in which the local agenda was not always in line with and was often disrupted by the institutional agenda represented by the final evaluation form.

The first way in which the document controlled the conversation in these meetings was by essentially limiting the length or extent of the conversation dedicated to certain topics. In multiple instances during his end-of-placement conference, Jack made attempts to engage in conversation about various aspects of his own teaching and of pedagogy more generally (more often than the other student teachers I observed). In several cases, Jack gave himself a lower rating than his mentors had given. In other words, more than once, Jack made reference to an area that he felt was weaker or needed to be worked on. In theory, this kind of reflection was to be one of the central purposes of these meetings. This reflection on the part of Jack is exactly the sort of analysis that the teacher candidate handbook described. However, given the constraints of these meetings, the attempts were often ignored or redirected. Interestingly, the form conflicts with not only Jack's goals but some of the program's goals as well.

Jack, for instance, referenced struggling with issues of classroom management (particularly in his first placement). This characterization became relevant in team meeting. It provided a moment for Jack to discuss what he was concerned about and how

he might grow in this area, but the opportunity was not available to him and the document and its purposes continued to control the conversation.

Jack: No. well. I at least don't try to be laid back with the students. But that's something- I mean- wherever classroom management comes in. That's something that I struggle with. I do feel like I'm laid back. And I don't think I can be. So I am going to work on that.

Alice: That's...No- That's another. That's the last one. Anything else that you wanna- Of course, you get along with all the faculty. That's it. And I think I can go with proficient. And the next one deals with your ability to self-assess or look at yourself. And you're doing it right now very well. You know where your- Jack- uh- encourages constructive criticism is the main thing there I have. Anything else that you think I should add there? (transcript, 2/27/07)

Alice pointed out that the topic of classroom management had already been discussed, and she moved to immediately give him a rating and ask if there was anything else about this area (professional characteristics) that needed to be addressed. Oddly enough, he was then praised for self-assessing and pointing out one of his areas for growth. His critique of his own management was used as evidence of his ability to self-assess, but was not used as an opportunity to discuss issues of classroom management.

It may very well be the case that Jack's focus on classroom management, though he viewed it as his greatest weakness and an area of concern, should not have dominated the meeting. In other words, without the presence of the form, focusing solely on Jack's concerns might not have been the most productive approach for the meeting either. This moment serves as an indication of how the demands of the program cut off a chance for Jack to focus on his own needs, but I am not suggesting that focusing only on Jack's self-declared needs would have been preferable. In fact the conflict between the two only highlights the tension and indicates that one was privileged over the other, rather than learning emerging from the contested space.

It was not always the case that Jack was being critical of his own practice. In one episode the group was discussing the practice of “attending to individual differences.” Jack attempted to provide evidence of how he had done this in one set of lessons in which students read a story and then composed letters to their U. S. Representative.

Jack: What we did is- We wrote- We had read a story about a girl who took part in a suffrage parade in 1917 and so we talked about her being this little activist. I called her a hero of justice. So we were all heroes of justice and we were going to figure out what injustice in the world, in our community, or in the larger world we were going to solve and then write to Sen- uh Congressman Smith about. So they wrote these letters that I'm going to actually deliver, now that I've gotten them all, I'm going to deliver today. Some of them wrote about smoking and some of them wrote about- the environment

Alice: I'll be interested to- It'll be interesting to hear if you hear back and you'll have to keep up-

Jack: Some of them wrote about the crisis in Darfur, the Iraq war, things that- so they had choice in that too.

Alice: I've already given you proficiency. So that's- you're a good guy. Ok. On the next section. (transcript, 2/27/07)

Once again, Alice made clear to Jack that the amount of detail he presented was not required and that the areas he wanted to address were not necessarily relevant. In this case, the topic was cut off because Jack had already reached the level of proficiency. The implication is that there is no need for further discussion if the evidence already presented has earned him a rating of at least proficient. Again, this episode demonstrated the way in which the end goal was a rating on the form, not a discussion of the topics relevant and important to the local participants.

In looking at these episodes in relation to the entire transcript, it becomes evident that Jack made multiple attempts to talk specifically about the areas of assessment and classroom management. These were both areas that he perceived to be weaknesses. He showed determination in attempting to address them and even rated himself lower on the rubric than the mentors had. He also attempted to go into depth about some of the areas

he perceived as strengths. While these areas mattered greatly to him, they were only three of the many that needed to be discussed. The exigencies of the form were broader than his purposes and therefore failed to address his needs in the meeting. In these episodes from Jack's conferences, the document worked to control the conversation by limiting the extent to which certain topics were engaged.

In addition to its function of limiting the time spent on certain topics, the document also controlled the conversation by limiting the choice of topics available for in-depth conversation. In multiple conferences, there were moments where the student teacher and the classroom mentor engaged in conversations not directly related to the form. Goffman (1981) discussed the role of subordinated communication in interpersonal interactions. He argued that participants often engage in conversation that is not directly related to the task at hand. In these cases, the "informal talk is subordinated to the task at hand, the accommodation being not to another conversation but to...the work in progress" (p. 133). He referred to this informal, subordinate talk as byplay: "subordinated communication of a subset of ratified participants" (p. 134).

Throughout the end-of-placement conferences, there were interesting instances of byplay that are instructive for considering and illuminating the role of the document in dictating the terms of the conversation. Almost all instances of byplay occurred between the student teacher and the classroom mentor. Often, this informal, sidebar talk took place while the university mentor was writing on the form. This observation fits with Goffman's argument. He said that byplay often occurs "when and where the task allow[s]" (p. 134). Below I present a specific example of byplay and discuss how it serves as an example of the goals and needs of the student teacher and classroom mentor

being subordinated to the task of completing the end-of-placement conference report, continuing the theme that the intended goal (collaborative, formative assessment focused on scaffolded learning and goal setting) was not enacted during the team meetings.

One example of this sort of byplay was evident in a conference when Kate and Ms. Shaw began discussing an upcoming visit by the mayor and other local celebrities, focusing on how all of these events were going to affect their class schedule. As Mary wrote down what had been discussed previously, the other two engaged in a form of byplay. Throughout the conversation (until Mary joined) they spoke in a noticeably quieter tone.

((one minute of silence))

Ms. Shaw: ((whispering)) We gotta figure out when we're gonna do all this. I wonder if we'll even have time for evaluating-

Kate: I don't know. What's that assembly like...Is the mayor gonna come and read?

Ms. Shaw: I don't know but I think he is coming back to read to us during our planning time.

Mary: Who's coming to read to you? (transcript, 3/1/07)

After a long period of silence while Mary wrote, Ms. Shaw brought up a topic that was important in terms of planning for the coming days with Kate. Her initial mention of the visiting dignitaries had more to do with the interruption it would cause to their schedule and how they would adjust. Mary, as a sort of outsider in this conversation, focused in on who was coming and later on their motivation for coming, moving the conversation away from its original focus. At the end of this line of conversation, she once again used the form to redirect the conversation by saying, "Ok. Professionalism?" (fieldnotes, 3/1/07). With only two words, she cut off the conversation about working around upcoming events and moved back to the task at hand by turning to the next item on the form. She reclaimed the role of speaker and conversation director from Ms. Shaw,

effectively cutting off the byplay and refocusing their talk. By taking time to write on the form, she opened up a space for more unofficial, informal talk to occur, but once the writing was done, the conversation quickly returned to the form. We see here, again, that the end-of-placement conference was “defined by the purposes of institutions, rather than in terms of the multiple and shifting purposes of individual citizens and their communities” (Hamilton, 2001, p. 179).

Summary and Possible Implications

Member checking with one of the university mentors corroborated several of my conclusions (fieldnotes, 2/16/09). She claimed that, in her experience, the classroom mentor “was just there because she had to be” and that the purpose of the meeting felt like not much more than filling out paperwork for the three participants. As she explained, the team meeting “did not feel like a conversation to me. It felt like running through a form.” She allowed for the fact, as do I, that there was likely variation between the approaches of some university mentors and how they handled the meetings, but she agreed with my assessment that the meetings were largely about program purposes and privileged that space over others. She said, “It was all about the department and what the department needed to document their progress.” She suggested that there were certainly other situations in which more authentic assessment and learning took place, but that these meetings were the only times that all three parties met together for the most part. When I asked specifically if any of the three participants valued the meeting, she said no. Analysis of what occurred during the end-of-placement team meetings, and specifically how what occurred was guided by the document used as a record of the conference, reveals once again that the intended curriculum was not entirely lived out in the actual

experiences of the student teachers at Cooper. Unlike other events, such as seminar and small group meetings, these conferences also included representatives from the public school space, and therefore reveal other aspects of the system that were not evident in those events. While the form could have been contested or appropriated for other purposes (Anagostopoulos, Smith, & Basmadjian, 2007; Bieler & Thomas, 2009) it was not in this instance.

These events also indicate the way in which, perhaps as a result of the NCATE process, assessment and the collection of evidence have taken a central place in the student teaching semester. Throughout these meetings, the data indicate that student teachers were positioned largely as objects of this data collection. In the example involving Jack and his desire to discuss classroom management discussed above, for instance, the focus on gathering evidence cut off a line of development that would have been beneficial for student teacher learning. The focus on the collection of evidence also served to reduce teaching and learning to a set of observable skills, in line with the first theme described earlier in this chapter. In other words, the student teaching experience became largely about the activities associated with effective instruction rather than about what should result from effective instruction.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have presented analyses and findings related to the space of the student teaching system that was occupied by Cooper and the student teachers. At times representatives from the realm of the public schools also inhabited that space. The documents, artifacts, conversations, events, and parties that were part of this space served

as evidence for addressing my study's first research question: How are the intended outcomes of teacher education enacted and assessed during the student teaching semester, what contradictions or tensions arise, and what are the possible implications for student teacher learning? In sum, my analysis suggests several important findings that were revealed through attention to the documents of the program, the meetings held with mentors and instructors, and the end-of-placement conference and structure. In particular, the findings revealed through the analysis of the program's documents and written curriculum were often contradicted by or misrepresented in the lived curriculum. These three distinct, yet related, themes reveal interesting implications for teacher education.

First, although P-12 student learning was emphasized in the documents produced by Cooper and assessed through multiple measures, discussions of it were conspicuously absent from the lived curriculum in the student teacher – Cooper space. There was a clear message that teachers need to assess their students and base instruction on that assessment, but there was not frequent discussion of what P-12 students had learned. Rather, conceptions of effective instruction focused on the implementation of certain student-centered or progressive strategies and practices. In addition, effective instruction was characterized as creative, fun, and engaging more often than it was characterized as effective or connected to student learning.

The second, closely related theme that was evident in documents and interactions was the serious division that was created between the world of the program and the world of public schools. Researchers have often described student teachers as caught in the middle during their experience, as needing to navigate between the two worlds. What my analysis suggests is that this divide was exacerbated by the practices and norms

established in the Cooper space. The definitions of and approaches to teaching and learning espoused within that space were privileged over the norms of the public space and the beliefs and practices of mentors in that space. Student teachers in this study demonstrated adeptness at navigating between the two worlds (successfully reproducing and following the norms of a given space when needed), but because of the privileging of the Cooper space and its approach, they were unable to challenge the discourse of critique or dualism in order to create hybrid forms of knowledge related to teaching and learning.

The final theme and its related findings were connected to the ubiquitous presence of data in the program. The end-of-placement team meeting became largely an exercise in collecting evidence rather than supporting learning. At times, the need for data positioned student teachers as objects, as instances of the program's success. For instance, Jack attempted to discuss his concerns about designing assessment and about managing the classroom, but was cut off and redirected because those conversations might have detracted from the process of recording information and completing the form. The focus on collecting data led university mentors to cut off lines of discussion and sometimes ignore the needs of student teachers during conferences. The focus on requirements and assessments led student teachers to separate their teaching from their work as students in the program.

In the next chapter I present analyses related to two individual student teachers who were focal participants in the study and planned to work in high-needs schools in the future. I present these cases as examples of how the aspects of the space and system described in this chapter affected and influenced the experiences and learning of

individual preservice teachers. In addition, the next chapter will consider in more detail how these preservice teachers navigated the conflicts that arose and attempted to (or not) challenge the structures, definitions, and norms that were a hindrance to their learning. Having established findings and possible implications through my analysis of the documents and events described here, I move to examining these possibilities and their implications in the next chapter.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF INDIVIDUAL STUDENT TEACHERS AND THEIR EXPERIENCES

The previous chapter examined findings related to three themes observed during my analysis of the data. These themes highlighted several of the contradictions and tensions that were evident between the intended outcomes of the program (as well as how those outcomes were assessed) and the curriculum as it was enacted during program-run learning events. Specifically, I described findings related to how effective instruction was conceived, the division between the program and the P-12 school space, and assessment at the programmatic level. The purpose of that chapter was to look at student teaching experience through a contextual analysis of the structures and events directly connected to the program of teacher education at Cooper. The purpose of this chapter is to address this study's second research question: How are the contradictions or tensions navigated by individual student teachers planning to work in high-need settings and what are the possible implications for their learning and practice? To this end, I will examine the manner in which Jack and Kate navigated the experience and the possible effects that the tensions and contradictions explored in the previous chapter had on their individual experiences.

The previous chapter examined the student teacher – Cooper space of the student teaching system and looked specifically at issues related to how the experience was defined through programmatic documents and lived out through various events and structures. In some instances, the analysis revealed a disconnect between the espoused

purposes and goals of the programs and the realities of learning to teach during the student teaching semester. In addition, analysis revealed that student teachers must navigate between the spaces of the program and their placement classrooms largely because of the way that the program defines and separates these spaces. In this chapter I investigate how these findings affected the experiences of student teachers on an individual level. I use the cases of the two focal student teachers to examine the implications introduced in the previous chapter and to further refine them. In order to accomplish this goal, the chapter is divided into two major sections. Each one will discuss analysis and findings related to one of the student teachers. In each case, I present analysis related to their positioning, their views of teaching and learning, and an episode from the semester that is particularly revealing. After presenting the cases, I explore possible conclusions across the cases in more detail at the end of the chapter.

In order to fully capture what takes place in the learning-to-teach system, an understanding of the voices of the student teachers is required. “Teaching must be situated in relationship to one’s biography, present circumstances, deep commitments, affective investments, social context, and conflicting discourses about what it means to become a teacher” (Britzman, 2003, p. 31). Exploring these aspects in relation to individual student teachers is essential for considering the effects of the structure of the program and of their interactions with other parties connected to the program. Therefore, this chapter presents findings related to the shifting identities and positions of these student teachers.

As many theorists and researchers in the sociocultural tradition have argued, identity is a fluid construction not a static state, being created and recreated in multiple

contexts and social interactions. Davies and Harré (1990) have posited, “An individual emerges through the processes of social interaction, not as a relatively fixed end product but as one who is constituted and reconstituted through the various discursive practices in which they participate” (p. 46). They distinguish between the ideas of role and positioning, arguing that the concept of role is a static one and that identity is much more fluid. In analyzing the data collected during this study, understanding the positioning of student teachers became central to understanding the effects of the university setting on their learning. Having discussed some of the ways in which student teachers generally were positioned, I turn now to look at two specific cases. My analysis seeks to uncover both the ways in which these student teachers positioned themselves and were positioned by the program and its representatives. It is in looking at these two forms of positioning that competing and counterproductive goals are revealed. A detailed understanding of these two student teachers and their experiences will allow for a more complete analysis of the effects of the interactions and events examined in the previous chapter. My argument is not that Kate and Jack are representative of the way that student teachers identify themselves and position themselves within the learning-to-teach system, but rather that they reveal at least some of the many available positions and identities that student teachers might take up or represent. In addition, they are the focus of my exploration because of their desire and commitment to work in high-need schools.

By examining in detail transcripts of their interviews, their written reflections, their lesson plans, and their interactions with mentors from the university and the field, I will present a picture of Kate and Jack and their experiences. It is important to consider how these participants viewed themselves as students, teachers, and student teachers. I

present a description of their biographies and their student teaching semester, an overview of how they were positioned during the student teaching experience, and an analysis of their views of teaching, learning, and the program. In each case, I will also thoroughly explore a unit plan they taught. Examination of these events provides an opportunity to consider an assessment used by the program and how it was enacted in the case of these two student teachers.

Jack

After providing background information about Jack and the schools where he student taught, I report on my analysis of the positioning of Jack during student teaching, specifically exploring his identity as underprepared for student teaching and as having the wrong disposition for teaching. These positions were both self-identified and reaffirmed by other parties. Next, I look at Jack's views of teaching and learning and specifically report on findings related to his conception of effective instruction as identified by certain practices (and the absence of other practices) and his belief that successful instruction is connected to student enjoyment. Finally, I look at a unit plan that Jack created for student teaching and the evaluation of that plan. This particular episode reveals how Jack navigated the spaces of student teaching and how he came to define the experience as largely disconnected from his own goals.

In multiple instances Jack discussed the act of teaching as an endeavor connected to the lives of and opportunities for students. He viewed the profession and his place in it as a chance to "make a difference" for students who were struggling or not being treated equitably by our system of education. His comments and approach were not just

indicative of wanting to work for change in schools, but also of viewing the relationship between students and teachers as one centered on care, mentorship, and influence.

Well my hope is to uh make a difference...I'm obviously not in it for the money. [...] I wanna have an impact on- on children that I feel like are being um...kind of undercut by the system. Kids that have- have everything going for them except a school system- you know an environment and school system that- that holds them back. (transcript 2/19/07)

Jack's description of his reasons for wanting to work in high-need schools was characterized by a sense of justice and equity. His response valued the culture of students and the differences that are present in the classroom in a broad sense, but perhaps did not address the pedagogical challenges or approaches needed in the situation he described. As reviewers have noted, much of what goes on in coursework (that is focused on equity and diversity) at colleges of teacher education attempts to move teacher candidates from a place of ignorance to knowledge in terms of social justice and multicultural issues as they relate to education in our society, even while a significant amount of research ignores issues of diversity (e.g., Wideen et al., 1998). Jack demonstrated an awareness of inequities and came to the program with that awareness (based on his own experiences in a rural community), but (similarly to his sense of his pedagogically-based lack of preparation) at the end of the program his description remains general, not specific. He discussed the challenges, not how to solve them. This situation raises the question: By focusing so much attention on valuing the identities of student and on recognizing the injustices of the system are we sacrificing attention to student learning and achievement? This question is important for framing my examination of Jack's experience, it's connection to the themes explored in Chapter IV, and the implications for teachers who, like Jack, are committed to working in high-need schools.

Jack was one of only two males in his class to major in Elementary Education and the only one to complete the program. He was a senior at the time of this study and came to Cooper from a rural community in Appalachia. While he described the area where he grew up as having failing schools and extreme poverty, both of his parents held advanced degrees and he described his own family as upper class. In his application to student teaching, he wrote that while he came from a privileged background, he saw from the example of his parents, who work as a doctor and a consultant for non-profit organizations, the importance of working to improve the community. In a letter he wrote to himself at the beginning of student teaching (as part of an exercise conducted by the instructors), Jack wrote:

I hope to either teach in an urban setting or in rural eastern Kentucky. Both areas have extreme needs, but I have wondered if I would be a more realistic (and effective) role model to a group of students that shared my cultural and racial background.

After graduating from the program, Jack enrolled in an M.Ed. program at Cooper, but indicated that his intention was still to teach in an urban or rural school and eventually start a non-profit organization in his community in the future.

Jack completed his first student teaching placement at Gray Magnet Middle School. The school drew 30% of its students from the local area and assigned the rest of the spaces based on a lottery. The school was 66% African American and 31% White (I use the terms used by the school district), with 46% of the students receiving free or reduced lunch. The school boasted of its positive test results: 93.7% of its students were proficient on the state test in reading and language and 91.3% in math. Jack taught fifth and sixth-grade English Language Arts, Social Studies, and Reading with Ms. Fleming.

Jack's second placement was at Green Elementary School with Ms. Schmitt. There he taught all subjects in a self-contained third-grade classroom. The school was the largest elementary school in the city and was in its first year with a new principal, who had a history of being moved to struggling schools. Though the school was part of an urban school district, it was located some distance from the city center. The student population was 40% African American, 29% Hispanic, and 27% White. Fifty-six percent of the students in the school were on free or reduced lunch.

View of Self as Student Teacher

In general, Jack was frustrated with his experience at Cooper. At times he expressed a feeling that members of the university community viewed him as unprepared and not serious about his work. He viewed the issue not as a lack of commitment or desire but as related to his preparation and experiences prior to student teaching. For Jack, there was a major disconnect between what he had learned through coursework at Cooper and what he experienced in local school settings. The divide was very real for him and he was largely unsuccessful at navigating it, as I will demonstrate. Another related aspect of his identity as a student and student teacher was centered on issues of his personality, which he often described as laid-back. In this section, I explore the disconnect by looking first at the issue of preparation and then at issues related to his dispositions and sense of fit with the profession and the schools. Both of these areas were central to how Jack experienced student teaching and viewed his own learning and success. Both were connected to the themes from Chapter IV and have possible

implications for our understanding of the learning and development of preservice teachers.

Underprepared

On multiple occasions Jack expressed frustration about the applicability of what he had learned in class. He was not critical of instructors or course content necessarily, but of the lack of connection between content and the field. He said that most of the relevant information he learned came from his experiences in schools and that he forgot most of what had been taught at the university. Or put more succinctly, “A lot of it didn’t stick” (fieldnotes, 2/19/07). One comment from an interview with Jack, in response to a question regarding what he had learned about teaching English-language learners, sums up his view of coursework and its application for him:

[The professor] seemed to really know her stuff in terms of the kind of a linguistic background. Um...so yeah. I feel like I’ve had- I’ve had. Um. I’d say a fair background in terms of my classes addressing the issue of English-language learners, but- it didn’t- none of it really stuck because I wasn’t teaching at the time. (transcript, 2/19/07)

What is most evident here is not only his claim that he has forgotten most of what was covered in coursework, but his suggestion that only what is learned in the field (or in conjunction with field-based experiences, perhaps) is memorable, applicable, and would serve him during student teaching and beyond.

At another point in one of our interviews, when asked about what he had learned in coursework but not seen reflected in practices he had observed, Jack discussed differentiated instruction and grading. I include this moment here because it makes evident that Jack did actually remember things from the courses he had taken and was aware of when things discussed in those courses were not reflected in the field. While he

had this awareness, he still felt unprepared in these areas, having never seen them actually put into practice.

I don't see a lot of varied instruction. I know that it's kind of mentioned and it's mentioned in our lesson plan template. Our learning design template, sorry. But meeting different needs in every class. Even with that reminder on a lesson plan I'm not really confident that I do it. I don't see other teachers doing it...Also, issues with grading. I mean I know we're- everybody's a fan of rubrics. We've gotta have rubrics for everything and that's great, but in terms of logistics. How many grades constitute a valid assessment of a child? And how often should you be- That whole kind of practical element is just ignored. I don't know if that needs to be taught or just needs to be handed to us on a piece of paper...That's something that I find myself falling back on my mentor teachers a lot. (transcript, 3/13/07)

Jack's discussion reflects the view of effective instruction as defined by activity.

In other words, as described in the previous chapter, Jack viewed effective instruction as the implementation of practices that should create an optimal learning environment—as what teachers do more than what the students learn. For example, Jack argued that teachers should vary activities according to the needs of students, but his assessment stops there. It is not directly connected to student outcomes.

In the above response, Jack was able to identify what was wrong, but not implement what he thought was better. He was able to critique but unable to move forward. At times in his response, Jack bordered on mocking some of the practices of the university—for instance, correcting himself to say lesson design instead of plan and in discussing the obsession with rubrics. These comments reflect an attitude that is, at the very least skeptical of the practices espoused by the university. In one instance, he had heard over and over about the importance of differentiating (and seems to value it), but was not confident in doing it and felt underprepared, not because no one had taught him about it but because he had never seen anyone do it. He had not seen the practice in action and therefore was uncertain about implementing it. In the second instance, he

recalled the importance that had been placed on using rubrics to assess student work, but he was unable to connect this approach to assessment with the requirements (namely assigning grades) of his placement classroom. There was a separation again between the practice of assessing and the outcome. Here he may have felt capable of using rubrics, but was not certain about how to use them in the context of tallying points and assigning letter grades. In both cases, Jack demonstrated his dubious feelings about his preparation because while he had been able to recognize and critique ineffective instruction, as well as identify problems, he had not been supported in responding to the issues.

Finally, there were also instances in which Jack attributed his difficulties during student teaching to a lack of preparation in a certain area. His first placement, in a middle school, was his more difficult placement and one in which he, admittedly, struggled with instruction and classroom management. Interestingly, he attributed some of these struggles, specifically his inability to connect theory with practice, to the structure of the program at Cooper:

Well it's kind of unusual because for the most part my classes have been tailored towards younger grades. [...] So I've seen a lot of. Um...writing workshop and reading- reading groups [...] So I- I feel like the- I feel like the things that have been modeled for me aren't really applicable to that high a grade. (transcript, 2/19/07)

The specific methods that Jack discussed, reading groups and writing workshop, are certainly applicable and useful in middle school settings. He felt unprepared, however, to teach reading and writing in middle schools because the practices he had learned about in coursework had once again not been viewed in practice. But in addition to having no context to map the ideas onto, Jack argued that he had not learned how, even in theory, to apply these practices at the middle school level. Jack adopted an identity of

unprepared for what he faced in the student teaching experience. At some times, he felt unprepared because he had not seen the theory in action while he was learning it; at other times, he felt unprepared because he had never seen it enacted even after learning it; and finally, he sometimes felt underprepared because the theory he had learned had not been applied to the specific context in which he was teaching. Clear in all these instances is the idea that Jack felt unprepared, and largely attributed that feeling to a lack of connection between the university and the field. Also clear is that his sense of underpreparedness became a crutch or an excuse to use when his own instruction was not effective.

Wrong Background and Wrong Disposition

In addition to lack of experience and expertise, Jack also made frequent references to his cultural background, as well as his personality, and how those pieces of his identity might be unfit for working in a diverse, urban school setting. It was perhaps this low sense of efficacy in multiple areas that most characterizes Jack's positioning of himself in relation to his identity as a student teacher. In this section, I specifically address findings related to the cultural mismatch with students that he described and aspects of his personality that caused concern, particularly in his first placement classroom.

Jack mentioned multiple times that he wanted to work in a high-need school, and at the same time often referenced the issue of cultural fit, saying that he would probably be more successful working with students who shared his cultural background.

I wanna teach [...] in a failing school. Either in the inner city or in eastern Kentucky. [...] Part of me wants to shy away from the ..the- urban, failing school setting because of the cultural divide that I feel. Because um- it almost seems like a cop out but I have so much more in common with white, rural, southern student body. (transcript, 2/19/07)

These statements from Jack came after I asked him about his plans after graduation. Jack was aware that my own study focused on teaching in diverse settings and that I had taught in an urban middle school. He agreed to be a case study because it was his intent to work in an under-performing school. Considering this, it was not surprising that Jack discussed his dilemma with little direct prodding. Although I cannot say for certain, it is possible that Jack was using the lack of cultural fit with students like those at Gray Middle School as a rationale for not teaching in a place where he felt largely unsuccessful as a student teacher. If that is the case, the experience he had in his first placement may have done some work to shift Jack away from one of his possible paths. I would argue that this analysis is a potentially accurate one because Jack felt more successful in his second placement, which was also a diverse, urban school, where he did not culturally match many of the students in the manner he described. Even though he had success in one situation characterized by cultural mismatch, he used his first placement as the reason for potentially deciding not to work in an urban school. Of course, neither placement was in a high-poverty, rural school, so it is impossible to know if he would have felt more successful in those settings.

In addition to questions related to his cultural background, Jack also discussed misgivings about how his own demeanor or personality worked in the classroom. There were obvious connections between his concerns about being too “laid back” and the difficulties he discussed concerning classroom management.

I'm typically pretty lenient. And I tend to let things slide. [...] If I ignore behavior and just try to keep the class going then the noise level rises and rises and people continue to act out. [...] I think of myself as kind of a care-free guy and not really trying to be nit-picky every time somebody wads up a piece of paper and throws it at their friend. (transcript, 2/19/07)

Jack focused on issues of personality and disposition. It was not clear why he believed that his personality was not conducive to his goals. Jack did not discuss how to find a style that worked for him, given his easy-going nature, but rather discussed the issue as one in which the only resolution was to alter his personality.

Jack's personality also became the subject of interactions with his university mentor. Alice, on one of the post-observation report forms, wrote that Jack was "learning to put some real personality into interactions." During one of the end-of-placement conferences, the following exchange took place:

Alice: On the next section. Jack is punctual, present, and well-dressed at all times. Respects students and colleagues. Poised. And certainly- I don't guess I should say laid back- I'll say confident.

Ms. Fleming: Yes.

Alice: I was being a little facetious there.

Jack: No. Well. I at least don't try to be laid back with the students. But that's something- I mean- wherever classroom management comes in. That's something that I struggle with. I do feel like I'm laid back. And I don't think I can be. So I am going to work on that. (transcript, 2/27/07)

In the end, Jack framed the problem not as working on classroom management but as working on his personality. Alice initially raised the issue in a rather odd manner, clearly wanting to address the issue of "being laid back," but perhaps not knowing how. She mentioned laid back and then confident, which seem unrelated in this context. While she claimed to be just giving him a hard time, the issue is one that obviously concerned Jack and that he may have wanted to discuss further.

Personal experience suggests that this identity-related dilemma may be a common one for new teachers. In other ways, though, Jack's "care-free" approach had other consequences in terms of his interactions with the program and its representatives. For

instance, he was often positioned by the instructors of his seminar course as lazy and not a hard worker. He described one situation to me during an interview,

We met as an entire class on Tuesday and the teachers said that we could freely talk for a while and then we are going to conference with some students for a while. "Some students" being me. And they pulled me aside and read me the riot act about scraping by with the bare minimum. (transcript, 3/13/07)

Their perception of him related directly to his easy-going personality in some ways, but it was also tied into issues of following requirements and doing what was required by the program as a separate thing from what was necessary for student teaching. Jack argued that he worked hard in his placement classrooms. As he told one of his instructors when she questioned his effort, "I'm putting forth a great deal of effort at school. That may not come through in the written assignments. I would encourage you to come see me teach." (fieldnotes, 3/26/07). In terms of requirements, however, he did focus on meeting the requirements, largely because he viewed them as unrelated to the act of student teaching in many ways. This particular aspect of his approach, which demonstrates the ways in which he navigated between spaces, and the situation that developed where his own identity and positioning of him as a student teacher within the program collided will be explored in more detail by discussing an episode later in this chapter. As I hypothesized in Chapter IV, student teachers, in this case Jack, navigated the space by performing for the program in the way that they felt was required, but separated this performance from their experiences in the classroom.

View of Teaching and Learning

I derived multiple themes while analyzing data connected to Jack and his view of teaching and learning. In this section, I report on two of the major themes that were

evident. First, I look at how Jack engaged in critiquing the practices of his first classroom mentor as one of the main ways of defining effective instruction. He labeled this teacher as traditional and defined effective teaching as “outside the box.” Then, I report on Jack’s heavy focus on enjoyment and engagement as defining aspects of effective instruction.

The Absence of Best Practice

Jack was able to describe what was not good teaching more easily and readily than he described what it was. Or, to put it another way, to Jack, good teaching was teaching that did not adhere to traditional practices—teaching that was “outside of the box.” As with the other student teachers discussed in the previous chapter, he often resorted to the practice of criticizing his classroom mentors and defining quality instruction as the absence of mediocrity. He also, as was the case in other conversations, equated ineffectual practice with the use of textbooks and worksheets, which, as I have argued, does not quite capture the essence of what could define effective instruction. He gave the following description of practices in response to a question about what he had learned from his classroom mentor:

[She] teaches using the textbook and the workbook pages and does mostly individual work and keeps her classroom quiet by having them do individual work for the entire period. Which doesn't- doesn't sit well with the Cooper idea of teaching. (transcript 2/19/07)

Jack felt that his own view of teaching (or at least the one he that Cooper espoused) did not align with the practices at Gray, and he articulated what was missing in terms of specific practices. Within the critique of his classroom mentor, he referred to her use of the textbook and workbook pages as well as a lack of group work or collaboration. In other words, his conception of what was absent from the classroom was more about energy and creativity than strategic activity to promote learning. He went on to say,

I've reverted back to her system for the most part and I think that...I think that it's possible to set up a classroom with those kids in which they could be able to do cooperative work or group work. But it would have to be from the beginning of class- from the beginning of the year and very clearly structured so that students had defined roles in groups and knew exactly what they were supposed to be doing. (transcript, 2/19/07)

He attempted on a few occasions (and chides himself for giving up) to make the class more engaging, but reverted to the classroom mentor's ways—largely because of classroom management. Here he blames his inability to implement cooperative learning strategies on the fact that he was not in the classroom from the beginning and therefore unable to establish the environment that would have allowed for these strategies to be successfully incorporated. He emphasized that he would have preferred to be with a teacher who aligned with the “Cooper way” of teaching.

In a subsequent interview, I asked Jack again about his relationship with Ms. Fleming and about his overall assessment of his experience at Gray. He repeated what he had said earlier, about her style and approach to teaching, but he also began to analyze it a bit more closely and think more about his own reaction and response in the situation.

I don't think it was a very good match [with me and Ms. Fleming]. I don't think that she challenges herself very much to think outside the box. She's very based on using the textbook activities and assessments and reading selections and everything...It's kind of like this song and dance where she does what the book says and they do what the book says and everybody comes out- I don't know- It almost seemed like an illusion of learning because a lot of things weren't sinking in it seemed like. (transcript, 3/13/07)

Jack presented fairly harsh criticisms of his classroom mentor, largely based on the fact that she did not think outside of the box and relied on prepared materials. In some ways, Jack characterized her approach as a lack of commitment or an attempt to do as little work as possible. When comparing Ms. Fleming with his second mentor, Ms. Schmitt, he said, “I felt like [Ms. Fleming] would just walk in in the morning, pick up the

textbook, open it up to the next page in the textbook or the next chapter and just like do it for the day and then the next day do it again and again and again” (fieldnotes, 5/9/07). An underlying criticism here is that she does no work outside of the class or the school day. In addition to his view of her teaching as a lack of hard work, it is also clear that he viewed it as a lack of imagination. To him, good teaching was largely about thinking outside the box. A complication with his view, though, is that it is unclear where or if he was able to move beyond this conception of teaching. This complication is connected to the focus on activity over learning discussed previously. Jack defined teaching and learning in relation to what is done, not to what it accomplishes. Ironically, though, he recognized that learning was about more than the activity, characterizing the placement classroom as one in which there was only “an illusion of learning.”

The reflection that Jack included on some of lesson plans provides further evidence of his focus on activity rather than outcomes. The post-teaching reflection portion of the program’s lesson template included multiple questions to guide student teachers in their reflection. The first of these questions read, “To what extent did your students learn what you intended?” In multiple cases, it was evident that Jack believed his students had not met the learning outcomes or that he had difficulty telling whether or not they had. For instance, on one lesson plan he wrote, “Collectively, the class has a great deal of knowledge about plant growth. However, each student seemed shaky about their knowledge when I asked follow-up questions.” In another instance, he recognized that while an activity seemed ideal, it may not have actually worked. “I like the idea of [the strategy] because it uses multiple senses and thinking skills. I’m not convinced that it makes a significant impact on [the assessment].”

When he did reflect directly on student learning, his reflection indicated that he was having difficulty in this area. In addition, he often answered the question about what students learned by describing how well they completed the activity rather than with direct reference to their learning. On one lesson plan he wrote, “Students did very well measuring and graphing their results in this lesson. All students completed the activity with reasonable results.” His focus is on completing the activity rather than on what results might be considered reasonable or more specific assessments of what students learned. In another instance, he wrote, “The majority of students recorded a variety of observations and drew and labeled pictures of their plants.” Again, success was determined by the fact that the activity was completed correctly.

In his second placement, Jack described practices that were slightly more original or thought provoking than those he had seen in his first classroom. He said, “I was surprised as an inexperienced teacher I often used the textbooks as a fall back...[Ms. Schmitt] said we almost never open the math textbook. She was always doing things that were different, different activities across the board” (transcript, 5/9/07). From observations, lesson plans, and conversations it was apparent that this characterization was accurate. Interestingly, though, Ms. Schmitt followed the basal reader in a very lock-step fashion when it came to the reading program in her room. Regardless, even in this instance Jack was focused on the act of using other approaches, not on the result. Obviously, research could demonstrate and experts could argue that the “outside of the box” practices are more likely to produce results, but Jack’s assessment and approach to teaching was based on the assumption that they automatically would and that other approaches automatically did not. This approach raises questions about the messages that

were sent in university coursework and how those messages were taken up by student teachers—in terms of how we view and talk about practicing teachers and in what we emphasize as the identifying characteristics of effective instruction.

Student Enjoyment

Jack also focused heavily on student engagement and enjoyment when discussing issues of teaching and learning, in terms of literacy instruction in particular. During one interview I asked him about his major takeaways from his literacy classes at Cooper. He replied, “The overwhelming message in my literacy classes is that reading has to be enjoyable. It can't be just another skill that you teach like your multiplication tables. Students need practice in order to improve their reading, and they're not going to practice if they don't like to read” (transcript, 5/9/07). While it would certainly be interesting to examine Jack’s syllabi and interview his professors to ascertain whether or not his description of the focus of literacy coursework at Cooper was accurate, I am more interested in the fact that Jack viewed the most fundamental aspect of reading to be enjoyment than whether this was the intended message of the program and its faculty. Of course, I am not saying that reading should not be enjoyable, but I would argue that Jack’s response indicated a very narrow view of reading instruction and one that may not be as comprehensive as literacy educators would hope. Jack’s statement indicated that he viewed enjoyment as step one and had very few opinions about teaching reading beyond that. In fact, when I asked him, at a separate point, about his ideal ELA classroom, he replied:

I would certainly want it to foster enjoyment of reading and writing. Which is something that I don't see happening in this class. Um..so kind of a two-pronged approach of certainly they need- the students need to- you need to foster an enjoyment of- of reading different types of texts and writing in different ways.

But also you know there need to be the skills. There needs to be grammar and there needs to be. So I would probably see that embedded into interesting activities and engaging activities. (transcript, 2/19/07)

He did move momentarily beyond enjoyment in this description, but only to include grammar. Even then, he argued that the more fundamental, boring things should be taught in interesting and engaging ways. The focus returned quickly to his emphasis on enjoyment. As with teaching outside of the box, enjoyment is certainly not a bad practice, but should not be the end goal or the sole defining aspect of instruction, as it appeared to be at times for Jack. He summed it up in another instance by saying, “The most important thing is that I want to teach reading in a way that will be meaningful and enjoyable for students, not just dry and circle the adverb in the sentence” (fieldnotes, 2/19/07). As was the case with the general views discussed in the previous chapter, Jack viewed teaching and learning in a fashion that focused on oversimplified practices and affective outcomes, paying little more than lip service to student learning.

Further evidence is available from some of Jack’s weekly reflections during his first placement. In analyzing the style of his placement teacher, Jack wrote, “I would like to be able to teach the content in a more engaging way, but am unsure how to do so.” Later in the semester he wrote, “While I was still only observing my field mentor’s class, I probably would have said that I would never teach using her model—straight from the teacher textbooks.” He labels her methods as unengaging, but as the second comment indicates he did at times replicate them.

Overall, Jack’s notions of teaching and learning were characterized by general, broad conceptions and approaches. He was able to identify the shortcomings of his mentor’s approach to teaching and learning, but was more likely to critique than to

problem solve. He viewed effective teaching and learning as something characterized by enjoyment. He used enjoyment and engagement as the central measure of success. Given these themes evident through my analysis, Jack's approach to teaching and learning was disconnected from outcomes—not surprising in light of the finding that student learning was similarly absent from the lived curriculum during the semester of this study. In addition, his approach reflected attention to activity. He was concerned largely with what he did, rather than what the outcomes were. When he did focus on outcomes, they related more to affective responses to instruction than to academic outcomes. In the next section I will demonstrate how Jack's positioning and views of teaching and learning manifested themselves in a particular episode during the semester related to the program's unit plan assessment.

Teaching A Wrinkle in Time

In this section, I report on my analysis of one specific episode in which Jack taught a unit on *A Wrinkle in Time* in his first placement classroom and submitted a unit plan to his instructors at Cooper as one of the assessments for the semester. The purpose of this close analysis of a single event is to demonstrate the ways in which Jack's sense of self in the program and view of teaching and learning discussed above interact with the outcomes and assessments of student teaching at Cooper that were analyzed in the previous chapter and the effects of those interactions. I believe that this event, the evaluation of a unit plan created by Jack during his first placement, highlights the complexities of the relationships between student teachers and the program of teacher education as they played out in the case of Jack, in addition to underscoring issues related

to the evaluation of teacher candidates, oversimplified notions of teaching and learning, and values placed on different components of the student teaching experience. In order to demonstrate these effects, I will first describe the unit plan and its actual implementation in the classroom. This description is based on Jack's own reflections on the unit during interviews. Next, I analyze a transcript from the event that took place when Mary and Jack discussed his unit plan and evaluation. Finally, I present findings and analysis related to the set of events surrounding his unit plan.

Teaching the Unit

As is the case in many programs of teacher education, the unit plan was the assignment that served as an assessment of a student teacher's ability to plan instruction. Submitting a unit plan during student teaching had been part of the requirements for at least four years prior to this study (and likely longer). Preservice teachers at Cooper had submitted unit plans before in other courses, but the student teaching unit plans were meant to be the final measure of teacher candidates' ability to plan. While designing and planning assessments for the NCATE review process, Cooper made the unit plan assignment one of the official assessments of candidate preparedness. While the assignment itself did not change drastically, the evaluation of it did. The assessment of the unit was completed using a rubric that addressed 13 standards. The student teachers received a score in each of those 13 areas (such as "Connections Across the Curriculum" and "Development of Critical Thinking, Problem Solving, and Performance Skills") and an overall score.

The focus and construction of the unit plan were to be determined by the student teachers in conjunction with their university and classroom mentors. During his time in

Ms. Fleming's classroom at Gray Middle School, Jack was asked to teach a unit on *A Wrinkle in Time*. While he taught several other units (such as writing research papers and a unit on Black History Month), he chose the unit based on the novel as the one he would use for the unit plan assignment required for the seminar course at Cooper. The actual written unit plan included 13 lesson plans (one of them a science lesson on gravity and the atmosphere). The document that Jack submitted to his seminar instructors included an introduction and overview of the unit that accomplished several purposes. It provided a rationale for choosing the book: "This book is [on the district approved reading list...[and] provides high-quality examples in a Newberry-winning piece of literature." Jack's introduction also explained what would be taught during the course of the unit: "The class will explore the standards-based elements of fiction." And, finally, gave an overview of the activities that the students would engage in to meet the goals, such as various approaches to reading the text and the use of graphic organizers. Obviously, the introduction alone does not provide a complete picture of the unit that Jack planned, but the lessons included did relate to these goals and reflected the general approach established here.

After instruction related to this unit was completed, Jack discussed it with me in one of his interviews and gave a sense of how he thought the unit went and what he could have done differently.

We just finished reading *A Wrinkle in Time* with my advanced language arts and my regular language arts classes and the only issue that I saw there is that I think it was above many of their levels. That was about the age that I read *Wrinkle in Time*, but there are words in that book that I had never seen before. [...] I made the decision, probably the wrong decision, to not do vocabulary in the book. To just kind of skip over it and read for meaning and enjoyment and focus on bigger ideas. [...] I think they enjoyed reading the book. The majority of them did. Because it's a good book and it's interesting. (transcript, 3/13/07)

In his analysis of the unit, a dilemma related to enjoyment emerged. As demonstrated earlier, Jack focused heavily on enjoyment as one of the main qualities of effective instruction. While he picked up on an aspect of instruction that he might choose to do differently next time (vocabulary), he did not provide a thorough rationale, only relating it in a vague sense of some students' difficulties with comprehension. His overall assessment of the unit and its success was only indirectly related to the students' comprehension of the novel or learning in terms of the elements of fiction (which had been established as the instructional focus for his unit). Rather, his own assessment of the unit was based on their enjoyment of the book. He discussed that he might have focused more on vocabulary but not on how that could have better served the instructional goals of the unit.

During another exchange related to the unit it was clear that Jack struggled with ensuring and improving the comprehension of his students. I asked him how the students read the text, and his response demonstrated that he had indeed used multiple ways of reading in the unit but also again that enjoyment was the end goal.

We varied the way we read it and depending on the activity I didn't know how closely students were reading and understanding. If they read silently and then answered with an open-ended question it wasn't always clear how well they understood or how well they read. I didn't want them to have to complete comprehension questions after reading every chapter just to prove that they had read it because one of my goals for the unit was for it to be- to foster enjoyment of reading. (transcript, 3/13/07)

Jack gave thought to various aspects of instruction within this unit, but was driven largely by the goal of "fostering enjoyment of reading." This goal was reflective of his learning in the program (saying that enjoyment was the overwhelming message in his literacy coursework) and of his view of Ms. Fleming's approach to reading (which he felt

was boring and unengaging). When he discussed assessment, he did so in terms of tools rather than outcomes. He was concerned about their comprehension but was unwilling to use the tool he had available to assess comprehension because it was too traditional. While his description confirmed previous findings discussed, the central issue at stake in this section of my analysis relates more directly to the unit plan document and the process of evaluating it. Jack was able to describe and reflect on the delivery of the unit in our interviews, but his interaction with a seminar instructor at Cooper revealed that his instruction and the unit plan he submitted were not directly connected.

Evaluating the Unit

Each unit plan turned in by student teachers was assessed by one of the instructors and rated according to the program's levels of competency. Jack received a rating of "Not Evident" on six standards and "Emergent" on seven. His overall rating for the unit plan was "Not Evident." The only comments written on the evaluation were:

TC [teacher candidate] did not teach this unit nor did he include any lessons outside of the unit that he actually taught. Therefore, no reflections and no impact on student learning statement. Integration of [social studies], math, and P.E. appear to be cursory inclusions to meet minimal requirements.

As evident from the brief comments the central problem with this unit plan was that Jack did not actually teach it. He did, as described above, teach a unit on *A Wrinkle in Time* during his placement at Gray Middle School. However, the unit he taught and the unit that he turned in were not the same. This issue was raised during a conference with Mary, the seminar instructor who evaluated his unit plan (see Appendix D for the complete transcript of this interaction). During the course of the conversation, Mary and Jack discussed the lack of reflection in Jack's unit plan and other ways that it fell short of the desired product. Jack immediately admitted that the lesson plans he turned in were

not the ones he taught during his placement—that he created separate lessons that he believed more fully aligned with the program’s goals but did not believe these lessons would be successful in his placement classroom. His response demonstrates how he saw this assessment as something disconnected from his practice and his own learning.

Jack and Mary also discussed his confusion over the requirements of the assignment. Jack explained that he thought lessons did not need to actually be taught based on the instructors’ discussion of the assignment in earlier seminar sessions. Mary explained that he had misunderstood those discussions. Some student teachers needed to make alterations to their plans or the assignment due to the constraints of their particular placements, but those exceptions were in extreme cases and did not apply to Jack. Jack was somewhat defensive during the conversation and argued that the expectations were not clear. He believed that he had fulfilled the requirements (such as the number of lesson plans and the inclusion of interdisciplinary connections). He viewed the requirements of the assignment as separate from the actual instruction that took place in his classroom. In the section that follows, I use particular moments from this interaction to demonstrate Jack’s approach to the assignment and its implications.

Analysis of the Event

As discussed previously, Jack felt generally unprepared to deliver the kind of instruction that he believed would be best for his students. In large part, he was unable to reconcile what he believed to be effective instruction with what he was actually able to do in his first placement classroom. This predicament was reiterated during his conversation with Mary:

A lot of the things that I- that I wanted to do I didn't think would be controlled. [...] I didn't think I would have been able to control twenty-six kids outside on the

high school track. Um. With the behavior problems that we've had. And so those were...I mean it was a decision that was presented that we could either turn in the unit- we could either turn in lessons we had taught or we could turn in units I mean lessons that we hadn't taught. (transcript, 3/28/07)

Jack submitted a unit plan that matched his beliefs but not the reality of his situation. It is important to consider why and how he came to this decision and to analyze the aspects of the program and the structure that led him in that direction. The event reveals several important issues that I will examine. There are ways in which the implicit and explicit expectations of the unit plan did not align—there was an emphasis placed on the work or the product that has implications for how the student teacher viewed the goals of the assignment, for instance. Jack came to view the unit plan as something disconnected from his experience and this approach impacted his relationship with the program. This analysis demonstrates how the various goals of the program and the various needs of Jack come into conflict in this situation. It illustrates how tensions related to programmatic assessments and to the approach of navigating the divide between program and schools by fulfilling requirements had implications for this preservice teacher.

It was not evident to Jack whether the unit plan assignment was meant to evaluate how the student teacher plans or how the student teacher implements plans. This confusion was central to the interaction between Jack and Mary. In fact, after their meeting Jack returned to his peers in another part of the room and said, “I had to get an earful. I got low scores in every category. Based on the short lesson plans they can make a judgment” (fieldnotes, 3/27/07). The implied meaning is that he thinks it unfair to judge his teaching on a few lesson plans, rather than on observation of him in the classroom. While a large part of the concern with his unit was the lack of reflection, it is not clear

that reflections would have been enough, in Jack's mind, to provide an adequate picture to evaluate him. In reality, if Jack had made up reflections, this conversation and the poor evaluation probably would not have happened. If the unit was intended to evaluate his planning, it is unclear through the conversation why it did not pass muster. There was no evaluation of what was there.

The assignment, whatever the intention, became something that was separate from the actual classroom practices of Jack (and other student teachers). In the previous chapter, I presented an exchange in which one student teacher was debating how to include interdisciplinary lessons in the artifact she turned in when she would not be able to actually teach those lessons in her classroom. It is no surprise given that interaction and the conversation between Jack and Mary that student teachers viewed the assignments that were required as related to their needs as a university student but not to their needs as a classroom teacher. As demonstrated when he described his reflective practice, Jack argued that he was indeed doing everything that he believed the unit plan was meant to measure:

I consider myself a reflective teacher. After I finish- After I finish teaching a lesson I talk with- I talk with my mentor teacher about what she thinks went well what she would do differently. [...] I had a long conversation with my mentor teacher about would she have handled that differently. (transcript, 3/27/07)

While he never explicitly said so, his line of argumentation implied that the unit plan alone was simply incapable of measuring the reality of his experience. What was important to Jack was that he actually reflected in practice, not that he accurately depicted his reflection in writing on an assignment. A portion of the addendum to the unit plan was supposed to directly address student learning, but Jack's approach to reflection does not address that here, and Mary does not point him in that direction during their

conversation. The critique of his unit is formulated largely as a problem of not fulfilling the requirements, but not as a problem of failing to provide evidence of student learning.

In the end, the unit plan assessment became more about meeting the requirements set forth than about implementing quality instruction in the classroom. As Jack stated, “What I turned in was what the syllabus asked” (line 70). Because Jack viewed it that way, he submitted lesson plans that he believed reflected good practice and would be what the instructors wanted. He was fulfilling the requirements of the assignment in order to complete the requirements; in doing so he was not focused on what was going on in his placement classroom. The idea that the assignment was actually focused on the final, written product submitted to the university was reinforced by some of the instructors’ comments related to the unit plan. In line 78, Jack recounted one of Deb’s discussions of the assignment. The way he described her comment focuses on the issue of work—“She said that nobody was getting extra work.”

Part of Jack’s confusion was due to changes in the assignment that were based on student teachers’ difficulties meeting the requirements of the unit plan in their placements. Mary commented,

If you taught your unit but because you were limited by the subject content area that you were responsible for that you could not write- do- implement say a science lesson or you had those extra lessons you didn’t need an addendum for that. (transcript, 3/27/07, lines 101-104)

In certain cases, evidenced here, it was the assumption of the instructors that the unit plan might not reflect the reality of the classroom. So while it might be argued that Jack misunderstood the guidelines and expectations, it is clear that there were situations in which the unit plan did not have to reflect the reality of the classroom and the instruction

that was delivered. There are reasons, beyond doing the minimum amount of work, that Jack reasonably approached the assignment as he did.

After this incident, Jack viewed the assignment and other requirements of the seminar even more suspiciously. He emphasized that he would work harder to make sure he met the requirements (in order to graduate and be certified), but did not value them. When talking about his unit plan for the second placement he told his classmates that he had been planning to turn in a unit on plants that was already underway. However, he hadn't been documenting lessons in the manner required by the assignment and was planning to put them together later (again viewing the two things as separate): "I was going to retroactively put it together, which is apparently not ok unless you can fake it, which is fine. But I don't think she will fall for that now" (fieldnotes, 3/27/07). A disconnect between the actual practice of teaching and the things required by the university is evident in this episode and affected how Jack viewed the experience. I would argue that Jack did not view the assignment itself or the feedback he received as beneficial to his learning or to his teaching. I would also argue, it is difficult to see how it could be beneficial in this scenario. Because the assignment was designed to capture the essence of something that it is not (i.e. to stand in for or to represent actual instruction) it is perhaps an essentially separate task.

Summary

Jack's case demonstrates multiple ways in which the findings presented in the previous chapter had a direct impact on the experiences of individual student teachers:

1. Jack conceived of teaching and learning in a manner similar to the conceptions of effective instruction evident in the lived curriculum during this student teaching semester. He often defined quality teaching as the opposite of the practices he observed or thought to be normal (as “outside the box”), as characterized by a certain set of progressive practices, and as related to activity over learning. These oversimplifications led him to position himself as underprepared for the classroom and to easily identify problems but struggle in identifying solutions.
2. Jack identified affective outcomes as the goal of his unit and a central tenet of his philosophy of teaching (generally and of teaching literacy specifically). He valued outcomes related to student enjoyment over outcomes related to student achievement.
3. Jack navigated the competing contexts of program and school by adopting the practices and emphases of the space in which he was operating. He attempted to follow the requirements of the program in order to be successful in that space, but separated what was expected there from what he did in the classroom. He viewed and treated the program’s assessment as disconnected from his learning.

Aspects of the curriculum and the interactions that student teachers had with the program and its representatives discussed in the previous chapter likely had an effect on Jack and led to some of the findings listed above. The lack of attention to student learning as an outcome in the reality of the student teaching semester allowed Jack to maintain his focus on enjoyment over achievement. The focus placed on assessments and requirements led Jack to essentially fabricate a unit plan. He did so not to be deceitful or get out of work (he actually did double the work in some regards by planning one unit

and teaching another) but because he actually thought that doing so was more in line with the program's expectations.

In one of her critiques of alternative pathways to teaching, Darling-Hammond (2000) has claimed:

Studies of teachers admitted with less than full preparation find that recruits tend to be less satisfied with their training and have greater difficulties planning curriculum, teaching, managing the classroom, and diagnosing students' learning needs. They are less able to adapt their instruction to promote student learning and less likely to see it as their job to do so, blaming students if their teaching is not effective. (p. 167)

While it is troubling that she does not actually cite any of the studies that demonstrated these findings, more interesting for my analysis of Jack and his experiences is that even after having completed a well-intentioned, high-quality program of teacher education, he still fits her description in almost every way. He was not pleased with his program of teacher education, he had difficulty managing the classroom and understanding the learning of his students, and he was unable to adapt his instruction when it would have been prudent to do so. While he at times recognized his own struggles (particularly related to classroom management and to effectively assessing his students' learning) there were not structured learning opportunities in which these issues were addressed.

Kate

Kate was a senior at the time of this study. Originally from the northeast, she came to Cooper after participating in the City Year program of AmeriCorps in Washington, D. C. for one year. During her time there she worked with an after-school program. In many ways, she looked like the typical teacher candidate, what the profession continues to increasingly look like: young, White, middle class, and female.

However, various members of the university community quickly indicated that she was anything but typical. One instructor noted her candor and passion. I heard other instructors refer to these same qualities in negative terms. Her short hair cut, her choice of t-shirts, and her activities outside of the university were all clear indications of her politics and her social justice orientation. During one practicum, for instance, a teacher complained about her clothing (not because it was immodest, but because it was too political). While both of her parents held advanced degrees, Kate worked full time throughout college in order to pay her own living expenses.

Kate was a dual major in Elementary Education and Special Education. Her first placement was in a first-grade classroom at Marion Elementary School, a magnet school for math and science. There she worked with Ms. Shaw, who had served as a classroom mentor for the university on several occasions and received excellent reviews. Kate's classroom was a self-contained class of 16 first graders. The student population at the school was 90% African American, 6% White, 3% Asian, and 1% Hispanic. Sixty-three percent of the students were on free or reduced lunch. The school was well regarded in the local community.

Kate's second placement was at Hamilton Middle School in a fifth and sixth-grade resource room with Ms. Butler. Kate lived in Hamilton's zone and often walked or rode her bike to school. Her classroom was a resource room for social studies and language arts and she had between four and 12 students in each class. Hamilton Middle School had not been used for placements by the university in recent years and had a negative reputation. The student population was 74% Black, 19% White, and 6%

Hispanic. Eighty-eight percent of the students were eligible for free or reduced lunch, and only two percent received ESL instruction.

As I did in the case of Jack, I will now move on to discuss various aspects of Kate's identity and experience. First, I consider how she positioned herself as a teacher and in relation to the program. Next, I will analyze her approach to teaching and learning. Finally, I look at a series of lessons that she taught during her second placement and draw conclusions about the effects of programmatic structures and the curriculum on Kate's experience, focusing on how she navigated the difficulties of the student teaching experience and the competing agendas of multiple spaces.

View of Self as Student Teacher

I believe it is important to consider the positions that the student teachers took up themselves in addition to considering the work done by the university to position student teachers within the system of certification (and accreditation). These positions were evident through self-report and self-description in interviews and reflections. At times, the positions were also evident during small group and seminar meetings, as well as conferences with mentors. While Kate identified herself in multiple ways at various points, I focus here on the positions that were evident throughout the course of the semester: her positioning as a community activist and as an autonomous learner.

Community Oriented

In our discussions, Kate spoke frequently about her activities in the community in which she lived. Her comments were significant in two ways. First, they indicated her desire to position herself as someone active in the community and as someone committed

to issues of social justice. Secondly, she consistently indicated a belief that teachers should be positioned in this way in the community. As she said at one point, “It is important to live and work in the same community. I want everything to happen in the same place” (fieldnotes, 2/20/07). It was unacceptable in her opinion to teach all day at a school in the city and then go home to the suburbs. Her focus on the importance of community involvement as it relates to classroom instruction will be further explored in the section related to Kate’s views about teaching and learning. Here, I will present findings related to her identity as an active community member generally.

In a way that may be very different than many undergraduate teacher candidates, Kate viewed her community as the neighborhood in which she lived, not the university. In fact, during her third year of study, she petitioned the university to move off-campus and often mentioned how little contact she had with the university and that the contact she did have was mostly out of necessity. She explained:

Last year, I really had to fight to live off campus. My friend had bought some property and they were starting this community of activists, and non-profits, and artists and stuff. I really wanted to live there and help it get started. [The university] finally let me do that. (fieldnotes, 2/20/07)

She continued to live off-campus during her final year (including during the student teaching experience).

Kate and her boyfriend were active in the community in multiple ways. They held a “free garage sale” on weekends where people could drop off or pick up various items. They also built bikes for students in the neighborhood. She spoke about seeing the kids from her school in this context.

The coolest thing ever was hanging out with the kids on the streets after school and stuff and hopefully that will continue... I see them all the time...with their brothers and sisters... One girl lives two doors down from me and totally hates it.

Her little brothers hang out all the time. We made them both a bicycle, but she won't even say hello to me. Her family teases her about it, which doesn't make it any better. All the rest of them thought it was cool if I came walking down the street with my dog. (transcript, 4/30/07)

She gave this anecdote in response to a question about living and working in the same neighborhood and her commitment to working in an urban public school.

It is important to note that Kate's peers and instructors ratified her positioning as an active community member. During one of the final seminar meetings of the semester, the topic of the end of year awards ceremony was raised, and the instructor mentioned that she had not received any nominations over e-mail for the volunteerism award given by the college. Several students immediately said that they would nominate Kate and spoke about a tutoring program she had started. Several students said, "We vote Kate." The instructor asked for her resume and said, "I was surprised that you didn't send it to me" (fieldnotes, 4/23/07). In one of the team meetings the mentor also commented on Kate's commitment to students and cited her visit to an after-school program in the community as evidence (fieldnotes, 3/1/07).

After one of our interviews, Kate invited me to come by one of her friend's houses where a group was gathered to discuss and plan a new community art initiative. She also periodically e-mailed me with various activities going on in the neighborhood. From all signs, Kate appeared to truly be an active community member and a respected, positive addition to her neighborhood.

Autonomous

In addition to positioning herself as and being seen as actively involved in the community outside of the school and university, Kate also positioned herself as autonomous and purposefully disconnected from and wary of the university setting. This

characteristic was evident in her desire to live apart from the university, but was also evident in other ways. She viewed and talked about her education as self-directed, and did not shy away from criticizing the program, instructors, or mentors. At one point, she went so far as to say, “I’m glad to be able to graduate, but it has been a waste of time...There are good things to put in a filing cabinet, but there was nothing valuable taught” (fieldnotes, 3/16/07).

She decided early on in her career to double major in elementary education and special education. Based on her prior experience with AmeriCorps, she believed that having a background in special education would serve her well in “high poverty, urban settings,” but she intended all along to teach in a regular education setting. This decision demonstrates the ownership that she took early on in her own preparation and in determining her own course of study.

At various points in our interview she discussed her discontent with the program, frequently describing aspects of it as a waste of time. It is important to note that she consistently referred to various benefits of the program as well. However, I focus here on her critiques, because I believe they represent an important finding for this study. Namely, Kate was confident in what she believed and thought she needed in terms of preparation for teaching, and believed that the program often fell short of meeting her needs. Sometimes these shortcomings were directly connected to Kate’s goals: “I want to teach middle school. No classes focused on middle school” (fieldnotes, 2/20/07). In other cases, she gave much broader critiques of the program: The student teaching seminar meetings had a “kind of fluffy agenda...[Instructors] saying write down the funniest part of your week. Nobody wants to do that” (fieldnotes, 3/16/07)

Kate also described how she often challenged professors in class. In one case she mentioned asking a professor why they needed to know something, saying about the situation, “I’ve always had to work full time and feel like my time was wasted in that class” (fieldnotes, 2/20/07). There was a disconnect between Kate’s own views of what was valuable and the program’s view. She suggested that the university was not aware of or respectful of her situation and needs. Kate viewed the program as preparing a certain kind of person to be a teacher; she did not fit the type.

It often seemed to be the case, in Kate’s opinion, that the program and its significant others asked teacher candidates to do something for them that had little effect on or benefit for the candidates. In one case, students were told that they needed to come on a Saturday to take a test. The test was being piloted as an NCATE assessment. The student teachers were told that this test would not count for them, but that they needed to come. Kate described the situation by saying,

We were told it wouldn’t count... So I was there for twenty minutes or so, didn’t really do anything and left. So [the director] e-mailed me...and told me I had to retake this. I said ok. I retook... The fact remains that you told me it didn’t matter how we did... So she...brought out my folder and showed me concerns and told me I was on thin ice. (transcript, 2/20/07)

Kate’s tendency to question and subvert the university’s goals was also demonstrated in her comments about one of the assignments (the action research plan) that student teachers were required to conduct during the semester. In response to a question I asked about what she thought about the requirements for student teaching and the action research project in particular, Kate told me,

I didn't do [the action research project]. ((laughing)) I made everything up. Yeah. I um. I didn't have time to make up transition games and um so I didn't do it. I don't think it helped anyone else. Judging from our small group meeting. Uh. Like the uh outline of it- the format of it was too constrictive. Most of my girls in my

small group were in kindergarten. So like they couldn't really use it. I think it's a good idea. But uh. I made mine up and I'm sure I'll get an A on it. (transcript, 3/16/07)

The assignment for the project involved developing a game that could be played during transition times to reinforce a concept that had been taught. Kate's answer to my question indicates that she already saw the value in this kind of work, but viewed this particular project as irrelevant and time consuming. While her approach (making up the data) could certainly be labeled as dishonest, it indicates her compartmentalization of what was best for her as a student and what the university needed from her and is related to the issues of assessment discussed in Chapter IV. As in the case of the Saturday pilot test, she is willing to fulfill requirements, but only takes them seriously if they align with her own goals or may affect her ability to complete the program.

Her perceived autonomy was also evident in another comment she received from a methods professor. Kate recounted how this professor told her that she did not accept feedback well and only listened to things that applied directly to her (fieldnotes, 3/16/07). Kate recognized this fault and took responsibility for some of her negative interactions with faculty, but mentioned often that she felt that the university could have done more to address her needs. In another instance, she mentioned that her courses had all brushed the surface of important issues related to race, class, language, and gender. She argued that instructors "don't go deep enough" (fieldnotes, 2/2/07). She recognized that she and her peers were often viewed as unwilling to engage these issues by the faculty, but, in her estimation, the problem was that faculty members were only scratching the surface and that students were tired of not exploring the issues more seriously.

View of Teaching and Learning

As is, no doubt, quickly evident in these findings, Kate was fairly opinionated about Cooper, the teacher education program, and other aspects of her experiences preparing to teach. She portrayed a sense of firmness and assuredness in her beliefs, but at the same time was open to learning and experiencing. When it came to her view of teaching and learning, it was often difficult, in interviews anyway, to get her to discuss specific aspects of pedagogy, although she did at times. Through my analysis of our conversation, though, I derived several themes that provide insight into her approach to the field and her experiences as a student teacher. Not surprisingly, given her attachment to her own community, Kate placed a serious emphasis on the importance of community involvement and knowing students. She viewed teaching as largely dependent upon those relationships. In discussing her experiences at Cooper, she revealed a sense of frustration with the world of educational theory and policy that provided evidence about her approach to teaching, and teaching literacy in particular. Her discussion of what other teachers were doing wrong was also one of the ways in which her own philosophy was evident. I will discuss all of these areas in turn and conclude the section by considering a few of the moments where Kate explicitly talked about her view of excellent educational practices.

Community and Student Oriented

In her first response during my initial interview with her, Kate emphasized the importance of the relationship between a school and its community. In our interviews she spoke often about this relationship and her own work in the community as described earlier. The connection she felt to the community was directly tied to her view of

teaching and learning. In one of her reflections she wrote, “I would like my classroom to extend past the classroom. To be more involved in the students’ lives, the parents’ lives, and their communities. I feel better getting to know students in their own territory and on their own terms than in the classroom.” Her statements in the reflection demonstrate a strong appreciation for the lives of students and a recognition of the importance of the relationship between school and community.

For her second placement, Kate specifically requested that she work in a classroom at her neighborhood middle school and was given that placement, even though the school had not been used for placements in recent years—due in large part to the negative reputation that the school had. She explained her rationale for wanting to work there:

The community is well enough aware of me to be comfortable with me and know that I’m there... That’s why I think it is important not to just pack up and leave and go home to the suburbs or something like that. (transcript, 2/20/07)

Her response here makes evident her own view of the relationship between a teacher and the community, but also posits that her position as active community member is different than the typical position taken by a teacher relative to the community in which he or she works—at least in Kate’s mind. She viewed involvement with the community as perhaps the most essential criteria for success in the classroom, and seemed to argue that this is where most urban teachers are missing the mark.

Kate made attempts not just to talk about connecting what happens inside the classroom with the world outside but to actually connect with her students outside of school. During our second interview, Kate mentioned the relationship she had built with one student in the classroom. She met with her on weekends and at home. She discussed

the experience with me in an interview and wrote about it in one of her reflections. This approach also influenced how she viewed specific aspects of pedagogy. For Kate, quality instruction centered on knowing the needs (broadly conceived) of students. As she said, “You have to individualize instruction. Not just knowing their reading level, but knowing them” (fieldnotes, 3/16/07). Interestingly, her beliefs aligned well with the program’s PGP outlined in the candidate handbook. Her frustration may have been connected to the disjunctures that were present between the espoused beliefs of the program and the realities of the field experience.

The focus on community as an integral aspect of quality education also included the students and their role as community members. Kate mentioned service learning as a key aspect of what she would label a successful school. “I think that is important,” she said, “We could identify an issue for the class. It is a good idea to pick up trash or tutor younger kids. Would be cool if they decide on an issue and do it” (fieldnotes 3/16/07).

Other Aspects of Quality Instruction

In addition to the relationship between school and community, Kate articulated several other aspects of effective curricula.

I think centers are really important and having kids create something and finish. Having projects. I think lots of books are really important... Integrating what you're doing in social studies with what you're doing in language arts is important... Talking a lot about personal experiences and writing about them. Reading relevant literature. (fieldnotes, 2/20/07)

Her focus, like other student teachers, was on specific practices that would be involved in effective literacy instruction in a classroom. When it came to these more specific aspects of pedagogy, Kate’s experience was an interesting one. As a dual major in Elementary and Special Education, she discussed how different (and sometimes conflicting)

approaches to instruction were espoused in different classes she took. For Kate, therefore, talking about what she believed characterized quality instruction often involved making a choice between the two departments and the two approaches. These differences were specifically apparent in the area of literacy instruction. When asked to give details about some of the differences between the two programs, Kate focused on literacy courses:

There was this phonics class in special ed and they were just telling us about fluency and how readers develop fluency and different stages to work towards. Then we get to [another professor's] class and she said just the complete opposite thing. We all raised our hands and said that's not true. She got really defensive and ignored us. It was really hard because you are a student and these professors have just told you two opposite things and you're just like, how can we resolve this issue. Then you realize that it's just the different philosophies of the two departments. (transcript, 2/20/07)

It could be the case that being presented with multiple viewpoints and approaches would be beneficial for Kate (or any student teacher). However, as will be evident when I present findings about one of the units she taught, Kate struggled to incorporate the different approaches in practice. She recognized that neither one was absolutely correct and that both had merit, but did not have a method for combining them in her own teaching. Again, there is evidence here of being asked to approach things critically without an urgency for resolving them.

At one point Kate characterized the difference between the two programs as being about a focus on individual students and their needs (in special education) and a focus on the whole class (in elementary education). In the end, the aspects of education with which she entered the program (such as her focus on community) remained strong, but what she was able to take from the program was complicated by the contrasting approaches of two departments and her sense that, in some cases at least, the program was not focused on the substance of helping students.

Centered on Students

Kate valued the work of practitioners in the field in a way that contrasted with the privileging of the university described earlier. Kate described her practicum experiences prior to student teaching as the most meaningful experiences she had at Cooper. She praised Ms. Shaw and other teachers she had worked with before student teaching on multiple occasions. But when it came to her second placement classroom at Hamilton Middle School, Kate had no positive things to say. Kate did not engage in the practice of critiquing public schools and teachers, except in this one case.

Interestingly, she had more positive things to say about her experiences in classrooms than most student teachers and, again, felt that she had learned more in the public schools working with teachers (even when she did not agree with them completely) than she had from Cooper. She valued the public school space over the Cooper space. During the interview that took place at the beginning of her second placement, all of this changed. She said, “It’s just terrible. None of the teachers do anything. None of the kids do anything... There is typically 10 or 15 minutes of instruction in an hour period and that is just a worksheet” (fieldnotes, 3/16/07). Like others, her first criteria was about activity and the kind of activity taking place.

Kate did not simply question the teaching practices but angrily described something she viewed as unjust on some level. In one of her first reflections during this placement she wrote,

These classes exist merely to pass the time. Mrs. Butler has been teaching these subjects at this school for nearly thirty years- yet each class consists of nothing more than completing a worksheet or making a poster... The other classes I observed follow the same patterns of unstimulating classrooms, boring lessons, and a lack of dedication to learning. I’m not sure if this speaks more of the school,

special education, the administration, or simply these individuals. (transcript, 3/16/07)

For Kate, the bottom line was the lack of learning and the lack of attention to it. She does not stop short by simply saying that the practices of the teacher were not creative or interesting enough, but actually implied that the school and those she has seen are doing a disservice to students. Her condemnation of the practices is a much stronger (and different one) than Jack or other student teachers gave. The difference is not surprising given her identity and reflects a commitment to educating students who are not being served.

Although she may not have challenged the teachers in their presence, she certainly did in our conversations:

They probably think that these kids can't learn how to read. No one is going to take the time to teach them. They are far behind and have gaps in their learning. If the teacher thought it was important, they would do more. I don't think they think it's important. The kids' IEPs are all exactly the same. They aren't individualized, they don't mean anything. (fieldnotes, 4/30/07)

The criticisms that Kate lodged against these teachers and the school were forceful. In contrast to Jack, she was not holding the teachers up to a list of criteria or effective strategies, but rather judging them on their commitment to students. Although she had serious concerns about the school, she had positive experiences with the students and ended up working at Hamilton after graduation from Cooper.

The impact of teaching on students was central to Kate's personal definitions of the practice. She discussed this impact outside of the classroom and within, in both social terms and academic ones. She engaged in practices that reflected her beliefs and became agitated when others did not. Her intense focus on students, their lives within and outside of the classroom, is one possible reason for the friction that she had with Cooper and

other parties within that space. Her perception was that their focus was not directly on the realities of students in the classroom. She valued the public school space and what she learned there over her experiences at Cooper. Her critique of classroom teachers, when she gave it, was not concerned essentially with the kinds of activities going on in their room, but the disservice to students that was apparent. While Kate was willing to engage in activities to satisfy the requirements of the program, she did so reluctantly and was quick to criticize those practices. The aspects of her beliefs about teaching and learning discussed in this section are particularly relevant and important for considering the set of lessons that I examine in the next section.

Teaching Persepolis

As I did in the case of Jack, I conclude my findings and analysis related to the experiences of Kate by describing a series of lessons that she taught in her second placement classroom. These lessons and the intent behind them revealed the confusions and contradictions that embodied Kate's learning-to-teach experience up until that point. In choosing to teach *Persepolis* (an autobiographical, graphic novel written by an Iranian woman about her experiences during and after the time of the Islamic Revolution) to her fifth-grade students, Kate made a brave and interesting choice. By using the text to explore issues related to politics in the Middle East and the United State's relationship with the countries and people of that region and the Islamic faith, Kate demonstrated that her ideas about examining critical issues with her students, examining the implications of our relationships and interests, challenging her students academically, and asking them to make connections between their own lives and a global society were not simply rhetoric.

I make clear these points about Kate's lessons on *Persepolis* to emphasize that any critique presented in my discussion of this episode is not about Kate's decision or attempt to teach this book or these topics, but of the difficulty she had in doing so, which relates not to her desire to promote social justice and critical literacy skills, but to her struggle to do these things effectively as a result of the lack of support she received before and during student teaching.

In this section I will describe the lessons based on my observations and Kate's statements. I specifically focus on her instructional goals and the way that they were reflected during the lessons. After describing the lessons and what occurred in practice, I present some possible interpretations of this series of classroom events, of Kate's choice to engage in them, and of the possible implications they have for my understanding of the program and its effects.

The Lessons

During Kate's first placement she truly appreciated and respected her classroom mentor. They planned together, co-taught, and spent time reflecting extensively on lessons. Kate adopted most of the practices of Ms. Shaw. Unlike Jack, however, Kate believed that Ms. Shaw was an excellent teacher and replicated many of her practices, such as centers, strategies for literacy and math instruction, shared reading, and guided reading groups. Kate's experience in her second placement was almost the complete opposite. As already mentioned, she was very critical of Ms. Butler. They spent little time planning together, and Kate felt that she was on her own to come up with lessons and even goals for the students. She told me at one point that she could do "anything she wanted" because Ms. Butler barely paid attention (fieldnotes, 4/30/07).

In an interview that took place after Kate had finished reading *Persepolis* with her students, I asked her why she had chosen the book and what her goals for the lessons were. She said, “I wanted them to learn how to sound out words and split them up. Talk about what they knew about what was going on in the Middle East and how it came to be that way. Gain awareness of other cultures” (fieldnotes, 4/30/07). She had chosen, while reading the text, to focus on chunking words and on understanding the conflict in the Middle East. She saw herself teaching critical literacy and decoding at the same time. Her goals were commendable, yet somewhat incongruous.

Her students were struggling readers and did have difficulty with the text (with decoding and comprehension). The text itself contains many difficult (and culturally specific) vocabulary words and concepts. Students struggled with the words and had very little background knowledge related to the events or even to this part of the world. As Kate pointed out, some of them did not know who Saddam Hussein was, let alone other central figures in recent Middle Eastern history. One of her reasons for choosing the book was that she thought the graphic novel format would aid their comprehension, which was true to an extent. While I commend Kate for choosing to engage her students with this interesting and significant text, I would argue that it was not an age or ability appropriate text for her students. In some ways, her desire to engage in political conversations and to expand the worldview of her students may have led her to make an ill-advised decision in terms of the text she chose. As she said, she was totally on her own in making this decision. She probably could have used more support.

The lessons I observed were well planned, organized, and engaged the students. Kate began the two lessons I observed by reviewing what had occurred on the previous

day in the reading (fieldnotes, 4/18/07 and 4/22/07). It was evident that the group had spent quite a bit of time discussing the concept of revolutions and different types of revolutions. Most of the answers that students gave had something to do with the main character, her parents, and their role in the revolution or its effects on them. In the course of the lessons, Kate's focus was exactly as she had described. She spent time looking at words and helping students chunk them. She also spent time engaging with them on very serious political issues. At one point for instance, a student struggled to decode the word reopened, and Kate said, "Bet you can figure out that one. Remember how we talked about looking for parts you know. There's a word you know in the middle of this one" (fieldnotes, 4/22/07). At other times she encouraged them to sound out words syllable by syllable. At the same time, she talked about political prisoners, the United State's dependence on oil, and other revolutionary figures in history.

After reading the book, Kate had the students create a one-page graphic representation of an event from their own lives. Throughout the reading she had emphasized that this was a true story that happened in the author's life when she was about their age. For this reason, she wanted them to write about something that had happened to them. While she tried to make the project connected to the issues of injustice that they had discussed, she eventually told the students to write about whatever they wanted, "race cars or basketball or whatever" (fieldnotes, 4/22/07). There were not clear instructions and she did not engage them in any sort of prewriting activity. The students, I noted, were lost and asking one another what they were supposed to do.

Issues Revealed in the Lessons

In many ways, Kate represented the student that researchers and educators with an interest in preparing teachers for a multicultural society would envy. She came to the program sharing a change agenda and interested in working with and for the community. In fact, I would argue, that as a student Kate was more involved in the community and in working for change than any other students and than most faculty and other university representatives with whom she had contact. She would have benefited from further discussions of diversity and working with communities that continued to challenge her and allowed her to continue thinking about issues related to being an outsider and supporting student learning, but as she said, most of the conversation in the program had not gone deep enough.

While Kate clearly had knowledge related to decoding and to critical literacy, as well as the belief that both were important, she was fairly unsuccessful at making progress with her students in either of these areas (let alone both simultaneously). She knew more about what she should do than how to do it successfully. She set about to improve the reading of her students and to increase their knowledge of the world. Both of these things are in line with the curriculum of the program, but it was clear in the case of Kate that the intent and the outcome were not as directly connect as they might be.

In this situation, where the classroom teacher provided no example that Kate could emulate and the program had provided little specific details on how to accomplish the tasks she set before herself, Kate made an attempt to actually do something radically different than what was going on in her school, something that would have met the goals and expectations of the program, and something that few other student teachers attempt.

She attempted to simultaneously engage the students, address their literacy needs, and broaden their worldview. Because she was not able to implement specific tools and strategies in a more effective manner, she fell short of having the sort of impact she might have had with more support and within a structure that did a better job of actually connecting the theory to the practice.

Summary

Kate's case demonstrates multiple ways in which the findings presented in the previous chapter had a direct impact on the experiences of individual student teachers:

1. Kate largely separated her experiences and her learning from the program at Cooper. She expressly valued her experiences in the field and felt she had learned more there. She did not complete the assessments in the manner in which they were intended, simply doing what she needed to do in order to be certified.
2. Kate made commendable attempts to ensure “that students achieve, develop a positive sense of themselves, and develop a commitment to larger social and community concerns,” (Ladson-Billings, 2001, p. 16). She already had, to some extent at least, the belief and view of students that would have made successful teaching possible, but there were no structured opportunities created for her to transform her practice.

The themes and related findings discussed in the previous chapter may have contributed to these implications in the case of Kate. I believe that her case, in particular, has implications for thinking about the preparation of already committed teachers. In her own words, the program at Cooper did not go deep enough in terms of diversity

(fieldnotes, 2/20/07). In addition, in my opinion, the program may not have provided enough of a grounding in the practices of culturally relevant pedagogy (beyond the theory) to improve Kate's practice. The case raises questions about the preparation of candidates committed to high-need settings and diverse populations who are prepared within traditional programs of teacher education alongside prospective teachers who have deficit views of students that need confronting and are not committed to working in high-poverty urban or rural schools.

Conclusion

My analysis of the positions that teacher candidates were given and took up, as well as how they viewed the program, teaching and learning, and the student teaching experience, indicates the potential for tensions to be created through the competing values, purposes, and needs of various participants. These tensions often related to those explored in the previous chapter and led to a learning context that was complicated by the student teacher's desire to simultaneously become an independent practitioner and still pass muster according to the university's standards, as well as the university's need to simultaneously apprentice individual student teachers and demonstrate effectiveness at preparing large groups of teacher candidates. As demonstrated in the previous chapter, student teachers were positioned as object of assessment and of the program's ability to successfully produce qualified teachers. This need on the part of the program served to shift the focus from the student teacher as learner in practice with continually evolving and shifting needs, to the student teacher as learned (or not). The tensions and

disconnects that arose where the goals and structures of the programs met the individual student teachers were the focus of this chapter.

Kate and Jack were affected by my findings about the program in different ways, but both cases demonstrated the effects of the contradictions and tensions on student teachers intending to work in high-need schools. Specifically, I would argue that Jack and Kate both took up positions and responded in ways that were not surprising given my findings related to the program. Specifically,

1. Jack came to define effective instruction largely as instruction that did not reflect the practices of the classrooms. He viewed good teaching mainly as an activity that involved thinking and engaging in practices that were “outside of the box,” whether or not they resulted in increased student learning.
2. Jack also came to evaluate his own teaching on the basis of the students’ affective responses. He focused repeatedly on engaging them and making learning activities enjoyable.
3. Both Kate and Jack successfully navigated the disjointed spaces of their experience without disrupting the student teacher – Cooper space. Both were critical of this space, but their critiques were not pursued in the space itself.
4. Jack and Kate both fabricated assignments to meet the requirements of the programs when they thought the activity did not serve their needs or align with their actual classrooms. They saw the program’s assessment as separate from their learning, and therefore did not view these assessments as formative or as opportunities for structured learning to occur with guided help.

5. Kate made attempts to disrupt the practices that she critiqued in the public school space during her second placement. While she had the beliefs and knowledge that were necessary to attempt this change, she lacked the support to implement it effectively, the example of how it might be done to follow, and the skills and strategies that would have helped make it more successful.

Some have argued that the goal of teacher education “is to awaken awareness and...to create what Rich (1980) has called ‘disequilibrium,’ thus altering the images [preservice teachers] have of themselves and others that have been abstracted by the culture” (Martin & Van Gunten, 2002, p. 46). In addition, many programs of teacher education have moved to a model of inquiry and reflective practice (away from a training model). The cases of Kate and Jack bring into question the success and effectiveness of these two focuses. In the first instance because both students entered the program intending to work in high-need schools and with at least some awareness of culture and race and their connection to injustice. If a program is designed to “awaken” those beliefs, it does little to meet the needs of students like Jack and Kate. A program designed to create candidates like Jack and Kate did not sufficiently support them.

In the instance of a teacher education program with a newer, inquiry-based approach to preparation, it seems that a systematic, inquiry-driven approach would characterize the student teaching semester more than any aspect of the program. In the case of Jack, he focused largely on management and enjoyment, ignoring learning, and was quick to adopt the practices of his teacher. Given the same context, Kate took a different path. She was at least partially driven by the needs of her students, but was not able to effectively address those needs. She did not adopt her teacher’s practices, instead

radically departing from them in a manner that was not systematic. While she attempted change, she was not supported in enacting it.

This chapter has provided small-scale examples of some of the findings discussed in the previous chapter. Specifically, it has attempted to contextualize aspects of the program in terms of their impact on teachers planning to work in high-need schools. In the final chapter, I will provide a further examination of the major findings and situate them within the larger contexts of teacher education and research in the field.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

This study examined the experiences of preservice teachers within the context of a single program of teacher education and specifically addressed questions related to the experience of student teaching and the various factors that influenced the learning and practices of teacher candidates during that semester. The central questions that guided the study were:

1. How are the intended outcomes of teacher education enacted and assessed during the student teaching semester, what contradictions or tensions arise, and what are the possible implications for student teacher learning?
2. How are the contradictions or tensions navigated by individual student teachers planning to work in high-need settings and what are the possible implications for their learning and practice?

This chapter synthesizes and contextualizes the findings analyzed in the previous two chapters and examines the implications of those findings for teacher education and future research in the field.

These questions were framed within the current context of education in the U. S. and teacher education in particular. In addition, my study was informed by theories that regard teaching and learning as socially-mediated, culturally-situated activities.

Specifically, the study was designed to examine the learning of teacher candidates and the changes that occurred in their practices within various settings over the course of the

student teaching semester. Given this theoretical orientation, the questions and methods for the research were guided by a view of instruction and learning as involving an “interactive web of actors and artifacts...[where] cognition is distributed situationally in the physical environment” (Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2004, p. 9). To that end, findings were derived from data drawn from relevant artifacts and events involving the significant human actors.

Student teaching represents the final step in the process of initial preparation for teaching within the traditional learning-to-teach system that is typical of colleges of education. The semester is characterized by shifting roles and expectations, as the preservice teacher transitions from the identity of university student toward the identity of professional teacher, the program’s own role in the learning of the preservice teacher (too typically) comes to an end, and final determinations related to preservice teachers’ readiness for certification become central. The semester is distinguished by contrasting philosophies, competing agendas, and multiple contradictions. Certainly, the idea that teachers face challenges when they begin their careers in the classroom is not a new idea in the research on teacher preparation. In their review, Wideen, Mayer-Smith, and Moon (1998) looked at studies of preservice education and the early years of teaching and concluded that the experiences are ripe with conflict. They argued that what candidates learn in preservice courses often contradicts their own experiences as students and what they see happening in schools.

To study the student teaching experience in context, data were collected through interviews, observation of classroom events and program meetings, and the gathering of artifacts. These data were analyzed according to methods of qualitative data analysis laid

out by Strauss and Corbin (1998) and Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, and Allen (1993), as well as methods of discourse analysis (Gee, 1999). Analysis was ongoing throughout the study. Data collection and analysis resulted in the themes, findings, and possible interpretations that were presented in the previous chapters. They will be summarized here after I discuss the study's limitations.

Limitations

While I have contextualized these findings by providing a thick description of the setting, the participants, and the events, this study was conceptualized and undertaken as a naturalistic inquiry. Therefore, the generalizability of findings to settings beyond this one is not guaranteed. By providing description and including relevant transcripts and artifacts, though, I have attempted to ensure the transferability of findings, which leads to the credibility of the study and its results.

I have made attempts at different points to provide evidence of how the semester of student teaching under consideration was similar to and different from other semesters of student teaching at Cooper. In addition, I have, at times, drawn comparisons between different programs at Cooper. However, the findings of the study are limited by the fact that the study occurred over the course of a single semester at one university. I believe that the wealth of data collected during this semester was sufficient to allow for the conclusions discussed here, but that certain findings would be more powerful had they been drawn from data collected during multiple semesters of student teaching.

My attention to aspects of the student teaching experience directly connected to and overseen by the university may also be a limitation. As someone with previous

experience on the university side of the student teaching semester, this focus allowed me a particular kind of access to the experience. When possible, I have attempted to situate the experiences of Jack, Kate, and other student teachers within a larger context that includes more than just the seminar and small group meetings that took place at and through the university. While a study that included more data related to the placement schools, their views of teaching and learning, and their role in student teaching might be more powerful in certain regards, my focus on the university and its associated events related directly to the research questions that guided the study.

Finally, as discussed at various points, the student teaching experience is a complex one—composed of many voices and influenced by many people and groups. Given this complexity, it is inevitable that relevant information that could confirm or contradict certain findings was not captured. While I did interview one of the university mentors to check my hypotheses about certain aspects of the experience, I did not interview the seminar instructors or the director of elementary education. Their insights about the semester, and particularly their view of the NCATE process, may have provided alternative viewpoints on the interpretations presented here. The study has revealed certain aspects of student teaching, but there are other issues related to student teaching, such as the experience, beliefs, and practices of classroom mentors, that are not explored fully given the scope and nature of this study.

Summary of Findings and Their Implications

In Chapter I, I outlined several of the intended outcomes of teacher education from the literature and described the ways in which these outcomes are being assessed

according to scholars in the field. The outcomes described in that chapter, and repeated here for convenience, were impact on P-12 student learning; knowledge related to learners and learning; focus on inquiry, reflective practice, and strategic decision making; successful transition into the professional community; and attention to issues of equity and social justice. I expected to find the written components of the curriculum, the learning events, the structures, and the assessments geared towards apprenticing and measuring the learning of preservice teachers within these areas. Recognizing the difficulty of these endeavors and the possible tensions that are often part of student teaching, I attempted to situate the findings within a view of teacher education as a complex and complicated process. As described, student teaching may indeed be the most complicated period of that process, as many aspects of the experience are difficult for teacher educators and preservice teachers alike. For instance, transferring knowledge acquired in methods courses to the student teaching experience is a complicated process. Building collaborative relationships between university mentors and student teachers, as well as between classroom mentors and student teachers, involves many interests and agendas that do not always align. Situating my study within this reality is important for exploring the findings and their possible implications for teacher educators and researchers.

Data indicated that all of the outcomes were in some manner visible within the student teaching system at Cooper. Several of them, however, warranted closer attention in my findings because of issues that arose or their implications for student teacher learning. In particular, this study has implications for thinking about teacher education in relation to the outcomes focused on P-12 learning and inquiry and reflective practice. In

addition, there are implications described in this chapter that are specific to the assessment of teacher candidates and programs of teacher education that may suggest that assessment measures have the potential, ironically, to move the focus away from preservice teacher learning and P-12 student learning.

I now present an overview of the major conclusions from the study that relate to the questions addressed and the themes that were derived. In each case, I situate the discussion within a broader context in order to show how the conclusion being drawn connects to the outcomes of teacher education and theories of learning explored in Chapter I, as well as the previous research reviewed in Chapter II and elsewhere. Answers to both research questions are explored through the areas presented below and the findings captured within them. In other words, I present a summary of the findings at the programmatic level and at the level of the implications for individual preservice teachers as connected, rather than as separate sets of findings. While these three overlap in important ways, I present them here as a way to guide my discussion of the findings and their possible implications:

1. Throughout the course of this study there was a lack of productive, systematic attention to **P-12 student learning** as an outcome of teacher education. Findings from this study suggest that teaching and learning were defined as the implementation of activities or practices and characterized in other problematic ways, such as by focusing on affective outcomes. Teacher educators argue that teacher preparation should focus on preparing teachers who “investigate the effects of their teaching on students’ learning” (Darling-Hammond, 2000, p. 170). While student learning was labeled an outcome of the program (one of its central

goals, even), findings revealed that attention to student learning was virtually absent from the lived experiences of preservice teachers during the student teaching semester in the spaces where structured learning with the guidance of the program could have occurred. P-12 student learning was assumed, even though evidence revealed that preservice teachers were not comfortable assessing their students' learning.

2. Researchers have demonstrated and discussed the **divide between university and public school contexts**. This study revealed the ways in which the definitions, goals, and norms of the program at Cooper worked to reify and strengthen this divide by fostering a culture of critique, for instance. In the spaces where program representatives, student teachers, and school representatives interacted it was the vision, agenda, and Discourse of the program that were privileged. These situations led to a devaluing of the field and to an approach to learning about teaching that was focused on critique rather than on systematic inquiry and problem solving.
3. This study suggests that a **crisis of assessment** at the program level can have implications for the learning and development of student teachers. Research has not begun to fully address the implications of accreditation and systematic assessment for programs of teacher education. This study revealed the ways in which issues of accountability and the collection of data affected the activity within the student teaching system and the experiences of student teachers themselves. The manner in which assessment was enacted worked to separate the act of assessing from the learning of preservice teachers.

While describing findings in these areas and their specific implications for Jack, Kate, and other student teachers, I look at their relation to theory and practice in teacher education. Following this discussion I will consider directions for future research.

P-12 Student Learning

Questions regarding the outcome of teacher education related to the learning of P-12 students are largely open and contested, as described earlier. For the most part, however, the centrality of P-12 student learning as an outcome is not. One of the major factors that affects the use of P-12 student learning as an assessment of teacher candidate preparedness relates to difficulties measuring this particular outcome in the context of university-based teacher education programs. It was not surprising, therefore, that the program at Cooper had implemented only cursory ways of measuring impact on student learning during the student teaching semester. What was more unexpected was the fact that despite a stated focus on student learning and these measures, there was little attention to the learning of students during important events throughout the semester. The measures used and the events that occurred did not provide structured opportunities to engage preservice teachers in thinking about the relationship between their instruction and student learning.

During the course of this study, in fact, in situations within the student teacher – Cooper space, effective instruction was often defined not as activity that led to demonstrated student learning but as the inverse of the teaching practices in the local public school setting. In other words, student teachers viewed quality instruction as instruction that did not follow the more traditional examples set by their classroom

mentors. In addition, effective instruction was further simplified and represented by easily observable behaviors. One message seemingly communicated to teacher candidates at Cooper was that public school teachers rely too heavily on the textbooks and other pre-packaged curricular materials and that the student teacher should not. Good instruction involves student engagement (often interpreted as fun and enjoyable lessons rather than intellectually stimulating ones), progressive techniques and practices, or sheer creativity and force of personality. These messages were evident in multiple contexts.

In the case of the documents that were circulated within the program and directly connected to the student teaching experience, for instance, effective instruction was defined by the use of 44 indicators meant to be used in the evaluation of teacher candidates. Obviously, in this case teaching was not oversimplified, but it was overgeneralized. The 44 indicators were devoid of the very contextual situatedness that they actually espoused. They did not allow for differentiation and were conceived as measures for all preservice teachers, regardless of context, grade, or subject matter. Effective instruction was defined as inquiry-driven practice within the contexts in which teachers work in order to have an effect on student learning. However, in practice, the program did not follow this principle in the creation of the indicators, let alone with the student teachers in practice. Researchers have argued that effective instruction should “diagnose and make use of variability, rather than implement uniform techniques or routines” (Darling-Hammond & Snyder, 2000, p. 524). In principle, Cooper emphasized a similar approach to instruction but by failing to engage in the practice itself did not provide a helpful model for student teachers. Its own practices were uniform and routine, not making use of variability. Obviously, while this finding is significant in terms of the

lack of systematic attention to P-12 student learning it also relates to the crisis of assessment at the programmatic level, which will be discussed in a subsequent section.

In addition to the disconnect between valuing diversity in theory but not adjusting for it in practice, other issues related to the hidden curriculum of teacher education and the contradictions that frustrate and hinder the growth of student teacher learning in practice may actually be exacerbated by the increased attention to issues of diversity and difference when programs themselves are not able to simultaneously value difference and investigate the learning of their students. The implication is not that diversity and difference should be deemphasized, but that teacher educators must reflect the importance of difference in their own practice. I do not dispute the idea that teacher education needs to “[take] seriously questions regarding how the production of knowledge must be extended to create pedagogical strategies that are inclusive of the voices and histories of historically marginalized groups in American society” (Martin & Van Gunten, 2002). The emphasis, though, in this case was on recognizing the diversity and understanding difference, but not on the pedagogical strategies that are required or recommended because of it.

At the same time, beginning teachers may be less capable of responding to the situation and more reliant on easy, prescriptive, simplified ideas of what to do. For instance, Jack saw effective teaching as about engaging students. Other student teachers saw it as about using discovery learning or learning centers. This finding is not new, but the extent to which the structure of the program and the interactions that occurred actually led to these views and reinforced them was surprising.

To use an analogy, Beach and his colleague (2006) argue that teachers need to act as if they were reading a book for the first time when they lead discussions of literature in the classroom. Their argument is based on the premise that first-time readers are engaged in a different process than readers who have read a text multiple times and are engaged in analyzing it. First-time readers are most concerned with figuring out what has happened and thinking about what might happen next. For this reason, teachers need to put themselves in the role of first-time reader and save other discussions for second readings and for reflection after reading. Teacher educators might need to engage in a similar process to look at learning to teach as they would look at reading a text for the first time rather than the tenth. They should approach learning to teach with the concerns of a beginning teacher and adjust to those concerns, rather than continuing to approach beginning teachers as if they are experts and bemoaning the fact that they are not.

Wideen, Mayer-Smith, and Moon (1998) concluded, upon reviewing research on learning to teach, that

The implicit theory underlying traditional teacher education was based on a training model in which the university provides the theory, methods, and skills; the schools provide the setting in which that knowledge is practiced; and the beginning teacher provides the individual effort to apply such knowledge. (p. 167)

The intent at Cooper was to avoid this traditional approach. The reality of the experience continued to be rife with inconsistency and internal contradictions. While the approach to teaching and learning espoused by the program rejected decontextualized notions of or approaches to instruction, the program itself put forward a set of decontextualized characteristics for evaluating preservice teachers. While it could be said that Cooper's program had the goal of challenging the status quo in educational practice, the reality of the lived experiences of student teachers continued to look more like the traditional

teacher education programs, perhaps with new content but still with the same old approach. So while it seems like teacher educators have perhaps heeded the warnings of researchers in terms of how they approach teaching and learning (in theory at least) for P-12 students, this study suggests that they have yet to heed the warnings in terms of how they approach teaching and learning (in practice) with their own students.

In their review of research on methods coursework and field experiences Clift and Brady (2005) described the history of research (prior to 1970) in this area as follows: “Experimental groups of preservice teachers were trained to exhibit a certain behavior (i.e., asking higher level questions) and use that behavior in laboratory and classroom settings; comparisons were made against an untrained control group” (p. 309). Although the approach to research used by researchers has departed from this methodology in many cases, we must consider whether or not the underlying theory has changed in teacher education. Are we still looking to see if student teachers exhibit certain behaviors or reflect certain beliefs even if the behaviors and beliefs are of a different kind? Are we still ignoring the connection between these behaviors and beliefs and their connection to program components and P-12 student learning?

The program in this study valued certain aspects of teaching and learning in theory and in the intent laid out in their documents, but contradicted them in practice or failed to fully engage students in implementing them and systematically investigating their effectiveness. Others have shown similar failures are pervasive in practice. Risko and her colleagues (2002) demonstrated, for instance, that reflective practice is encouraged in programs of teacher education but not explicitly taught. My study could be used to draw a similar conclusion related specifically to student learning. The intent of

the program was to treat the learning of P-12 students as a central outcome. In practice, though, the program focused more on professional and personal characteristics, specific philosophies or approaches, and the importance of engagement and enjoyment, not on explicitly connecting these things to student outcomes in the classroom. In fact, the findings might suggest that there was little to no expectation that student teachers would or should have an impact on student learning. In the end, student teaching in the case of this study became as much if not more about the transition from student to teacher rather than the impact of student teachers on their students.

Zientek (2007) studied the self-efficacy of novice teachers in order to compare traditionally and non-traditionally certified teachers and their opinions of their preparation. She found that traditionally certified teachers felt more positively about their preparation programs in relation to areas such as instructional planning and strategy use than did their non-traditionally certified peers. The two groups, however, felt equally unprepared to assess student learning. The fact that this area is one in which traditionally prepared teachers feel underprepared is troubling, but perhaps not surprising given the findings of this study. It may not be that they feel underprepared, but that they actually are underprepared—not only to assess student learning but also to systematically engage in the process and use it to inform their instruction.

Divide Between University and Public School Contexts

Hybrid spaces, where the voices and goals of multiple participants meet and merge, are often identified as sites that are ripe for learning. In their study of classroom practices, Gutiérrez and her colleagues (1999) found this to be the case. “By attending to

the social, political, material, cognitive, and linguistic conflict, we also have documented these tensions as potential sites of rupture, innovation, and change that lead to learning” (p. 287). Of course, one of the key words from their finding is potential. These spaces have the potential to lead to learning, to innovation.

In this study, however, conflict did not lead to new sites for learning and the competing needs and goals of various participants did not merge or collide in transformative ways. In fact, in terms of the P-12 schools and the university, the program established the competing spaces as just that, irreconcilably in conflict, and ignored the potential for learning to occur in a hybrid space or through a border pedagogy. In cases where the needs of teacher candidates conflicted with or were not represented in the practices of the program, the student teachers abandoned their own needs to comply with the university when the university required it. Although they questioned these requirements, they did not make serious attempts to create a third space.

The space that existed was one of conflict, but not one in which conflict was valued or harnessed for purposes that might benefit student teachers and their students. The space created was one in which student teachers were rewarded for contrasting themselves with their classroom mentors or critiquing the practices of the public schools. Rather than attempt to solve the problem of the disconnect between universities and public schools, it was almost as if the university simply recognized the problem and treated it as a given. The needs identified or evident in various student teachers (how to deal with concerns about personality or how to be a radical teacher in a status quo environment, for instance) were also largely ignored and silenced in the hybrid spaces where they might have been most adequately addressed. Those student teachers often

chose, rather than actively working to change the context, to bend to the demands of the situation, in effect giving the university what it wanted and then working out their actual problems (or not) in other spaces.

The inability of the program to directly address the needs of public schools or take up and examine the concerns of individual teachers, which they viewed as tied to the public schools because of their own identity as teachers, led the student teachers in this study to view Cooper largely as a certificate granting institution. In addition, they viewed the program as something separate from the actual practices of classrooms. This separation was, in some implicit ways, promoted by the program and acted as a myth associated with student teaching—that you leave one world and enter another when you student teach, that while experience is the only true teacher the things you will encounter during your experience are ineffectual and unjust. These contradicting messages were detrimental not only to the relationship between P-12 and higher education but also to the learning experiences of teacher candidates in traditional teacher preparation programs—evidenced by the lack of support they received in problem solving in various contexts.

Research (as well as less scientific conjecture and observation) has revealed a disconnect between the university and the K-12 classroom. The student teaching semester becomes, in some ways, the ultimate introduction to this disconnect for teacher candidates. Both Jack and Kate chose to make up data and lesson plans because they failed to see the relevance of what the university asked or failed to see how the assignment could match the reality of the day-to-day that they were experiencing. There was a mismatch between individual and programmatic goals, as well as between program

and school goals. The mismatch was left unreconciled; it led student teachers to be skeptical of the university's relevance and look elsewhere for answers and support.

The finding that student teachers responded by giving the program what it wanted at the expense of actually engaging in learning activities was not unexpected. It revealed, however, that in the case of Jack and Kate the structure of the activities (such as the unit plan and action research project), as they viewed it, did little to improve their experience. In fact, it may have hindered it. Because the requirements were too rigid, too structured, or too tied to specific rubric categories in their estimation, Jack and Kate chose to either ignore the project completely (only completing it in order to receive the grade but not doing it as intended) or view it as something separate from their experience in the field.

Studies of teacher education and student teaching have often suggested that the practices of teacher education are not radical enough, that teacher education itself is too traditional, that the hidden curriculum works in opposition to espoused goals. As one researcher summarized, "Teacher education prepares teachers to fit into existing patterns and structures of teaching, schooling and society. It plays an integrating rather than a radicalizing role" (Phelan, 2001, p. 584). In the case of this study, the program (and the student teaching experience specifically) appeared to play neither an integrating nor a radicalizing role but fell somewhere in between. The semester was characterized not by assimilation or active change, but by critique.

Given the extent to which the university emphasized the break between their approach and the reality of classrooms, it was clear that integration into the profession as it is was not the intended outcome. While Jack integrated into the situation he encountered in his first placement, he did so despite what he had learned and taken away

from Cooper. His Cooper preparation actually made him feel guilty about adopting the practices of Ms. Fleming. Phelan's (2001) hypothesis was that colleges of education, perhaps despite their intentions, serve to integrate teachers into the culture of schooling as it is. In this case, Cooper did not. Jack assimilated to the culture of his placement classrooms, not directly because of what he learned or did at Cooper, but largely in spite of it—not through some fault of his own but because talk of change was not accompanied by a preparation leading to work for change.

Phelan and other researchers have also argued that colleges of education should ensure that their students work for the culture of schooling as it could or might be. This call is echoed in the documents circulated by the teacher education program at Cooper with its “future in the making” approach to educational practice. While that culture is described, it is not actualized. In reality, the culture of critique may do as much to normalize practices in schools as a more straightforward process of integration would. As Britzman (2003) suggested, “some teacher educators may encourage skepticism, as the correct approach to interpreting educational life, missing is the pedagogy for enacting change” (p. 213). Findings from this study suggest that the discourse for discussing educational life goes beyond healthy skepticism in many instances but do reinforce the idea that the pedagogy of change is absent. For a teacher like Jack, aware of the inequities present in contemporary schooling but unaware of how to effect change even in his own classroom, the only option became replicating the practices around him. Kate, also aware of the inequities and slightly more courageous in her instructional choices, took serious steps toward implementing critical, engaging, and achievement-driven instruction in her classroom, but she was not supported by the school or the university and was left to her

own devices. The culture of critique alone, perhaps intending to demonstrate “how schools work and for whom” (Phelan, 2001, p. 593), did not meet the needs of Kate and Jack, who needed more support not in tearing back the curtain but in actually making the schools (or even just their own classrooms) work differently.

“Student teachers tend not to rock the boat in the classrooms in which they are placed and thus do not always engage in critical conversations about their own teaching or their collaborating teachers’ practice” (Wilson, Floden, & Ferrini-Mundy, 2002, p. 195). In the case of this study, the first part of the argument is somewhat true. With the exception of Kate in her second placement and some other individual lessons described by student teachers, the preservice teachers did not diverge from the practices of their classroom mentors to a large extent. The second part of the statement, however, is contradicted by my findings. Jack, Kate, and others were at times hypercritical of their own practices, the practices of their classroom mentors, and the practices of the program in which they were learning to teach. I would argue that the one thing they all mastered through the program was actually the practice of being critical. Unfortunately, this practice was far too often left as an exercise in discourse rather than action.

The culture of critique present during this semester of student teaching reveals implications for teacher education on a local and a broader level. Given that colleges of education are often viewed as traditionalist institutions that support the status quo in education, it is a contradiction that they, or at least Cooper, spend so much time criticizing the practices of schools. It is perhaps because they have been talking of the change agenda outside of P-12 spaces for so long that they are viewed as ineffectual by others in the field. I believe that educational reform must involve institutions of higher

education, especially their colleges of education and programs of teacher education, and that a portion of the fault for being absent from conversations lies with these institutions and their approach to teacher education.

Crisis of Assessment

It is essential that programs of teacher education are preparing qualified candidates and even, in my opinion, that they be held accountable for the future practice of those candidates. However, the current push to meet the demands of accountability must be reimagined, not because it sacrifices one goal (individual student learning) for another (program accountability), but because it fails to allow for both goals to be met simultaneously. It turns student teachers like Kate and Jack into faceless teacher candidates. It simplifies all of their learning throughout the semester as elements that can be designated as emergent, proficient, or somewhere in between. It sacrifices the context and the nuances of learning to teach for the clarity and simplicity of data that purportedly demonstrate having learned to teach. I am not arguing, therefore, against the need to evaluate programs of teacher education or against the idea of assessing individual teacher candidates. I believe that both of these are important, even essential, practices. What I believe the findings presented in this study suggest, however, is that the fear and avoidance of systematic assessments and measures of learning (or other outcomes for that matter) is potentially more problematic than assessment and accountability themselves are believed to be.

Sleeter (2001) has argued that

It is quite possible that debates about limitations of positivism have produced generations of scholars who have not learned to use tools of positivist research

such as gathering quantitative data, having learned to equate such tools with how they have been used historically. (p. 240)

I wonder if a similar situation is not the case in programs of teacher education and the related coursework and field experiences. Due not only to the historic use of quantitative research tools but to the historic use of tools of measurement used for the systematic assessment of student learning, teacher educators have perhaps chosen to forego the tools altogether. In my study and my personal experience, there seems to be a fear not just of standardized tests but also of systematic approaches to investigating learning in general. The question of whether the tools themselves can be used for other purposes is an important one moving forward.

Student teachers in this study had difficulty examining the learning of their students, and that difficulty is likely tied to the program's own inconsistencies and hesitations in relation to assessment. The systematic investigation that was part of the student teaching experience (largely due to NCATE in this instance) was viewed as something separate from the preservice learner. It was presented as an investigation of the program as a whole, not of individual student teachers. My assessment must be viewed in light of the phase of accreditation in which the university was participating, namely that it was using and in some cases piloting these assessments. If we are to professionalize the role of the teacher, we must begin systematically measuring their success. We do not need to measure it only with the testing data of their students, but we need to not equate the act of measuring with the ways measurement has been used historically. If the field fails to take assessment and accountability seriously it risks being dismissed and becoming irrelevant. It risks becoming removed from what it is meant to influence: student learning.

Wilson, Floden, and Ferrini-Mundy (2002) make a similar point, “We would argue that we are limiting our capacity to generate the scholarship we need to improve teacher education if we are not preparing the next generation of teacher education researchers to use the full range of methods” (p. 202). We may not only be limiting our capacity to generate scholarship that will improve teacher education but our capacity to create and sustain programs that rigorously prepare new teachers and assess their success in doing so.

Teacher educators are often disdainful of the NCATE (and other) accreditation processes. As this study indicated, these processes have the ability to transform the practices and outcomes of teacher education programs in unintended ways. Here, for instance, the documentation required by NCATE and implemented at Cooper led to a problematic view and treatment of teacher candidates. A collaborative and potentially hybrid process turned into a top-down evaluation that objectified student teachers, rather than allowing them to be subjects in their own learning-to-teach experience. For this reason, we must examine in more detail and reconsider the ways in which we measure teacher candidate effectiveness. It is essential that we study it and that we connect it to student learning, but we must reconcile that need with an approach to teacher education that continues to value the experiences of student teachers, their needs and goals, and their individual learning.

Programs of teacher education continue replicating the practices they have rejected in theory and failing to provide radically different approaches to teaching and learning in practice. Teacher educators must learn to and be unafraid to investigate the effects of their programs on the learning *and teaching* of their students. Because

questions about the connections between changed beliefs and changed practice have been a part of the discourse for some time (Wideen, Mayer-Smith, & Moon, 1998; Klein, 2004), the research and practices of teacher educators must shift.

Implications and Recommendations

In this section, I describe implications and recommendations drawn from the findings in two specific areas: teacher education research and teacher education practice. The goal of this discussion is to demonstrate the contributions of this research to the field and think about its significance in terms of teacher education.

Teacher Education Research

Future research conducted by university-based teacher educators on programs of teacher education should locate itself clearly in relation to student learning in P-12 classrooms. As teacher educators, how do our dual roles as researcher and educator interact? What is our agenda and how does it overlap? Is it related to equity or cultural sensitivity? What is our goal? Is it closing the achievement gap or promoting multicultural pedagogy (not to imply that these are necessarily separate endeavors)? I believe that more multicultural, equity-oriented pedagogy would indeed help close the achievement gap. The issue as I see it, though, is in how the problem is framed. Walsh (2006) wrote, in response to AERA panel's 2005 report, "While the teacher education community has certainly embraced the classroom's *cultural* challenges posed by poverty and race, it seems to have absolved itself of responsibility for preparing teachers to take on the *pedagogical* and *learning* challenges posed by poverty and race" (p. 4). I,

unfortunately, believe that her sentiment was reflected in the experiences of student teachers during my study. Kate, who was largely already prepared for the cultural challenges, was left floundering when it came to the pedagogical challenges in her classroom, for instance.

We must move beyond research that asks only whether our coursework and our programs produce more culturally sensitive practitioners or lead to changed beliefs. I believe we must move on from that line of research, not because it is uninteresting or unimportant, is methodologically unsound, or fails to measure long-term effects, but because we should ask different questions. Without hesitation, I believe that programs of teacher education located in university settings (and other programs, for that matter) should address issues of race, gender, poverty, and other aspects of diversity and identity as they affect and are enacted in educational life in our society and that teacher educators must be serious about their own process for doing just that in their courses and the programs they design (see Milner & Smithey, 2003, for an example). But, how do we build these sorts of curriculum and simultaneously have a clear focus on P-12 student achievement? More importantly, though, we must think about *changing* practice, not just critiquing it. Research on the practices of teacher education programs, if it is to be influential, should make P-12 student achievement its main focus (and be willing to change and criticize its own practices). This recommendation is suggested based on the lack of attention to P-12 student learning in this study, the lack of attention evident in the literature and cited by multiple scholars as explored previously, and the place of programs of teacher education within the current educational landscape.

We have been discussing issues of identity and diversity and asking if our practices have an effect on the identity of teacher candidates. We now must also ask if our focus has had an effect on the achievement (broadly conceived) of P-12 students, because the truth appears to be that we do not know and that, at least in the case of this study and its findings, we may not even be trying to find out in practice. Assessments used in this study purported to measure the impact of preservice teachers on their students, but did little to address these issues in practice. The assessments themselves were disconnected from the learning of the preservice teachers, which meant that P-12 student learning was also not a central focus. While it has been forcefully argued that changes in beliefs do not necessarily lead to changes in practice, the research in teacher education is still driven by questions of changing beliefs. This study adds another dimension to the issue. Namely, not only is research focusing too heavily on beliefs and ignoring practices, but it may be doing so at the specific peril of student teachers who already possess the desired beliefs.

Further research related to these hypotheses is necessary. Future projects could be conceived to study the implications of assessment measures during student teaching and other phases of preservice preparation. Questions could relate to how preservice teachers, teacher educators, and school-based stakeholders view these assessment as well as how and where they are being used as not only assessments but structured, formative, learning events. In addition, we need more research that examines the conversations that do happen in relation to a student teachers' impact on student learning. As Christina emphasized in a follow-up conversation that occurred after data collection, conversations about P-12 student learning did occur in more informal settings. While it may be difficult

to capture these conversations in a study like this one, they are an important site for considering what student teachers learn about the connection between their practices and their students' achievement. I also think further research might examine my finding that preservice teachers who are committed to high-need schools and already well-situated for working with diverse populations may not be having their needs addressed.

Wilson, Floden, and Ferrini-Mundy (2002) criticize the research on student teaching and argue that it has largely “focused on attitude shifts rather than on changes in knowledge and skills” (p. 195). Rather than focusing on changes in knowledge and skills, however, it should focus on practice and on outcomes for students. We talk (and conduct research) more about preservice teachers' self-efficacy than we do about their actual effectiveness. These authors go on to say, “We were also struck with the dearth of impact measures. We...believe that, as teachers, we ought to be held accountable for what our students (in this case, prospective teachers) learn” (p. 202). And I would add, what their students learn. While my study might itself be criticized (and rightly so) for not addressing the impact of student teachers on their students, I believe that the findings from this study indicate that lack of attention to the issue of impact is not specific to research in teacher education, but may be a problem in teacher education itself. It may not be surprising that researchers are not addressing impact in their research if it is not addressed in programs.

Others have argued for a stronger theoretical approach to studying teacher education, and I echo that call. I believe that theoretical orientations that view student teacher learning as a socially-mediated practice influenced by various actors, tools, and events are useful for considering the process of becoming teacher. In the case of this

study, theories of third space in educational research were important for examining the ways in which hybrid spaces were (and were not) productive. I believe that these theories have great potential to move the field of teacher education forward. Given the hybrid nature of learning contexts, it is essential to consider how and whether this hybridity is harnessed and used to promote the learning of student teachers and their impact on students. Applying this theoretical lens to a study of teacher education practices revealed the ways in which the program space can be privileged over other spaces and prevent productive hybridity from occurring. In addition, it revealed the ways in which preservice teachers become expert at navigating between multiple spaces by choosing not to disrupt and acquiescing to the requirements of the program, largely because the program is responsible for recommending their certification. Third space theoretical orientations could also be important in further research on the divide between university and school contexts and may provide insight regarding how these two spaces can work in concert to promote the learning of preservice teachers and P-12 students.

Teacher Education Practice

The findings related to student learning, the divide between the contexts of learning to teach, and assessment of preservice teachers also have implications for the practices of teacher education. I explore some of these implications here by suggesting important questions for teacher educators and by recommending certain shifts in thinking and practice that might address some of the concerns raised in this study.

Questions

The findings of this study suggest that teacher educators must examine their own practices and take more direct ownership over the challenges they face. Critics of teacher education are becoming increasingly vocal. For this reason, I believe that we must recognize the challenges of teacher education and work productively to alleviate them. In this vein, one important question for teacher educators might be, how might we study the practices of university mentors and classroom mentors in order to better understand whether the goals of student teaching are being met? These relationships are the cornerstone of the student teaching semester and often exist outside of the purview of the program of teacher education. While research on these relationships is certainly important, it is also essential for program directors and faculty to study the impact of mentors on the learning of preservice teachers and consider the ways in which these relationships are (or are not) in line with the goals and intended outcomes of the program. In the context of this study, for instance, it would have been important for teacher educators to study the practices of mentors during conferences to see if the intent of the forms and the meetings was being realized.

In addition, we must ask, in what ways might we make the connections between course content and teaching experiences more explicit? One possible approach worth studying would be a cohort model in which faculty who teach methods courses are involved with their students during student teaching. By observing them in the classroom, these faculty members would be able to make explicit connections back to methods courses as a part of apprenticeship during student teaching. It seems that more cohesion across the program would be beneficial for the practices of student teachers.

A final question relates to the findings about assessment and their implications for programs that are becoming more evidence-driven as a result of accountability measures and more focused attention to NCATE accreditation. Does the assessment and accreditation process have a direct effect on the interactions between student teachers and the other parties involved in the experience? It is important to consider whether some of the findings here were directly connected to the program's upcoming review and how that review might have been approached differently or in a manner that was more productive for student teachers. As programs become more evidence driven, questions related to the impact of the assessment process at the program level on individual students and their learning are important ones for teacher educators to consider.

Shifts

I believe this study suggests the need for certain shifts in our approach to thinking about the preparation of teachers, and the student teaching experience in particular. These shifts relate directly to a reconceptualization of the culminating experience of preservice education. First, teacher education would benefit from a shift in thinking related to the view of preservice teachers and of inservice teachers that is held in the field. Preservice teachers are often viewed as lacking the necessary beliefs and attitudes for working in high-need settings, with diverse student populations, or in high-poverty communities. This view of preservice teachers as necessarily lacking has specific implications in cases in which student teachers want to work in high-need context and possess at least some of the beliefs and attitudes that we believe are necessary for working in those contexts. This shift in thinking is largely about recognizing and utilizing the strengths of preservice teachers, rather than assuming certain deficits. In addition, I believe that a shift in our

thinking about the field is required. We must move from a view of inservice teachers as largely ineffectual and nearsighted, to one that values their expertise, situated knowledge, and commitment. We must view these teachers as partners in the preparation of our students and ourselves as partners in the education of their students. We must shift from a view of reform as one of resisting the field to a view of reform that is in partnership with the field.

Next, we should consider a shift from a culture of critique to a culture of inquiry. This culture of inquiry could be the driving force behind courses at colleges and universities, but also in terms of relationships between programs and schools. Rather than critiquing the instructional decisions of classroom-based mentors, we must challenge preservice teachers to understand the context of their challenges and work to problem solve within those contexts. The focus of our inquiry should be student learning. Programs can set the standard for inquiry by implementing assessment measures that are directly connected to preservice student learning opportunities. Currently, in some circles at least, assessment (particularly connected to NCATE) is viewed as a necessary evil. I believe teacher education needs to shift from this view to one that values the assessment process as an essential component of preparing teachers. Rather than assuming a defensive posture related to issues of assessment and student achievement, we should assume an offensive one and work to redefine the processes of assessment in radically different and productive ways.

These shifts should work in conjunction with a reconceptualization of the culminating experience for preservice teachers. If truly hybrid spaces that allow for reform of practices are our goal, we would benefit from viewing student teaching as an

opportunity not only for preservice teacher learning and development, but for changed practice on the local level of classrooms. In other words, if we shift from viewing student teaching as centrally related to the purposes of teacher education (i.e. preservice teacher learning) to viewing the experience as directly connected to the purposes of classrooms and teachers (i.e. P-12 student learning), we may actually create situations that are simultaneously beneficial for both purposes. If our goal is to reform classroom practices, we may have no better opportunity as teacher educators to do just that than in the situations where our students work with local teachers. If these relationships are viewed as partnerships focused on the needs and purposes of the classrooms, our students would benefit by seeing the ways in which practices can be transformed through the collaboration of partners (student teachers, classroom teachers, and university representatives). Rather than hoping that we will eventually prepare enough high-quality teachers to reach a critical mass in schools that will transform practices there, we should investigate the ways in which we can work with classroom teachers during the student teaching semester to collaboratively transform practices on a local level.

Conclusion

Research on teacher education has revealed important findings about preparing teachers for classrooms. We know, for instance, that there are mixed messages sent to preservice teachers from various people with whom they interact, that student teachers replicate the practices of their classroom mentors more often than they break from those practices, that preservice teachers think more about classroom management than most aspects of classroom life. These things, and others, have been identified as roadblocks to

learning, as conflicts and obstacles to success in the classroom. Rather than solve these problems, though, it appears that certain practices in teacher education may exacerbate them. Rather than show preservice teachers how to implement effective instruction in classrooms, we give them more reason to and more opportunities to simply critique what is going on there. Instead of listening to them as learners, we ignore their needs, fail to create a space that values the experiences of public schools or our own students, and leave them even more frustrated. Pleasing our students should not be our main goal, necessarily, but is it any wonder that colleges of education are being challenged when teachers like Kate and Jack leave our programs frustrated, do most of their learning “on the job,” and never hear from us again?

Milner (2008) argues for a theory of teacher education based on “disruptive movement.” He writes,

Movements have at their core shifts, disruptions, and transformation of current situations—with special attention placed on altering the status quo to such a degree that more equitable situations and opportunities emerge for those placed on the margins or those considered substandard or inferior. (p. 339)

In cases where the goals of traditional programs of teacher education and university-based researchers are related to the goals of alternative certification programs and education reform movements in terms of a focus on providing more equitable opportunities for marginalized groups, then I would argue that teacher educators could take responsibility for working with and talking to others who share their purpose, even those who take different approaches. Recognizing the difficulties and challenges faced by traditional and alternative programs as well as the reality that their goals do not always align and sometimes may even contradict one another, I believe that we can seek out instances where the work of those who prepare teachers in various settings shares

common purposes and use these instances to build and move. As Milner argues, “‘movement forward’ is, indeed, movement forward, even when the paths of movement are not necessarily straightforward” (p. 340). We (teacher educators and researchers in teacher education) must listen (and respond) to our critics. Because we disagree with them on how student achievement should be defined and measured, we have left the conversation. Because our focus has not been fully on student achievement, they have consigned us to irrelevancy.

In the current educational landscape, in which the achievement gap persists, quality teachers are hard to find and harder to retain, and there is a general sense of concern or consternation with traditional teacher preparation programs, the issues and questions raised in this chapter are important for researchers and teacher educators to consider. We must focus our attention more squarely on P-12 student learning. Until we do, I do not think we can expect our students to view themselves as one of the most important factors in their students’ learning and success. We must value the public school space and work to create change with and through that space not against it. Until we do, I do not think we can be surprised that student teachers view their relation to the university as centrally about being certified rather than authentic learning or that novice teachers struggle when we expect them to resist the world of which they are now a part. We must become more comfortable with assessing our own success, directly tying that to the learning of our students, and using assessment measures as opportunities for further learning. Until we do, I do not think we can be surprised by the criticism lobbied at teacher education or build a successful argument for its merits.

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE FIELD NOTES

Field Notes

Date: 3/13/07

Interview: Jack (between placements)

Audio file:

Me:

Asked Jack to share assignments and reflections with me. As well as other things and work from previous semesters.

Jack:

Tells how during seminar he was pulled aside by instructors. He was singled out for "scraping by with the bare minimum." He tells me this to explain that his reflections aren't very long.

Or that the lessons aren't thorough enough.

Continues and talks about being the only guy now that the other guy was kicked out prior to student teaching. Says that the director "had a bone to pick with him."

Other evidence of this during one of the seminar meetings when they discussed his unit plan from the first semester. The instructors view him as not putting in effort, he sees them as being out to get him.

Me:

Interesting. Send me a CD with all that stuff.

Explain the process of deidentifying everything, taking student names out.

Talked about setting up future observations of classroom and meetings.

Start with questions about initial thoughts about second placement and differences between it and the first.

Jack:

Third graders are more interested in me as the teacher. They want to know about me.

Most of sixth graders were too cool to care.

They want to know about pets, married, etc.

Anticipates having a more personal relationship with students in this placement.

2nd school is a title one school for the first time this year. More middle class students in this school.

Different demographics than the first school. This school is not really urban at all.

There are four ELL (Spanish). One student whose parents are from Iraq and speak Farsi. The linguistic differences are something that I didn't have in placement one.

Refers to them as ELL students, but I'm not sure that English is their second language in every case.

Will have all subjects, not just ELA and Social Studies. Wouldn't have known if kid was good at math before. Could have used that to hook a kid. See strengths and weaknesses across subject areas.

Throughout the interview, Jack makes references to all the benefits of being in a self-contained elementary classroom. He seems to already prefer this placement to his first and credits that to elementary vs. middle, but not sure it is that simple.

Get to know students better.

In a little bit he talks about how he was able to get to know students at school 1 outside of the classroom.

ME:

What about how the ELL are incorporated into the class. What level are they at?

JACK:

They have resources. They have separate classrooms for ELL students who aren't ready for regular classroom. So the ones he has are not in there. They are considered ready. I think they are. Only been two days. They struggle with spelling and vocabulary.

He hasn't been here long, but again, these don't actually appear to be ELL students.

ME:

Describe the rest of the student population at the school.

JACK:

Pretty even. Classroom has 4 Hispanic, 8 African American, 1 middle eastern, the rest white. So about 50% white, 25% hispanic/middle eastern, 25% AA.

ME:

Going back to your first placement. What do you think you were successful at doing.

JACK:

Outside of instruction, felt able to connect with the kids. In the hallways before and after class. Not sure if it translated.

Mentions this first, but thinks he'll be able to do it better at school 2.

Maybe it would have been worse if I hadn't done that. It was difficult to control the classes.

Focus turns to management and control.

I improved in classroom management. Still one of the weaker areas.

Feels comfortable with the content.

ME:

Did you get to teach content that you were excited about? How were those decisions made? Did you just follow her calendar?

JACK:

We read A Wrinkle in Time. I read it and enjoyed. Considered quality literature. It is essential literature for 6th grade.

He had some choice here, but the book is on the required list.

Social studies could have been interesting, but it wasn't because we used the textbook.

Following the textbook is a practice that comes from his teacher, but there isn't any indication that he was required to do it that way.

We could have reenacted the Olympics. Could have been fun and engaging but it wasn't.

Sets up a dichotomy between textbook/boring and fun/engaging. No mention of outcomes in terms of learning.

Felt too strung out. Not enough time to plan. Not confident to control the kids outside.

Reason for not making it more fun/engaging is management. Uses the phrase "control the kids" again. Where does this language come from?

Not wild about some of the content. I tried to act excited about them. Persian leaders.

Interesting side thing that we rarely talk about...how to teach content that doesn't appeal to you.

ME:

Did they like a wrinkle in time?

JACK:

Some did some didn't.

Couldn't tell if students were reading and understanding. Not always clear how well they read.

Why not? What were the assessments—look at the plans.

But I didn't want to give questions just to have them prove they read it. Set a goal to enjoy reading, not just answer closed questions.

Again, a dichotomy between traditional teaching (objective questions) and enjoyment—what about comprehension/learning?

Read parts aloud. I read parts to them.

Some enjoyed. Some got it. Some had a hard time.

Reading aloud helped the struggling readers to participate.

Mentioned by other participants as well—reading aloud seems to be the number one tool for helping struggling readers.

Some thought it was boring and said so on their test at the end.

ME:

mentioned building relationships. Any students that you had a hard time connecting with or reaching?

JACK:

Yes. For different reasons.

One student failing all subjects.

Said earlier that he would have never known if a student was good at math, but here he knows that a student is failing.

Had conference with mother and teachers. He never did his work. He was missing skills he should have learned in 3rd or 4th grade.

He loved drawing. Tried to connect with him there. Varied assignments. Asked him to draw instead of write. Would show some understanding, or that he did something.

The goal is really to get work out of the student. There needs to be evidence that he is there, more than evidence that he is learning something.

Usually just didn't do it.

Another kid--behavior and academic problems. He was suspended three times while I was there. Made threats. Drew picture with a chain saw and cutting off my head.

He tells this story pretty nonchalantly. Made threats against multiple teachers, doesn't seem like he took it seriously.

Those were the obvious ones. You would notice there was something wrong with them immediately.

Other than those, doesn't feel like he had a hard time. Some acted out in class, but I had a good relationship with them outside of class which probably did help. "I've asked you three times to sit down and work on your homework." They thought I was being fair, not just a mean teacher.

There's some contradiction here. He mentions multiple times that he had serious problems with management, but now says that they thought he was fair and his relationships helped him....even though he had to ask multiple times.

ME:

How did you match up with cooperating teacher?

JACK:

I don't think it was a very good match. She doesn't challenge herself to think outside the box. She uses textbook activities and readings.

This approach is what he falls into, but obviously not what he thinks is best.

Multiple reasons for this. Easiest thing to do and to grade. Very clear expectations that way. Students know what to do. Calls it a "song and dance" where everyone does what the book says. Seemed like an "illusion" of learning. Nothing really sinking in.

A very negative characterization of the teacher's approach, yet it is exactly what he does with them. Interesting to explore the reasons across the different cases here....why do they fall into this "trap?" He is citing ease, time, grading, students know what to do.

Says he fell into the trap. The students never worked in groups or on difficult questions.

Several of the participants have talked about never working in groups, but I think the "or on difficult questions" is a unique comment.

They gave up on them. They wanted questions with yes or no answers.

Because of behavior problems when he gave them things they weren't used to. Says he fell to her way, because it was the only way to be productive. That way was better than chaos.

Teach her way or lose control of the class. Not clear how much of an effort he put into trying something else. Doesn't reflect on why there were behavior problems when he tried new things.

Wishes he had a model of imaginative, engaging teaching. Got stuck with her model. Which was boring and not effective.

He just referred to it as productive, though, so it can be productive without being engaging. Is effective always fun?

Also another reason: not a model to follow.

ME:

you probably didn't tell her this. but did you have conversations about why that is her approach.

JACK:

In the beginning he said he wanted to be creative. Sold it to teacher by saying, "That's what my supervisors want." That way he wasn't criticizing her. She said that was fine and said she would be inspired to mix things up too.

Immediately recognizes that her style doesn't match his. His comment to her is very interesting. Seems to fall under the university vs. the real world—haha, those crazy people from the university who think it is possible to plan engaging lessons all the time.

She saw me try four or five times and tank. So, that might have reinforced her style. So, this wasn't good in terms of professional development for the coop either.

She is a multi-tasker. Efficient. Grading papers while students are working. One of her goals was to get things done and not take them home. Her way of teaching was easy for her.

He uses language of efficiency and productivity. Students are working, not learning.

Students still struggled, but it was clear what was expected.

Ok to struggle as long as they know what they are struggling with?

ME:

Issues of diversity: gender, race. Did you match up with her there? Did she bring those issues into the classroom?

JACK:

She didn't talk about race at all. With students--they would talk about family backgrounds. Would talk about social, economic things.

Race is avoided.

Did talk about an article about tendencies of urban African American students. She thought it was interesting.

Calls them tendencies...interesting.

Asking vs. telling people what to do. Would you get out your book vs. Get out your book.

I think Kate mentions this too. Why is this always the one that serves as the example? Of course, it does relate to management.

Viewed as not authoritative to urban students. If you ask, it leaves it open. You don't have to get out your book.

He says to urban students here, not African-American students.

She thought it was interesting.

Did some Black History month activities. School-wide focus. Talked about something controversial.

He asked students why we celebrate Black history month and they had bland answers: To learn about George Washington Carver. To learn about achievements of African Americans.

Again, it is the classic example of Carver.

Then asked why we have Black History month and not White history month. Why is there a month devoted to Black History. Students gave blank looks. The coop teacher looked uncomfortable. He talked about how white people wrote the books about white people. This was a response to that.

Not sure how "controversial" this actually is. Is it controversial because it claims our history books are racist? Is it controversial because he is speaking against Black history month in a sense?

It surprising to me that the students gave blank looks. Jack's view is that he is educating these students about something.

The ideal would be to have everything incorporated, not separate months. Study an integrated history.

Whose ideal is this? Where does it come from? Is it the only possible answer?

That was a big idea for these kids. Seemed to make the teacher uncomfortable. "I don't think it is normal to talk to kids that age about current discrimination and injustice." We talk about it in the past.

Why does he think it is not normal? I would say that kids that age talk, think, know about discrimination in the present. The Discomfort comes from being White? He doesn't directly say this.

ME:

What was the kids' reaction?

JACK:

He didn't ask for their thoughts, "just provided the insight."

Did notice some light bulbs, seemed to make sense. That people in power write the history.

Wow! Providing insight. Not sure how to describe this approach. Educating the oppressed?

Would asking for their thoughts have made it even more controversial?

ME:

How did the writing project go (Black history)? How did it go? What did they get out of it?

JACK:

Doesn't think what he said about the month changed the assignment or what they thought about it.

Gives this introduction to Black history month, but then gives them a very traditional Black history research project. Questions it, but then does exactly what he was questioning. Changing the assignment might have changed what they thought about it.

They just thought of it as another thing to get done to get through.

Some student chose contemporary artists: 50 cent. They seemed interested. Hoped they would be interested.

The goal is engagement.

The people who chose GWC were bored and the people that wrote about Germaine Dupris were engaged.

Doesn't know what was accomplished. They temporarily learned some facts about one African American. Some research and writing skills.

So where is the fault? Why didn't they accomplish much? Why does he not know what or if they learned anything?

ME:

What other kinds of things happened at the school for BHM?

JACK:

They read a quote every morning for announcements.

Different classes hung up projects.

Classes were reading books related to Black History. 8th grade: the Contender, about a black teenager in the Bronx.

Lots of teachers were making connections.

ME:

The letters to their representative. I was struck by the issues they picked: war, Darfur. Why did they pick those? How did you set it up? One girl's letter was fairly inflammatory. how did those come up? Was it good...?

JACK:

Mostly guided them.

Did not talk about the Iraq war. He didn't want to make statements that a parent might disagree with.

Concern is about what parents will think.

Several students asked if they could write about it. Good, but didn't want to put his opinion out there.

There's a difference between bringing it up and putting your opinion out there.

Started by reading a story about women's suffrage. Injustice. Talked about what were injustices in their lives.

He easily asks for their input and brings this story into their lives in this instance. What is the difference between this and the Black history month example? Race vs. gender?

Talking about injustices in their lives was what he was afraid to do earlier.

for some it was about being able to play sports. others it was smoking was dangerous.

i provided the example of darfur. Not a topic that parents would complain about. might disagree about what to do, but it is happening.

His example pushes them to think more globally, but in a way that he views as uncontroversial.

Thought that would stretch their scope.

All the information about Darfur had come from me. It was so terrible, that it stuck with them. Several chose that.

Idea was to connect with the story and think about being active citizens.

I'm not sure, should find out if this was an activity that went with the story in the book or something that he planned on his own. Obviously, he is using a story from the textbook, but is he planning his own activities and goals to go with it.

They thought Congressman wouldn't read letters.

He told them that in seven years they would vote and have a responsibility. So they'll listen to you because you'll be deciding in the future.

Think that was a good message. Kids believed it. Says he felt like he was lying a little. Congressman may not read them. Good idea to foster.

Need to share their opinions and be active citizens.

Good use of time. Kids were into it.

Integrated things. They wrote a business letter. Wrote address in the right place, used colon.

Why was this important? Is that what the lesson was about and it was just a fancy way of doing that? Look at the goals/objectives in his plans.

Unclear how the controversial topics would go.

One student's family was pro war. and others who had heard that it was a bad thing. Told them they were entitled to their opinions and could discuss them with their parents, but we aren't going to go there right now.

The whole lesson is about being citizens in a democracy, but he avoids disagreements and a topic that people have opinions about. Does this message get to the kids?

ME:

Now you are half way through student teaching. What has changed, in terms of your ideas about teaching?

JACK:

Unclear what factors make the two placements so different. Elem v. Middle? School atmosphere?

Don't know that I would want to teach 6th at school 1. I might if I was there from the beginning of the year. With my classroom and my rules.

Reinforces desire to teacher 4th/5th grade. Thought about middle school. You can be sarcastic. They are a little more grown up. But this makes me want to move away from middle and go to upper elementary.

So he blames a bad experience on the fact that it was middle school...is there more to it though? Would he feel the same way if he had been at middle school in the suburbs? Was it just that school? That teacher's style?

"if I was there from the beginning of the year" – similar to many other comments, there is a sense that there is only so much you can do as a student teacher...that so much is out of your control...that time is an issue. Lack of good teaching is blamed on the students,

the school, and the coop teacher, not on the student teacher themselves. Does this run throughout?

ME:

What makes the two "environments" so different?

JACK:

Probably an elementary middle thing.

Is it? Is about other things too?

The teachers are more like care takers.

In middle the responsibility is on the student. Teachers have to draw a hard line.

They have to? They do?

School now is more nurturing. The other was more about kids being little grown ups, more responsible.

His description indicates that it was more about them being little workers.

The school has a more positive atmosphere than middle school, which was negative.

Negativity between students and teachers. Big difference.

Doesn't analyze where this negativity comes from. It is obviously about more than the fact that this is a middle school, right? But, I hear that a lot. Is this something worth exploring in terms of questions about having multiple placements? What is the difference between having a middle and elem placement vs. having two elem. Placements?

I haven't seen a lot of misbehavior. and what I've seen is easy to deal with. It isn't escalating.

One kid went to office for fighting over football at recess.

The whole atmosphere in younger grades is more positive. Don't know why that is.

....

I don't know how to be positive to kids at school 1 without it coming off cheesy or just not working.

Does well at describing the difference, but isn't able to map on what is going on in school 2 to school 1. Why is he unable to be positive with school 1?

ME:

Do you notice it too in the teachers apart from their students?

JACK:

The faculty at 1 was nice and open and welcoming. They were friendly to each other. Shared resources.

What I'm reading between the lines is that the faculty had an us vs. them attitude.

Only been to one lunch at new school. The difference was, at 1, the teachers bitched about what all the things the kids did wrong. At 2, they sat around and gossiped about other teachers. both were entertaining.

Talks about the teachers they were gossiping about....drama about stealing books.

ME:

Anything that clicked during placement 1 or anything that didn't line up with what you've learned here?

JACK:

Most of my classes were for younger grades. So the sixth grade was apart from a lot of what he had studied.

So part of the difficulty with middle school has to do with preparation. We aren't preparing them for middle grades—but what is that about exactly?

I don't know. Can't think of anything.

I'm sure a lot didn't click. I have forgotten a lot too.

ME:

What did you not get that you wish you would have, besides classroom management?

JACK:

You can rule out content. Can't expect Peabody to teach us all of that. Teachers should do that on their own.

Don't see a lot of varied instruction. Mentioned in learning design template. Meeting different needs in the class.

One issue is a lack of models of what we are telling them to do. Differentiate, but never show them what that looks like.

Even with the reminder on the lesson plan, I'm not confident that I do it.

Don't see other teachers doing it. Short of students going to a resource room. Varied instruction.

Mentions issues of grading. Everyone loves rubrics, but in terms of grading logistics.

How many grades do you need for it to be valid? How often should you give grades?

That whole practical element is ignored. Needs to be taught or just given on a sheet of paper?

This runs throughout the interviews. Grading is a big concern, coming from the coops I assume.

Finds himself falling back on the mentor to know what to do. Asks the teacher how many grades to collect, how much to cover, etc.

ME:

Thanks.

APPENDIX B

POST-OBSERVATION CONFERENCE REPORT FORM

Post-Observation Conferencing Form

Teacher Candidate: _____ School: _____
 Grade/Subject: _____ Conference Facilitator: _____
 Summary of lesson discussed:

Ratings for Professional Growth Profile:

NE = Not Evident E = Emergent

P = Proficient A = Accomplished

Professional Growth Profile

SUBJECT MATTER KNOWLEDGE FOR TEACHING:

_____ Possesses a solid command of the subject matter, focuses on the big ideas, core conceptual structures and their interrelationships, and makes connections across subject matter knowledge

_____ Designs and organizes subject matter knowledge to make it accessible to students, recognizes landmarks in the development of student understanding and scaffolds subject matter knowledge as it relates to students' trajectories of development

UNDERSTANDING OF LEARNERS AND LEARNING:

_____ Plans for learners unique strengths, resources, goals and motivations; envisions developmental learning trajectories and plans learning experiences that support students' progress along these trajectories; understands and draws appropriately on learning theory to support their investigations and analyses of student learning and planning for instruction; identifies and seeks to learn about students' linguistic, social and cultural histories and repertoires

_____ Enters into the learners' thinking/reasoning as reflected in learners' talk and work and uses these insights into learners to inform planning and instruction; focuses on engaging students in understanding big ideas; aims to utilize student strengths as resources for teaching and learning

CONCEPTIONS OF THE PRACTICE AND PROFESSION OF TEACHING:

_____ Recognizes role in supporting and/or constraining learning through the conditions and opportunities he or she makes available to students

_____ Recognizes that teaching and learning are nested within a broader education system

_____ Recognizes that learning involves an ongoing critical analysis and revision of one's own practice, and pursuit of other opportunities for learning and renewal, are central of one's role as a teacher

INITIAL REPERTOIRE IN CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTION AND ASSESSMENT:

_____ Uses a carefully chosen set of research-based instructional and assessment strategies, curriculum materials, and classroom management techniques to support work with all students

_____ Demonstrates abilities to both modify existing materials to support students' learning of subject matter and to develop new materials

_____ Uses a variety of assessment techniques (formal and informal) to collect data on student progress and can interpret these data to inform setting, planning and instruction for all students

_____ Can plan simultaneously for instruction, management and assessment to create an optimal learning environment for all students

Commendations:

Recommendations:

Goals and Strategies for Continued Growth:

This report was written in collaboration and represents issues and strategies upon which we have agreed

Teacher Candidate's Signature _____ Date _____

Top Copy - Teacher Candidate

Facilitator's Signature _____ Date _____

Middle Copy - Official File

Bottom Copy - Mentor

APPENDIX C

STUDENT TEACHING TEAM CONFERENCE REPORT FORM

Teacher Candidate: _____
University Mentor: _____
Mentor Teacher: _____
School: _____
Grade/Subjects: _____

Directions:

Each team member will prepare for a team conference by considering the Teacher Candidate's capabilities in the main areas of teaching as outlined on the professional growth profile. In preparing narrative comments consider the specific items listed within each category as a guide and considering both areas of strength and challenge demonstrated by the Teacher Candidate. Recommend a level of competency according to the indicators listed below.

During the team conference, recommendations will be discussed and evidence shared in support of each recommendation. The team will reach a consensus rating and evidence will be noted. During the first team conference underline the agreed upon level of competency. During the second team conference circle the agreed upon level of competency.

At the conclusion of each team conference, the teacher candidate should articulate goals for the future. The Mentors can offer suggestions and supports in relation to the goals identified.

At the conclusion of the team conference, all team members should review the written report and indicate that each team member agrees with the statements written on the form by writing their initials in the appropriate space in the chart above.

Descriptive Criteria for Rating Teacher Candidates:

Not Evident: The candidates demonstrate limited and surface understanding of the content as exemplified in their performances as teachers. This level performance provides limited or no evidence that the candidate has knowledge of content, has the proficiencies to apply that knowledge to teaching, or can have a positive impact on the learning of all his/her students.

Emergent: The emergent level of performance provides evidence that teacher candidates' proficiencies are developing with opportunities for ongoing practice. The teacher candidate has knowledge of content, has the proficiencies to apply that knowledge to teaching, or can have a positive impact on the learning of all his/her students. The candidates have enthusiasm and attitudes appropriate to successful teaching and are willing to create with their mentor teacher, university mentor, and other relevant professionals a plan to remove any weaknesses and raise their performance to a proficient level.

Proficient: The candidates demonstrate an accurate understanding of the content, as exemplified in their performances as teachers. The proficient performance provides clear evidence that the teacher candidate has knowledge of the content, has the proficiencies to apply that knowledge to teaching situations, has enthusiasm and attitudes appropriate to successful teaching, and can have a positive impact on the learning of all his/her students. The candidate is open to constructive feedback from mentor teachers, university mentors, and other members of the profession and modifies their teaching accordingly.

Accomplished: The candidates have an accurate and deep understanding of the content as exemplified in their performances as teachers. The level of accomplished performance provides clear, convincing, and consistent evidence that the teacher candidate has knowledge of the content, has the proficiencies to apply that knowledge to teaching situations, has enthusiasm and attitudes appropriate to successful teaching, and has a consistent positive impact on learning of all his/her students. The candidate is a reflective practitioner. He or she examines his or her practice and is open to constructive feedback from mentor teachers, university mentors, and other members of the profession.

Subject Matter Knowledge for Teaching:

I. Candidates who are accomplished have a deep understanding of the content areas to be taught. They:

- possess a solid command of the subject matter
- focus on the big ideas (core conceptual structures) and their interrelationships
- make connections across subject matter knowledge
- create opportunities to teach for interdisciplinary study

Team Conference 1

Team Conference 2

Evidence:

Competency Level (Underline at team conference 1 and Circle at team conference 2):

In Planning	<i>Not Evident</i>	<i>Emergent</i>	<i>Proficient</i>	<i>Accomplished</i>
In Teaching	<i>Not Evident</i>	<i>Emergent</i>	<i>Proficient</i>	<i>Accomplished</i>

II. Candidates who are accomplished make content accessible to students through an ability to:

- design and organization of subject matter knowledge
- recognize landmarks in the development of student understanding
- scaffold subject matter knowledge as related to students' trajectories of development

Team Conference 1

Team Conference 2

Evidence:

Competency Level (Underline at team conference 1 and Circle at team conference 2):

In Planning	<i>Not Evident</i>	<i>Emergent</i>	<i>Proficient</i>	<i>Accomplished</i>
In Teaching	<i>Not Evident</i>	<i>Emergent</i>	<i>Proficient</i>	<i>Accomplished</i>

Understanding of Learners and Learning

I. Candidates who are accomplished in **planning** as it reflects their understanding of learners and learning:

- plan for learners' unique strengths, resources, goals and motivations
- envision developmental learning trajectories and plan learning experiences that support students progress along these trajectories
- understand and draw appropriately on learning theory to support their investigations and analyses of student learning and planning for instruction and
- identify and seek to learn about students' linguistic, social and cultural histories and repertoires

Team Conference 1

Team Conference 2

Evidence:

Competency Level (Underline at team conference 1 and Circle at team conference 2):

Not Evident

Emergent

Proficient

Accomplished

II. Candidates who are accomplished in **implementing** their plans as they reflect their understanding of learners and learning:

- enter into the learners' thinking/reasoning as reflected in learners' talk and work and use these insights into learners to inform planning and instruction
- focus on engaging students in understanding big ideas and
- aim to utilize student strengths as resources for teaching and learning

Team Conference 1

Team Conference 2

Evidence:

Competency Level (Underline at team conference 1 and Circle at team conference 2):

Not Evident

Emergent

Proficient

Accomplished

Conceptions of the Practice and Profession of Teaching

I. Candidates recognize their role in supporting and/or constraining learning through the conditions and opportunities they make available to students. Candidate who are accomplished:

- demonstrate enthusiasm for teaching and learning
- develop rapport with all students
- encourage student attendance
- support students in developing a positive self-identity
- demonstrate respect for all cultures, learners and families through collaborative relationships with parents and members of the broader community and
- attend to individual differences, interests and capabilities as reflected in differentiated planning, teaching and/or assessment

Team Conference 1

Team Conference 2

Evidence:

Competency Level (Underline at team conference 1 and Circle at team conference 2):

In Planning	<i>Not Evident</i>	<i>Emergent</i>	<i>Proficient</i>	<i>Accomplished</i>
In Teaching	<i>Not Evident</i>	<i>Emergent</i>	<i>Proficient</i>	<i>Accomplished</i>

Conceptions of the Practice and Profession of Teaching

II. Candidates recognize that teaching and learning are nested within a broader education system. Candidates who are accomplished:

- exhibit professional poise and confidence
- demonstrate respect for their teaching colleagues
- align teaching and learning practices with professional standards
- comply with school, district, state and federal guidelines for professional conduct
- adhere to the Professional Code of Ethics
- cooperate with school staff and administration

Evidence: *Team Conference 1* *Team Conference 2*

Competency Level (Underline at team conference 1 and Circle at team conference 2):
 In Planning Not Evident Emergent Proficient Accomplished
 In Teaching Not Evident Emergent Proficient Accomplished

III. Candidates recognize that learning involves an ongoing critical analysis and revision of one's practice and pursuit of other opportunities for learning and renewal, are central to one's role as a teacher. Candidates who are accomplished:

- accept and act on constructive feedback
- engage in self-assessment
- initiate opportunities to extend their understanding of teaching and learning
- displays resourcefulness and creativity in constructing a rich learning experience within the context of the student teaching experience

Evidence: *Team Conference 1* *Team Conference 2*

Competency Level (Underline at team conference 1 and Circle at team conference 2):
Not Evident Emergent Proficient Accomplished

Initial Repertoire in Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

I. Candidates use a carefully chosen set of research-based instructional and assessment strategies, curriculum materials, and classroom management techniques to support their work with all students. Candidates who are accomplished

- develop a full complement of planning, preparation, and teaching practice that reflects their solid command of subject matter knowledge for teaching and their ability to understand and learners and learning
- plan curricular and instructional tools based on their deeper function in supporting learning by matching tools and approach to a variety of learning goals and needs

Team Conference 1

Team Conference 2

Evidence:

Competency Level (Underline at team conference 1 and Circle at team conference 2):

Not Evident

Emergent

Proficient

Accomplished

II. Candidates demonstrate abilities to both modify existing materials to support students' learning of subject matter and to develop new materials. Candidates possess skills to create modifications and accommodations for students who require them. Candidates who are accomplished:

- give clear sequences, directions, and/or explanations
- implement effective questioning techniques
- include appropriate wait time following questions
- facilitate group discussion relevant to and supporting learning goals
- monitor learners' responses and adjust teaching accordingly

Team Conference 1

Team Conference 2

Evidence:

Competency Level (Underline at team conference 1 and Circle at team conference 2):

Not Evident

Emergent

Proficient

Accomplished

Initial Repertoire in Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

III. Candidates use a variety of assessment techniques (formal and informal) to collect data on student progress and can interpret these data to informal-setting, planning and instruction for all students. Candidates who are accomplished:

- use a variety of formal and informal assessment strategies to inform specific procedures for reteaching, if necessary, and to refine future lessons
- align assessment strategies with state and national standards
- allow for alternative means of achieving learning goal

Team Conference 1

Team Conference 2

Evidence:

Competency Level (Underline at team conference 1 and Circle at team conference 2):

In Planning	<u>Not Evident</u>	<u>Emergent</u>	<u>Proficient</u>
	<i>Accomplished</i>		
In Teaching	<u>Not Evident</u>	<u>Emergent</u>	<u>Proficient</u>
	<i>Accomplished</i>		

IV. Candidates can plan simultaneously for instruction, management and assessment to create an optimal learning environment for all students. Candidates who are accomplished:

- create a classroom environment that optimizes learning activities
- develop relationships with students that motivate and engage them in the learning
- conduct instruction and maintains teaching momentum
- manages student work as a measure of accountability

Team Conference 1

Team Conference 2

Evidence:

Competency Level (Underline at team conference 1 and Circle at team conference 2):

In Planning	<u>Not Evident</u>	<u>Emergent</u>	<u>Proficient</u>	<u>Accomplished</u>
In Teaching	<u>Not Evident</u>	<u>Emergent</u>	<u>Proficient</u>	<u>Accomplished</u>

APPENDIX D

TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING BETWEEN JACK AND MARY
REGARDING JACK'S UNIT PLAN

1 Mary: Ok. Um. I spent a lot of time digging for- through what- what you had.
2 Jack: Hm hmm.
3 Mary: You missed a couple key pieces.
4 Jack: Ok.
5 Mary: And we already pretty much had that conversation.
6 Jack: Alright.
7 Mary: Before we even saw your unit plan. Let it be understood that I'm hearing really
8 good things about where you are in this placement.
9 Jack: Ok.
10 Mary: Um. But this is history so-
11 Jack: Alright.
12 Mary: We're gonna take a look and...
13 ((Jack looks through the evaluation form and the comments.))
14 Mary: And it won't take long. You can see.
15 Jack: Right...Ok. Any? I mean I can read through what-
16 Mary: You can read the back.
17 Jack: The back. Ok. Well there's no reflection because the unit- the actual lessons that I
18 taught were different from the lessons that I turned in with the unit.
19 Mary: But. At some point you...you didn't teach anything out of this unit?
20 Jack: No I mean I taught *A Wrinkle in Time* but I didn't teach it the same way that it was
21 presented in this unit.
22 Mary: Why not?
23 Jack: Umm. A lot of the things that I- that I wanted to do I didn't think would be
24 controlled. So there were some things like taking them outside to the- uh- like no
25 that wasn't related to *A Wrinkle in Time*. That was an additional- um- an
26 additional social studies lesson but something like that I didn't teach because I
27 didn't think I would have been able to control twenty-six kids outside on the high
28 school track. Um. With the behavior problems that we've had. And so those
29 were...I mean it was a decision that was presented that we could either turn in the
30 unit- we could either turn in lessons we had taught or we could turn in units I
31 mean lessons that we hadn't taught. And so I chose to turn in lessons that-
32 Mary: That was within the context of the fact that we had some situations where uh we
33 had some students that did not have- There were two reasons for that.
34 Jack: Ok.
35 Mary: One was students that were in situations where they were so restricted by the
36 school that they didn't really have opportunity to step outside of that. But even in
37 those cases where a unit was designed there were some sample lessons of units
38 that were taught. And reflection pieces to go with that.
39 Jack: Ok. Well I- Nowhere within the information that I heard in class or saw on the
40 syllabus was- uh was I given the information that I needed to turn in any lessons
41 with reflections. And um I understand if 25 other people did it then. You know I
42 missed it. But that was never said. And it will certainly be different the second
43 time around. Um. I'm committing myself to putting a whole lot more effort and
44 you will see a lot more from me in the second unit. But that was not asked of me.
45 Mary: So even the- even the lessons that were not in your unit per se-
46 Jack: Ok.

47 Mary: Were lessons just out of your head that you would like to have taught some day if
48 you felt like teaching them.

49 Jack: Right. I mean I looked at the sixth grade standards. I thought about my students in
50 my class. I said. I looked at the requirements for what needed to be turned in.
51 Well I need a PE lesson. I need lessons that integrate different subjects and I made
52 a lesson that I thought would- would do that.

53 Mary: So your understanding...was that even though an addendum was required that
54 you- you obviously didn't need an addendum cause you hadn't taught anything
55 that you had written about.

56 Jack: Right....And I understand the value of an addendum. I certainly. I consider myself
57 a reflective teacher. After I finish- After I finish teaching a lesson I talk with- I
58 talk with my mentor teacher about what she thinks went well what she would do
59 differently. Um. For instance yesterday I was teaching a lesson and there were
60 two students that typically have cooperative learning problems and their working
61 with their table groups and both of them kind of blew up and stormed off and sat
62 in the corner and- and I chose to go on with the lesson and work with the people
63 that were. Um. That were tuned in and willing to work. And after that um. After
64 that finished and they came back and um and we finished the lesson I had a long
65 conversation with my mentor teacher about would she have handled that
66 differently. Would she have stopped and tried to get them back in. Would she
67 have tried to use that as a learning tool to um. To really facilitate them being able
68 to work cooperatively with their table groups in the future. And- and so I consider
69 myself a reflective teacher. And I understand that what I turned in may not. Well
70 does not show that. But again what I turned in was what the syllabus asked. I
71 mean I really-

72 Mary: You didn't turn in- You didn't turn in-

73 Jack: We were told in class. I asked multiple questions. You know we had hour and a
74 half long question and answer sessions where you know I asked op- I asked
75 clearly. So. You're telling me that what we turn in does not have to be what we
76 teach. That we can write a unit. That we can you know. As long as we have a unit
77 of ten or more lessons. As long as we have the six different subject areas included
78 that we can turn those in and I remember Deb saying that. I mean she said that
79 nobody was getting extra work because if you did the addendum on the lessons
80 you taught that was the extra work. If you wrote separate lessons for your unit on
81 top of the lessons you were teaching that was your extra work. And so your
82 choices were to do the unit outside of the lessons you were teaching or to do the
83 addendum on the lessons that you were teaching. Did- I mean did- That was
84 certainly told to this class.

85 Mary: You- Did you write addendum lessons like the- I mean the thing is. You wrote no
86 reflections either on the added lessons.

87 Jack: Right.

88 Mary: Or the unit.

89 Jack: Right. Those lessons weren't taught to you know Ms. Fleming's class in sixth
90 grade.

91 Mary: Well then. For- The problem is of course where do I find the information to be
92 able to make a judgment call on this given-

93 Jack: Right.
94 Mary: Given absolutely nothing to work with. And you did- you did have this.
95 Jack: Right. But I also had the. You know I also had the conversations that we had had.
96 Where your choices were to either. I mean you know. Do you remember telling us
97 about the two choices of doing the addendum or writing additional lessons on the
98 side of the lessons you were teaching.
99 Mary: Yeah. My understanding of what was told was that if you could not implement
100 your unit and you had those extra lessons you wrote the addendum for those extra
101 lessons. If you taught your unit but because you were limited by the subject
102 content area that you were responsible for that you could not write- do-
103 implement say a science lesson or you had those extra lessons you didn't need an
104 addendum for that.
105 Jack: Ok.
106 Mary: Do you see? I mean do you see the sense in that?
107 Jack: Yes. I understand now I wish that I had been presented with that more clearly.
108 You know six weeks ago. Because I wouldn't have- I would have turned in a very
109 different looking lesson. A very different looking unit. But I honestly turned in
110 what I thought was something that met the requirements for what was being asked
111 of me. And- and I un- I mean clearly I understand and I see that that's not the
112 case.
113 Mary: Alright. That was just because they are in unique situations. And-
114 Jack: Right. Ok and that needs- that certainly in the future needs to be much more
115 clearly stated because I don't- I mean-
116 Mary: Everybody else understood that.
117 Jack: Right. I don't know if I just. You know I just heard what I wanted to hear or what
118 but from everything that I heard and from our multiple question and answer
119 sessions I truly thought when I turned in my unit I was turning in something that-
120 that met the requirements. Maybe not exceeded the requirements but certainly
121 something that met the requirements of the assignment. Based on- not based on
122 the rubric but based on our conversation and based on the description in the
123 syllabus.

REFERENCES

- Achinstein, B., & Barrett, A. (2004). (Re)framing classroom contexts: How new teachers and mentors view diverse learners and challenges of practice. *Teachers College Record, 106*(4), 716-747.
- Alvermann, D. E., Moon, J. S., & Hagood, M. C. (1999). *Popular culture in the classroom: Teaching and researching critical media literacy*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Anagnostopoulos, D., Smith, E. R., Basmadjian, K. G. (2007). Bridging the university-school divide: Horizontal expertise and the “two worlds pitfall.” *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(2), 138-152.
- Anderson, N. A., & Radencich, M. C. (2001). The value of feedback in early field experience: Peer, teacher, and supervisor coach. *Action in Teacher Education, 23*(3), 66-74.
- Anderson, S. E. (1998). Integrating multimedia multicultural materials into an educational psychology course. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 6*(2-3), 169-182.
- Artiles, A. J., Barreto, R. M., Pena, L., & McClafferty, K. (1998). Pathways to teacher learning in multicultural contexts: A longitudinal case study of two novice bilingual teachers in urban schools. *Remedial and Special Education, 19*(2), 70-90.
- Artiles, A. J., & McClafferty, K. (1998). Learning to teach culturally diverse learners: Charting change in preservice teachers’ thinking about effective teaching. *Elementary School Journal, 98*(3), 189-220.
- Artiles, A. J., Trent, S. C., Hoffman-Kipp, P., & Lopez-Torres, L. (2000). From individual acquisition to cultural-historical practices in multicultural teacher education. *Remedial and Special Education, 21*(2), 79-89.
- Ball, A. F. (2000a). Empowering pedagogies that enhance the learning of multicultural students. *Teachers College Record, 102*(6), 1006-1034.
- Ball, A. F. (2000b). Preparing teachers for diversity: Lessons learned from the U. S. and South Africa. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16*(4), 491-509.
- Banks, J. A. (2006). *Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum, and teaching* (5th edition). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Becket, D. R. (1998). Increasing the number of Latino and Navajo teachers in hard-to-staff schools. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61, 68-76.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Bieler, D., & Thomas, A. B. (2009). Finding freedom in dialectic inquiry: New teachers' responses to silencing. *Teachers College Record*, 111(4).
- Blanton, M. L., Berenson, S. B., & Norwood, K. S. (2001). Using classroom discourse to understand a prospective mathematics teacher's developing practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(2), 227-242.
- Bloome, D., & Bailey, F. M. (1992). Studying language and literacy through events, particularity, and intertextuality. In R. Beach, J. L. Green, M. L. Kamil, & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Multidisciplinary perspectives on literacy research* (pp. 181-210). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Borko, H., & Mayfield, V. (1995). The roles of the cooperating teacher and university supervisor in learning to teach. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 11(5), 501-518.
- Bowman, C. L., & McCormick, S. (2000). Comparison of peer coaching versus traditional supervision effects. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 93(4), 256-261.
- Brandt, D., & Clinton, K. (2002). Limits of the local: Expanding perspectives on literacy as a social practice. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 34(3), 337-356.
- Britzman, D. P. (2003). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach* (Revised ed.). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Burant, T. J., & Kirby, D. (2002). Beyond classroom-based early field experiences: Understanding an "educative practicum" in an urban school community. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 561-575.
- Causey, V. E., Thomas, C. D., & Armento, B. J. (2000). Cultural diversity is basically a foreign term to me: The challenges of diversity for preservice teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(1), 33-45.
- Chevalier, M., & Houser, N. O. (1997). Preservice teachers' multicultural self-development through adolescent fiction. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 40(6), 426-436.
- Clark, C., & Medina, C. (2000). How reading and writing literacy narratives affect preservice teachers' understanding of literacy, pedagogy, and multiculturalism. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(1), 63-76.

- Clarke, J. (2002). A new kind of symmetry: Actor-network theories and the new literacy studies. *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 34(2), 107-122.
- Clift, R. T., & Brady, P. (2005). Research on methods courses and field experiences. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education* (pp. 309-424). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2001). The outcomes question in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 527-546.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). Assessing assessment in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 54(3), 187-191.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2005). The new teacher education: For better or worse? *Educational Researcher*, 34(7), 3-17.
- Cochran-Smith, M., Davis, D., & Fries, M. K. (2003). Multicultural teacher education: Research, practice, and policy. In J. A. Banks & C. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. *Review of Research in Education*, 24(1), 249-305.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. M. (Eds.). (2005). *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cole, M. (1998). Can cultural psychology help us think about diversity? *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 5(4), 291-304.
- Cook, L. S., Smagorinsky, P., Fry, P. G., Konopak, B., & Moore, C. (2002). Problems in developing a constructivist approach to teaching: One teacher's transition from teacher preparation to teaching. *The Elementary School Journal*, 102(5), 389-413.
- Cook, D. W., & VanCleaf, D. W. (2000). Multicultural perceptions of 1st-year elementary teachers' urban, suburban, and rural student teacher placements. *Urban Education*, 35(2), 165-174.
- Corcoran, E. (1981). Transition shock: The beginning teacher's paradox. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 32(3), 19-23.
- Costigan, A. (2004). Finding a name for what they want: A study of New York City's Teaching Fellows. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20, 129-143.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1996). The quiet revolution: Rethinking teacher development.

Educational Leadership, 53(6), 4-10.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). How teacher education matters. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(3), 166-173.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Assessing teacher education: The usefulness of multiple measures for assessing program outcomes. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57(2), 120-138.

Darling-Hammond, L., Chung, R., & Frelow, F. (2002). Variation in teacher preparation: How well do different pathways prepare teachers to teach? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(4), 286-302.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Snyder, J. (2000). Authentic assessment of teaching in context. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(5), 523-545.

Davies, R., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The social construction of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 20(1), 43-63.

Deering, T. E., & Stanutz, A. (1995). Preservice field experience as a multicultural component of a teacher education program. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 46(5), 390-394.

Duesterberg, L. M. (1998). Rethinking culture in the pedagogy and practices of preservice teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 14(5), 497-512.

Duesterberg, L. M. (1999). Theorizing race in the context of learning to teach. *Teachers College Record*, 100(4), 751-775.

Dyson, A. H. (1993). *Social worlds of children learning to write in an urban primary school*. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Education. (n.d.). Retrieved January 28, 2009 from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/agenda/education/>.

Erlanson, D. A., Harris, E. L., Skipper, B. L., & Allen, S. D. (1993). *Doing naturalistic inquiry: A guide to methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Fairbanks, C. M., Freedman, D., & Kahn, C. (2000). The role of effective mentors in learning to teach. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(2), 102-112.

Freire, P. (2002). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th anniversary edition). New York: Continuum.

Furman, J. S. (2006, November). *Discussing diversity in the student teaching semester*. Poster presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English,

Nashville, TN.

- Furman, J. S. (2008). Tensions in multicultural teacher education research: Demographics and the need to demonstrate effectiveness. *Education and Urban Society, 41*(1), 55-79.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, & practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (2nd ed.). London: Taylor & Francis.
- Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. London: Routledge.
- Gipe, J. P., Duffy, C. A., & Richards, J. C. (1989). A comparison of two types of early field experiences. *Reading Improvement, 26*(3), 254-265.
- Gladwell, M. (2008, December 15). Most likely to succeed: How do we hire when we can't tell who's right for the job? *The New Yorker*. Retrieved December 18, 2008 from <http://www.newyorker.com>.
- Glazerman, S., Mayre, D., & Decker, P. (2005). Alternatives routes to teaching: The impacts of Teach for America on student achievement and other outcomes. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 25*(1), 75-96.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goodwin, A. L. (1997). Multicultural stories: Preservice teachers' conceptions of and responses to issues of diversity. *Urban Education, 32*(1), 117-145.
- Grant, C. A., & Secada, W. G. (1990). Preparing teachers for diversity. In W. R. Houston, M. Haberman, & J. Sikula (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 403-422). Old Tappan, NJ: Macmillan.
- Grisham, D. L., Laguardia, A., & Brink, B. (2000). Partners in professionalism: Creating a quality field experience for preservice teachers. *Action in Teacher Education, 21*(4), 27-40.
- Grossman, P. (2008). Responding to our critics: From crisis to opportunity in research on teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 59*(1), 10-23.
- Grossman, P., Smagorinsky, P., & Valencia, S. (1999). Appropriating tools for teaching English: A theoretical framework for research on learning to teach. *American Journal of Education, 108*, 1-29.

- Grossman, P., Valencia, S., Evans, K., Thompson, C., Martin, S., & Place, N. (2000). *Transitions into teaching: Learning to teach writing in teacher education and beyond*. National Research Center on English Learning & Achievement.
- Groulx, J. G. (2001). Changing preservice teacher perceptions of minority schools. *Urban Education, 36*(1), 60-92.
- Gutiérrez, K., Baquedano-Lopez, P., & Tejada, C. (1999). Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. *Mind, Culture, and Activity, 6*(4), 286-303.
- Gutiérrez, K., Baquedano-Lopez, P., & Turner, M. G. (1997). Putting language back into language arts: When the radical middle meets the third space. *Language Arts, 74*(5), 368-379.
- Guyton, E. M., & Wesche, M. V. (2005). The multicultural efficacy scale: Development, item selection, and reliability. *Multicultural Perspectives, 7*(4), 21.
- Hamilton, M. (2001). Privileged literacies: Policy, institutional process and the life of the IALS. *Language and Education, 15*(2-3), 178-196.
- Hawkey, K. (1998). Mentor pedagogy and student teacher professional development: A study of two mentoring relationships. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 14*(6), 657-670.
- Hoffman, J. V., Roller, C., Maloch, B., Sailors, M., Duffy, G., & Beretvas, S. N. (2005). Teachers' preparation to teach reading and their experiences and practices in the first three years of teaching. *The Elementary School Journal, 105*(3), 267-287.
- Hollins, E. R., & Guzman, M. T. (2005). Research on preparing teachers for diverse populations. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 477-548). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Smith, T. M. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership, 60*(8), 30-33.
- Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (1992). Model standards for beginning teacher licensing and development: A resource for state dialogue. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Irvine, J. J. (2003). *Educating teachers for diversity: Seeing with a cultural eye*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Keogh, J., Dole, S., & Hudson, E. (2006). *Supervisor or mentor? Questioning the quality of pre-service teacher practicum experiences*. Unpublished manuscript,

Australian Association for Research in Education.

- Kober, N. (2001). *It takes more than testing*. Washington, DC: Center on Education Policy.
- Korthagen, F. A. J. (2004). In search of the essence of a good teacher: Towards a more holistic approach in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(1), 77-97.
- Laczko-Kerr, I., & Berliner, D. (2002). The effectiveness of Teach for America and other under-certified teachers on student academic achievement: A case of harmful public policy. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 10(37). Retrieved from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n37>.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994a). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994b). Reading between the lines and beyond the pages: A culturally relevant approach to literacy teaching. *Theory into Practice*, 31(4), 312-320.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). What does it take to be a successful teacher in a diverse classroom? *Rethinking Schools*, 15.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2008). A letter to our next President. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(3), 235-239.
- LaFramboise, K. L., & Griffith, P. L. (1997). Using research cases to examine diversity Issues with preservice teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(4), 369-382.
- Lave, J. (1996). Teaching as learning, in practice. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 3(3), 149-164.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lawrence, S. M. (1997). Beyond race awareness: White racial identity and multicultural teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 48(2), 108-117.
- Lea, V. (2004). The reflective cultural portfolio: Identifying public cultural scripts in the private voices of white student teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55(2), 116-127.
- Levine, A. (2006). *Educating school teachers*. New York: The Education Schools Project.

- Luke, A. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In L. J. Saha (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the sociology of education, Vol. 1*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Mahiri, J. (2004). *What they don't learn in school: Literacy in the lives of urban youth*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Maloch, B., Flint, A. S., Eldridge, D., Harmon, J., Loven, R., Fine, J. C., Bryant-Shanklin, M., & Martinez, M. (2003). Understandings, beliefs, and reported decision making of first-year teachers from different reading teacher preparation programs. *The Elementary School Journal, 103*(5), 431-457.
- Markley, T. (2004). Defining the effective teacher: Current arguments in education. *Essays in Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.usca.edu/essays/vol112004/markey.pdf>
- Martin, R.J., & Van Guten, D.M. (2002). Reflected identities: Applying positionality and multicultural social reconstructionism in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(1), 44-54.
- Mayes, C., Montero, F., & Cutri, R. M. (2004). First-year Latino teacher. *Multicultural Perspectives, 12*(1), 2-10.
- McFalls, E. L., & Cobb-Roberts, D. (2001). Reducing resistance to diversity through cognitive dissonance instruction: Implications for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(2), 164-172.
- McIntyre, A. (1997). Constructing an image of a white teacher. *Teachers College Record, 98*(4), 653-681.
- Milner, H. R. (2007). Race, narrative inquiry, and self-study in curriculum and teacher education. *Education and Urban Society, 39*(4), 584-609.
- Milner, H. R. (2008). Critical Race Theory and interest convergence as analytic tools in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 59*(4) 332-346.
- Moje, E. B., Ciechanowski, K. M., Kramer, K., Ellis, L., Carrillo, R., & Collazo, T. (2004). Working toward third space in content area literacy: An examination of everyday funds of knowledge and discourse. *Reading Research Quarterly, 39*(1), 38-70.
- Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 21*(2), 20-24.
- Montecinos, C. (2004). Paradoxes in multicultural teacher education research: Students of color positioned as objects while ignored as subjects. *International Journal of*

Qualitative Studies in Education, 17(2), 167-181.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (2004). *Fifty years after Brown v. Board of Education: A two-tiered education system*. Washington, D. C.

New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(1), 60-92.

Noell, G. H., Porter, B. A., Patt, R. M., & Dahir, A. (2008). *Value added assessment of teacher preparation in Louisiana: 2004-2005 to 2006-2007*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana Board of Regents. Retrieved December 17, 2008 from [http://www.regents.la.gov/Academic/TE/2008/Final%20Value-Added%20Report%20\(12.02.08\).pdf](http://www.regents.la.gov/Academic/TE/2008/Final%20Value-Added%20Report%20(12.02.08).pdf).

Noordhoff, K., & Kleinfeld, J. (1993). Preparing teachers for multicultural classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 9(1), 27-39.

Olmedo, I. M. (1997). Challenging old assumptions: Preparing teachers for inner city schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(3), 245-258.

Phelan, A. M. (2001). Power and place in teaching and teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(5), 583-597.

Reder, S., & Davila, E. (2005). Context and literacy practices. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25, 170-187.

Reynolds, A. (1992). What is competent beginning teaching? A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(1), 1-35.

Risko, V. J., Roller, C. M., Cummins, C., Bean, R. M., Block, C. C., Anders, P. L., & Flood, J. (2008). A critical analysis of research on reading teacher education. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43(3), 252-288.

Risko, V. J., Vukelich, C., & Roskos, K. (2002). Preparing teachers for reflective Practice: Intentions, contradictions, and possibilities. *Language Arts*, 80(2), 134-144.

Roberts, S. K., Jensen, S. J., & Hadjiyianni, E. (1998). Using research study groups in teacher education courses: Learning through diversity. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 41(2), 124-133.

Rogers, T., Marshall, E., & Tyson, C. A. (2006). Dialogic narratives of literacy, teaching, and schooling: Preparing literacy teachers for diverse settings. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 41(2), 202-224.

Ross, D. D., & Smith, W. (1992). Understanding preservice teachers' perspectives on

- diversity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(2), 94-103.
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rushton, S. P. (2001). Cultural assimilation: A narrative case study of student-teaching in an inner-city school. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 147-160.
- Sadowski, M. (2001). Closing the gap one school at a time. *Harvard Education Letter*, 17(3).
- Sanders, W., & Horn, P. (1998) Research findings from the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) database: Implications for educational evaluation and research. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 12(3), 247-256.
- Sleeter, C. E. (1989). Doing multicultural education across grade levels and subject areas: A case study of Wisconsin. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 5(3), 189-203.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2001a). Epistemological diversity in research on preservice teacher preparation for historically underserved children. In W. Secada (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education* (vol. 25, pp. 209-250). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2001b). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of Whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(2), 94-106.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2005). Preparing white teachers for diverse students. In *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring issues in changing contexts*.
- Sleeter, C. E., & McLaren, P. L. (1995). *Multicultural education, critical pedagogy, and the politics of difference*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Smagorinsky, P., Jakubiak, C., & Moore, C. (2008). Student teaching in the contact zone: Learning to teach amid multiple interests in a vocational English class. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(5), 442-454.
- Smagorinsky, P., Lakly, A., & Johnson, T. S. (2002). Acquiescence, accommodation, and resistance in learning to teach. *English Education*, 34(3), 187-213.
- Smith, N. B. (2002). *American reading instruction*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Soja, E. W. (1996). *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

- Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2004). Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36(1), 3-34.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tiezzi, L. J., & Cross, B. E. (1997). Utilizing research on prospective teachers' beliefs to inform urban field experiences. *Urban Review*, 29(2), 113-125.
- Ukpokodu, O. N. (2004). The impact of shadowing culturally different students on preservice teachers' disposition toward diversity. *Multicultural Education*, 12(2), 19-28.
- Valli, L. (1995). The dilemma of race: Learning to be color blind and color conscious. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 46(2), 120-130.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). *Educating culturally responsive teachers*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Walsh, K. (2006). Teacher education: Coming up empty. *Fwd.*, 3 (1), 1-6.
- What Louisiana can teach (2008, December 18). *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.newyorktimes.com>
- 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, S. M., Floden, R. E., & Ferrini-Mundy, J. (2002). Teacher preparation research: An insider's view from the outside. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(3), 190-204.
- Zeichner, K. M., & Hoeft, K. (1996). Teacher socialization for cultural diversity. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd edition, pp. 525-547). New York: Macmillan.
- Zeichner, K. M., Grant, C., Gay, G., Gillette, M., Valli, L., & Villegas, A. M. (1998). A research informed vision of good practice in multicultural teacher education: Design principles. *Theory into Practice*, 37(2), 163-171.
- Zientek, L. R. (2007). Preparing high-quality teachers: Views from the classroom. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(4), 959-1001.