

PERCEIVED IMPACT BY TEACHER CANDIDATES OF SPECIFIC SUPERVISION  
EXPERIENCES FOCUSED ON CRITICAL REFLECTION

by

Pamela Briggs

A dissertation

submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education in Curriculum and Instruction

Boise State University

August 2012

© 2012

Pamela Briggs

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE COLLEGE

**DEFENSE COMMITTEE AND FINAL READING APPROVALS**

of the dissertation submitted by

Pamela Briggs

Dissertation Title: Perceived Impact by Teacher Candidates of Specific Supervision Experiences Focused on Critical Reflection

Date of Final Oral Examination: 09 May 2012

The following individuals read and discussed the dissertation submitted by student Pamela Briggs, and they evaluated her presentation and response to questions during the final oral examination. They found that the student passed the final oral examination.

Jennifer Snow, Ph.D. Chair, Supervisory Committee

Maggie Chase, Ph.D. Member, Supervisory Committee

Susan Martin, Ph.D. Member, Supervisory Committee

Elva Reza-Lopez, Ph.D. Member, Supervisory Committee

The final reading approval of the dissertation was granted by Jennifer Snow, Ph.D., Chair of the Supervisory Committee. The dissertation was approved for the Graduate College by John R. Pelton, Ph.D., Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Teacher candidates who were willing to share their thoughts, conversations, and teaching experiences with me enriched the process of the study as well as the insights presented in this dissertation. Knowing that as a professional learning community we had the opportunity of sharing experiences with dialogue and learning communities is a bonus for me as a researcher/educator and fills me with gratefulness for them and their students. Likewise, I appreciate school principals, mentors, and district officials who supported this study.

At a university level, I am profoundly grateful for the caring and knowledgeable Boise State University professors who took the time and made the extra effort to counsel me about university issues in writing, learning, and teaching--and then provided opportunities for me to teach, supervise, serve on committees, and do research alongside them at the university. Each of these individuals has inspired me to expand my capacity.

To one particular professor and my advisor, Dr. Jennifer Snow, there are not words created to express the appreciation I feel for her smiling, encouraging, complimenting, and “nudging” to keep me moving forward even when I was ready to quit. I could not have completed this dissertation without her generous and patient reading of my work, her interest and belief in what I was studying, and the time she put aside to meet and dialogue with me.

Indeed, an endeavor such as a dissertation requires the patient support of an entire group of committee members who read and reread a researcher's work and offer their suggestions. Heartfelt thanks of appreciation for the service of all my dear and profoundly respected colleagues and committee members, Dr. Jennifer Snow, Dr. Susan Martin, Dr. Maggie Chase, and Dr. Elva-Reza Lopez. Their devotion to and love for teacher education and teacher candidates are evident in every conversation I have with them. They set the example for building the professional learning community, thoughtfully contributing to the scholarly research in teacher education and keeping balance and perspective a significant part of their personal and professional lives.

On a personal level, I am grateful to parents who never stopped learning and contributing to the world; to sisters and a brother who are amazing professionally and personally; to Jenna and Ryan who continue to teach and inspire; to Cade, Keeley, Conrad, and Clara for their fun, caring hearts and good ideas; to supportive friends and family who somehow knew when to come by, write a note, or call, and to the one above who watches over us all.

## ABSTRACT

This phenomenological case study describes the perceived impact by teacher candidates of specific supervision experiences focused on critical reflection. Within this study, critical reflection is defined as examining one's teaching practice to consider the effects of one's choices on others relevant to social and political context. The purpose of the study was to understand and describe the experience of specific supervision practices through the perceptions of teacher candidates practicing teaching during their professional year at assigned elementary schools. Data from this study focused on two main questions, "What specific supervision experiences do teacher candidates consider helpful to their teacher development?" and "How are the supervision experiences that teacher candidates find helpful manifested in their instructional thoughts, discussions, and behaviors?" This dissertation is written to inform teachers, teacher educators, and educational researchers.

The settings for the dissertation were three elementary schools where a state university placed teacher candidates for practice teaching. All the teacher candidates at the three schools were invited to participate. Data was collected over the period of one semester (from August, 2011 through December, 2011) and included multiple types of writing prompts, seminar transcripts, lesson observations and debriefings, teacher candidate journals, and field notes.

Specific supervision practices began with six seminars focused individually upon (1) analyzing teaching beliefs, where they come from and how they affect one's current teaching practices, (2) types of and purposes for reflection in teaching, (3) ways to develop dialogue and learning communities, (4) considerations for providing equity in teaching, (5) modeling of what reflective teaching can look like, and (6) post reflections and video depictions of the reflection modeling.

Findings indicate the unanimous perception of teacher candidates that the seminar and handouts related to dialogue and learning communities were the most helpful aspects of supervision experiences. As teacher candidates developed and used recommendations for building dialogue and a learning community in the classroom, their critical reflection abilities and that of their students seemed to be enhanced.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	xv
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background.....	1
Understanding the Power of Teacher Candidates' Teaching Beliefs .....	4
Low Levels of Reflection in Teacher Education .....	5
Professional Guidance in Developing Critical Reflection Skills.....	5
Systematic Structures for Developing Critical Reflection Skills.....	6
Transformative Purposes for Teacher Training in Critical Reflection .....	6
The Professional Year for Teacher Candidates .....	8
Promoting Critical Reflection in Teacher Candidates .....	9
Research Problem/Significance .....	10
Research Question .....	13
Definitions of Terms.....	13
Organization of the Dissertation .....	17
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	18
Introduction.....	18
Critical Reflection as Deep Reflection .....	19

Critical Reflection Levels and Frameworks .....	21
Characteristics of Critical Reflection.....	22
Beginning in the Basement: The Role of Autobiography in Critical Reflection.....	23
The Role of Context in Critical Reflection.....	24
Seeing Pathways Open Ahead: Modeling Critical Reflection.....	25
Overcoming Challenges and Tensions of Critical Reflection.....	28
Summary of Challenges and Tensions to Learning Critical Reflection .....	31
Teacher Education .....	32
Develop Teachers Who Become Expert in How to Teach .....	33
Foster the Development of Dialogue and Questions to Analyze Teaching ....	34
Establish an Interactive Professional Community .....	36
Foster Development of Dialogue and Question Use in Supervision .....	37
Foster Dialogue and Questions in a Learning Community.....	39
Use Technology Applications for High-Impact Preparation .....	40
Teacher Education Summary.....	41
CHAPTER 3: METHOD .....	43
Introduction.....	43
Situating the Research Question .....	44
Researcher Biography.....	44
Views of Learning.....	45
Researcher Subjectivity .....	46
Researcher Roles.....	47
Seminar Facilitator/Participant .....	47

Teacher Modeling Reflective Practice.....	47
Instruction Observer/Evaluator.....	48
Advocate for Critical Reflection.....	49
Data Collector.....	49
State University’s Teacher Education Program.....	50
Professional Year in Teacher Preparation.....	51
Participant Context.....	52
Participant Selection.....	52
Role of Participants.....	53
Placement Schools for Practice Teaching.....	53
Participant Characteristics.....	54
Madelyn Olsen Elementary.....	55
Inspiration Elementary.....	60
Littlefield Elementary.....	64
Specific Features of Supervision.....	65
Timeline for Supervision and Study.....	66
Professional Year Seminars.....	67
Supervisor Observations and Debriefings.....	77
Study Design.....	77
Establishing Consent.....	79
Data Collection and Organization.....	79
Data Analysis.....	81
Credibility Procedures.....	88

Debriefing .....	88
Exit Writing Prompts and Likert Rating Scale .....	89
Audit Trail.....	89
Study Limitations.....	90
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS .....	95
Representations of Dialogue and Learning Community Among Teacher Candidates.....	98
Dialogue with Self .....	99
Dialogue with Students.....	109
Dialogue with Colleagues.....	126
Researcher Notes on Findings .....	140
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR CRITICAL REFLECTION, DIALOGUE AND LEARNING COMMUNITIES .....	142
Summary of Study Findings .....	143
Depiction of Themes.....	144
The Variety of Practices in This Supervision Format Enhanced Teacher Candidate Access to Dialogue and Learning Community Concepts Presented in Seminar #3.....	144
Dialogue and Learning Communities Drew out Teacher Candidates’ Critical Reflections on Their Particular Situations, Relationships, and Practices .....	146
Nudges from Supervision Experiences Prompted Teacher Candidates to Focus on Student Dialogue and Learning Community.....	149
As Teacher Candidates Developed Dialogue and Learning Community Abilities, Their Critical Reflection and Their Students’ Critical Reflection Seemed to be Enhanced .....	152
Theme Discussion Conclusion.....	152
Tensions to Explore in Critical Reflection, Dialogue and Learning Communities ..	153

Role Tensions.....	154
Power Tensions.....	156
Domain Tensions .....	157
Researcher Study Reflections and Looking Ahead .....	158
REFERENCES .....	161
APPENDIX A.....	176
Recruitment Email Letter to Teacher Candidates.....	176
Recruitment Email Letter to Teacher Candidates.....	177
APPENDIX B.....	178
Consent Form to be a Research Participant .....	178
Consent Form to be a Research Participant .....	179
APPENDIX C.....	182
Intern and Student Teacher Learning Community Seminar Schedule Distributed at the Introductory Meetings Before Seminars Began.....	182
APPENDIX D.....	186
List of National School Reform Faculty Protocols Used.....	186
List of National School Reform Faculty (www.nsrffharmony, 2011) Protocols Used .....	187
APPENDIX E .....	188
Reflection Info Sheet Distributed and Discussed at Seminar #2 .....	188
APPENDIX F.....	192
Developmental Levels of Reflection (Hatton & Smith, 1995) Distributed and Discussed at Seminar #2 .....	192
APPENDIX G.....	194

Dialogue and Learning Communities in Teaching Info Sheet Distributed and Discussed in Seminar #3 .....	194
APPENDIX H.....	196
Prompt for Discussion about Equity in Teaching (Role Play) Distributed and Discussed in Seminar #4.....	196
APPENDIX I .....	198
Matching Activity: Equity Scenarios and Teaching Theory Distributed and Facilitated at Seminar #4 .....	198
APPENDIX J .....	201
Researcher Journal Sample: Modeling a Critical Reflecting Cycle of Instruction Distributed and Discussed During Seminar #5 and #6.....	201
APPENDIX K.....	206
Adaptation of Hatton and Smith’s (1995) Developmental Levels of Reflection Distributed and Discussed at Seminar #6 .....	206
APPENDIX L .....	208
Letter to Parents from Teacher Candidates about Videotaping Instruction.....	208
APPENDIX M .....	210
Recruitment Email Letter to Mentor Teachers .....	210
APPENDIX N.....	212
Principal Recruitment Email Letter .....	212
APPENDIX O.....	214
Intern and Student Teacher Lesson Observation Form.....	214
APPENDIX P.....	217
Color Codes Assigned to Teacher Candidates.....	217
Color Codes Assigned to Teacher Candidates.....	218
APPENDIX Q.....	219

Codes Used in Constant Comparative Document Analysis.....	219
APPENDIX R.....	221
Interim Case Study of Candy’s Responses to Likert Rating Scale: Prioritizing Supervision Practices .....	221
APPENDIX S.....	223
Interim Case Study of Candy’s Responses to Exit Writing Prompts (EWP) Regarding Supervision Practices: .....	223
APPENDIX T .....	225
Interim Case Study of Intern Teachers’ Responses to a Likert Rating Scale of Supervision Experiences .....	225
APPENDIX U.....	227
Interim Case Study of Student Teachers’ Responses to a Likert Rating Scale: Prioritizing Supervision Experiences.....	227

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Teacher Candidates and School Placement Demographics .....	55
Table 2.	Supervision and Study Timeline .....	67
Table 3.	Initial Units of Analysis Used to Identify Impact of Supervisors.....	82
Table 4.	Ways Documents Were Analyzed to Answer Research Questions .....	87
Table 5.	Percentage of Participants Citing Supervision Experiences as Helpful or Very Helpful .....	96
Table 6.	Participant Pathways to Using and/or Development of Dialogue and Learning Communities.....	98

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

### **Background**

Teacher reflection can potentially move us toward a more refined description and understanding of how to transform individuals from students of education into indispensable educators. (Pultorak & Barnes, 2009, p. 44)

Typically, reflection is a process of thinking carefully or deeply about the influence of one's past and present experiences while implying ensuing change (Oxford English Dictionary, 2011). Thus, teacher reflection suggests evaluating the influence of a teacher candidate's past and present experiences to consider making changes to enhance their instruction. Although the concept of reflection in teaching continues to evolve, teacher educators generally agree that reflection is a vital part of good teaching (Dana & Yendol-Silva, 2003; Orland-Barak & Yinon, 2007; Schon, 1987; Zeichner & Liston, 1987). Reflection can prompt teachers toward enhanced understandings and educational improvements. Specifically, teacher reflection can make two significant contributions to education by: helping teachers in developing professional proficiency and promoting social justice or equity (Orland-Barak & Yinon, 2007; Proce, 2006; Tse, 2007; Walkington, 2005).

To enhance proficiency, the concept of reflective practice suggests that rather than teaching a lesson mechanically and moving on, educators continually examine the quality and purpose of their instruction. As Sockett (2008) found, reflective teachers are

constantly testing the theories behind their own teaching practices to help them become more proficient teachers. Likewise, teaching proficiency is enhanced when reflective teachers constantly evaluate what their students think and understand and then redesign instruction to adjust to what students have or haven't yet learned (Darling-Hammond, 2008). Thus, reflective teaching suggests modification to the curriculum based on the needs of students--all students. As teachers employ the reiterative process of reflection to examine and reexamine how to meet all students' needs, teachers are in effect promoting the life chances of all students and supporting equity or social justice in education (Orland-Barak & Yinon, 2007; Proce, 2006; Tse, 2007; Walkington, 2005).

Although reflection is a vital aspect of teaching and teacher education for multiple reasons, there are problems that prompt calls for reform. For example, after examining several teacher education programs, Rodgers and Scott (2008) found reflection was important to help teacher candidates form understandings from their experiences, maintain a questioning disposition toward authorities, and construct their professional identities. However, teacher candidates felt that teacher educators in the programs often left the process of reflection undefined (Rodgers & Scott, 2008). Therefore, though reflection is a goal of teacher education programs, guiding teacher candidates in knowing what reflection is and how to use it has been fraught with challenges (Hatton & Smith, 1995). If teacher educators leave the definition of reflection obscure and the process of reflection undefined, teachers are not likely to use it effectively for either developing their own professional capacities or the capacities of their students. Therefore, a major goal of teacher education programs includes guiding teacher candidates and classroom teachers in understanding the meaning and process of reflectivity (Pultorak & Barnes,

2009), even though teacher education research argues that there is a lack of clarity on how to do this effectively.

Sometimes, to move forward, it helps to look at where one has already been. Before reflection in teaching became a desired practice, teacher education programs were more focused on training teachers to “behave in a certain way, rather than promoting them to think and understand their underlying reasons for choosing certain strategies for meeting the changing needs of their students” (Pultorak & Barnes, 2009, p. 35), which translated into the classroom as “the curriculum was provided and it was taught.” With the change toward reflection in education, however, the focus has been on thinking about *what* is being taught, *why*, and to *whom* it is being taught, all within the *context* of how it relates to the culture and surroundings of the students being taught so that instruction is most effective for all students (Pultorak & Barnes, 2009).

Thus, the teacher education literature suggests that in designing effective reflection instruction for teacher candidates, teacher educators might want to consider issues about what is being taught, why, and to whom within the context of how it relates to teacher candidates’ needs. Darling-Hammond (2006) asserts the idea of having teacher candidates reflect on their field or clinical experiences where they traditionally apply theories from coursework into practice experiences in classrooms. Teachers can then reflect directly on what they are doing and seeing in real classroom settings.

Still, even with the benefit of this meaningful learning context, my synthesis of the teacher education literature suggested that teacher training in reflection has often been lacking in four key areas: (a) a lack of teacher educators’ understanding about the power of teacher candidates’ teaching beliefs, (b) the focus on lower levels of reflection in

teacher education programs, (c) the need for professional guidance in developing skills of critical reflection, and (d) systematic structures for skill development. The next section will discuss each of these four conditions that need to be addressed if teacher education in reflection or reflectivity is to be taught effectively to teacher candidates.

### **Understanding the Power of Teacher Candidates' Teaching Beliefs**

Teacher candidates often come into teacher education programs with their beliefs about teaching and learning well settled and based on the schooling experiences they have had (Lortie, 1975). These beliefs can be in opposition to research-based constructivist practices in education. Constructivism asserts the importance of examining prior experiences, knowledge, and beliefs to construct additional new understandings. Fixed beliefs can work against the epistemology of reflection, which stresses multiple viewpoints (Yost, Sentner, & Forlenza-Bailey, 2000). If a teacher candidate's belief is set, they may be closed to the idea of multiple viewpoints. To promote reflection, teacher candidates "must have opportunities to understand how their beliefs measure up against the philosophy of their teacher education programs, so that cognitive change or transformation can occur" (Yost, Sentner, & Forlenza-Bailey, 2000, p. 42).

Cognitive change can be fraught with tension as individuals peer out from their comfort zones, yet it provides the building blocks for transformation of teaching from the beliefs teacher candidates may currently have toward a new belief system. It can be especially painful as changes in perspective, professional relationships, and traditional practices are contemplated. For example, if a teacher has a belief that teaching is primarily done in isolation from other teachers, changing or transforming that belief could be difficult and painful. Yet transformative teaching requires self-scrutiny and "a

fundamental restructuring of social relations and practices” (Brookfield, 2003, p. 142). Such a shift in a person’s view can result from intense critical reflection challenging the person’s beliefs and assumptions (Mezirow, 1995). Thus, from a constructivist perspective, an intensely meaningful experience in the context of practice-teaching during clinical experience may prompt reassessment of a teacher candidate’s beliefs and generate a transformation of established teaching beliefs or assumptions.

### **Low Levels of Reflection in Teacher Education**

When teacher education programs do promote reflection, Smyth (1992) warns that it is often on lower levels of reflection, rather than on the transformative aspects of reflection towards reforms in education. For example, teacher candidates may be writing in reflection journals, but it may just be descriptions without purposeful or penetrating insight on educational issues such as the possible relationship of social class to student ability and how to address it. Yost, Sentner, and Forlenza-Bailey (2000) suggest teacher educators develop a systematic approach to teaching critical reflection and argue that “teacher educators must find ways to imbue teacher candidates with the intellectual and professional experiences necessary to enable them to reflect on critical levels” (p. 40).

### **Professional Guidance in Developing Critical Reflection Skills**

Teacher candidates need guidance in developing skills of reflection or inquiry since they can be overwhelmed by learning the many complex tasks in their new teaching role (Cochran-Smith, Barnatt, Friedman, & Pine, 2009). And their emerging teacher identity may not include qualities of continually and critically reflecting on their teaching for purposes of transforming it. But with supportive dialogue from supervisors and other mentors, teacher candidates may develop greater capacity for critical reflection toward

teaching and begin reshaping their identities accordingly (Abt-Perkins, Hauschildt, & Dale, 2000; Dinkelman, 2000; Henderson & Kesson, 2004).

### **Systematic Structures for Developing Critical Reflection Skills**

Fourth, structures or frameworks for learning can provide systematic approaches to developing skill levels of critical reflection. In frameworks suggested by scholars (van Manen, 1977; Hatton & Smith, 1995; King & Kitchener, 2004), developmental levels of reflection or reflectivity are characterized with critical reflection at the highest level. The higher thought processes of critical reflection involve analyzing the assumptions underlying a decision or act and the broader ethical, moral, political, and historical implications behind the decision or act. Thus, a reflective teacher is one who makes teaching decisions on the basis of a conscious awareness and careful consideration of the assumptions on which the decisions are based, and the technical, educational, and ethical consequences of those decisions. The end result of a teacher's critical reflection is cognitive change or transformation (Yost, Sentner, & Forlenza-Bailey, 2000, p. 41) for purposes of better and more equitable practices in classroom teaching and learning.

### **Transformative Purposes for Teacher Training in Critical Reflection**

Developing skills in critical reflection can help teacher candidates recognize and address issues of equity or social justice as they solve problems in the classroom. As research cited earlier suggested, reflection can help teachers enhance teaching proficiency and help address issues of social justice or equity (Orland-Barak & Yinon, 2007; Proce, 2006; Tse, 2007; Walkington, 2005). With the complexity and diversity of student needs in U.S. schools, critical reflection is an invaluable tool for solving the real-life dilemmas that teachers regularly face.

Some of that complexity can be seen in the wide diversity of student populations teachers are required to work with. Constantly changing U.S. demographics are creating complex arrays of cultural representations and student needs in today's classrooms (Ball, 2009), and many new teachers feel inadequate to teach students from so many backgrounds. Embedded in these changing demographics are disparities where students lack advantages related to socioeconomic class, race, language, culture, age, and ability (Gay & Kirkland, 2003; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Poor and minority children often receive an inferior education where resources are lacking, funding is low, facilities are substandard, and teachers are unqualified (Barr & Parrett, 2007; Kozol, 1991). Teachers need awareness of potential inequities and opportunities to build their knowledge, capacity for advocacy, skills for transformation, and sense of efficacy in understanding and supporting success for all their student populations (Delpit, 1995; Shandomo, 2010; Sleeter, 2008).

Teacher candidates may first encounter equity issues in their school placements where they are learning to apply theory from coursework into teaching practice and to design their own teaching pedagogy. By developing a critically reflective approach toward teaching and learning, teachers can gain the knowledge and skills they will need to expand and enrich student opportunities and help level the playing field for all students. Using critical reflection, teacher candidates can reflect on their own beliefs, consider how those beliefs affect classroom interactions, and take action to address issues of cultural inequity that may be present in the classroom (Wiseman & Fox, 2011).

Going beyond ideas of integrating cultural stories into the curriculum, this *equity pedagogy* (Banks, 2004) is teaching that considers the way instructional types can either

promote or discourage achievement among students of diverse social, cultural, and racial groups. When teachers have the opportunity for reflection or inquiry that takes issues of student diversity and equity into account, teacher understanding of the classroom can be not only formed but quite literally transformed (Britzman, 2003) through promoting and improving student academic success (Sleeter, 2008). As teacher candidates examine school interactions and policies, they can potentially create opportunities in which the schooling culture and structures can empower students and promote equity (Banks, 2004).

### **The Professional Year for Teacher Candidates**

Critically reflective supervision aims to support the professional growth of teacher candidates by promoting their development of critically reflective pedagogy in their classrooms. My study purpose was to see how teacher candidates construct understandings of critical reflection through the supervisory experiences I provided during their professional year.

The university's professional year is designed by the college's teacher education department as two semesters of sixteen weeks each for teacher candidates to practice teaching in assigned schools. The first semester of the professional year, teacher candidates work in a classroom three days a week with an experienced mentor teacher, gradually taking on increasingly more teaching responsibility and as well as doing an inquiry or research project on an education issue of their choosing. The purpose of the inquiry project is to promote habits of inquiry or reflection into problems that can arise in the context of teaching and learning.

During teacher candidates' second and final semester of the professional year, they work in the classroom full-time and gradually assume complete responsibility from their mentor for the classroom, including all teaching, assessing student progress, classroom management, and attending staff meetings. As teacher candidates go through their professional year, they are overseen by a supervisor representing the university who meets and talks with them, leads on-site educational seminars, answers questions, observes teacher candidates' instruction in the classroom, and debriefs on their instruction to appraise progress and areas of needed growth.

### **Promoting Critical Reflection in Teacher Candidates**

This study sought to promote teacher candidates' critical reflection on teaching and learning during supervision in ways suggested by the scholarly literature in teacher education. The approach used in my supervision was intended to promote teacher candidates' critical reflection on their own instructional beliefs and practices and help them to recognize and address issues of equity in the classroom which may require change or transformation of their teaching beliefs and practices. As teacher candidates notice and address equity issues which can negatively affect learning in the classroom, students' potential success and life chances may be increased.

My motivation for this study was politically derived from a desire to 1) work toward improving the success and life chances of all students, 2) increase the number of teachers who use critical reflection to include equity awareness and action, and 3) embed critical reflection or inquiry into all of teacher candidates' clinical experiences. My research agenda focused on promoting teacher candidates to develop transformative views on teaching and learning, and characterizing the understandings they developed

during that process. My desire to focus on critical reflection was based on a philosophy or agenda regarding “beliefs and assumptions about the nature of schooling, teaching, teachers, and their education” (Zeichner, 1983, p. 3) and suggested a social justice agenda. By increasing awareness and reasoned responses to issues of equity or social justice, teachers can enter the transformative arena of sustaining the right of all students to experience educational success, as suggested by Barr and Parrett (2007):

Education’s transformation into an essential right has not happened by chance. It has emerged through a long and turbulent history of social protests and educational policy, from the denial of education to a variety of under-represented and disadvantaged groups, including African Americans, Latinos, and other minorities; the poor; women; the handicapped; people living in isolated rural areas; and many others. These transformations in public education have been accomplished through a long history of strife for social justice. (p. 2-3)

To participate in the transformation of education on a national as well as an individual level, teacher candidates need to develop critical reflectivity toward all aspects of teaching and learning to evaluate the purposes and potential hierarchical power issues behind them (McLaren, 2007, Shandomo, 2010).

### **Research Problem/Significance**

One area of teacher education that needs further development is the way reflection is cultivated in teacher candidates (Rodgers & Scott, 2008). Colleges of education have sought to promote reflection or inquiry by having teacher candidates select a topic of interest or concern and doing a research project on it within the context of their clinical experience. Another approach to training teacher candidates about reflection has focused on including elements of reflection or inquiry within the college’s core teaching values. The list of core teaching values may also function as or be embedded in scoring rubrics

during coursework and practice teaching with the intent of fostering the knowledge, skills, and dispositions for reflective teaching.

Yet my synthesis of teacher education literature suggested that this approach to training teacher candidates in the vital skills of reflection may not be enough. In order to prepare teacher candidates to enter classrooms as reflective teachers on a high level and address the needs of increasingly diverse students with an awareness of how equity and social justice issues can deny students' educational success, the ways teacher candidates develop skills of reflection needed to be explicitly addressed.

By enhancing the way reflection skills are cultivated, teacher candidates can potentially learn skills and dispositions to transform their practice and make it more equitable. Equity related to education is determined when "the gap is eliminated and achievement of all is raised" (Achinstein, B., & Athanases, 2005, p. 844). Helping all students be successful by increasing their educational opportunities can lead to improved life chances for students.

My research endeavored to address the call in the literature to determine how to effectively cultivate teacher candidates' understandings of critical reflection to meet the complex and diverse needs of students in today's classrooms. To that end, Darling-Hammond (2006) suggested that teacher candidates learn reflection or inquiry most effectively in the context of practice teaching. Still, the lack of clarity in colleges of education about how to effectively develop critical reflection may be related to the way practice teaching is typically supervised.

In universities, supervision of teacher candidates is often handled by graduate students and adjunct instructors who may cycle in and out of supervision depending on

the timing of their academic coursework. Supervisors can also bring a variety of experience, training, and knowledge to their teacher candidate support role (Koerner, Rust, & Baumgartner, 2002). This approach to supervision may contribute to tentativeness, inconsistency, and lack of clear vision in how to promote reflection in supervision of teacher candidates.

Indeed, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE; 2010) Blue Ribbon Panel Report argued that there is a prevalent or “endemic unevenness” in quality of teacher candidate’s clinical teaching practice experience (p. 4). Thus, there is a compromised level of professional support teacher candidates may be receiving, while the Blue Ribbon Panel Report (NCATE, 2010) suggests teacher candidates need even, consistent supervision in order to really understand what reflection is and how to use it to improve teaching and learning. Thus, teachers who aren’t taught about reflection effectively through consistent supervisory guidance are less likely to have the skills they will require to address the learning needs of all students.

This study provided weekly supervision through instructional learning community seminars the first six weeks, followed by weekly individual meetings, which included a minimum of five observations and debriefings of individual teacher candidates’ instruction. The seminar experiences were based on features in the teacher education literature that could support teacher candidates’ reflection and teaching development. In an effort to support teacher candidates’ critical reflection in the context of supervision experiences to promote their teacher development, I designed and conducted this study.

### **Research Question**

During almost two years of supervising teacher candidates in clinical practice teaching, I tried to support them in developing reflection or inquiry into their teaching practice. Consequently, I became curious about how teacher candidates would perceive systematic instruction and support in developing critical reflection during six supervision seminars followed by weekly individual meetings and/or supervision debriefings on their lessons in the classroom.

With that idea in mind, the main research question guiding my investigation became: *What is the perceived impact by teacher candidates of specific supervision experiences focused on critical reflection?* And the two sub-questions supporting potential answers to this main question became: (1) What specific supervision experiences do teacher candidates consider helpful to their teacher development? (2) How are the supervision experiences that teacher candidates find helpful manifested in their instructional thoughts, discussions, and behaviors?

This study involved engaging teacher candidates in activities designed to explicitly develop critical reflection skills, knowledge, and dispositions. By understanding how to better assist teacher candidates in developing critical reflection on their practice, their ability to recognize and respond to equity issues in the classroom and promote the success all learners might be enhanced.

### **Definitions of Terms**

***Clinical Practice:*** The opportunity teacher candidates have to practice teaching in schools and apply theories they have learned in coursework to the context of their own

teaching situations. Teacher candidates are traditionally placed in classrooms with a mentor assigned to model good teaching practice. (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 221).

***Clinical Supervisor:*** A teacher educator assigned to support and sustain teacher candidates through their developmental stages of teaching practice in their clinical experience. The clinical supervisor's role may include formal and informal evaluation of the teacher candidate's progress along with formative (during practice) assessments and summative (final) assessments. (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 221).

***Coaching:*** The act of supporting and facilitating teacher learning (Nolan & Hoover, 2004).

***Coaching Platform:*** The set of beliefs or the philosophy which guide a coach or supervisor in working with teachers (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002).

***Community of Practice:*** Groups of people sharing a common interest and a desire who support one another through group interaction and ongoing support (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

***Critical Reflection:*** Reflection that includes consideration about the effects of one's choices on others relevant to social and political context and examining one's teaching practice (Hatton & Smith, 1995).

***Dialogue:*** A form of conversation characterized as lateral such that participants share power in the discussion (Freire, 2003).

***Equity:*** Equity within education is characterized as closing the gap between the quality of education some students receive from the quality other students receive,

despite differences such as social class, race, or family background (Achinstein, B., & Athanases, 2005).

***Knowledge:*** The fact or condition of knowing something with familiarity gained through experience or association (Merriam-Webster Online, 2011).

***Nudges:*** Influences on individual study participants from others involved in education.

***Pedagogy:*** The art and science of teaching (Merriam-Webster Online, 2011).

***Professional Learning Community:*** Professional groups building on the idea of a community of practice to include a focus on professional knowledge development and problem solving through group interaction and ongoing professional support (DuFour, Eaker, & DuFour, 2005).

***Shifts:*** A change within an individual teacher candidate's beliefs and worldview relative to education.

***Skill:*** A learned power of doing something competently (Merriam-Webster Online, 2011)

***Social Justice in Teaching:*** Teaching for social justice focuses on who has access to rich learning and life opportunities and examines what “social, economic, and institutional barriers may constrain individuals’ or groups’ learning and life opportunities” (Cochran-Smith, Shakman, Jong, Terrell, Barnatt, & McQuillan, 2009, p. 375).

***Teacher Educator:*** From a formal perspective, a teacher educator is someone who has the official responsibility as a representative of an educational institution for

helping a teacher candidate develop effective teaching skills, knowledge, and dispositions, which, from a broader less formal view, could also include the mentor teacher and other influential teachers with whom a teacher candidate is placed in a particular school.

***Transformation:*** Transformation is to reevaluate prior knowledge and beliefs in developing a different lens from which to view the world (Brookfield, 2003; King, 2004). This fundamental shift in one's worldview emerges from intense critical reflection that challenges previously held beliefs and assumptions (Servage, 2008, p. 66) within a group with diverse perspectives (Mezirow, 1995). Transformation may result from sudden insight or an extended process of critical self-reflection or scrutiny (Cranton, 2002).

The term supervisor is used throughout this study. A supervisor is a person who supports the professional development of teacher candidates by “helping them understand and improve their teaching practice” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002) to help all students be successful in school. I must confess I have never been comfortable with the word. It conjures up visions of an inspector, rather than a more egalitarian image of an experienced teacher coaching and collaborating with teacher candidates. The term supervisor is a standard term in colleges of education and education literature for a person who supports the development of teacher candidates during their clinical practice experience.

The dictionary definition of the word supervisor is “one who exercises general direction or control over people; one who inspects and directs the work of others” (Merriam-Webster Online, 2011). That seems to support my connotation or image of the word and the message it may send to my teacher candidates. The term coach is defined as

“one who instructs or trains” (Merriam-Webster Online, 2011). The term coach implies for me a less hierarchical relationship where one isn’t necessarily dominating the others, in keeping with Zeichner’s call for more egalitarian views of supervision (2010).

I want this study to promote the concept of a community of colleagues each critically reflecting and sharing on how to improve teaching practice with me as a coach beside, rather than over them. I believe this model can help teacher candidates gain valuable collaborative experience in preparation for future collaborative communities in the schools where they will work with their teaching peers.

### **Organization of the Dissertation**

The remaining chapters provide a detailed account of this investigation into supervision experiences focused on critical reflection. I explore critical reflection and the background for the seminar experiences from teacher education scholarly literature in Chapter 2. The context and methods used for the study are addressed in Chapter 3. Some of the data and findings resulting from this study are presented in Chapter 4. A discussion of the implications, tensions, and suggestions for future study conclude this dissertation in Chapter 5.

## CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

### **Introduction**

This study examined ways to support teacher candidates' critical reflection in the context of supervision experiences to promote their teacher development. Critical reflection was used to frame, analyze, and problem-solve dilemmas that can arise in practice teaching. During the professional year, supervisors are assigned to teacher candidates for the purpose of supporting their efforts to learn about teaching while practicing in placement schools (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Darling-Hammond, 2005; Goldhammer, 1969; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002). Yet, teacher candidates may often be told by a supervisor what is wrong with their teaching, without providing them research-based opportunities and experience in critical reflection on their teaching practice (Shandomo, 2010; Yost, Sentner, & Forlenza-Bailey, 2000; Zeichner & Teitelbaum, 1982). Further, teacher candidates may be supervised by available graduate students, retired teachers, administrators, and adjunct professors (Feiman-Nemser, 2001a; Koerner, Rust & Baumgartner, 2002; Slick 1998). From this pool of overseers, the training, experience, and agendas of these supervisors can vary widely as to how and when teacher candidates should be supervised.

Consequently, teacher candidates may be trying to learn to teach within varying degrees of support or isolation, despite the fact that research supports the benefits of consistent, quality supervisory support (NCATE, 2010; Feiman-Nemser, 2001a). There is also a need for establishing patterns of career-long peer collaboration among new

teachers (Cochran-Smith, 2003). When teacher candidates receive support and feedback from supervisors in collaboration with peers, teacher candidates' abilities can be improved.

The literature reviewed in this chapter establishes a conceptual framework for the study by organizing the work of educators who advocate research-based principles in teacher education, in particular those practices that promote success during teacher candidates' clinical practice experiences.

To date, little is known about how teacher candidates experience critical self-reflection on their teaching within a learning community, particularly given the other conditions of this study. Therefore, this literature review promotes understanding of how teacher candidates experience critical reflection on their teaching practice as they are given opportunities within a learning community comprised primarily of peers, mentors, students, and the university supervisor. Building upon Jacobs' (2007) research of supervisors engaged in critical reflection with teacher candidates, one of the subjects to be discussed in this chapter is a description of critical reflection and the conditions and considerations that relate to its use in improving instruction. This study is undergirded by a review of existing literature on theories and approaches in clinical (in school) teaching practice including effective supervision and interaction within learning communities.

### Critical Reflection as Deep Reflection

The benefit of critical reflection for teachers is supported in teacher education (Shandomo, 2010; Wiseman & Fox, 2011; Zeichner, 1990) as a means of continually examining and improving teaching to meet the complex variety of student needs.

Therefore, supervisors of teacher candidates must understand what critical reflection is

and how to help new teachers develop this approach toward their teaching practice. If new teachers are not able to critically reflect on the diversity of needs represented by students' culture, social class, race, ethnicity, gender, age ability, and family background, teachers are likely to "fall back on assumptions from their own educational experiences about what students need" (Achinstein & Athanases, 2005; p. 843; Athanases & Achinstein, 2003). Through the process of critical reflection, educators may uncover assumptions regulating their actions, along with the cultural historical conditions that promoted those assumptions and actions (Cranton, 1996) and evaluate existing social, cultural, political or professional conditions and actions that might go unquestioned (Brookfield, 1995; 2004; McLaren, 2007).

Whereas reflection is a central topic of teacher education literature (Adler, 1991; Smyth, 1989; Zeichner, 1993), critical reflection is a sub group of the reflection literature (Jacobs, 2007). Education scholars have suggested interrelated definitions of reflection. Dewey (1997) considered reflection a "[a]ctive, persistent, and careful evaluation of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it, and the future conclusions to which it tends" (p. 6). Schon (1983) supported this dynamic view of reflection as individual and collective, suggesting that reflection about teaching is like a dialogue with teaching situations to understand the issues and problem-solve possible solutions. He also saw reflection as a collective process in which participant voices reason and dialogue interactively. Rodgers (2002) built upon this interactive aspect of reflection as a "systematic, rigorous, disciplined meaning-making cycle that moves the learner along from one experience to the next with increased understanding" to value and ensure personal and intellectual growth and progress of oneself and others (p. 245).

### Critical Reflection Levels and Frameworks

Education scholars have also suggested particular frameworks for understanding and developing reflection that not only help clarify reflection but also help clarify its relationship to critical reflection. For example, a sequential process of five developmental levels of reflection, built upon the reflection research of Habermas (1972) and van Manen (1977), was proposed by Hatton and Smith (1995). At Level 1, *technical rationality* is considered an important pre-reflective stage in initial teacher candidate development concerned with evaluating teaching effectiveness and efficiency. Level 2, described as *descriptive*, relates to teachers “analyzing performance in their professional role” (p. 45). Level 3 is *dialogic reflection*, hearing one’s voice individually or collectively with others in critiquing a professional situation. Level 4, *critical reflection*, relates to seeing the practices of one’s profession as problematic according to ethical criteria. Level 5 is *contextual reflection* in which educators may use any of levels 1-4 above to deal with professional problems as they occur, which can then be recalled and shared with others later. The levels from 1-5 increasingly look beyond technical, individual aspects of instruction toward the outwardly expansive effects of instruction on students and others in an increasing context of social awareness and interaction.

A seven-stage developmental reflection framework formulated by King and Kitchener (2004) also begins with prereflection, in three *prereflective stages*, leading into two *transitionally reflective stages* and concluding with two *fully reflective stages*. The stages are based on individuals’ views and assumptions of knowledge coupled with willingness or unwillingness to examine those views and assumptions. This framework moves from sole reliance on one’s own observations and contexts outward toward

considering and ultimately examining and reexamining knowledge from multiple perspectives and contexts. For example, in the three prereflective stages, knowledge is based on personal beliefs or on what authorities say. In the two transitionally reflective stages, knowledge is based on one's own interpretation of contextual conditions. And in the two fully reflective stages evidence is evaluated across perspectives and contexts, and then reevaluated as new evidence or tools of inquiry become available and "knowledge is constructed into individual conclusions" (p. 7). Both frameworks share the idea of reflection as working beyond one's own perspective toward reflection from an expanded world view and suggest an increasing capacity to critically reflect, to inform, and be informed by reflections of others.

#### Characteristics of Critical Reflection

Thus, all reflection is not critical reflection. Brookfield (2004) argued that two distinctive features constitute critical reflection: considerations of power that can undergird, frame, and distort many education practices, and second, questioning the assumptions educators make about those practices. The literature suggested that the purposes of critical reflection in teaching practice are to help teachers evolve into *transformative intellectuals* who examine the ways schooling in general, and one's own teaching in particular, may "contribute or fail to contribute to a just and humane society" (Giroux, 1988), support or fail to support democracy (Greene, 1988; Henderson & Kesson, 2004; Henderson & Gornik, 2007), and enrich or fail to "enrich the learning opportunities and life chances for all K-12 students" (Cochran-Smith, 2002, p. 17). Reflection can begin a process in which teachers question assumptions made based on

their own life experiences (autobiographies), and begin to look outward toward the broader context and consequences of issues in schools, community, and the world.

### Beginning in the Basement: The Role of Autobiography in Critical Reflection

Examining autobiography was suggested as a valuable process for all teachers (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002). For instance, scholars supported the idea of including supervisors in critical reflection on their own autobiographies (Abt-Perkins, Hauschildt, & Dale, 2000; Grant & Zozakiewicz, 1995; Howard, 2003; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1982) as well as mentors (Achinstein & Athanases, 2005). Nieto (2000) asserted that teacher education programs need to promote teacher candidates' self-understanding to learn from their background experiences and their biases to determine how they could affect their teaching perspectives. Specifically, Ladson-Billings (1994) argued that this type of critical self-reflection can disclose blindness to privilege, which may or may not have been a part of a teacher's life due to issues of culture, social class, race, ethnicity, gender, age, ability, or family background. Whether consciously, or unconsciously, a teacher's autobiography of lived experience may impact individual teaching practice. Programs that promote and provide assignments for self-understanding can help teacher candidates "reflect on how the cultural context and conditions in which they grew up influenced their beliefs about knowledge, education, learning and teaching" (Darling-Hammond, French & Garcia-Lopez, 2002, p. 203). Examining one's personal autobiography can help teachers understand their beliefs and how they may have originated (Smyth, 1989).

Yet the value of personal autobiography for teacher candidates need not be confined to retrospection. Pinar (1975) suggested that educators gain understanding about

what they have believed, but also synthesize and project what they currently do and believe to visualize their future teaching beliefs, actions, and consequences. Pinar called this process *currere* (to run), implying that the autobiographical thread is continuous, worthy of cyclical re-examination, and significant to the transformation of teacher beliefs and actions. Consequent impact of teachers' self-knowledge to students in the classroom was suggested by Palmer (1998):

When I do not know myself, I cannot know who my students are. I will see them through a glass darkly, in the shadows of my unexamined life—and when I cannot see them clearly, I cannot teach them well. (p. 2)

### The Role of Context in Critical Reflection

Coupled with the idea of teachers' self-knowledge is the importance of teaching experience being situated within an appropriate context (Lave & Wenger, 1991), Abt-Perkins et al. (2000) found that teacher candidates were more receptive to the idea of critical reflection if the supervisors, for example, brought up specific needs or concerns in the teacher candidate's practice experience, such as issues with classroom management, which teacher interns found to be immediately relevant and situated to the understandings they currently needed. Zeichner (1995) also found that the imposition of elements of critical reflection without them being grounded and situated in the context of real-life teaching experiences was resisted by teacher candidates.

Shandomo (2010) argued that in order to foster critical reflection toward the various issues of equity in teaching such as students' culture, social class, race, ethnicity, gender, age, ability, and family background, teacher candidates must have knowledge about the situated context in which they work, and share that knowledge with mentors, supervisors, and other teacher candidates to realize the strengths and weaknesses

individual students bring with them into the classroom and how to address them effectively (Shandomo, 2010). This information can help inform choices teacher candidates make in instruction and serve as supervisory prompts to disclose how they are learning to address students' variety of needs equitably (Davidman, 1990). For example, supervisors may refer to a specific demographic feature of the classroom a teacher candidate is teaching in to inquire about whether the candidate felt an instructional process met student needs represented in that demographic information. This communication between supervisor and teacher candidate can model critical reflection in practice and help teacher candidates practice and visualize critical reflection in their teaching role.

#### Seeing Pathways Open Ahead: Modeling Critical Reflection

Since teacher candidates may have limited or no experience reflecting critically about classroom issues and procedures that may be accepted as the norm, it becomes part of the supervisor's role to provide ways for teacher candidates to learn how this can be done. Four potential modeling approaches to helping teacher candidates develop skills of critical reflection that are relevant to this study follow.

- 1) An approach suggested by Zeichner (1995) was to have his teacher candidates read writings on critical thinking and reflection by Gloria Ladson-Billings (1994) and Lisa Delpit (1995). Reading essays and lived experiences of teachers using critical reflection can help teacher candidates understand why and how to enact critical reflection as new teachers. For example, Ladson-Billings (1994) shared a teacher's narrative (experience) of modeling critical

reflection with students as a question arose in class about the ancient

Egyptians:

Teacher: Why do we care what race the Egyptians were?

Students: Because maybe they were black.

Teacher: Why would that matter?

Students: Because then we could show that black people made the pyramids.

Teacher: What would that prove?

Students: That black people can do incredible things. It seems like books only show the Europeans or whites doing great things.

Teacher: Why is that?

As teacher candidates read and discuss narratives like this, they can gain a deeper understanding of ways to make knowledge problematic, examine elements of inequity in society and enhance learning in students' situated context.

- 2) Critical reflection can also be modeled when supervisors and mentors tell teacher candidates their own narratives about dilemmas they have encountered in working to teach equitably, exposing the challenges they have faced, and in the process, recasting the supervisory, mentor, and candidate relationship into a less hierarchical status as Zeichner (2010) recommended.
- 3) A third approach to modeling critical reflection can take place during teacher candidate seminars by the supervisor's example (Grant & Zozakiewicz, 1995; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1982). For example, a supervisor can help a teacher

candidate look below the exterior of perplexing student behavior without judging or blaming the student, but rather with questions about that behavior to understanding what might be or have been leading up to it (Achinstein & Athanases, 2005). Questions are the vehicle for stimulating critically reflective discussions leading to deeper insights. Yet, advocating the value of critical reflection means nothing if the teacher candidates do not see the supervisor asking questions and using critical reflection to create an equity-aware pedagogy (Gay, 1998).

- 4) The fourth modeling approach for critical reflection, similar to Schon's (1983) restructuring of teaching situations through the use of intellectual curiosity, is the process of reframing. Schon saw restructuring (or reframing) as a way to use intellectual curiosity to restructure a teacher's situation from another stance or perspective, examine assumptions, and consider solutions from different angles. In their concept of reframing, Achinstein and Barrett (2004) adapted Bolman and Deal's (2002) reframing concepts for mentor use in helping teacher candidates understand and manage problems of practice. The three frames include: *managerial frame* (technical focus on behavior and procedures), *human relations frame* (focus on needs, feelings, and relationships), and *political frame* (focus on social change and justice). Achinstein and Barrett (2004) found that modeling this approach could help teacher candidates get to the root causes underlying surface issues. For example, if a teacher candidate expresses concern about students' apparent lack of interest in the lesson, support from the mentor or supervisor may help

reframe the issue as really focused on the teacher's lack of awareness regarding the socio-economic background of particular students and how to teach them effectively. Each of the four modeling approaches to critical reflection can help move emerging understandings of teaching practice into action and navigate tensions that may arise from critical reflection on classroom practice.

### Overcoming Challenges and Tensions of Critical Reflection

Because critical reflection can be challenging for teacher candidates as they enter their new teaching practice, a number of tensions emerged from the literature. Often these tensions focused on three key areas: roles, school culture, and forthrightness related to critical reflection. A discussion follows on these three challenges to learning critical reflection with some possible solutions.

#### Role Challenges in Learning Critical Reflection

Teacher candidates often struggle to understand many complex new roles and responsibilities (Darling-Hammond, 2006) and can, therefore, enter their teaching practice assignments needing the comforting security of specific procedures (Cochran-Smith, 2002). This need to rely on rote routines can foster a desire to make the learning-to-teach experience simpler and more formulaic (Aulls & Shore, 2008), and can make the uncertain aspects of critical reflection appear unappealing and burdensome rather than a possibility for student and teacher empowerment (Henderson & Kesson, 2004).

Another role-related challenge occurs because supervisors have dual roles to balance. There is a continual flux of tension between the supervisor's role as evaluator of

candidates' teaching practice, and supporter of their learning and emerging capacity (Yusko & Feiman-Nemser, 2008). This element can foster a hierarchical relationship between supervisor and teacher candidate despite the need for it being less so (Zeichner, 2010).

### School Culture Challenges to Learning Critical Reflection

Cultural aspects of schools can also be an obstacle to teacher candidates developing critical reflection during their clinical practice. In schools without a “tradition of inquiry, collaboration or experimentation, there is a vigilant press to preserve the status quo” (Feiman-Nemser, 2001a, p. 1021). Tension and confusion can also be increased when a supervisor or mentor challenges a teacher candidate to consider his/her teaching from a different perspective, while the teacher candidate is receiving only accolades on evaluations from school administrators and colleagues (Achinstein & Athanases, 2005). For example, Abt-Perkins et al. (2000) described a classroom evaluation that seemed to reflect exemplary teaching; however, the teaching strategies used may not have demonstrated awareness of students' diverse cultural backgrounds and needs for teaching adaptations. Thus, teacher candidates may become confused by receiving mixed signals about what constitutes good teaching practice.

### University Culture Challenges to Learning Critical Reflection

Likewise, the college culture may fail to foster critical reflection in teacher candidates. Feiman-Nemser (2001a) argued that teacher education coursework where traditions of lecture and self-based learning may abound do little to “develop students' critical perspectives and deep understanding, link theory and practice or cultivate habits

of analysis and reflection” (p. 1020). In contrast to what candidates may have learned in their teacher education coursework, Ball and Forzani (2009) asserted that learning to teach is not just about telling students, but rather about a continuous cycle of critical reflection on how to ask students “questions (to which teachers may have to not have complete answers), probe student ideas and provoke disequilibrium and intellectual risk taking” (p. 500). Significantly, use of questions in a teacher’s pedagogy to probe student ideas can support equity in teaching and the interactive analysis of democracy (Cochran-Smith, Shakman et al, 2009; Greene, 1988; Henderson & Kesson, 2004). Yet, teacher candidates may have an *apprenticeship of observation* (Lortie, 1975), with limited or no opportunities for critical reflection in their college cultures. Therefore, Cochran-Smith (2001) called for a new apprenticeship of observation where analysis, inquiry, and reflection are demonstrated for teacher candidates in teacher education coursework as well as in clinical practice to promote a critical reflection stance (disposition) toward teaching practices and their consequences.

#### Using Explicitness to Address the Challenges of Learning Critical Reflection

Understandings about critical reflection in dialogue were found to be enhanced when the teacher educator, supervisor, or mentor who was teaching about critical reflection was explicit and forthright about their desire to develop teachers’ critical reflection (Dinkelman, 2000); Whipp, 2003). In her study of email conversations, Whipp (2003) determined that when teacher educators, wanting to develop critical reflection in their students, were explicit about their goal and motive about why critical reflection is important, students were more receptive. Dinkelman (2000) found, in a study focused on supervision and methods-course support for developing critical reflection in secondary

social studies teacher candidates, students benefited when three elements of critical reflection were made explicit: conversations about the meaning of critical reflection, assignments to help see the value of critical reflection, and pertinent vocabulary and language development. By explicitly adding these three elements up front, Dinkelman (2000) spelled out the purpose as well as the process of the critically reflective learning activities and motivated teacher candidates to integrate critical reflection into their practice.

### Summary of Challenges and Tensions to Learning Critical Reflection

Critical reflection in teacher education means examining and improving teaching to meet the complex variety of students' needs (Wiseman & Fox, 2011; Zeichner, 1990). Teacher candidates need to use critical reflection to make sure issues of students' culture, social class, race, ethnicity, gender, age, ability, and family background are included when teaching practices and problems are considered. Teacher educators can help teacher candidates by modeling critical reflection through selecting readings related to equity issues, sharing their own narratives of how they have used critical reflection, using teaching candidate seminars for analyzing teaching dilemmas, and using intellectual curiosity to reframe problems in teaching from different perspectives. Despite the benefits of critical reflection, there are challenges to learning it related to roles within supervision, schooling and university culture, and the need for explicitness in disclosing the purpose and process of teaching critical reflection to teacher candidates.

## Teacher Education

The demands of teaching are greater than ever with challenging and every-changing school environments, often requiring teachers to be *adaptive experts* in knowing how to teach in ways that meet diverse student needs (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005, p. 407). Thus, pedagogy becomes critical and *how* one teaches becomes as significant as *what* one teaches (Loughran & Russell, 1997). Still teacher education reports (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986) have been more likely to focus on issues such as curriculum and what teachers should learn without making it clear that “the medium *is* the message” in teacher education (Grossman, 2005, p. 425). Rather than the teacher-dominated model teacher candidates may be used to, effective pedagogy is more a process of two-way communication (Hamilton & McWilliam, 2001, p. 18).

While teacher candidates’ developing a base of knowledge is important, NCATE’s Blue Ribbon Panel Report (2010) called for the weaving of content and pedagogy around clinical experiences of practice throughout teacher preparation. In fact, the panel asserted that clinical practice should be the core experience of teacher preparation to help teacher candidates become “expert practitioners” (p. 5). In a call for completely overhauling teacher education programs across America, the Blue Ribbon Panel Report (NCATE, 2010) argued that clinical preparation is “not clearly defined and insufficiently supported” (p. 4). There is a lack of consistency in how clinical teaching practice is provided to teacher candidates and wide variations in quality. To help promote cohesiveness and uniformity, the Panel identified ten core reform principles for designing effective clinically based teacher preparation programs. Four of the Blue Ribbon Panel’s

(2010) core principles are central to the purposes of this study and will be synthesized with similar recommendations from researchers into a framework to present my findings from the teacher education literature:

- Develop teachers who become expert in how to teach
- Foster the development of tools and dispositions to analyze teaching
- Establish an interactive professional community
- Use technology applications for high-impact teacher preparation (NCATE, 2010, p. 5)

#### Develop Teachers Who Become Expert in How to Teach

The clinical teaching practice experience is an extended time to continue doing what teacher candidates have learned about in coursework and have seen represented by teachers in their placement schools. Feiman-Nemser (2001a) sees this as a time when the teacher candidate develops a “basic repertoire as part of their professional growth continuum” (p. 1050). She defines this beginning repertoire in terms of becoming familiar with good curricular resources, learning a variety of general and subject specific models of teaching, and exploring assessments to appraise student understandings with the ultimate goal of being “able to critically reflect on when, where, how, and why to use particular pedagogical approaches” (p. 1018). Part of good teaching is to have a range of approaches to help all students learn and the ability to determine which teaching approach will be most effective. To determine best approach options, Schon (1983) argued for reflective practice, in which teachers have a reflective conversation with their particular situation to reflect on construction of the problem and feasible strategies of action. Using critical reflection can further help develop teaching practice by the ways it

“involves what the teacher does before entering the classroom, while in the classroom, and retrospectively after leaving the classroom” (Shandomo, 2010, p. 107). Cochran-Smith (1999) defines this sequence as reflection for, in, and on teaching practice and calls it an inquiry stance toward teaching and learning. She suggests that having an inquiry stance promotes a teacher’s disposition to reflect critically on all aspects of teaching and learning (Cochran-Smith, 1999, p. 274). Thus, critical reflection and inquiry-mindedness are equated by these educators as ways to improve teaching and learning.

To further unpack the challenges of learning about teaching practice, Grossman et al. (2009) compared how practice is taught across three professional disciplines devoted to individual improvement. In all three disciplines, professional practice required three elements: *representations* of what practice does or could look like (such as modeling through video representations of teaching), *decomposition* of constituent parts of classroom practice for explicit analysis (such as learning specifically how to do instructional subject transitions in a classroom), and *approximations* of practice (such as a teacher being made aware of specific ways their practice has improved). As teacher candidates critically reflect on teaching practice, their process of learning to teaching progresses along the continuum of professional growth suggested by Feiman-Nemser (2001a).

### Foster the Development of Dialogue and Questions to Analyze Teaching

Seeing the teacher candidate’s situation as a context for inquiry and reflection, it becomes important to discuss what reflective teachers do. Often, a period of detachment from an instructional situation can help inform reflection (Hatton, 1994). Ryan and Cooper (2006) suggested a protocol of questions that reflective teachers ask:

- What am I doing and why?
- How can I better meet my students' needs?
- What options are available?
- How can I encourage more involvement or learning on the part of the students?
- Have I considered my own values as a professional and my comfort level in acting on those values?
- What conscious choice can I make to make a difference?

Asking self-reflective questions about teaching practice for purposes of continually trying to enact better teaching is not unlike Sergiovanni and Starrat's (2002) claim that the majority of evaluation in teacher preparation should be aimed at formative (ongoing developmental) purposes. In this ongoing development, Smyth (1989) suggested teacher candidates use a four-step reflection protocol to develop "practitioner-derived knowledge" (p. 2) and expand their perceptions:

Describing:	What do I do as an educator?
Informing:	What does this mean?
Confronting:	How did I come to be like this?
Reconstructing:	How might I do things differently?

By asking these types of critically reflective questions, teacher candidates can analyze their teaching curriculum choices to determine if access to learning is being provided optimally to all students (Cochran-Smith, Shakman et al., 2009). Henderson and Gornick (2007) suggest teachers and teacher candidates reflect more expansively, beyond the instrumental analysis of *what worked* to ask themselves:

Who is benefitting from this educational practice or program, and how are they benefitting? Are there students who are being left behind, poorly treated, or even

ignored? What is the educational practice's impact on student motivation, retention, and graduation? How does the practice impact human relations, between teachers, students, parents, and staff? (p. 9)

Teaching in this respect is seen as leadership in teaching with the transformative responsibility of helping to reform schooling from a primary focus on goals and efficiency toward including consciousness-raising for equitable teaching (Freire, 2003; Giroux, 1988; McLaren, 2007). As teacher candidates develop and share their expanding awareness of consequences of teaching choices, the ability to critically reflect can be improved and potentially inform the wider teaching community.

#### Establish an Interactive Professional Community

All actions have a particular context in which they occur and may be derived by the social influences in which people are immersed. Lave and Wenger (1991) asserted that all activities are situated and practiced within specific social contexts or communities that have influence on and give meaning to those activities. Thus, learning activities are situated within communities that practice learning together. In teacher education, “Learning is increasingly lodged within communities of practice—cohorts of teacher candidates who learn together as well as placements with veteran colleagues within professional development schools and other collegial work settings” (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005, p. 407).

Yet the concept of communities of practice as Lave and Wenger (1991) see it calls for “dethroning veteran teachers, mentors, and supervisors as master pedagogues to move the focus away from teaching toward a focus on access to all the resources available in community participation” (p. 94). Participation in a community of practice is considered an “immersive practice opportunity for a newcomer's incremental learning,

motivation and identity creation” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 110). Within the context of clinical teaching practice, this reflects Zeichner’s (2010) argument for a non-hierarchical relationship between supervisor, teacher candidate, and mentor. Using constructivist approaches combined with the active participation in communities of practice creates more of a shared vision of responsibility for learning how to teach within a professional community. Still, studies suggest that letting a teacher just get thrown into the teaching pool unaided in clinical teaching practice isn’t the answer either (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985; Britzman, 1991), but rather, guidance, modeling, coaching, feedback, and consistent support from a supervisor are necessary. This type of support is consistent with sociocultural learning theory (Henderson, 1996; Vygotsky, 1978).

#### Foster Development of Dialogue and Question Use in Supervision

Nevertheless, although teacher candidates appreciate and need this kind of interaction, there is little systematic research on specifically what the most effective supervisors do (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005) to effectively support teacher candidates during their clinical teaching practice. However, Feiman-Nemser (2001b) provided hints on effective supervision by describing how an individual who is considered an exemplary supervisor promotes critical reflection on teaching through:

- Consciousness-raising: bringing topics to a teacher candidate’s attention that all teachers need to reflect on.
- Pinpointing problems: helping teacher candidates be able to open dialogue about problems in their teaching that may be caused by conditions hidden to their view.

- Probing candidate's thinking: asking questions that prompt teacher candidates to analyze their rationale for teaching in a certain way and promotes a disposition of critical reflection.
- Recognizing growth in the teacher candidate's ability.
- Focusing discussions toward students and their learning.

These discussion strategies suggest the power of dialogue in communities of practice and the way a supervisor can help a community of teacher candidates develop critical collegueship as part of their continuum of professional development. This development process is most effective if begun early in a teacher candidate's career, as Feiman-Nemser (2001a) contends:

If teachers are going to participate in building a new professional culture, they must be introduced early on to the skills of critical reflection or inquiry and given many opportunities to develop the habits of critical collegueship. They must be involved in communities of practice where they can learn with and from reform-minded teachers working to improve the education and life chances of all students. We can only prepare teachers for schools as they should be in schools that are moving toward a shared division of powerful teaching and learning. (p. 1049)

One of the prime examples of critical collegueship came from a study done by Stigler and Hiebert (1999) on math instruction in America, Germany, and Japan. In particular, the teachers collaborated to do intensive lesson studies on their teaching. Teachers would spend months or a full year refining the teaching of one lesson within context, defining the problem that needs work, teaching the lesson, reflecting on its effect with students, evaluating the lesson, and reflecting some more towards improved enactment and student performance. The framework of principles guiding this development process adds insight to and is supported by the research literature.

Principle #1: Expect improvement to be continual, gradual, and incremental.

Principle #2: Maintain a constant focus on student learning goals.

Principle #3: Focus on teaching, not teachers.

Principle #4: Make improvements in context.

Principle #5: Make improvements the work of teachers.

Principle #6: Build a system that can learn from its own experience.

Principle #7: Build a support system by involving others interested in education.

These principles reiterate Feiman-Nemser's (2001a) continuum of learning to teach across the professional life-span and stress the ongoing social role of collaboration in educational communities.

#### Foster Dialogue and Questions in a Learning Community

Social implies discussion and dialogue, about which many assumptions can abound, such as the idea that interacting is just talking and we all know how to do that. Yet, there are protocols to help make dialogue more effective. Adding to the need for questions to generate critical reflection discussed earlier, Dennis Sparks (2005) cites the dialogue recommendations of Elinor and Gerard (1998) as transformational elements for discussions in learning communities:

- Inquiring into underlying assumptions
- Interacting at a slower pace with silence between speakers
- Letting go of the need for a specific outcome
- Listening without resistance
- Focusing on shared meaning and learning
- Suspending judgment
- Conversing to the group as a whole rather than to one person in the group

- Sharing the responsibility of the dialogue in a non-hierarchical way
- Suspending role and status distinctions

To further clarify the role of dialogue in learning communities, Sparks (2005) suggested that dialogue does not try to convince others that they are wrong, or advocate a particular point of view. Dialogue does not promote defensiveness, “which is a barrier to deep understanding and transformational learning that can accompany dialogue” (p. 171). The teaching and learning potential within the dialogue of learning communities can also be richly enhanced by well-considered and articulated personal stories and narratives (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Sparks, 2005) that “people can understand, relate to, and remember” (Tichy, 2002, p. 121).

#### Use Technology Applications for High-Impact Preparation

Rich academic discussion can be complex process for teacher candidates to learn. Using discussion in multiple web-based settings to instruct teacher candidates about ways to engage in academic discussions, Hatch and Grossman (2009) found they had to “establish norms for participation, assist students in purposeful readings of assigned text beforehand, and model characteristics of academic dialogue (p. 71).

In addition to dialogue within electronic networking, other forms of technology are used in teacher candidate applications. Teacher U (NCATE, 2010), composed of three of the highest performing charter school networks in America, relies heavily on self-videotaping of student teaching for intern learning and performance evaluation purposes. Analyzing videotapes of teaching is consistent with research promoting the merging of principles of teaching with situated instances of

teaching and learning (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Hammerness, Darling-Hammond, & Shulman, 2002; Lampert & Ball, 1998).

### **Teacher Education Summary**

Clinical teaching practice needs to be at the center of teacher education programs, along with ways to decompose the teaching process into its component parts for explicit practice opportunities (Grossman, Hammerness, & McDonald, 2009). To unpack the components of teaching practice and handle the complexities of the modern classroom, teacher candidates need to develop skills in critical reflection (Grossman, Hammerness, & McDonald, 2009; Lampert, 2001). Through multiple means and opportunities for teacher candidates to critically reflect on teaching practice and with structured guidance from supervisors and mentors, the ability to reflect critically on teaching pedagogy can be developed. Critical reflection on teaching and learning can be transformational by progressively envisioning and enacting changes to one's teaching practice.

Key features promoting teaching transformation include opportunities for teacher candidates to practice “problem solving, interpersonal and communications skills, professional decision making, and collaboration” (NCATE, 2010). These skills are best developed early in a teacher's continuum of experience within communities of practice where candidates dialogue, reason, and learn from one another. This opportunity in clinical practice helps teacher candidates learn to consider multiple perspectives and “establish their rationale for choices among alternative solutions” (Yost, Sentner, & Forlenza-Bailey, 2000, p. 46). As teacher candidates continually and critically reflect on teaching and learning in the classroom, they can incrementally become adaptive experts in recognizing and addressing potential classroom influences of social class, race, gender,

age, ability, and family background to improve educational opportunities and life chances of all students.

## CHAPTER 3: METHOD

### **Introduction**

To investigate the impact of specific supervision experiences focused on critical reflection with teacher candidates in elementary education, a phenomenological case study (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007) was used. The study occurred during the fall semester of 2011 at what I will call State University in the western United States. In accordance with State University's requirements, I worked with their Internal Review Board (IRB) and received IRB approval of all study procedures. State University placed the teacher candidates at three different elementary schools in groups of 2, 4, and 5 to practice teaching in classrooms and were assigned to my supervision. My investigation was guided by the following research question:

*What is the perceived impact by teacher candidates of specific supervision experiences focused on critical reflection?*

This chapter situates the research question by describing the background of the researcher, the university's teacher education program, the personal characteristics of the participants and their placement schools, supervision activities, and the research design that was used to answer the research question.

## Situating the Research Question

### Researcher Biography

The focus for this investigation was influenced by my teacher education background. During my first few years as an elementary school teacher, I earned a graduate degree focused on curriculum and instruction in English as a Second Language (ESL). My research focus in the graduate program was on developing a teaching pedagogy based on critical reflection to meet more students' needs in the classroom. As I finished the graduate program, I was also beginning my first year of what turned into ten years of teaching, first in an ESL classroom working with immigrant children from around the world, then in a traditional elementary classroom. As a teacher, I was aware and concerned about equity issues and the consequences of types of instruction and procedures with my students. I was especially concerned about making sure that students had access to what they needed to be successful and to enhance their life chances rather than limit them.

With the heightened awareness from my graduate program, I began to consciously work as a new teacher toward meeting the diverse needs of my students by critically reflecting on my instruction and schooling practices. Meanwhile, as I began to see the way teaching processes often went unquestioned by my colleagues, I became curious about how teachers could be supported in developing a critically reflective stance toward education. I wanted to provide a meaningful context for teachers to develop patterns of critical reflection as they formed their pedagogy for instruction. My thought was that if teachers had this opportunity early in their teaching careers, they might be more disposed to examine instructional processes to make sure they promote equity and

success for all of their students. This desire translated to providing supervisor and peer support for teacher candidates developing habits of critical reflection during their school practice sessions.

### Views of Learning

My beliefs about learning stem from constructivism (Vygotsky, 1978), a learning theory in which new knowledge connects to what someone already knows.

Constructivism provides the theoretical grounding for this research investigation. Crotty (1998) asserted that within constructivism, “each person’s way of making sense of the world is as valid and worthy of respect as any other” (p. 58). Constructivist theories suggest comparing individual perceptions and social constructions without necessarily validating one over another (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Patton, 2002). Thus, in this study, I was interested in investigating the perspectives and experiences of individual teacher candidates as well as the potentially reciprocal influence between them and their professional learning community. My goal was to capture individual voices and experiences as teacher candidates engaged in individual and collective construction of understandings.

My desire to richly describe the meaning or essence of experience for participants placed this qualitative research approach in the theoretical camp of phenomenology. As Merriam (2001) asserted, qualitative phenomenological research focuses on “the essence or structure of participant experience through studying a phenomenon commonly experienced” (p. 15). The primary phenomenon under scrutiny was teacher candidates’ self- and socially constructed knowledge from experiencing research-based supervision activities designed to promote critical reflection.

There has been a call for research to establish effective processes to help teacher candidates develop reflectivity (Hatton & Smith, 1995; Pultorak & Barnes, 2009; Rodgers & Scott, 2008). Additionally, there has been a call for more systematic research on what effective supervision looks like (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). Hints were scattered in the literature about what aspects might need to be present in supervision to address both of those research needs. I used my synthesis of those aspects to form a structure of activities for cultivating candidates' critical reflection. I then used participants' individual perspectives on the helpfulness or non-helpfulness of the activities to gain more insight into approaches for enhancing teacher development through a focus on critical reflection.

### **Researcher Subjectivity**

In qualitative research, the researcher serves as the main instrument of data collection and analysis (Merriam, 2001). This approach allows the researcher to focus on the subjective perceptions of participants and how they interpret their experiences (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Qualitative researchers need to establish a degree of distance from their own perceptions and those of participants to ensure that participant views are represented fairly (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). Data collected can be overly influenced by the researcher's views and potentially lessen a study's internal validity unless the researcher uses specific processes, such as *bracketing* (Patton, 2002), to distance the personal views of the researcher. To promote credibility and trustworthiness of this study, I needed to disclose my subjectivities and biases (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). I have presented my autobiography as the researcher in this study to acknowledge my potential

biases and my awareness of the need to ensure that the data collected from the study represents the participants' perspectives and not my own.

## **Researcher Roles**

### Seminar Facilitator/Participant

Before beginning observations of teacher candidates' lesson instruction, my primary role was as a facilitator and participant in six learning community seminars. In managing the face-to-face learning community seminars, my facilitation and participation tasks with teacher candidates included listening, clarifying concerns, asking questions, answering questions, offering ideas, and assisting the group in using critical reflection to enhance their understandings of teaching and learning. Yet, I found myself engaged in other roles, which included being an instructor in the seminars who had prioritized and chosen the teacher education information to offer teacher candidates and who planned on modeling ways to apply critical reflection into classroom instruction.

### Teacher Modeling Reflective Practice

During the facilitation of the meetings, I took on the role of classroom teacher by planning and teaching a lesson in a third-grade classroom. One of my purposes in teaching the lesson was to model a critical self-reflection cycle in teaching where teacher candidates could learn from seeing a reflection cycle that was potentially new to them. To that end, I videotaped myself teaching a lesson in a third-grade classroom. By doing this, I followed a suggestion by Intrator and Kunzman (2009) cited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (2010) that teacher educators find opportunities to teach students in the K-12 classroom. To further model the critical reflection cycle, I

explicitly used the Developmental Levels of Reflection (Hatton & Smith, 1995) to plan my lesson, including a pre-, during-, and post-lesson reflection. I made copies of my lesson and reflections for teacher candidates and used them for discussion in Seminar #5 and Seminar #6.

To model the importance of familiarity with teaching context, I also shared with teacher candidates how I met with the classroom teacher several weeks ahead of time to get to know her, as well as the students individually, along with the classroom procedures. I also shared my critical reflection on the curriculum materials the teacher had given me with her suggestion that I could modify them any way I needed to, assuming I would still focus on the math concept they contained. After critically reflecting on my lesson plans with the teacher candidates during Seminar #5, I videotaped myself teaching the lesson and subsequently shared my during- and post-lesson reflections at Seminar #6.

#### Instruction Observer/Evaluator

Each week during the semester, I met with teacher candidates to dialogue, schedule, and observe them teaching at least five lessons in the classroom. These observations were followed by scheduled debriefings between me and the teacher candidate. During debriefings, we discussed the teacher candidate's during- and post-lesson reflections along with my observation comments and specific prompts for critical reflection on their lesson. Following these debriefings, the teacher candidates and I both wrote journal reflections to develop additional insights and understandings about the lesson. My researcher journal entries also included comments about the teacher candidate's lesson. Teacher candidates' journal reflections were either hand-delivered to

me, sent as an email attachment, or I retrieved them for analysis from the supervision blog site.

### Advocate for Critical Reflection

In addition to my roles as facilitator, critical reflection modeler, and supervisor, I assumed the role of advocate. My primary purpose in the study was advocating that teacher candidates critically reflect on their teaching pedagogy to enhance the quality and equity of instruction. I wanted to kindle a critically reflective stance (disposition) on all issues of teaching and learning. Cochran-Smith (2003) called this an inquiry stance toward all aspects of teaching and learning for purposes of equity in reaching all students' learning needs. Researchers are beginning to assert that critical reflection or inquiry should be imbedded into every aspect of teacher education, including teaching practice (Cochran-Smith, Shakman et al., 2009; Darling-Hammond, 2005; Feiman-Nemser, 2001a).

### Data Collector

In addition to the roles already mentioned, as the researcher in the study, I collected data to determine the impact of specific supervision practices with teaching candidates. To promote clarity in reading about the data sources, nine codes are consistently used for the types of documents I collected. These nine data codes will be referred to throughout Chapters 3, 4, and 5.

BWP – Belief Writing Prompts

RWP – Reflection Writing Prompts

UWP – Understandings Writing Prompts

EWP/LRS – Exit Writing Prompts and Likert Rating Scale

ST - Seminar Transcripts

TCJ - Teacher Candidate Journals

FN - Field Notes

ODN – Observation Debriefing Notes

RJ – Researcher Journal

Data sources are referred to in a systematic order. The data source code is first, followed by the teacher candidate's name (if it is not obviously mentioned in the related text), and the date the document was written. For example, reference to a September 29, 2011 comment made by Paula collected from seminar transcripts is listed as "(ST, Paula, 9/29/2011)" or "(ST, 9/29/2011)." Data collection and credibility are provided in the final sections of this chapter.

### **State University's Teacher Education Program**

The elementary teacher education program at State University is a four-year program accredited by NCATE, in which teacher candidates fulfill the requirements for a Bachelor of Arts degree. Within the elementary education program, coursework is required in a variety of teaching methods areas, including a general teaching and learning methods class, curriculum and methods classes in social studies, mathematics, science, classroom learning environments, and assessment. Methods coursework and practice teaching in schools are also required in exceptionality and cultural diversity to help teacher candidates meet the unique needs of individual students. Teacher candidates also are instructed in child and educational psychology and classroom management.

One or more of these courses may include short-term classroom teaching experiences with an assigned and experienced mentor teacher. After successful completion of university core requirements with at least a 2.75 grade point average, teacher education coursework with at least a 3.0 grade point average, teacher candidates may apply for their professional year of practice teaching. Once the professional year is completed and the teacher candidates receive positive recommendations from their supervisor and mentor, the university may recommend that the teacher candidate receive a K-8 elementary education teaching certification from the State Department of Education.

#### Professional Year in Teacher Preparation

The first sixteen weeks of the Professional Year teacher candidates are considered Intern Teachers. They practice teaching three days per week in an elementary classroom alongside a mentor teacher to which they have been assigned. The intern teaching semester is teacher candidates' first experience with university supervision of their teaching practice in the classroom. During these sixteen weeks, intern teachers may begin primarily by observing the actions and procedures of their mentor and gradually taking on increased teaching responsibilities. The second sixteen weeks of the Professional Year teacher candidates are considered Student Teachers. Their practice teaching occurs five days per week during which time teacher candidates gradually assume complete responsibility for most if not all aspects of the classroom, including lesson planning, teaching, assessing student progress, classroom management, attending staff meetings, and other requirements. Thus, teacher candidates engage in their Professional Year at the

schools where the university and the schools have agreed to place them while being taught and overseen by a university supervisor. The university's catalog states that:

During the Professional Year, teacher candidates are expected to engage in responsible teaching, participate in co-curricular activities, maintain close contact with faculty and students in the assigned school, and participate in seminars and conferences with their university supervisors.

Supervision at State University is typically performed by graduate students, adjunct teachers, retired teachers, administrators and university professors. Supervisors and teacher candidates are guided in the Professional Year by the Elementary Education Field Guide with its foundational Core Teaching Standards. These ten standards are based on national teaching standards and form the basis of teacher candidate performance assessments at the end of each semester's sixteen-week practice experience.

### **Participant Context**

This section provides specific participant features, including participant selection and roles, as well as participants' personal characteristics within the settings of their individual placement schools.

#### **Participant Selection**

Participant selection for this study was based on convenience (Patton, 2002) in that all participants were teacher candidates in their final year of practice teaching. The university assigned these 11 teacher candidates to practice teaching at three schools with me as their supervisor. Among the 11 were first-semester teacher candidates and second or final-semester teacher candidates who were placed in groups of 2, 4, and 5 at the three schools. All 11 teacher candidates were sent a Participant Recruitment Email Letter (Appendix A) to inform them of the study. All 11 teacher candidates agreed to participate

in this study and signed a letter of consent (Appendix B). As outlined in the letter of consent, teacher candidates agreed to participate on a voluntary basis and were given no compensation for their participation.

### Role of Participants

Participation in the study was time intensive with teacher candidates: 1) attending six weekly seminars together during the first six weeks of the semester, 2) planning, teaching, and debriefing on five lessons observed by me as their supervisor, 3) self-videotaping one of their lessons and debriefing with me, and 4) writing weekly journal reflections about the seminar themes, lesson observations, or other teacher candidate concerns. Teacher candidates were given the option of whether they wanted me to observe the lesson they were videotaping. I chose this approach because, though there was clarity on the benefits of videotaping and analyzing teaching candidates' lessons (NCATE, 2010), there was less clarity on whether it was explicitly beneficial for the supervisor to watch the lesson.

### Placement Schools for Practice Teaching

Once the school principals have determined which teachers in their buildings have enough experience, skill, and desire to mentor a teacher candidate, the wheels are set in motion for placement. Supervisors and university administrators may collaborate with school principals and district administrators to determine which teacher candidates are placed in which schools with which teachers. State University requires that teacher candidates have a primary grade teaching experience (in a kindergarten – third-grade

classroom) as well as an intermediate grade teaching experience (in a fourth – sixth grade classroom).

Each school can have the added distinction of differing demographics. For example, a school may have a high percentage of student immigrants who are learning English or a high percentage of students from low-income families. Such conditions can make teachers' instruction and student learning more challenging. Financially, schools may have the finest and most up-to-date equipment and classroom resources or be lacking in these features. Thus, the community context and financial resources of the particular school can frame much of the learning opportunities available to students.

### Participant Characteristics

A summary of demographic information for the teacher candidates and their placement schools is provided in Table 1. Pseudonyms are used for names of the teacher candidates and their schools. Additional information includes whether the schools have sufficient percentage of student families qualifying for free and reduced lunch to receive Title I federal program money (T1); whether there is a sufficient student population learning English to qualify for federally funded support (EL); if the teacher candidate is an intern teacher (in the first semester of their Professional Year) or a student teacher (in the second semester of their professional year); the grade level(s) in which teacher candidates did their practice teaching; and whether the school allowed teacher candidates to remain in one grade/class the entire semester or required them to transfer to another grade/class mid-semester.

**Table 1. Teacher Candidates and School Placement Demographics**

	Name	Intern/ <b>Student</b> Teacher	Placement School	Title 1/EL	Grade	Change Mid- Semester
1	Candy	Intern	Madelyn O.	T1/EL	K	5 <sup>th</sup>
2	Haley	Intern	Madelyn O.	T1/EL	6 <sup>th</sup>	K
3	Wendy	Intern	Madelyn O.	T1/EL	5 <sup>th</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>
4	Elaine	Intern	Madelyn O.	T1/EL	2 <sup>nd</sup>	6 <sup>th</sup>
5	Brad	<b>Student</b>	Madelyn O.	T1/EL	1 <sup>st</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>
6	Laura	Intern	Inspiration	-	3 <sup>rd</sup>	-
7	Annett	<b>Student</b>	Inspiration	-	5 <sup>th</sup>	-
8	Paula	<b>Student</b>	Inspiration	-	K	-
9	Suzanne	<b>Student</b>	Inspiration	-	2 <sup>nd</sup>	-
10	Holly	Intern	Littlefield	T1/EL	3 <sup>rd</sup>	-
11	Tana	<b>Student</b>	Littlefield	T1/EL	1 <sup>st</sup>	-

#### Madelyn Olsen Elementary

There is a high immigrant population learning English and other basic skills at Madelyn Olsen, which receives federal assistance as a Title I and an EL school. Teacher candidates placed there are required to split each semester between a primary and an intermediate classroom teaching experience. Exact dates for these grade level transitions are determined by agreement among the mentors involved. So teacher candidates such as Brad transitioned at a different time than Haley since they had completely different mentors. But generally, the transitions were mid-semester for everyone.

Five teacher candidates were placed at Madelyn Olsen, four intern teachers in the first semester of the professional year and one student teacher in the second semester of the professional year. The semester this study began was my first supervision experience at Madelyn Olsen. It was also my first opportunity to meet the five teacher candidates. This section provides a description of each teacher candidate. To situate teacher candidates individually at their placement schools, personal characteristics, relationship with their mentors, and the perspectives about their school are presented.

### Candy

Candy was an intern teacher who had recently spent a semester studying in Spain and felt that this experience had helped her learn to be more outgoing with others (FN, 8/31/2011). Candy's warm, engaging personality was evident from the first day I met her. In order to make up for missing teacher education coursework while she studied abroad, Candy was taking multiple methods courses while she was intern-teaching. During the seminars, she commented about how overwhelming it was for her (FN, 9/28/2011).

The first half of the semester Candy did her practice teaching in a kindergarten classroom in which she taught a morning class until noon and an afternoon class after lunch. Candy had good relations with her kindergarten mentor and enjoyed the students, although she didn't always agree with how her mentor planned her lessons (TCJ/11/30/2011).

Candy was excited but anxious about transitioning mid-semester to older students and a different mentor in a fifth grade classroom placement (FN, 10/24/2011). When Candy moved to her 5<sup>th</sup> grade placement mid-semester, she established a good relationship with her mentor and the students. Candy appreciated Madelyn Olsen

Elementary as the site for practice teaching even with some serious homework issues that arose among her fifth-grade students. Candy reached out to an intern teacher at another school who had developed some solutions to homework non-completion in elementary classrooms (FN, 12/9/2011).

### Haley

Haley was an intern teacher who had recently gotten married when this study was conducted and was getting everyone used to her new last name and email address. Haley radiated a quiet, confident, and gentle personality at Madelyn Olsen. During the mornings of her internship, Haley attended university art classes to complete an art minor (ST, 8/31/2011). She made up for the morning hours she missed by practice teaching five afternoons per week for an equivalent amount of time.

The first half of the semester Haley did her practice teaching in a sixth-grade classroom in which she enjoyed working with students and collaborating with her mentor. Haley was building a rapport with students as well as her sixth grade mentor when I observed her first lesson (ODN, 10/5/2011). When Haley transitioned mid-semester to her kindergarten placement, her new kindergarten mentor commented to me how impressed she was that Haley was handling the different instructional needs between sixth graders and kindergartners very well (FN, 11/16/2011). One of the ways Haley did this was by planning and teaching vibrant art lessons. She turned the room and hallway into an attractive art gallery from the ceiling of the classroom to the bulletin board in the hall.

### Wendy

As an intern teacher, Wendy was good-natured and usually had a ready smile. She enjoyed playing the piano and wanted to incorporate music into lessons whenever she felt it could benefit student learning (ODN, 11/2/2011). Wendy lived in a nearby town about 45 miles from her placement site and it was difficult for her to gauge the time required for her to be on time. The first half of the semester Wendy did per practice teaching in a fifth-grade class. Wendy started the semester optimistically:

My first few days of being an intern have been quite a new experience for me. It is a whole different world and I am trying really hard to adjust and be flexible. I feel extremely fortunate to be among such a professional faculty. This is a wonderful school. My mentor teacher is awesome. Every day will be a storm of information in her class. I strongly hope I am prepared enough for this opportunity. (TCJ, 9/11/2011)

But after the first month, Wendy felt uncomfortable. She hadn't developed a good rapport with her mentor or a comfort level with the students. Wendy told me she felt intimidated by her mentor, Ardeth, and wanted her to share more about classroom procedures such as lesson planning (FN, 9/28/2011). Wendy only taught small groups during her fifth-grade placement. At mid-semester, Wendy transitioned to her second-grade placement class and she was more comfortable. Her second-grade mentor was outgoing and tried to make Wendy feel welcome there. By the end of the semester, Wendy was able to teach a lesson to the entire second-grade class (ODN, 12/8/2011).

### Elaine

Elaine began the semester as an intern teacher with extensive classroom experience working as a teaching aide with small groups of ESL students at Madelyn Olsen. She had also taken a district-recommended ESL course to learn pedagogy for

reaching students who are learning English. The course included material about the benefits of critical thinking for teachers and students (ST, 8/31/2011).

Elaine was very comfortable with the school, staff, and students. In fact, it wasn't unusual for Elaine to greet students by name as we went down the hall together (FN, 10/5/2011). She was also a creative cook and when holidays rolled around, Elaine could be seen taking homemade treats to staff members. Elaine had the added characteristic of being a fluent Spanish speaker, an attribute greatly appreciated by the second-grade mentor who said that she really hoped Elaine could get a teaching position at Madelyn Olsen (FN, 10/26/2011). After finishing the first half of the semester in second grade, Elaine transitioned to sixth grade. With the attitude issues in the sixth grade class, Elaine worked closely with her mentor and often sought out her opinions and perspectives on classroom issues (ODN, 12/9/2011).

### Brad

Brad was the only student teacher and the only male teacher candidate at Madelyn Olsen. Brad had not done his intern teaching at the school the prior semester. Brad was new to the school because he chose to move with his mentor when she transferred from another school in the district. This move had occurred during the summer and his mentor had set up her class in a brand new setting (FN, 8/24/2011).

At the previous school, Brad rarely saw his supervisor. Brad and his mentor arrived at Madelyn Olsen frustrated by the lack of supervision the prior semester and expressed their relief that I would be there regularly (FN, 8/24/2011). Brad was nervous about how the new semester would go with so many changes to get used to.

During the first half of the semester, Brad continued practice teaching in first grade with his mentor from the prior semester. They had developed such a close relationship that they could communicate verbally and nonverbally with the slightest gestures (ODN, 10/4/2011). Their relationship became strained in the weeks prior to Brad's transition to his fourth-grade classroom placement. Brad was concerned that his mentor thought he wasn't as strong in classroom management as he could or should be (FN, 11/10/2011).

Brad's fourth-grade mentor was supportive in making him feel comfortable with the older students and classroom routines and help him handle how much he missed the first graders. When we met to plan his fourth-grade lesson observations, Brad knew from memory the timeline of every subject and event in the classroom. He knew how subjects were taught, the programs used, and who would be teaching them between him and his mentor (FN, 11/10/2011).

### Inspiration Elementary

Inspiration Elementary was the only school among the three in the study that did not receive federal money from Title I or EL assistance programs. During the course of this study, four teacher candidates were placed at Inspiration Elementary, three student teachers who had done their intern teaching there the prior semester and one intern teacher who was just beginning her Professional Year.

### Laura

Laura came to Inspiration Elementary as an intern teacher, joining a group of three student teachers who did intern teaching there the prior semester. Laura and I did

know each other however, since I had been one of her teaching methods instructors the prior year. Since Laura couldn't meet with the group when we first met at Inspiration, she and I met at the university together (FN, 8/23/2011). Laura openly expressed the tension she was under with planning her approaching wedding, childcare issues with her son, and the 40-minute commute she would be doing for this semester.

Laura talked about how excited she was to start practice teaching at this particular school. The principal had been her much-admired fifth-grade teacher and had remained a close family friend over the years (BWP, 8/27/2011). Laura was glad that teacher candidates at Inspiration were not required to change classrooms mid-semester because she was able to spend the entire semester in her third-grade placement. Laura got along well with the students who were the same age as her third-grade son (FN, 8/23/2011). Laura developed a close relationship with her third-grade mentor and would quote things her mentor said at the seminars (ST, 9/15/2011).

### Annett

Annett began her student teaching semester with two years of prior experience working with young children as a nanny. Annett was very comfortable with children and could easily interact with them with enthusiasm and creative ideas. As a student teacher at Inspiration, Annett rejoined Suzanne and Paula with whom she had an established relationship from intern teaching together the prior semester. When I met with the three of them to look at the semester ahead, they were chatting like old friends (FN, 8/24/2011). Annett was very caring for the other teacher candidates and if she had a concern about one of them or knew of a specific problem they were having, she would come to me to see what could be done (FN, 10/27/2011).

Annett was thrilled that she could remain in her fourth-grade classroom the entire time. Annett had a deep sense of responsibility to her students and to her mentor. Annett debriefed with him about instruction and other issues in the classroom every day. She felt that this relationship with her mentor was a big part of her success during her student teaching (EWP/LRS, 12/7/2011).

### Paula

When Paula began the semester as a student teacher, she was a mother of two children and expecting her third child. In fact, Paula and her family moved during the semester to a bigger house for their growing family. Paula had served a mission in another state for her church and was caring, enthusiastic, and outgoing with others (ODN, 9/1/2011). She was comfortable with children and had a strong sense of responsibility to help students succeed in school.

Paula was excited to practice teaching in kindergarten. She had explicitly asked if she could be assigned to a kindergarten classroom for her student teaching semester. Paula admired her kindergarten mentor who taught lessons to the students with a sense of humor that engaged and delighted them (ST, 9/29/2011). It took almost a month for Paula to find her own style of teaching and managing kindergartners that worked well and comfortably for her. And singing her management cues and some instructions provided the answer she had been looking for.

Paula found Inspiration Elementary to be a positive environment for students and for her practice teaching. She was sad to have to leave three weeks early before the semester officially ended because her baby was ready to be born. A written agreement was made between Paula, her mentor, the principal, the school district and the university

stipulating that Paula would return to finish student teaching the next semester (FN, 11/14/2011).

### Suzanne

Suzanne began the semester as a student teacher with extensive experience on the university basketball team. Teamwork was an important character trait in Suzanne's life and in her desires to create a sense of community in her classroom. Suzanne felt strongly that it is by mistakes that we learn, in fact that's what "learning really means." She wanted to help students take risks in their learning efforts by challenging students' thinking (BWP, 9/1/2011).

Suzanne came eagerly to our first seminar with a new journal her grandmother had recently given her specifically for teachers. Laura, Annett, Paula, and I were all curious about the reflection prompts in the journal and they were a topic of conversation. Ultimately, everyone asked Suzanne to copy a blank page from her teacher journal for all the seminar participants, which she did. The journal prompts were questions that seemed to fit right in with our seminar topics and reflections, such as, "Goals and ideas for a better tomorrow," "My action plan," and "The process of reflection that will help me in evaluating the plan's effectiveness" (ST, 9/1/2011). The idea of action plans recurred at times when this group met in seminar (ST, 9/29/2011).

Suzanne enjoyed the students in her second-grade placement for the semester, but she struggled to build a relationship with her mentor until she finally felt comfortable talking openly with her mentor about issues in the classroom.

### Littlefield Elementary

Littlefield Elementary had a high student population from families who had recently immigrated to the area from other countries and students from mid to low socio-economic levels. Littlefield received federal support from Title I and EL programs. During the course of this study, two teacher candidates were placed at Littlefield Elementary, Holly and Tana. Holly was new to Littlefield. Tana did her practice teaching there the prior semester with me assigned to be her university supervisor.

### Holly

When Holly began as an intern teacher, she had prior experiences working as a nanny with young children. She was very comfortable with children. Holly had a full personal life, working part-time at her nanny job, planning her approaching wedding, and completing two methods courses (FN, 8/26/2011). These conditions often prohibited Holly from participating in school-related functions.

No one told me in advising that I would need to keep some time open on school days before and after school. I thought my time was my own. I have already made commitments to work on the off-school hours and plans for weekend travel. I won't be able to attend parent/teacher conferences, the family activities at night or staff meetings before school. (FN, 9/30/2011)

Holly had a relationship of trust with Marva, her third-grade mentor, and went to her for feedback when issues arose in the classroom or when topics piqued her interest in the seminars (TCJ, 9/28/2011). Marva was supportive by offering Holly articles to read, talking about classroom events, and working with her to set up electronic presentations with the school's less than state-of-the art equipment.

Holly was comfortable with whole-group instruction from the time of her first observation (ODN, 10/26/2011). She enjoyed the diverse mix of students from many

cultures at Littlefield and developed a curiosity about the differences among schools and neighborhoods.

### Tana

Tana developed a reputation for her helpfulness and her dedication to teaching while at Littlefield. As an intern teacher there the prior semester, Tana had been able and willing to come to the aid of her mentor's grade-level colleagues. In fact, the staff's appreciation for Tana carried into the semester of this study. Staff members continued to praise how she had helped with the complex demands of the yearly social studies competition (FN, 10/3/2011).

Another carry-over from her prior semester as an intern teacher was that Tana had taught in fourth/fifth grade combo class with no strong behavior or academic problems. She developed a perspective that this was the norm for classrooms even though she had been told it was not. The semester this study began, Tana was a student teacher in a first-grade classroom of students with challenging academic, behavior, and family issues, including the death of a student's parent (ODN, 10/28/2011). Tana felt high levels of anxiety and helplessness about these situations and specific first-grade students. Tana had a close relationship with her first-grade mentor and gradually developed positive relationships with her first graders (ODN, 11/11/2011).

### **Specific Features of Supervision**

This section provides a timeline for supervision and study deadlines and descriptions of the six seminars and supervision practices. I used specific teacher education practices from my research in Chapter 2 to design a systematic supervision

process. Holding seminars fulfilled university stipulations for supervisors in State University's Elementary Education Field Guide for Professional Year Internship and Student Teaching. I based the order of topics to be addressed in the seminars upon anticipation of what information and experiences teacher candidates would need to build their understandings and to potentially practice applying them in the seminars and/or the classroom.

#### Timeline for Supervision and Study

Following my August 17, 2011 e-mail invitation to meet with teacher candidates for the new semester, our meetings officially began on Wednesday, August 24, 2011. I met throughout the day with each group of teacher candidates at their placement schools, with the exception of Laura. Because Laura did not have time available on that Wednesday and another mutually agreeable day was not available, Laura asked if she and I could meet Tuesday, August 23, 2011, at the university. Thus, supervision began on August 17, 2011 and continued 15 weeks until December 9, 2011, the last full week of teaching practice for intern and student teachers. A timeline for supervision and the study is presented in Table 2 with a more detailed seminar schedule in Appendix C.

**Table 2. Supervision and Study Timeline**

Task	Date(s)
Contacted teacher candidates	August 17, 2011
Held introductory teacher candidate meetings	August 23-24, 2011
Metropolitan School District Approval	August 30 – September 9, 2011
Baxter School District Approval	August 30 – September 29, 2011
1 <sup>st</sup> Seminar: Effects of Teaching Beliefs	August 31 – September 2, 2011
2 <sup>nd</sup> Seminar: Levels of Reflection	September 7-9, 2011
3 <sup>rd</sup> Seminar: Dialogue and Learning Communities	September 14-16, 2011
4 <sup>th</sup> Seminar: Reflection for Equitable Instruction	September 21-23, 2011
5 <sup>th</sup> Seminar: Modeling Pre-Lesson Reflection	September 28-30, 2011
Supervisor's lesson in a third grade classroom	October 3, 2011
6 <sup>th</sup> Seminar: Modeling Post-Lesson Reflection	October 3-5, 2011
Beginning of Lesson Observations and Debriefings	October 4 – December 9, 2011
Institutional Review Board deadline	October 15, 2011
Exit Writing Prompts and Likert Rating Scale	December 5-9, 2011

### Professional Year Seminars

Teacher candidates were allowed to select the best day and time for our seminars from among the three days that I could make supervision visits. I chose the place within

each school based on room availability and suitability. The Madelyn Olsen teacher candidates preferred Wednesdays after school for their seminars. Inspiration teacher candidates preferred Thursday afternoons during the last hour of the day when their students went to special classes. Littlefield teacher candidates chose Friday mornings before school. The only exception was the sixth seminar. Since the Metropolitan School District didn't have school on the normal seminar days for Inspiration and Littlefield, we had Seminar #6 on Monday, October 3, 2011 for both schools.

During the semester, I used four primary protocols (see list in Appendix D) from the National School Reform Faculty website ([www.nsrffharmony.org](http://www.nsrffharmony.org)). One of the NSRF protocols I studied before the seminars began was *Considerations for Responsive Facilitation* in order to understand my facilitator role.

#### Seminar #1: Teaching Beliefs

Seminar #1 occurred from August 31 – September 2, 2011 at all three schools and within a week after the new school year had begun. The seminar began with my asking how everyone was doing in their classrooms and how they felt about the school. This led to a question I asked to introduce the idea of teaching beliefs and the impact our teaching beliefs can have on instruction (Yost, Sentner, & Forlenza-Bailey, 2000; Howard, 2003):

*How can our school experiences influence our teaching beliefs and practices?*

After a few minutes of discussion and to further unpack teaching beliefs, I used a protocol I had adapted for the smaller size of the seminar groups, Inquiry Circles and Storytelling Summary Sheet ([www.nsrffharmony.org](http://www.nsrffharmony.org)). Teacher candidates were asked to think about their teaching beliefs and what had formed those beliefs. They were asked to reflect on their schooling from elementary through college related to teaching and

learning. As suggested by the protocol, I then asked teacher candidates to first write down their schooling experiences and their teaching beliefs. Second, I asked them to interview one other person in the group and write down that individual's school experiences, beliefs, and understandings. Third, teacher candidates were asked to come back to the whole group and report on what they learned about one another's teaching beliefs in the interviews. Since there was an odd number in the Madelyn Olsen group, I assumed the role of partner for Wendy and interviewed and reported on her. The activity purpose was to foster insight into one's own experiences from hearing peers' understandings of their experiences.

At Madelyn Olsen and Littlefield, where the teacher candidates didn't know one another, using this protocol allowed participants to talk one-on-one with a peer and get to know one another a little bit. At Inspiration, it allowed one-on-one interactions between Laura as a new teacher candidate and one of the other three people who already knew each another.

After everyone had a chance to share teaching and learning beliefs in this format, I asked teacher candidates to write individual responses to the following Belief Writing Prompts (BWP), which I called *Reflecting on Your Teaching and Learning Beliefs*:

- 1) How do you feel your experiences measure up against the philosophy of your teaching education program?
- 2) Do you foresee those experiences impacting you as a teacher? And if so, How?
- 3) How do you feel your knowledge and beliefs measure against the philosophy of your teaching education program?

- 4) Do you foresee your knowledge and beliefs impacting your teaching? And if so, how?

Subsequently, we discussed written responses from anyone who wanted to share. Before concluding the seminar, I collected the written responses to the prompts. I felt that the sequence of having the activity and discussion before the writing prompts might promote reflection on individual teacher candidates' schooling experiences and beliefs.

### Seminar #2: The Role of Reflection

The second week's seminar occurred from September 7 – 9, 2011 and began with my asking what was happening at the school and how teacher candidates were doing. Specifically, I asked about interests and/or concerns of teacher candidates, such as how Candy's methods classes were going. I told the group that we would continue the university's practice of reflecting during the semester. I said I would like them to write responses to some Reflection Writing Prompts (RWP) so I could determine what specific feelings and understandings they had about reflection (Darling-Hammond, 2008; Cochran-Smith, Shakman et al., 2009; Sockett, 2008). The prompts were essentially three questions related to reflective aspects of the supervision practices teacher candidates would be encountering in the coming weeks and months:

- 1) Describe your understandings about reflection in teaching.
- 2) How do you think reflection could relate to equity issues in the classroom?
- 3) How do you feel reflection might relate to collaboration?

The writing was followed by a discussion about teacher candidate responses. Then, I shared some information about reflection by distributing a Reflection Info Sheet (Appendix E). To engage teacher candidates and promote their responses to the

information, I asked them to select and share the purposes of reflection they found particularly interesting and/or surprising from among the five listed.

- To understand experience
- To foster a questioning disposition
- To enhance teaching proficiency
- To construct a professional identity
- To test education theory in school experience

To transition from purposes of reflection and develop the idea of levels of reflection, I asked teacher candidates if they were aware of times when their personal reflections seemed to be for different purposes or at different levels. At each school, ideas were shared about the different purposes and levels of reflection in teacher candidates' lives, such as what to have for dinner as opposed to decisions about whether or not to buy a new car. It was generally felt that the greater the potential impact of the decision, the deeper the reflection could conceivably be.

I asked if teacher candidates had ever thought about the idea of different purposes and levels of reflection in education. I shared that education researchers (Hatton & Smith, 1995; King & Kitchener, 2004) had suggested specific levels of reflection in teaching. I passed out a copy of Hatton and Smith's Developmental Levels of Reflection for teacher candidates to look at (Appendix F). Then, I asked what teacher candidates thought about the levels and whether the levels could inform their own reflections in teaching. We talked specifically about why *reflection on teaching technique* was considered the first level of reflection in education on Hatton and Smith's chart. We also talked about critical

reflection as the highest level in the ways it looks at the short-term and long-term consequences of instructional practices.

At the Inspiration Elementary seminar, Suzanne asked if these levels could also be used with students. That comment laid paving stones for some teacher candidates to explore possible effects of teachers' instructional reflections on student reflections. I asked teacher candidates to think about these levels during the coming weeks and write what they thought about them in their journals in terms of their teaching.

At that point, teacher candidates were given the option of doing weekly written reflections in one of four ways, hand-written and delivered to me each week when I came to their school, typed and hand-delivered, typed into the designated blog site I set up, or typed as an email attachment and sent to me. The only stipulation was they choose and commit to one reflection method, or let me know if they wanted to change, so that expectations would be clear. There were diverse responses to journaling options among the 11 teacher candidates:

Writing on the electronic blog site	4
Hand writing journals and giving copies to me	5
Sending typed journal entries as email attachments	2

I wanted teacher candidates to have a say in how they did their written reflections and be comfortable with the method they chose.

### Seminar #3: Dialogue and Learning Communities

The seminar began as usual with sharing what was going on with teacher candidates. To begin the seminar, I initiated a discussion with the help of an information sheet (Appendix G) I synthesized from research on characteristics of effective dialogue (Brookfield, 1995; Elinor & Gerard, 1998; Ryan & Cooper, 2006). The Info Sheets were distributed to teacher candidates who were asked to look for dialogue characteristics that particularly interested or surprised them. My intention was to prompt teacher candidates to form their own personal list of effective dialogue strategies from the list of recommendations. We then discussed what dialogue strategies each person had chosen. Since some teacher candidates had chosen *Inquiring into underlying assumptions* as a dialogue strategy, we talked about what type of questions would be appropriate for doing that. I suggested that there were specific types of questions that could promote dialogue, including *probing* and *clarifying* questions. We talked about how we would define probing and clarifying questions. In order for us to see examples of each type of question, I distributed a copy of Pocket Guide to Probing Questions ([www.nsrharmony.org](http://www.nsrharmony.org)) for us to read and discuss how these could be used as instructional strategies with students in the classroom.

### Seminar #4: Student Needs and the Role of Equity in Teaching

Informal conversations within each seminar group led into Seminar #4. I started the formal part of the seminar by distributing a copy of Quinn's Six Questions ([www.nwrharmony.org](http://www.nwrharmony.org)) and initiating dialogue about how the questions could be used to assess teaching pedagogy:

- What am I teaching and to whom?

- Why am I teaching it?
- How am I teaching it?
- Why am I teaching it that way?
- What evidence will I collect to show my kids are getting it?
- How will my students know they are getting it?

During the dialogue, I shared that researchers have suggested that teachers ask themselves questions to determine if their instruction is equitable. (Ladson-Billings, 1994; Pultorak & Barnes, 2009, Shandomo, 2010). Seminar groups talked about ways the questions could help them be better teachers and work to meet the academic needs of all students.

The teaching dialogue cited in Chapter 2 from Ladson-Billings (1994), which I call Prompt for Discussion about Equity in Teaching, was distributed and read as a role-play (Appendix H). Each participant took the part of the teacher or a student. More questions were used after the role-play to prompt dialogue and reflection.

- How was equity an issue in this pedagogy?
- What are students' unique qualities that should influence your teaching pedagogy?
- How can critical reflection be used to meet student needs equitably?

To give teacher candidates additional experience in confronting possible equity issues and the theories that can support ways of handling them, we did a scenario activity (Appendix I) I had designed. Groups of two or three teacher candidates were given a set of *theory cards* and a set of *equity scenario cards* and asked to collaborate in determining which theory card(s) might support how they could handle dilemmas in each equity

scenario card. Then, these groups were asked to share how and why they matched particular theory cards to scenario cards with the whole seminar group.

#### Seminar #5: Modeling Pre-Lesson Critical Reflection

Critical reflection in teaching is advocated as part of a teacher's travel bag to develop critical reflection in students and help transform society (Darling-Hammond, 2005; Feiman-Nemser, 2001a; Giroux, 1988). To that end, we made explicit connections from prior seminars between teaching, critical reflection, use of dialogue, and equitable instruction. I shared my desire to find a class in which to teach and use the seminar ideas we had talked about thus far. Holly and I got excited about the idea of me teaching at Littlefield with its diverse mix of students.

Subsequently, I met with Marva, Holly's third-grade mentor, who agreed to have me teach a math lesson to her students. I visited the class to observe students during a math lesson and made a seating chart of students to get to know them. Then, I created a math lesson with my critical reflections before teaching the lesson. At Seminar #5, I shared a copy of my lesson plan and pre-lesson reflections with each teacher candidate (see Appendix J). We discussed specific areas of the lesson plan to determine if I had planned my lesson with equity in mind for all of the students. There was one term that I changed in the lesson because I didn't think it was common knowledge for some of the EL students and might complicate their math learning. The following Monday morning I taught the math lesson while Marva videotaped it.

### Seminar #6: Modeling Post-Lesson Critical Reflection

The videotaped lesson was shared that afternoon with each of the Littlefield and Inspiration seminar groups and the Madelyn Olsen group two days later. Since I had some technology difficulties arise, it didn't work out to show the entire videotaped lesson to the seminar groups. With the exception of Holly who was in the class during my entire third-grade lesson, the other teacher candidates only got to see 10-20 minutes of the videotaped lesson. This condition made it difficult to get a full sense of the interactive dialogue I used during the lesson. My post-lesson reflections were added to the pre-reflections and given to teacher candidates for discussion purposes at Seminar #6. We critiqued my instruction from the video clip, the lesson plan, and the reflections I had distributed. The goal was to determine if my instructional practices could help students develop the dialogue and questioning skills that would help prepare them for living in a democracy (Darling-Hammond et al., 2002; Henderson & Kesson, 2004).

I found the process of trying to apply Hatton and Smith's (1995) Levels of Reflection to my pre-, during-, and post-lesson reflection cycle very difficult. During discussions in Seminar #6, I confided my desire to clarify Hatton and Smith's (1995) reflection levels by combining them with the simplicity of Quinn's Six Questions ([www.nsrffharmony.org](http://www.nsrffharmony.org)) and information from other educational scholars (Henderson & Kesson, 2004; McLaren, 1995) to form an adaptation of the reflection levels (Appendix K). Discussion of this idea concluded Seminar #6 as the final seminar of the semester.

Thus, seminar groups met together weekly for about an hour each for six weeks during the beginning of the semester until the final seminar the week of October 3, 2011. At that point, lesson observations and debriefings began. Throughout the lesson

debriefings during the semester, teacher candidates and I referred back to the levels of reflection and other seminar concepts as they came up.

### Supervisor Observations and Debriefings

Supervision of teacher candidates' lessons included pre-lesson discussions one-on-one whenever possible. I observed at least five lessons for each teacher candidate and debriefed with them as soon as possible thereafter, as recommended by Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002). My debriefing goal was to support teacher candidates' continual improvement of instructional pedagogy to meet their students' needs. My Observation and Debriefing form was based on the university's teaching standards and allowed space for open-ended comments and questions. The last page included my adaptation of Hatton & Smith's (1995) Developmental Levels of Reflection with Dialogic Reflection explicitly suggesting *consideration of effects of reflection levels for teachers and students*. While observing teacher candidates' instruction, I focused on writing comments about effective teaching practices teacher candidates had used relative to each of the ten university standards. I also wrote probing questions to prompt teacher candidates' critical reflection on how instructional practices might have been improved for their students.

For nine of the 11 teacher candidates, there was an extra debriefing on their videotaped lesson. It was the teacher candidates' option whether or not to have me observe their videotaped lesson.

### **Study Design**

This investigation was a phenomenological case study of the phenomenon of specific supervision practices with the cases of 11 teacher candidates to answer the

question: What is the impact on teacher candidates from specific supervision practices focused on critical reflection? A phenomenological study strives to understand “the meaning, structure and essence of an individual or group’s lived experience of a specific phenomenon” (Patton, 2002, p. 132). The phenomenon in this study is a collection of specific supervision experiences provided to promote teacher candidates’ understandings and teacher development. The experiences provided related to: 1) teaching beliefs, 2) levels of reflection, 3) dialogue and learning communities, and 4) equity. The main processes of providing these experiences were seminar discussions, videotaped instruction, supervisor modeling, and lesson observation and debriefings. I wanted to know how participants perceived the value of these experiences.

A case study was selected primarily for two reasons: the intertwined variables and the set amount of time for the study. Yin (2003) maintains that a case study is the appropriate research design when the variables of the phenomenon and the variables of the context cannot be separated. It would not have been feasible to study supervision practices separately from the contexts of teacher candidates, their mentors, classrooms, and school placement sites. According to Merriam (2001), a case study is appropriate when there is a specific amount of time for data collection or a limited number of participants who could be studied. This investigation had a time boundary of 16 weeks and a specific number of teacher candidates assigned to my supervision. As the researcher for the study, my focus was on the potential impact upon teacher candidates from specific supervision practices. Thus, using a phenomenological case study design helped me to uncover the essence or impact of supervision practices upon teacher candidates.

### Establishing Consent

In order for videotaping to take place in the two school districts, I talked with principals at the three schools and district overseers about any concerns they may have about teacher candidates videotaping their instruction. Subsequent to these conversations, I spoke with mentors and teacher candidates about sending home a letter to parents. The purpose of the letter was to make parents aware of the videotaping purpose for teacher development and that in the videotaping every effort possible would be made to minimize student inclusion (Appendix L). When absolutely necessary, the videotaping from the back of the room might include the back of students' heads. To that end, I wrote a template letter for teacher candidates to fill out and send home with students in their classes. Principals felt that this would be a courtesy to parents and would allow parents the opportunity to ask questions or request that their child be excluded from the videotaping area. One school district required me as the researcher to also write email recruitment letters to the mentors (Appendix M) and the principals (Appendix N) informing them about my study, my commitment to anonymity, and my request for their compliance.

### Data Collection and Organization

The documents I collected and analyzed to answer the research question were three specific writing prompts, seminar transcripts, teacher candidates' journal entries, researcher field notes, lesson observation and debriefing notes, and exit writing prompts with one question using a Likert rating scale.

*Writing Prompts.* Three writing prompts were administered during the seminars. The Beliefs Writing Prompt (BWP) was given toward the beginning of Seminar #1 to

determine teacher candidates' teaching beliefs. To determine teacher candidates' initial perspectives on reflection, their responses to Reflection Writing Prompts (RWP) were sought during Seminar #2. The Understandings Writing Prompt (UWP) was administered at the end of Seminar #6 for teacher candidates to express what they felt they understood well from the seminars and what they might have felt needed clarification. The Exit Writing Prompts and Likert Rating Scale were sent as an email attachment during the last week of the study to determine participant perceptions of supervision practices. Responses to all writing prompts and the Likert rating scale were placed in individual participant files after document analysis was concluded.

*Seminar Transcripts and Field Notes.* The evening following the seminars, I transcribed the digital recordings of our discussions. Additionally, I wrote detailed recollections as field notes of what I had observed during the seminars and what I had heard from other staff members. When seminars concluded, I continued to write field notes on what I saw and heard relative to this investigation. Typed copies were added weekly to my research binder with dividers for transcripts and field notes. There were three days, however, when my digital recorder malfunctioned, September 14-16, 2011 and had to be fixed. These three days were during Seminar #3, Dialogue and Learning Communities. So I had to rely on my typed field notes for those three days.

*Participant Journal Entries.* I collected participants' journal reflections weekly by printing blogged entries and email attachment entries. Handwritten journal reflections were collected at the seminars and during the weekly meetings with teacher candidates after the sixth seminar concluded. Journal entries were placed chronologically in individual participant files.

*Lesson Observation and Debriefings*. When the sixth seminar concluded the week of October 3, 2011, my lesson observations of and debriefings with teacher candidates began. I wrote notes in the margins of my observations about our conversations. Lesson Observation and Debriefings (Appendix O) with margin notes were placed chronologically in participant files.

Triangulation of results occurred by collecting data from multiple dissimilar sources to study the same unit (Guba & Lincoln 1989; Merriam, 2001) and provided support for ascertaining participants' perceived impact of supervision experiences.

### Data Analysis

I started data analysis during data collection (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Merriam, 2001; Miles & Huberman, 1984). Doing data collection and data analysis simultaneously helped me to be continually aware of teacher candidates' emerging perceptions, and to recognize actions I might need to take in supervision and/or research practices.

To highlight individual participants' comments within seminar transcripts and field notes, I established color codes for each teacher candidate (see Appendix P). For example, all comments said by Laura were highlighted in light blue on seminar transcripts and field notes. This color coding established a systematic way to quickly recognize individual comments participants made or comments their mentors made about them for my document analysis.

During the 15 weeks of data collection, I did a coding process described by Bogdan and Biklen (2007), which calls for organizing the data from documents into units of analysis for researcher examination. Key supervision practices such as beliefs, reflections, dialogue, learning community, equity, videotaping, modeling, and critical

reflection became units of analysis (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Patton, 2002) as represented in Table 3.

---

**Table 3. Initial Units of Analysis Used to Identify Impact of Supervisors**

<b>Supervision Experiences</b>
<b>Discussion about Teaching Beliefs</b>
<b>Levels and Purposes of Reflection</b>
<b>Dialogue and Learning Communities</b>
<b>Equity in Teaching</b>
<b>Videotaping Instruction</b>
<b>Modeling Reflection</b>
<b>Observation and Debriefing</b>

---

Additionally, I remained open to codes that could emerge beyond the categories already cited. Thus, in addition to looking for teacher candidate thoughts, conversations, and/or behaviors related to supervision experiences, I remained open to additional terms or codes that could become subset categories of data (Appendix Q). Sometimes sub-codes surfaced from the data, as occurred with various types of dialogue teacher candidates engaged in. For instance, some teacher candidates, such as Laura and Annett, wrote explicitly in their journals about dialogue or discussions with themselves, highlighting questions and responses involved in making sense of their teaching

experiences and/or solving problems. Other teacher candidates used dialogue with their students and then wrote or talked about the results of the dialogue in terms of instructional practices, student learning, and/or classroom management. Some teacher candidates demonstrated and/or referred to dialogue (or the lack of it) with peers, mentors, and/or supervisors. Thus, sub-codes emerged regarding dialogue with self, dialogue with students, and dialogue with various types of colleagues--peers, mentors, and supervisors.

In some cases, the emerging codes were exact words used by participants, as was the case for example with the specific term *risk-taking* used by Suzanne in her responses to the Beliefs Writing Prompts (BWP, 9/1/2011). However, at other times, I interpreted meanings based on analysis of particular situations. For instance, when Suzanne later expressed how extremely hesitant she was to approach her busy mentor, one of the codes I used for her situation was *risk-taking* as a summary term for what she seemed to be experiencing.

I coded all the documents by circling key words and phrases related to supervision experiences and writing summary terms in the margins. Throughout the investigation, I did *constant comparative analysis* of one incident or unit of information with another (Merriam, 2001). This process helped determine, refine, and at times link my codes to one another. As shown in Appendix Q, emerging codes in the study seemed to fall into categories related to either the seminars or prompts for change. For example, during data analysis of Annett's journal entries, her comment, "I've always *tried* to ask questions with purpose and now I have examples and a little bit more knowledge to put my questioning into *action*," (TCJ, 9/15/2011) suggested to me that she felt nudged to

change her pedagogical approach. In this way, emerging codes suggested teacher candidates' perceptions and potential applications of supervision concepts.

At the end of the semester, I made a summary sheet from all the coded documents to try and capture the essence of participant perspectives on supervision experiences (Miles & Huberman, 1984). To do this, I used questions that had guided my coding efforts originally:

- What were the key perceptions that stood out?
- What information was provided (or still needed)?
- What new thoughts are generated?

The summary sheets gave me a sense of individual perspectives, but I wanted an organized overview of participant perspectives. I wanted to know what specific supervision practices participants found helpful to their teacher development during the semester and how the practices considered helpful were manifest in teacher candidates' instructional pedagogy. I was also curious about whether the helpful practices related back to critical reflection in some way.

Ultimately, I employed open-ended exit writing prompts and one question using a Likert rating scale (EWP/LRS) to appraise individual participants' closing perceptions of supervision practices. Then, I used coded data from research documents as evidence to confirm or disconfirm the essence of EWP/LRS responses. For example, I appraised the intern and student teacher responses numerically to see if there were any supervision experiences that every teacher candidate perceived as "Very Helpful" or "Helpful." When I discovered there was one supervision experience in that category, I searched for

incidences in the other documents to write a description of individual participant experience that confirmed or disconfirmed their EWP/LRS responses.

My plan for the EWP/LRS was to give teacher candidates an opportunity to explicitly indicate what value, if any, supervision practices provided for their teacher development. I decided to code the EWP/LRS responses in a variety of ways because I saw them as crucial to participant voice. To prepare the data for analysis, I used Foss and Waters' (2007) cut and paste approach to systematically cut the data apart for sorting, comparing, and contrasting.

1. First, one question asked teacher candidates to rate supervision experiences on a Likert numeric representation or rating scale (i.e., “3” represented “Very Helpful,” “2” represented “Helpful,” “1” represented “Less Helpful”, and “0” represented “Not Helpful”). I made interim case study tables for the data from this question to show how individual participants perceived their supervision experiences and help determine each participant’s most valuable and least valuable experiences (Appendix R).
2. Second, I made an interim case study data display of each participant’s responses to the Exit Writing Prompts (see Appendix S). To simplify and clarify the data, I decided to collapse any overlapping, open-ended questions. For example, questions 2 and 8 are related to aspects of reflection; questions 6, 7, and 9 are related to observation and debriefing; questions 4 and 5 are related to videotaping; and questions 11 and 12 are related to participants’ perceived use of dialogue in their classroom instruction. This process allowed me to consolidate the data into six categories for the writing prompts for each participant.

3. The third step helped clarify Exit Writing Prompt responses across the participants. To prepare individual Exit Writing Prompt response sheets for cutting apart, I wrote the pseudonym for each participant next to each response. Then, I cut all responses apart and glued them together by question (i.e. all the responses to question 1 together, question 2 together, etc.).
4. The fourth step was to make data tables showing the Likert representations based on whether teacher candidates were Intern Teachers in their first semester or Student Teachers in their second semester of the Professional Year (see Appendices T and U). I was curious to see if there were differences in the perceived value of supervision practices related to the length of time participants had been practice teaching.
5. Fifth, I joined data from the Likert rating scale for intern and student teachers to determine a frequency count for specific supervision experiences that teacher candidates found helpful or very helpful. That process immediately revealed which supervision practices participants found most helpful. But it didn't portray how participants perceived all other supervision experiences. To accomplish that, I determined the percentage of helpful or very helpful responses for each supervision practice by dividing the number of responses into the number of participant responses citing the particular experience as helpful or very helpful.

The primary ways documents were analyzed to help answer the research questions(s) are provided in Table 4.

**Table 4. Ways Documents Were Analyzed to Answer Research Questions**

Research Question	Focus	3 Writing Prompts from Seminars:	Seminar Transcripts	Teacher Candidate Journals	Field Notes	Observation Debriefing Notes	Exit Writing Prompts/ Likert Rating Scale:
Main	Impact of supervision experiences	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sub #1	Specifically helpful supervision experiences						X
Sub #2	Ways the helpful supervision experiences manifest in teacher candidates	X	X	X	X	X	X

My research journal was a tool that helped me make sense of the data. For example, one paragraph from a whole-page double spaced reflection reads:

Suzanne loves constructive criticism and she has started excelling as a teacher. Suzanne and I debriefed after her lesson today for 75 minutes before she needed to go do afterschool duty! I had written many notes on her Observation and Debriefing form that we discussed at this debriefing. As Suzanne left for duty, she said, half-jokingly, "Is there a time we could talk all day?" Interesting. If I try to give others a similar amount of constructive criticism they take it very differently! Idea: Do teacher candidates need customized levels of constructive criticism in their observations? (RJ, 11/17/2011)

## **Credibility Procedures**

Credibility is the degree of trustworthiness a research project generates. Creswell and Miller (2000) cite Schwandt in defining validity in qualitative research as “how accurately the account represents participants’ realities of the social phenomena and is credible to them” (p. 1).

The theoretical framework or interpretive position the researcher uses determines selection of procedures. The credibility methods I chose were based on the constructivist theoretical perspective. Since the constructivist approach focuses on individual meaning-making, methods that portray participants individually were chosen. The main validity techniques I used to triangulate (substantiate) the findings from my data were debriefing with a professor/mentor, teacher candidate writing prompts, and providing an accessible audit trail of my analysis process.

### Debriefing

By debriefing with a more experienced researcher, the disclosing of significant ideas for coding and the overall credibility of a research project can be enhanced. The more experienced researcher can critique the direction the researcher is going, ask probing questions and offer alternate perspectives when they are needed. In response to this critique, the researcher must justify themes and evidence for their inclusion from the data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). During the course of this study, I debriefed every week or every other week for about an hour with an experienced teacher, supervisor, and qualitative researcher from the College of Education. I brought to each of these appointments my written itinerary of emerging ideas and concerns to critically discuss

and secure feedback for the conclusions I saw emerging from the data. The credibility of my study was strengthened by the perspective of this more experienced researcher.

#### Exit Writing Prompts and Likert Rating Scale

Obtaining the perspectives of participants in a phenomenological study also strengthens credibility. Knowing the point of view of the teacher candidates regarding the supervision practices allows minimal room for misinterpretation of their positions. The Exit Writing Prompts and Likert Rating Scale for instance helped confirm where teacher candidates stood on their experiences at the end of the study and helped avoid researcher subjectivity on how teacher candidates appraised the value of their experiences (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007).

#### Audit Trail

In qualitative studies of this kind, researchers focus on the accuracy and comprehensiveness of their data (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Further, qualitative researchers gauge the reliability of their studies by the degree of match-up between the way they record the data and what actually happens in the process they are studying, rather than strict consistency across different observations. The organized and methodical procedures of analysis described earlier support this study's reliability. Documenting these procedures establishes an audit trail (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Data for this study is thoroughly documented and easily retrievable for confirmation. The data is stored on a computer hard drive, a thumb drive and in two oversize binders. The largest binder contains all the observations and writing prompt responses for each teacher candidate by

their pseudonym. The mid-size binder contains the Researcher Journal and many of the Field Notes.

*Data triangulation* was accomplished by using data from a variety of sources to help verify the facts (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Creswell, 1998; Patton, 2002). Journal entries of participants, seminar transcripts, researcher field notes, and writing prompts highlight meaning-making and the ways teacher candidates perceived supervision experiences and help clarify any discrepancies that may have arisen.

### **Study Limitations**

The design of this study had the following potential limitations:

- 1) *Researcher Roles and Responsibilities*: The researcher assumed a number of roles explained earlier in this chapter that could increase study limitations.
  - *Power Ethics*: As a supervisor, I had authority over teacher candidates' performance evaluations and professional year grades. This raises a potential concern of power ethics that could have caused participants to behave and/or respond in ways that secured the best possible grades and letters of reference from me rather than teacher candidates being totally candid about how they viewed supervision practices. Therefore, participants responding to the Exit Writing Prompts, for example, could potentially align with my perspective in valuing supervision practices because of my power in evaluating their pedagogy.
  - *New Instructional Practices*: I was facilitating instructional practices in the six seminars that I had never used before. I had no way of knowing

whether the way I planned to present them would be effective or not. For example, I had never integrated developmental levels of reflection into my own pedagogy and was trying to model doing so with teacher candidates. My lack of prior experience teaching the seminar topics could have impaired the quality of the seminars and thus could have been a study limitation.

- *Data Collection:* Adding the role of data collector to my supervision could have limited teacher candidate participation in the seminars. I wondered if using the digital recorder was intrusive to discussion within particular seminars where little or no discussion was generated. At times, participants appeared to glance at the digital recorder and appeared guarded. Ultimately, I had no way of knowing whether teacher candidate comments and behaviors were what they would have been under non-research conditions.
- *Navigating University Requirements and School Requests:* Even my organizational role as supervisor had potential limitations for the seminar process. At Madelyn Olsen, two of the mentor teachers had a suggestion for helping teacher candidates meet one of State University's Professional Year requirements to interview 2-3 Madelyn Olsen staff members. Rather than have teacher candidates individually circulate around the school to do these interviews, the mentors proposed that a different staff member come to the seminars each of the remaining weeks to answer the teacher candidates' interview questions all at once. I knew this approach would

save some staff members from potentially being over-interviewed by the five Madelyn Olsen teacher candidates. I agreed to this idea to support the school staff but was apprehensive about adding more responsibilities to the teacher candidates' seminar day. Indeed, after staff members answered interview questions at the beginning of subsequent seminars, teacher candidates appeared more ready to go home than engage in a seminar. So my desire as a supervisor to support school staff could have created limitations for seminar effectiveness, teacher candidate perceptions of the seminars and study results.

- 2) *Complex Teacher Candidate Roles and Responsibilities*: Seminar instruction may appear to teacher candidates as unnecessary interventions and extra work (Henderson & Kesson, 2004; Wagner, 1997) at a time when teacher candidates desire to simplify their practice teaching experience (Aulls & Shore, 2008). Indeed, my seminar topics were interventions based on teacher education literature and intended to strengthen teacher candidates' pedagogy. Furthermore, teacher candidates can struggle to understand complex roles and responsibilities during their professional year (Darling-Hammond, 2006) and can begin their teaching practice needing the security of specific and/or familiar procedures (Cochran-Smith, 2002). There was a wide range of familiarity and engagement with the seminar concepts, some of which were very new to participants. Moreover, as State University teacher candidates enter their professional year, they are experiencing first-time, on-site supervision and learning to understand their role relative to a university

supervisor. Therefore, teacher candidate struggles to adapt to demands of new professional roles and responsibilities may have created resistance and generated study limitations.

- 3) *Individual Participant and Group Characteristics*: Each teacher candidate had unique background experiences, perceptions, and personalities. In fact, each participant was at an individual place on the developmental path of teacher development. These individual qualities could affect the group dynamics and the quality of interactions in the seminars. Thus, individual and group characteristics could prevent or promote interactions in and beyond the seminar experience. For example, the two teacher candidates at Littlefield did not feel that their group generated rich discussion and rarely offered their thoughts to one another in the seminars. Yet even with five teacher candidates at the Madelyn Olsen seminars, teacher candidates usually kept their thoughts to themselves. Neither of these two groups had teacher candidates who were acquainted with each other before the seminars began. However, three of the four teacher candidates at Inspiration Elementary had relationships established from the previous semester. These previously established relationships may have been a factor in this group's higher incidence of dialogue, even as Laura navigated her new-comer role in the group dynamic. Individual and group characteristics could have been limitations and predetermined, to some extent, participant involvement and quality of experience. Another mix of individual and group characteristics could have generated different levels of engagement and altered the results of the study.

- 4) *Time Restrictions:* Each of the six seminars typically lasted no longer than one hour, and the study was conducted within one sixteen-week college semester. Those time parameters may have been insufficient for teacher candidates to develop deep understandings of the supervision concepts and practices.

Thus, the complexity of researcher and teacher candidate roles and responsibilities, individual and/or group characteristics, and time boundaries may be limitations for this study.

## CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

Due to data analysis, it became apparent that Seminar #3 on Dialogue and Learning Communities was unanimously considered the helpful or very helpful supervision experience to the teacher candidates (EWP/LRS, 2011). The main factors or characteristics in the dialogue and learning community seminar that suggest explanations for its influence on teacher candidates' development include its: (1) Comprehensible input from information sheets discussed in the seminar, (2) Potential application in multiple education relationships, and (3) Evidence of benefits with dedicated effort and practice. Discussion during the seminar of the bulleted recommendations for enhancing dialogue and learning communities (Appendix G) were presented in a quick, simple, easy-to-understand format. With this information that appeared easily comprehensible, teacher candidates had no difficulty selecting one or a few recommendations that piqued their interest.

Opportunities for applying dialogue recommendations arose from the moment recommendations were introduced and practiced in the seminars, as teacher candidates conversed with each other, with themselves in their journals, with students, mentors, staff members, and me as their university supervisor. Ultimately, as teacher candidates made a dedicated effort to applying the recommendations for developing dialogue and learning communities and enhanced their skills, it wasn't unusual for teacher candidates to perceive benefits in their teaching practice with students in the classroom. Seeing benefits

to dialogue and learning-community efforts seemed to motivate increased application with students in the classroom.

Teacher candidates' ratings of supervision practices are presented in Table 5 (EWP/LRS).

**Table 5. Percentage of Participants Citing Supervision Experiences as Helpful or Very Helpful**

Supervision Experience	Percentage of Participants
Dialogue and Community Seminar/Handouts	100%
Mentor Debriefing	91%
Supervisor Debriefing	91%
Self-Videotaping	78%
Journaling	64%
General Seminar Format	64%
Equity Scenario Seminar Activity	60%
General Seminar Content	50%
Levels of Reflection Seminar and Handouts	45%
Supervisor's Self-Videotaping	45%

Furthermore, as the findings emerged, I realized that rather than answering the initial main question with detailed descriptions of teacher candidate perceptions related to the explicit impact of individual and/or combined supervision experiences, the data had specifically answered the two sub-questions. Subsequently, to correspond with the emergent findings, I changed the research question by integrating the two sub-questions to form a new main question:

*What specific supervision experiences focused on critical reflection do teacher candidates consider helpful to their development, and how do these manifest in teacher candidates' thoughts and actions?*

Results of document analysis and comparison substantiated not only that the dialogue and learning community seminar was the most helpful supervision practice, but also suggested that a variety of other supervision practices contributed to greater understanding of dialogue and learning community. For instance, despite the fact that all 11 participants felt the dialogue and learning community seminar and handouts were helpful or very helpful on the Exit Writing Prompts and Likert Rating Scale, further document analysis suggested specific supervision experiences actually promoted further understandings about dialogue and learning communities. Table 6 presents the data showing the variety of pathways teacher candidates took toward developing and using dialogue and learning community.

**Table 6. Participant Pathways to Using and/or Development of Dialogue and Learning Communities**

Name	Seminar #3	Handouts	Colleagues	Students	Video	Self
Annette		X	X	X		X
Brad	X		X	X		
Candy	X		X	X	X	
Elaine	X		X	X	X	X
Haley			X	X	X	X
Holly			X			X
Laura	X		X	X		X
Paula	X	X	X	X		X
Suzanne	X		X	X		X
Tana			X			X
Wendy						X

These individual pathways are significant because in each case there were explicit references by teacher candidates' to specific information and/or incidents they felt promoted their development of dialogue and learning community.

### **Representations of Dialogue and Learning Community Among Teacher Candidates**

Based upon the constant comparative coding and document analysis described in Chapter 3, this section portrays the types of dialogue that occurred, often why they occurred, and the results or consequences of the dialogue. The representations provided in this section help portray how teacher candidates were nudged by dialogue and learning

community concepts to enhance their pedagogy and more richly benefit the learning and critical reflections of themselves and their students.

The primary ways dialogue and/or learning community concepts were represented (or not) in the data were: (1) dialogue with self, (2) dialogue with students, and (3) dialogue with colleagues—peers, mentor(s), and supervisor. Certainly some dialogue examples could fall into more than one of these three categories, but I am presenting my interpretation of where data could reasonably be categorized to gain understanding of teacher candidates' experiences.

### Dialogue with Self

Some participants engaged in explicitly talking to themselves to make sense of events in their practice teaching experiences. Participants' purposes included concerns about the teaching day, improving pedagogy, creating community in the classroom, and improving relationships with mentors.

Laura expressed insights she gained from the Dialogue and Learning Community Seminar concerning an end-of-the-day behavior she had recently started as a new intern teacher. From the first day of practice teaching in her placement school, Laura felt bad about how she discussed her teaching day with herself and critiqued each of her actions as she drove the 30 miles toward her home.

The discussion about dialogue and learning communities made me realize that I am the kind of person who needs to reflect using dialogue. It also made me realize that others are not necessarily all this way and that I need to respect that.  
(EWP/LRS, 12/13/2011)

Laura found it validating and “soothing” to learn that she was actually engaging in dialogic reflection (Hatton & Smith, 1995) and not just criticizing herself (TCJ,

9/2/2011). These conversations with herself helped Laura “digest” her day by “breaking the lessons apart.” The soothing qualities of conversing with herself and her teaching situations (Schon, 1983) seemed to provide Laura insights she needed and a type of self-care for feeling peace at the end of the teaching day. From the insights gained in the seminar, Laura seemed to reframe what she perceived as a negative trait in herself and something she should really stop doing--to a positive behavior that promoted her reflective development as a teacher.

Wendy’s responses to the EWP/LRS revealed that the seminar discussion related to dialogue and community prompted conscious consideration of what she had learned as she interacted with colleagues and students. Wendy felt that the seminar discussion broadened her consideration of others’ perspectives.

These discussions deepened my reflections about effective and professional communication. After the discussions, I often thought about listening skills and being open-minded to multiple viewpoints as I was collaborating with my mentor teacher and when I was interacting with my students. (EWP/LRS, 12/11/2011)

Wendy felt that “thinking in this way allowed [her] to get out of her comfort zone” so that she could perceive concerns and interests of other people. Wendy described the impact of this seminar as:

- Deepening [her] reflections
- Prompting her thoughts about [seminar ideas] during subsequent interactions
- Prompting her awareness of other people’s perceptions

Wendy’s responses don’t suggest that she engaged in trying new dialogue or community-building strategies with colleagues or students, but that she thought about them more.

In other teacher candidates, there were events suggesting that they valued concepts of dialogue and learning communities and worked to apply them into their pedagogy. For example, Annett's responses to the Exit Writing Prompts confirmed her positive perspectives of concepts behind the dialogue and learning community seminar. Annett cited evidence of dialogue and questioning strategies being used in her classroom based on the changes she had made as a student teacher who had:

- changed her teaching pedagogy,
- gone out of her comfort zone to leave students without an answer, and
- used higher thinking questions to help students come to their answers.

Annett's process of change seemed to begin during the first month of school with an instructional dilemma. Annett found it very difficult to get students' attention for math instruction after lunch when students appeared to feel sleepy and unmotivated.

Try getting through to 32 students, some who stammer for 5 minutes and others that you can't get to slow down and articulate, before your core instruction begin – Annett.

Annett also found it frustrating to teach multiplication to fourth-graders, some of whom "couldn't add  $9+7$  quickly." She was at the point of "forcing [herself] to do some high level reflection" on the situation.

My first step was talking to myself and thinking of what needs to change. (Me to Me:) Okay they are tired and cannot focus on what I am saying let alone answer questions with a white board because that is distracting. Next, call my mom and cry. Go ahead and laugh; only after this step can I actually focus on a plan. I think of what I want to try by asking myself some questions, "What would it look like if I...", and "How is this different from what I've been doing?" (TCJ, 9/22/2011)

Annett loved asking herself these questions and then writing down her answers. In a sense, Annett was in a conversation with herself and the situation (Schon, 1983). She

made a plan of action and took it to her mentor. The next week she planned to try doing math centers “with more reflecting and reporting to come” (TCJ, 9/22/2011). Annett was continually questioning her teaching practices to question assumptions and improve pedagogy in the classroom (Brookfield, 2004).

Suzanne also wondered about assumptions regarding student abilities to dialogue in the classroom. For example, Suzanne liked having her students talk to their “elbow partner,” which she defined as someone “within arm’s reach” of individual students. Suzanne sometimes asked her second-grade students to tell their response to a question during the lesson to their elbow partners. But Suzanne had concerns that students needed explicit instruction in knowing how to talk and listen to one another.

I need to take some time to model and reinforce talking and listening—two crucial skills which can relate to the purpose of their learning task as well as building safety within our community of learners. (TCJ, 11/26/2011)

Many times Suzanne had seen passive or shy students miss out on opportunities to share while the socially confident and/or dominant students found many chances to dialogue with others (TCJ, 11/26/2011). Suzanne asked herself if students needed explicit guidance in developing their dialogue and questioning skills.

Do second graders need more direct instruction on how to write and verbally respond to questions? I plan to see if the teachers plan to discuss it down the road. (TCJ, 10/3/2011)

Suzanne felt that developing students’ dialogue and response skills could help them stay engaged and transition back and forth between different types of learning activities. Suzanne also felt enhancing these skills could potentially increase the quality and depth of student thinking and response.

At times, the immediate value of the dialogue and learning community seminar was not readily apparent and took some time to become part of a teacher candidate's belief system.

Maybe I am expecting too much, but I don't feel like I can see as much classroom application as I want to be able to see from the [dialogue and learning community] seminar - Elaine

Even though Elaine's initial journal entry following the dialogue and learning community seminar reflected a lack of connection to her practice, Elaine gave the seminar and handouts a "Helpful" rating on both parts of the Exit Writing Prompts and Likert Rating Scale. Elaine expressed appreciation for the seminar and defined her need for developing dialogue skills.

I enjoyed the review on probing and clarifying questions. I always need to reflect on the questions I ask and how I can ask more probing questions in my lessons. I need more work on how to prompt effective dialogue in the classroom.  
(EWP/LRS, 12/10/2011)

Yet, it does not appear that the seminar was the only or the primary catalyst that nudged Elaine's development of dialogue in the classroom. Significant prompts for dialogue development came from another supervision source—self-videotaping. Elaine's videotaped instruction helped her take apart the individual components of her instructional practices (Grossman, Hammerness & McDonald, 2009). In fact, Elaine stated that "videotaping was the most important feature of her supervision experience" and led her "to develop dialogue and learning community skills" (EWP/LRS, 12/10/2011). From the videotape, Elaine felt that she could specifically see teaching practices that could inhibit dialogue and community. For instance, Elaine felt she "was turning her back on part of the class during instruction" and "not giving students appropriate time for discussion in small groups" (EWP/LRS, 12/10/2011).

In post-reflections on a second-grade math lesson, Elaine felt she could have done more to explicitly encourage dialogue within the small group of students.

I could have worked on having students explain their solutions to their problems and how they came to solve them. I think I could have had the students work on developing more strategies, sharing strategies and building ways to solve them. (TCJ, 10/31/2011)

During my observation of this lesson, I noticed that students were moving the manipulatives (pieces) to regroup their part-to-whole understandings of the numbers, but it was definitely a quiet individual activity rather than the interactive dialogue opportunity Elaine had originally planned (ODN, 10/26/2011).

Recommendations at the seminar for building dialogue and learning communities provided the nudge for Paula to make and discuss goals with herself. During the seminar, Paula selected three particular Info Sheet recommendations (Elinor & Gerard, 1998; Ryan & Cooper, 2006; Sparks, 2005) that she planned to use in promoting dialogue in her classroom.

It was very difficult to only choose three because I felt passionate about all the suggestions, but I chose (1) inquiring into underlying assumptions, (2) listening without resistance, and (3) suspending role and status distinctions. (TCJ, 9/23/2011)

Paula liked these because they reminded her to “not give in to [her] own assumptions” and listen to fully understand individual perspectives. Paula felt that doing otherwise “could damage relationships not only with students but also with their parents.” Thus, Paula was making dialogue and learning community goals that could transcend beyond the immediate classroom to strengthen community with parents.

Another nudge for Paula’s development came from the teaching beliefs as a result of her own K-12 schooling experiences and were reflected in her self-dialogue.

Looking back on my schooling, I didn't feel I was an important part of the classroom. I feel now that I should have mattered more - Paula

Paula's responses to Exit Writing Prompts related back to her schooling experiences in which she didn't feel part of or have a voice in a community of learners (BWP, 9/1/2011). Paula realized she wanted to provide a totally different kind of classroom environment for her students.

Discussing learning communities allowed me to really evaluate what I wanted students to see, hear and feel when they were in my classroom. It allowed me to imagine my ideal classroom, to see the smiling, engaged faces of my students and it really made me think about the community that I would like in my future classroom. (EWP/LRS, 12/10/2011)

In that sense, Paula seemed to be projecting what she currently believed to visualize her future teaching situation in the forward-looking reflection suggested by Pinar (1975).

The biggest nudge to help Haley develop dialogue and learning community skills with her students was seeing the videotaping of her instruction. At the beginning of the semester, Haley needed several weeks to understand just what two-way dialogue could look like and sound like with her students. Videotaping disclosed the one-sided nature of instructional dialogue with her students.

I was doing all the talking. From the "I do, we do, they do" perspective, I kept the lesson on the "I do" phase. Involving students in the problem solving process would have kept [them] more involved. (ODN, 10/5/2011)

Haley's questions with students were usually rhetorical where an answer wasn't really expected or any real thinking required. For example, she had a habit initially of asking students, "Do you agree with that?" then quickly saying, "Uh, huh," and immediately continuing on with the lesson (ODN, 10/5/2011). These were important teaching practices for Haley to recognize in her instruction. After Haley saw and

responded to her video-taped lesson, her understanding of how to discuss ideas with her students and how to ask them meaningful questions increased steadily.

Candy used the Info Sheet (Elinor & Gerard, 1998; Ryan & Cooper, 2006; Sparks, 2005) activity from the Dialogue and Learning Community Seminar to make some of her teaching development goals. Candy wrote that the dialogue and learning community seminar supported what she already felt about developing dialogue as a significant part of her pedagogy. In particular, there were four recommendations on the Info Sheet that Candy designated as very important to her teacher development (TCJ, 9/18/2011)

- Letting go of the need for a specific outcome
- Suspending judgment
- Building on what others have said
- Wanting to hear from each person in the community

Candy saw these as “incredibly important for the foundation of a good learning community” and expressed a commitment to herself to apply them in her career as an educator (TCJ, 9/18/2011). Candy reflected upon committed to using them specifically in collaborating with colleagues and managing classroom meetings and dilemmas (Brooks & Brooks, 1993; Smyth, 1992, 1988).

Candy felt that the dialogue and learning community seminar substantiated experiences she had two semesters earlier in a university methods course. The instructor had created a community based on dialogue within a non-threatening learning environment, which she saw as “incredibly liberating” (TCJ, 9/18/2011). In her self-dialogue, Candy expressed that the seminar had provided specific tools for application.

The topic of dialogue and learning communities in teaching was really powerful last week. I felt like I was able to connect with the topic because of positive and negative experiences that I've had with dialogue in my education. My understanding of the topic has been expanded in the sense that I am more aware of specific ways in which I can make dialogue more effective. (TCJ, 9/18/2011)

Candy's response to the seminar suggests that she came away with added motivation and specific approaches she could use for dialogue and community-building with her students in the classroom.

A primary focus of Laura's self-dialogue related to providing a safe learning environment for her students. She especially admired how her mentor created a sense of community through having a student as a teacher's assistant (TCJ, 9/28/2011). The job of the teacher's assistant was to bring his or her assignment up to the document projector at the end of the day to show the rest of the class and use a marker to make corrections as needed. When the student made a mistake, Laura's mentor would say, "Is it okay to make mistakes?" The class would respond, "Yes!" This impressed Laura because she assumed she needed someone who had all the right answers in order for the student to come up and share their answers with the class.

I love the idea of being able to discuss why an answer was correct, even if it wasn't done in the typical manner and the idea of having such a great learning community built in your classroom that the students know it's okay to make a mistake and that they will not be ridiculed if they do make one. (TCJ, 9/28/2011)

Suzanne's self-dialogue often focused on being fair with students in using dialogue and building community. Suzanne's beliefs about the need for fairness resulted from her team sport experiences. She felt ignored by her basketball coach who seemed to exclusively answer the questions and meet the needs of the player Suzanne perceived as a misbehaving "non-team" teammate (ST, 9/1/2011). Furthermore, Suzanne saw the seminar group as a type of team where peer/colleagues support one another's success and

develop a safe environment where problems can be talked about together to promote solutions (DuFour, Eaker, DuFour, 2005).

Wendy's self-dialogue highlighted how she struggled to feel like she was a part of the fifth grade community and the other class communities in which she did substitute teaching. Wendy's need for the development of dialogue skills and confidence in her ability to learn dialogue skills were contributing factors.

I need to learn how to speak and act in a more professional manner. This is a harder problem for me to face but somehow it needs to be learned. I have to stop blaming the coldness in the room and see that I am really folding my arms because I am nervous and tense. Somehow I need to show more confidence even though I don't feel like I have it. I just need to get up there and remember that I have a plan. (TCJ, 11/14/2011)

Holly found self-dialogue beneficial in reframing (Achinstein & Barrett, 2004) classroom management situations. She made a point of dialoging with herself when lessons she had planned or dilemmas in class didn't turn out as well as she wanted. One particularly frustrating lesson on writing nudged Holly toward dialogue with herself.

One big idea I took away from this lesson is what to do when my frustration limit is high. I need to talk to myself and be aware of my [frustration] level. Then I need to remind myself to start positive praise and get [students] back into listening position every time they get out of control. (TCJ, 10/31/2011)

Holly felt that when she sensed students were not engaging with her instruction, she should consciously tell herself to realign with specific procedures that usually helped redirect student focus and subsequent behaviors.

Thus, teacher candidates used self-dialogue as represented in their journal entries to help them understand events of the teaching day, emerging roles and goals as teachers, ways to prompt effective dialogue during instruction, and community-building strategies

with students, parents, and colleagues. This dialogic form of reflection between one's self and the situation (Schon, 1983) for the purpose of solving dilemmas aligns with the concept of *dialogic reflection* proposed by Hatton and Smith (1995), which is “deliberative, narrative, involves weighing different viewpoints and solutions through a single voice or with others.” (Appendix F)

### Dialogue with Students

This section presents participant efforts to apply dialogue and learning community concepts into their practice teaching experiences. The primary data sources for this section's *Dialogue with Students* were Exit Writing Prompts and Likert Rating Scale (EWP/LRS), Field Notes (FN), and Observation and Debriefing Notes (ODN). Teacher candidate journal entries that were used were normally responses to lesson debriefing discussions. There was a wide range of ability levels in application, which suggested a developmental process unique to each participant. A variety of purposes for dialogue with students was also represented in the data, including dialogue to strengthen pedagogy and build students' content knowledge, dialogue to build community, and dialogue to more effectively manage students' classroom experiences.

Tana learned about the relationship between pedagogy that lacks two-way dialogue and student misbehavior with her first-grade students (ODN, 11/4/2011). Indeed, some of Tana's first-grade students were misbehaving to the point that she expressed having difficulty being the least bit positive with them when she taught a lesson. Observations of Tana's instruction revealed that she frowned at students frequently and resorted to telling students information rather than finding opportunities to ask students questions (Ball & Forzani, 2009). For example, during a mid-semester math

lesson, a student volunteered to come up to the overhead and try to put 23 straws in the correct columns of a place value chart. The student put 20 straws in two bundles of 10 under the column labeled “ones” and 3 single straws under the column labeled “tens.” Tana proceeded to move the straws to the correct columns. In debriefing the lesson, I asked Tana how she might have used questions to prompt her student’s understandings. In her journal reflections on the lesson, she wrote:

I could [have] asked the student “What’s this column say (tens) and this one (ones) and seen if he would have changed it for himself before changing it for him. (TCJ, 10/23/2011)

Tana’s rationale for not asking the student a question about his answer was grounded in protecting the student. Tana explained that sometimes she got nervous about asking students questions in front of the class rather than individually because she feared that the student would become embarrassed. It didn’t occur to Tana that asking the student a questions such as, “How did you decide where the straws should go?” could prompt *him* to discover the mistake he had made (FN, 10/23/2011).

In a subsequent lesson I observed, the dialogue was primarily focused on management issues or phonics rules with a group of five students. Tana taught a tightly scripted and controlled phonics lesson with specific sounds, rules, and readings Tana had to do within the 30 minutes allotted for the lesson.

- What goes between words?
- Is this a regular ‘t’?
- Why does “tapping” have two ‘p’s?

It appeared to be difficult for students to stay with the lesson. Shortly after the morning lesson began, students started to tap books, rock their chairs, and tease their

neighbors. Students received sticker prizes immediately following the lesson if Tana felt they had participated well. One student got a sticker. Tana looked like she was upset (ODN, 11/11/2011). Students weren't responding to her instruction and Tana could not see a relationship between *how* she dominated the instructional process and *why* students were resistant. Tana was at the point where her frustration level was high and she really wanted to change what was happening in the classroom (FN, 11/11/2011).

During a lunchtime conversation that day, I suggested to Tana that changing her pedagogy with students could help misbehaving students. We talked specifically about using two-way dialogue with them and recognizing the value of what they know and who they are. A few hours later that same afternoon there was a complete transformation of Tana's approach and demeanor with her students. She demonstrated respect for her first-graders by smiling and using positive affirmations. Tana even included a critical reflection question in her pedagogy to include student perspectives on making and shaking their jars of cream, "Why do you think some students' butter became solid faster than others?" Tana treated the students who had been challenging her with their behaviors kindly and respectfully. In the afternoon, I didn't see any misbehavior during any portion of Tana's entire lesson (FN, 11/11/2011).

Indeed, timing and method of teacher candidates' critical reflections on developing dialogue and learning community with students seemed to be individual to each participant. Laura suggests that the Dialogue and Learning Community Seminar may have helped her enhance verbal interactions with her students by gaining insight into their dialogue needs. In particular, Laura's interactions with students corresponded to the

seminar recommendations to: (1) interact at a slower pace with silence between speakers, and (2) wanting to hear from each person in the dialogue community:

Regarding dialogue and questions, I definitely became more aware of how much prompting the students need. I learned to allow more wait time for all students and discourage blurting to allow the students needed time to *have it*, and those that may think they *don't* have it—time to clarify their thoughts. (EWP/LRS, 12/13/2011)

Laura learned that some students during class dialogue feel they need to give a quick answer with anything that comes to their minds just to have an immediate answer. By forcing herself to use ample wait time after questions, Laura felt that she literally saw “kids’ faces change when they knew they had a strong answer” and hadn’t blurted out the first idea that came to their minds (EWP/LRS, 12/13/2011).

Yet, Laura still struggled to achieve the two goals of prompting and wait time with her students. During Laura’s practice teaching, her questions were at times rapid, frequent, and intense with limited wait time for student responses (FN, 10/27/2011; ODN, 11/10/2011). At other times, Laura engineered effective dialogue with slower pacing and appropriate questioning strategies (ODN, 10/19/2011). For example, after reading a paragraph to the class, Laura asked, “How might Abby have discovered that information?” She gave wait time and got several student responses during the subsequent dialogue. I felt that Laura had accomplished several good things with this one question and the way she handled the dialogue and writing that followed (FN, 10/19/2011).

- Students’ practicing of steps in the fact gathering process.
- Inferential teacher compliments for those who helped discover the information
- Informal assessment of who understood resource options for doing the assignment

Laura could have easily told the class this information, but her use of questioning and dialogue strategies appeared to make the lesson very powerful for her students (Ball & Forzani, 2009).

Laura felt she was enhancing students' thinking processes and question-response quality (ODN, 10/19/2011).

Wendy's experience also demonstrates the developmental nature of learning to use dialogue and community-building skills, even when research-based recommendations are provided. Wendy spoke for the first time to the entire fifth-grade class after she had been in the classroom 5 ½ weeks for three days per week. Wendy read a letter to the class to introduce herself. She projected the letter from the document camera and had students read along with her as a letter-writing exercise. Students could ask Wendy questions as they read the letter. Wendy felt like "it went really well and with more practice [she] would get over some of the nerves that [she] had" (TCJ, 9/30/2011).

By contrast, Elaine was comfortable and creative in finding and using resources to support the questioning aspects of her dialogue. Her efforts to develop dialogue and questioning were evident in a 3-Way observation of a reading comprehension lesson with a small group of second graders. Elaine and her five students were seated around the table taking turns reading paragraphs aloud from *Frog and Toad*. Before reading, each student got to roll a die. The number that came up was the voice that the student was supposed to use as they read. For example, if students rolled a "3," they could look at Elaine's chart and see that "3" meant the student should read like they thought tigers would sound if they could read aloud. This seemed to promote a common interest in what kind of animal each person would assume while reading.

Elaine engaged the group in brief dialogue with open-ended questions as time permitted:

- What was something important that happened to Frog or Toad in this chapter?
- Was there a problem that came up?
- Why was toad worried?
- How did the problem get solved?

Elaine's second-grade mentor, Kay, commented that Elaine "engaged the group with a variety of reading styles" and was beginning to consistently include "fantastic questions to promote higher level thinking skills" in students (OBN, 10/5/2011).

During an observation of Brad's reading instruction at the end of the semester, his use of questions to generate dialogue and learning with his students was evident in his teaching pedagogy (ODN, 12/2/2011).

Teacher: "What's the author's purpose?"

Student: "To tell us a folktale."

Teacher: "Why is he doing that?"

Student: "To entertain us."

Teacher: "Is that all?"

Student: "To teach us something."

Teacher: "Like what?"

Student: "How we can be safe?"

Brad used questions to help students understand why writers write and why readers read, rather than assuming students already understood that information.

As Haley had more experience following the observation of her videotaped lesson, she developed a quiet, systematic style of dialogue and questions with her sixth-grade class. In a six-three math lesson, for example, Haley asked what individual students had done to solve particular problems. I wrote these observations on her factoring lesson in sixth-grade math instruction (ODN, 10/26/2011):

Good inclusion of students' different problem-solving strategies! You progressively asked students in the group of six "how" they factored your given numbers. And you framed the activity of trying out their strategies with a motivating question: Could [the class] get the same answer with the strategies [you just shared]?

Haley had specific responses from students that demonstrated student engagement in the dialogue, such as one student's comparison strategy:

"Another way [to compare number values] is that  $\frac{3}{5}$  is just over one half and 0.4 and 42% are just under one half."

Haley was pleased with the interaction and the way she structured the dialogue around the real-life scenario of using recipes. She liked the fact that the "rigor of the problems gradually got more difficult" in a logical order that could promote students understandings during the class dialogue (TCJ, 11/7/2011). Haley was moving beyond rhetorical questioning strategies at this point in her sixth-grade placement just as it was time to transition to kindergarten.

In a late-semester kindergarten reading lesson in which students rotated to her small group, Haley was able to use effective literacy-promoting questions with the book, "A Time to Eat" (ODN, 11/16//2011). She had to keep things moving pretty fast to hold student attention. Having students look at the cover, Haley asked, "What do you think this story is about?" She proceeded to ask comprehension questions about every page,

such as, “What time of day do you think it is in the story—morning, noon or night?”  
“How do you know?”

Haley continued to take the dialogue skills she had developed in sixth grade and adapted them to kindergarten. In her lesson with kindergartners on using a number line, Haley asked students to find specific numbers on the number line that resembled a row of bricks on a mantel. The goal was to add tiny stockings to the number line mantel. At one point, she raised up a “0” card and began a dialogue with her students (ODN, 12/1/2011):

Teacher: “What is this?”

Students: “A zero.”

Teacher: “What does that mean?”

Students: “No stockings.”

Teacher: “It means we don’t get to add another stocking?”

Students: “UmHhm.”

Haley waited for student responses and modeled building on what students said in the dialogue. In the dialogue, Haley worked to clarify understandings about the value of zero and apply it to the game pieces in their activity.

Haley had adapted well to the big difference in age of her sixth-graders (the first eight weeks) and kindergartners (the second eight weeks), and had learned to effectively engage both age groups in dialogue with critical reflection questions. Still, Haley felt that asking questions and generating dialogue for students’ critical reflection was easier for her in sixth-grade (EWP/LRS, 12/12/2011).

Likewise, Paula learned how to engage her kindergarten students in dialogue and problem solving processes by asking students critical reflection questions. In a place

value lesson on the floor with her kindergartners, Paula pointed to her oversize place value chart. How many bundles of ten would 18 have?

- Where do we put the ten?
- Why couldn't the ten go here?
- What happens when we have more than one ten in this section?

Students appeared to enjoy her questions in the class dialogue to determine which numbers belonged where on the chart and why (ODN, 10/27/2011).

Sometimes Paula initiated dialogue with her students to solve behavioral problems during instruction and reconfirm their sense of community.

Later that day, I had a talk with students about how the morning went and what I wanted to see them do later on. We talked about listening to directions, staying in their seats during work times and being respectful of people working when they were done with their work. (TCJ, 9/28/2011)

Paula's reflection doesn't indicate what part students took in this conversation, but it infers there was interaction. Paula wanted students to be part of the dialogue and be aware of how they specifically contribute to or detract from the quality of their kindergarten learning community.

As Holly made conscious decisions to develop her dialogue practices and had more experience in her third-grade classroom, she seemed to get more comfortable with the dialogue process. My observation of Holly's third-grade Flag Fraction lesson cites that she used open-ended questions to create the sense of learning community among her students (ODN, 12/7/2011). For example, Holly led her students to consider a colorful flag projected on the Smart Board with four horizontal stripes, one red, one blue, and two yellow.

Teacher: How could we tell what fraction of this flag is colored red?

Students: We could count them, like 1, 1, 2, 3.

Teacher: We don't count that way, do we?

Students: (Laughter). No, it should be 1, 2, 3, 4.

Teacher: What part is blue?

Students: (Various answers.) One half. Two-Fourths.

Teacher: (Writing  $\frac{1}{2}$  and  $\frac{2}{4}$  next to the flag picture). Are those answers right?

Students: (Chatting among themselves).

Teacher: Who would like to come up and show us on the board how they did it?

Holly had three students take turns sharing their solution strategies, one student at a time. She continued to lead the dialogue by asking the class various strategy-related questions. Holly was comfortable enough to joke with students about ways they had perceived and counted the colors. This humor seemed to make students comfortable as well (FN, 12/7/2011).

Elaine made a conscious effort to include dialogue in her pedagogy with second-graders, including her lesson on firefighters.

As we brainstormed the various things firefighters do, the children were able to give input on the subject. I wanted everyone in the classroom to be heard so I had them talk to their elbow partners about why firefighters have important jobs. Then I had them share out not one of their own thoughts--but something that their elbow partner had shared with them. (TCJ, 9/14/2011)

Elaine was continuing to look for ways to make dialogue and community-building experiences in class a “permanent part of [her] pedagogical repertoire” (Feiman-Nemser, 2001a, p. 1018) as the time came for her to transition to sixth grade.

Still, when Elaine transitioned from second grade to a sixth grade classroom, there were adjustments to make. She had gotten accustomed to using open-ended questions with her second-graders and balked at the sixth grade curriculum because she felt that it was very *scripted* with “what to say when” so the curriculum could be taught in a predictable schedule (TCJ, 11/14/2011).

Yet Elaine found a way to develop dialogue and community with her sixth-graders. In my observation of her lesson on the respiratory system (ODN, 12/9/2011; FN,12/9/11), Elaine began by asking students, “Why is the respiratory system important?” Then she engaged students with review questions before giving them specific assignments in small group work. The questions served as review for the test coming in a few days. Each group was given a different question about the respiratory system, such as, “What happens to the lungs of a smoker?” “How do the lungs work to help you breathe?” Then groups of 4-5 students were to:

- Discuss their question.
- Come to a consensus about the answer.
- Provide a written rationale for their response.
- Determine who in the group will report the group response to the class.

Once again, Elaine combined a game-style atmosphere to build community during a learning activity. To determine which group would go first, Elaine rolled a giant 6-inch die. The number that came up corresponded to the assigned number for each group

posted on the board. There was a powerful sense of community in this lesson as students worked together, focused on their eminent presentations (ODN, 12/9/2011). The only significant issue that arose during the small group dialogues was the way particular students dominated the small group conversations. Nevertheless, these students were making sure the questions got answered so the group was prepared to present their responses.

Brad came to enjoy using dialogue not only for helping students construct understandings, but also for building rapport with them and generally managing the classroom. Brad's journal entry at the conclusion of his first-grade bat unit expressed the sense of enjoyment he and students had as he promoted dialogue with them.

We looked at [pictures of] bats' ears and talked about how students could determine what bats did and didn't eat by looking at features of their bodies. We talked about where bats lives and why. I introduced some new bats at this point and asked the class to choose their favorites and tell me why they liked that bat. (TCJ, 11/5/2011)

Though Brad's reflections don't explicitly tell how much students participated in the dialogue, they suggest that Brad was working at and excited about interactions with his students. At times, Brad's dialogue with first-grade students seemed to be for purposes of management and rapport-building. I wrote during the observation that Brad created a strong sense of community--with students engaged and attentive during the lesson (ODN, 10/4/2011).

- Thumb on chest!
- Watch your friends!
- Two plus seven. Where did you land?
- Ready, steady, go!

Brad's mentor, Jaimie, was also observing him during this instruction in a 3-Way observation. Jaimie commented that Brad was very strong with building student rapport by using little phrases, some of which involved student responses, to connect him to his student community and students to one another (FN, 10/4/2011).

Annett used a variety of questions to prompt dialogue and students' critical reflections during a lesson comparing fractions midway in the semester (ODN, 10/27/2011).

- Blue is smaller than purple you say—what makes it smaller?
- What's going to be a multiple number they could share?
- What other way could we do it?
- Let's find out if 15 is a multiple of 3!
- What's your favorite method?
- So what do we need here?
- Out of these two fractions, which one is bigger?

Student engagement and energy during the lesson was very strong. Annett's questions and connectedness to student responses seemed to foster team effort. It appeared as though not one student wanted to be left behind from the community adventure of what they were doing (FN, 10/27/2011).

Continuing to practice dialogue and build learning community, Annett tried a new way of teaching her fifth-graders a way to write poetry. She titled the lesson, "What's in my teacher's lunch box?" Annett passed around a lunch sack with items students were allowed to feel but not talk about. Then she placed a free-verse poem related to the lunch on the Smart Board and asked students questions to generate dialogue about what

students had noticed. Annett's goal was for students to create a poem like the one they saw displayed on the Smart Board by using the item in the lunch box as their theme. Annett liked the fact that student responses in the dialogue described the poem and led to comparing poetry to standard writing, such as "short, descriptive sentences, paragraphed differently, with alternating rhyming words" (TCJ, 11/16/2011). Even with the rich dialogue opportunities in this lesson, Annett wished she had more time to extend the lesson time so students could dialogue together about their poems.

As an intern teacher, Candy's responses to the Exit Writing Prompts of her EWP/LRS matched the positive tone of her Likert Rating Scale responses. Both emphasized her goals for dialogue and learning community in her teaching.

The discussion of dialogue and learning communities reinforced the importance and benefits of including it in my students' learning. I have made a conscious effort to model discussion and engage my students in meaningful conversations. (EWP/LRS, 12/12/2011)

Candy maintained that the quality of the conversations her students were having amongst themselves during instructional activities was evidence of her having used dialogue in her teaching pedagogy. She also perceived students' dialogic interactions as evidence of her efforts to build a learning community with students (EWP/LRS, 12/12/2011).

Candy's awareness of dialogue and opportunities for using it were developing as she noticed events in the classroom (Feiman-Nemser, 2001a). For example, it began to bother her that educators would give compliments for students' success with pat phrases such as "Good job!" Candy felt strongly that there were better ways with a learning community to respond with dialogue that could help develop student awareness of their learning process and capacity.

It's gotten to the point where I'll be giving a child specific praise and then asking them questions about their discovery and how they were able to figure some out or how they knew the answer so quickly, and they will respond with, "Because I'm so smart." Even when we are trying to create a positive learning experience for children, we are missing a great opportunity to dialogue with our students and help them to understand their own learning. We are not helping children become critical thinkers and we are labeling them [generically]. (TJC, 10/30/2011)

Candy's value for dialogue and questioning was not immediately evident in her instruction, particularly when she had not yet started to develop her own lessons. At my first observation of Candy's instruction, she taught a phonics lesson to kindergarteners, a lesson her mentor teacher had offered her to use. Candy sat at a table with five students and a large shadow box in front of her. The shadow box contained 26 items, each beginning with a different letter of the alphabet. Candy pointed to one item at a time or held it up and asked students what letter the item started with. She was using one question repeated for each letter. Students didn't really engage in responses beyond saying the name of the letter. So the dialogue was very limited (ODN, 10/26/2011).

This was a 3-Way Observation and Candy's mentor complimented her highly on how she generally differentiated questions with her students (TCJ, 10/30/2011, ODN, 10/26/2011). However, questions were not used in the lesson we had just observed.

After Candy transitioned to fifth grade, she began to design her own instruction. That is when her use of dialogue with students began to flourish and she could see the effects.

When I dialogue and question [my students], I feel I can literally see them engaging in critical thinking. (EWP/LRS, 12/12/2011)

During an observation of Candy's whole-group instruction on measurement conversion (ODN, 12/9/2011), Candy used frequent questions in interactive dialogue with students.

Teacher: "So, why would we multiply it [5280] by 2?"

Student: "That will give us the miles."

Teacher: "Are we looking for the miles?"

Student: "No, we're looking for the feet."

Teacher: "How many feet are we dealing with?"

Student: "5280."

Teacher: "And the problem said the boy went half of that. So what does that tell us?"

Student: "That we better divide by 2."

A few days later, Candy taught a math lesson on adding and subtracting feet and inches that included borrowing (ODN, 12/12/2011). Candy realized that students had needed her to be more explicit about concepts she had discussed with them during whole-group dialogue before they could be successful in figuring out math clues for small-group work. Candy noticed that one group was struggling to resolve their conversion clues and for the most part had given up. It wasn't making sense to them. Candy evaluated the situation and took action (Ball & Forzani, 2009).

This group just sat there and they weren't going to try and fix their answer. I finally got down on the floor with them and started asking them a series of questions. Suddenly a light bulb went off and they were able to solve the problem on their own. (TCJ, 12/12/2011)

This lesson happened to be the lesson Candy chose to have video-taped. She was very glad to have it reinforce her goals to be a teacher who uses dialogue to enhance students' learning.

The video confirmed my goals to not just give out the answers to students—but to give them tools to help them find the answer by using questions, scaffolding, and directing them to resources they're familiar with. (TCJ, 12/12/2011)

Candy had created a motivated community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) working toward figuring out their math problems and sharing the results with the class afterwards in whole-class dialogue (FN, 12/12/2011).

Still, despite the progress for most teacher candidates in using dialogue and building learning communities in the classroom, there were limitations to success despite teacher candidates' best efforts.

In December, during Wendy's oral traditions lesson in second grade, Wendy was able to get the lesson started and direct her instruction to the whole second-grade class. These were two of the biggest growth areas demonstrated by the lesson (ODN, 12/8/2011). Dialogue and community building were not easy for Wendy. Developmentally, Wendy wasn't yet able to effectively talk or build community with her students. But Wendy was making efforts in that direction and more comfortable doing so in the second-grade class where she had a closer relationship with her mentor.

There was one instance when Brad wanted desperately to engage a student in dialogue, but his best efforts failed. This was very disappointing to Brad but it taught him some limitations of developing dialogue and building community in certain situations.

Later that day I had to punch a student's card. This did not turn out well. He had a complete meltdown and started crying, kicking his desk and curled up into a ball and would not do anything. I took the kids to P.E. and came back for him. I tried with all my might to get him to do something or just to talk to him. He was not having it. This went on the whole time the kids were in P.E. Finally I had to grab the teacher next door, to ask for her help. I just couldn't handle it anymore. When all was said and done, he came around and he acted like nothing had happened at all. (TCJ, 11/28/2011)

Brad learned that it would have been better to not push conversation at that point, but to let the student have his meltdown without trying to interfere. Brad felt that if he had let the student relax and had waited until the student was ready, they "could have talked." As it was, Brad felt like his efforts made the situation worse. Brad was forced to give the student a space of time before it was possible to talk with him again.

[The student] still got in trouble in the end, but by waiting to talk with him, we got a lot further than I thought we would. This will be one strategy that I will use from now on. (TCJ, 11/28/2011)

Overall, teacher candidates were able to make progress in using dialogue with students and building learning communities with them.

### Dialogue with Colleagues

There were a variety of purposes and abilities when participants interacted with colleagues. At times, participants were hesitant to discuss certain topics with certain people when participants perceived they would feel embarrassed or intimidated. There were power differences to be accounted for in determining the risks involved in dialogue. For example, peers could be hesitant to disclose weaknesses for fear that they would be seen as poor teachers or someone who couldn't solve their own problems. At other times, participants struggled with suggestions or interactions with mentors who were perceived at times as experts without professional flaws. At times, the power issue involved me as

the university supervisor who noticed areas where teacher candidates needed to improve. The data in this section involves three types of dialogue with different colleagues: (1) peers, (2) mentors, and (3) supervisors.

### Peer Dialogue

Holly was talking about developing her dialogue skills as an intern teacher in the first semester of her Professional Year. During Seminar #3 on Dialogue and Learning Communities, the purposes of clarifying and probing questions were discussed. Holly got excited about learning the difference, especially since, as she related, “I really thought there were only clarifying questions” (ST, 9/9/2011). That was perhaps the only comment made during the seminars at Littlefield in which either of the two teacher candidates shared a weakness or lack of knowledge.

Sharing weakness was difficult for intern teachers in particular. Laura, as the only intern teacher in the seminars at Inspiration, met with me and three student teachers. All three of these student teachers had done their intern teaching the prior semester. My field notes reveal that the seminars seemed to be a source of tension for Laura.

Laura continues to be negative and guarded but supportive of the student teachers. It seems to be awkward for her and she argues her points in discussion perhaps to prove her ability is not less than the student teachers. (FN, 9/15/2011; FN, 9/29/2011)

Laura’s awkwardness or tension was reflected in the way she said she was sorry or made self-deprecating comments whenever she asked a question in the seminars.

I’m sorry. I don’t think you should NOT call on those kids that can’t get to the point right away. Could you....because I am one of those, obviously. (FN, 9/15/2011)

Laura also had challenges contributing to the sense of community in the seminars as she pulled out her phone the moment the seminars ended to make personal calls while the student teachers continued to discuss teaching issues with one another.

At one point, Paula felt she needed to share some of her classroom management frustrations. In Paula's third-grade placement the prior semester, she had a strong rapport with students and it seemed much easier for her to manage them. One afternoon following a seminar, Paula stayed late and shared with Suzanne and I how she didn't feel she had the rapport with her kindergarten students that her mentor had (FN, 9/15/2011). Paula's mentor had a funny way of making the students laugh as part of her management style.

Suzanne and I listened to Paula's dilemma and suggested she probably had talents or gifts of her own that could help her manage her students. Paula said she felt encouraged to figure out what that might possibly be. A few weeks later during Seminar #5, Paula shared that she had figure out the solution to her classroom management problem.

I sing! That's what's been working. I sing everything! [As if singing to her students] Oh, you're talking and you know it, please stop! Students join me singing on the "please stop" part of the song. Another song I like for writing instruction goes like this, Where do you start your letters? At the top, top, top! And kids love singing "At the top, top, top" along with me! (ST, 9/29/2011)

There was exuberant laughter and happy exclamations of congratulations for Paula from Suzanne in the seminar group. Paula continued to share how sometimes she just randomly made up songs when she needed to but that it still worked and her students still loved it (FN, 9/29/2011).

Then Paula asked Suzanne how one of her dilemmas had gone the past week to see if she had found a solution, “How did your clouds go with the Q-tips?” Suzanne responded, “The clouds went good and they were just all into using the Q-tips.” Then Suzanne shared another dilemma she was having with the seminar group. A discussion ensued among the four teacher candidates who offered perspectives on that type of dilemma.

Paula had not shared her dilemma at the seminar two weeks earlier, but she shared her successful solution of her problem. She had shared it in a smaller setting of colleagues after the seminar was over. When she had figured out a solution to her dilemma, she talked about it with all the seminar members. Paula consciously worked to create a classroom environment in which students felt safe and valued as they contributed to the class dialogue.

Suzanne felt that the seminar on dialogue and learning communities helped her see a relationship between dialogue and reflection. To that end, Suzanne felt that teacher candidates’ dialoguing about their varying classroom experiences helped them reflect on problem-solving.

Our [seminar] discussion of dialogue was very helpful and allowed me to understand another way that I can reflect—by sharing our experiences in a group to benefit all of us in our development. (EWP/LRS, 12/10/2011)

The last half an hour of Seminar #5, after Paula had shared her singing solution to kindergarten management, demonstrates Suzanne’s need for dialogue with peers in the seminar community. Suzanne seemed to thrive on supportive dialogue with her peers and suggested there be more of it in the seminars. The following excerpts begin with

Suzanne's response to Paula's singing solution with Suzanne's comments leading up to the dilemma she ultimately shared with her peers in the seminar:

- I think your kids would love that!
  - Woohoo! Woohoo! [upon hearing about Paula's song solution].
  - I just love sharing like this. I don't know if there is like a time that we could share—or if there is something that's not working at all—because these things are just so good!
  - [After I asked what she wanted to share] No, just that.
  - Umm. My problem is that my kids are like, "Pick on me!" They have so many thoughts and ideas that they want to share with me, that I'm like, "Would you put your hands down!"
- [Laughter from seminar members]
- I go from fifth grade where no one wants to contribute then to second grade where *everyone* is like they have *so* much to tell you. And it's like I don't want to hinder the connection—to say, "Oh, your connection to this topic doesn't matter." But at the same time, I don't know. I was thinking about talking with them at circle time about the process of learning and how we learn and everyone's going to learn a little differently. But just realizing that you don't *always* have to share that with everyone else in the classroom—that there are times when it is appropriate to share—like when you are at recess.
  - I love the idea of dialogue, but they just take forever to explain [their ideas]. And they all want to share.

Animated dialogue surrounded Suzanne's remarks with her peers offering suggestions, some of which she had tried—such as making sure comments were specific to the lesson topic before students shared them, or giving a certain number of tickets that students could use for comments during the day's discussions. When the time for the seminar ended, some teacher candidates stayed behind to brainstorm further (ST, 9/29/2011). Opening herself up in dialogue with peer colleagues seemed to help Suzanne pinpoint the problem and start working on a solution (Feiman-Nemser, 2001a).

#### Dialogue with Mentor(s) and/or Supervisor

There is a range of influence from the Dialogue and Learning Community Seminar upon teacher candidates' ability to engage in dialogue with their mentors. Sometimes, in fact, it appeared that combinations of additional factors, such as dialogue with peers and/or supervisor, contributed to mentor dialogue. At other times, the combined perspectives of mentor and supervisor could influence teacher candidates' interactions with their mentor and ultimately with students.

Brad's journal entry about the Dialogue and Community Seminar shows that Brad was talking about integrating more questions into his teaching pedagogy with Jaimie, his first-grade mentor.

Today's topic was all about dialogue and questioning in the classroom and how we use it. I thought this topic was pretty interesting. It made me stop and look at how I use questions in my classroom and where I use them. As soon as I got to school I talked with my teacher about questioning and how we need to incorporate them more into our lessons. We decided to start using them at the end. We are going to start asking why we are doing this and what are we doing? (TCJ, 9/15/2011)

Brad was able to take the professional rapport he had with his first-grade mentor into his relationship with his fourth-grade mentor. Brad had some classroom management

problems after he transitioned from practice teaching in first grade to practice teaching in fourth grade. Philosophically, Brad felt that teaching and learning should be fun and exciting, but he felt students were taking advantage of him. This came to a head when one fourth-grade student said he hated Brad.

So [my fourth-grade mentor] Alicia and I sat down and talked about the situation. She gave me one of the best pieces of advice a new teacher could get and that is to stay calm with the students at all times. She said the students know when you are getting upset or when you are not happy. (TCJ, 11/7/2011)

Brad appreciated this dialogue because it helped him explicitly understand that if he continued to show his emotions to the degree he had in class, his students would continue to “eat [him] alive.”

Brad cited conversations with his supervisor after lesson observations as factors contributing to his dialogue skills. If Brad was nervous about his teaching performance or specifically how he handled discussions with his students, he usually felt better after our debriefing conversations.

Mainly, when I could sit down with [my supervisor] and talk everything out, it helped me. I would say the debriefing helped me use dialogue and questions with my class. (FN, 9/14/2011)

Brad was able to talk openly with me about any of his professional teaching concerns as educational colleagues (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). Supervisory dialogue with Brad helped explore and reduce some of the tensions he was experiencing in his practice teaching.

At times, my supervisory dialogue helped teacher candidates with mentor or student issues and other times it did not seem to be of any assistance. For instance, Ardeth, Wendy’s fifth-grade mentor, told me that she wanted to see Wendy take more

initiative to notice things in the classroom and talk with her about what she observed (FN, 10/5/2011). Ardeth wanted to build a professional learning community with Wendy, but she wanted Wendy's active participation in making it happen (DuFour, Eaker, DuFour, 2005; Elinor & Gerard, 1998; Ryan & Cooper, 2006). Wendy felt intimidated by her mentor and didn't seem able to risk initiating dialogue with her (FN, 9/28/2011). My weekly dialogue and/or debriefings with Wendy during the semester required 60 – 90 minutes each time we met for her to understand what she needed to do, talk about how she might improve, and help her avoid crying through the whole discussion. Mid-semester Wendy still did not have a sense of community or skills in dialogue with her mentor or her fifth-grade class and it was time for her scheduled transition to second grade.

During our debriefing of Wendy's ordinal numbers lesson in second grade at the end of the semester, we talked about the progress she had made in being able to teach the whole class for the first time. We also talked again about "making sure you speak with conviction to let students know that what you're saying or about to say is worth paying attention to" (ODN, 12/8/ 2011). Still, during both of Wendy's final two lesson observations, her instruction began and continued so aimlessly, it was difficult to tell what she was teaching (FN, 12/8/2011). This was a source of tension for me as her supervisor in recognizing the lack of effective strategies to help Wendy.

Maybe a whole semester of trying to communicate with Wendy has taken a toll on my ability to dialogue with her. Why do I say that? For some reason, our dialogue doesn't seem to connect or help her make significant teaching improvements. (FN, 12/8/2011)

Dialogue did not appear to be working for Wendy and her fifth-grade mentor. Neither was it working for Wendy and me as her supervisor. There was clearly tension

between my role as her supervisor and her role in learning how to teach (Yusko & Feiman-Nemser, 2008).

Suzanne experienced her own tensions in trying to initiate dialogue with her mentor, Donna. During the first several weeks of school, Suzanne struggled to be “pro-active” and feel “comfortable” asking Donna questions. Suzanne talked about it with me during two of our discussions (FN, 9/22/2011; FN, 9/29/2011). The problem revolved around the risk-taking issues Suzanne had experienced throughout her schooling (PI, 8/31/2011). Suzanne felt Donna was very busy and Suzanne hesitated to take the risk of adding to her workload by asking questions (Feiman-Nemser, 2001a).

One day when I had a break between observations at the school, Annett came to tell me that Suzanne had talked with her about the difficulties Suzanne was having in initiating dialogue with her mentor. Donna had been Annett’s mentor the prior semester and had not experienced these difficulties. As Annett and I discussed the situation briefly, we realized that each of us had engaged in dialogue with Suzanne to listen and discuss potential solutions. Ultimately, Suzanne found a way to talk with Donna without feeling like a burden to her.

I feel a new comfort level with my mentor and have been more aggressive or pro-active with my approach to collaborating with her. This helps me as well as the students. My collaboration with my mentor has changed tremendously for the better. I feel like she really cares and that helps me to be extra thorough in preparation like her. (TCJ, 10/12/2011)

Suzanne had confided her mentor dilemma in private individual conversations with me as her supervisor and with Annett as her peer. This support from colleagues in her professional learning community supported Suzanne in building a relationship with her mentor (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Lave & Wenger, 1991). The process

of doing so fostered a positive sense of Suzanne's teaching role within the professional learning community (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Cochran-Smith, 2002) and nudged her to emulate her mentor.

From the beginning of the semester, Holly had a supportive relationship with her mentor. On the Exit Writing Prompts, in fact, Holly interpreted concepts of dialogue and learning community specifically in terms of debriefing with her mentor and her supervisor.

I think the idea of dialogue and learning communities had a large impact. It was nice to get others' opinions because there were and are obvious things I know I need to improve on, but there are also things I do well that I don't notice. Having someone to debrief with and relate to was a big plus! (EWP/LRS, 12/15/2011)

Holly used the information she gained from mentor and supervisor debriefings, discussion of written comments on observation forms, along with understandings she gained from Seminar #4 on equity in teaching as nudges in developing dialogue and questions with her students.

The [features during the semester that] that helped me use dialogue and questions with students and improve their critical thinking skills were mentor and supervisor debriefing and observation sheets and the equity scenarios. (EWP/LRS, 12/15/2011)

Nevertheless, not every debriefing nudged Holly to consider pursuing more dialogue opportunities for her students. During Holly's third-grade multiplication lesson involving a shopping scenario, Holly suggested that students talk in small groups of 3-4 students about what strategies they had used to solve their problem. I wrote in my observation notes that during this student dialogue "some students mostly yelled at each other what they thought the answer should be." Students in three of the groups I observed appeared to be engaging in yelling matches to share what they viewed as their superior

strategies. I wondered and wrote in my observation notes, “Do students need an explicit protocol for small group dialogue?”

In the 3-Way debriefing that followed between Holly, her mentor, Marva, and I, this idea came up as we went through my written comments. Holly’s eyes got big. She raised her eyebrows and looked like she was reflecting on it as a new idea to consider. Momentarily, Holly’s mentor said, “I don’t think so. They were fine.” At that point, Holly seemed to let the idea go and the conversation led toward a discussion of student personalities as the likely cause of students’ “enthusiasm” (ODN, 11/9/2011). Holly and her mentor had a very close professional relationship of trust (DuFour, Eaker, & DuFour, 2005). On the other hand, there seemed to be a residual tension between them and me as Holly’s supervisor (Yusko & Feiman-Nemser, 2008).

I began to notice the tension from the time I taught the math lesson in their third-grade class, and it continued until the end of the semester (FN, 12/16/2011).

Like Holly, Annett also cited debriefings with mentor and supervisor in terms of their benefit to promoting concepts of dialogue and learning community.

The dialogue and sense of a learning community I experienced particularly in supervisor and mentor debriefings were powerful and helpful to me. (EWP/LRS, Annett, 12/12/2011)

For example, after teaching a lesson based on the book, *Esperanza Rising*, Annett explained how she began to feel surprised and relieved when both her mentor and I brought something to her attention (TCJ, 10/20/2011).

They said that I don’t always have to give the answer to students’ questions. This thought had really never occurred to me. As a teacher I am here to guide students

to answers. When a student would ask the meaning of a word, I would almost automatically tell them.

After our dialogue, Annett wrote that she could see the benefit of letting the student have their learning “aha” moments as they read and “self-discovered answers.” She began to see how important questions could be in her instructional practices to prompt student explorations (Ball & Forzani, 2009) and began to look for opportunities to expand her knowledge.

About a week later, Annett did a masterful fifth-grade math lesson filled with dialogue, questions, and community building. When Annett and I met to debrief after the lesson, her comments caught me by surprise. She wanted me to explicitly talk with her about how to apply the examples on the Pocket Guide to Probing Questions ([www.nsrffharmony.org](http://www.nsrffharmony.org)) from Seminar #3 to her instruction. I pulled a copy out of my briefcase and we spent the next 30 minutes immersed in the process of evaluating the applicability of each question specifically first to reading and then to math. In that dialogue, one characteristic of good probing questions had particular significance for Annett—empowering the person with the dilemma to solve his or her own problem—rather than deferring to someone else to solve it (FN, 10/27/2011).

I am thinking about empowerment versus defeat in student thinking. I need to develop a comfort level with student dilemmas as they try to solve math problems in dialogue. I *loved* that we could do this just in our small group [of two] and take the time we needed to thoroughly dialogue and reflect on the probing questions. Wow! I’ve never had such a focused intentional need for deeper questions.

Annett’s determination to develop excellent probing questions may have begun one week earlier during the dialogue with her mentor and me, which is discussed in the

following section. The idea of empowering students to solve their dilemmas was the focus of the conversation. Nevertheless, earlier in the semester Annett attributed features of the dialogue and learning community seminar as helping her build a learning community (TCJ, 9/30/2011).

It was nice to have some examples of how/what I should be asking. It was also interesting to see that during our discussion in the seminar all of the student teachers had pretty much the same ideas on what we see and or expect from good learning communities.

There were times when supervision dialogue with me helped promote learning communities and directly affect pedagogy when issues with students arose. As mentioned in an earlier section, Tana had a problem with students chronically misbehaving during her instruction. Tana was also developing an instructional habit in the final semester of her Professional Year of feeding students information rather than asking her students questions or engaging them in dialogue (Ball & Forzani, 2009).

In our debriefing after two teacher-dominated lessons, I said to Tana, “There seemed to be emotional undercurrents during your instruction. What were you feeling about the students?” “About the process?” “About the program?” In our dialogue, it came out that Tana harbored resentments for students’ continual misbehavior. We discussed how her tone of voice, facial expressions, and comments looked as if she was not enjoying teaching and/or expected misbehavior from her students. We talked about how she could demonstrate positive expectations within her pedagogy (Greene, 1988; Noddings, 2007).

We talked about the specific ways Tana could engage her first-grade students in interactive dialogue through using open-ended questions. Tana’s eyes got big as we

talked, and she appeared to be having an ‘aha’ moment. I hoped that being explicit about what I saw might nudge Tana toward examining her assumptions regarding her students’ behaviors and critiquing her pedagogical processes for potential solutions (FN, 11/11/2011).

Tana seemed to need explicit dialogue to help her reframe her assumptions (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Feiman-Nemser, 2001a) and take responsibility for changes she needed to make in her pedagogy (Brookfield, 2004). As Grossman asserts, “The medium is the message” (2005, p. 425). Once she changed the way she thought and responded to her students, they in turn appeared to perceive her change and demonstrate interest in and respect for her efforts as a teacher.

There was also evidence in the data of rich dialogue connections between intern teachers, their students, and me as the university supervisor. For example, in one of my conversations with Haley, she expressed the dilemma of the low respect sixth-graders seemed to have for intern and/or student teachers. Haley experienced this when she substituted for her mentor, and student behaviors became very difficult to manage (FN, 12/12/2011). From things students had said in class, Haley felt students underrated and undervalued Haley’s knowledge about teaching. Students also wondered and verbalized whether any of the substitutes and student teachers rotating in and out of their classroom really wanted to be there. Haley and Elaine split the semester with these sixth-graders, each spending half the semester practice-teaching there.

In dialogue with Elaine, Haley learned that Elaine had experienced the same dilemma of students’ perceiving intern teachers as low-skilled and capricious in the way they came and went from the classroom community. Haley shared with me that Elaine

had in fact made a point to dialogue with the sixth-grade students to let them know that intern teachers definitely wanted to be at their school each day and had made many sacrifices to do so—that they had gone to school (including college) 17 years and paid \$20,000 to be there. Haley was greatly impressed by the way Elaine promoted this critically reflective conversation with their mutual sixth-grade students and could dialogically intermediate student assumptions (Elinor & Gerard, 1998).

### **Researcher Notes on Findings**

These stories portray the varied ways teacher candidates seemed to use dialogue and learning community concepts to critically reflect on and/or engage in developing their pedagogy to promote student learning. Their experiences support Schon's (1983) argument that reflection on teaching practice can be individual conversations with one's self as well as collective conversations. Clearly, there were a variety of ways and degrees in which teacher candidates engaged in the dynamic nature of reflection (Rodgers, 2002). To the degree that teacher candidates were willing and able to examine the teaching assumptions governing their actions, they were indeed engaging in critical reflection (Achinstein & Athanases, 2005; Brookfield, 2004; McLaren, 2007).

Were teacher candidates gaining awareness of equity in education (Banks, 2004; Sleeter, 2008)? As teacher candidates reflected on their practice, sometimes their awareness of student needs increased, and they made pedagogical changes. At times, teacher candidates became aware of a connection between dialogue, learning community, pedagogy, student engagement and student success (Ball, 2009). Yet the dialogic ways teacher candidates explored solutions to their challenges in the classroom were not without tension. Tension among colleagues—peers, mentors, and supervisors—was

evident throughout the study as one might expect from situations in which educators are nudged to reflect critically. Implications for teacher educators from study results and accompanying tensions will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR CRITICAL REFLECTION,  
DIALOGUE AND LEARNING COMMUNITIES

If teachers are going to participate in building a new professional culture, they must be introduced early on to the skills of critical reflection...and given many opportunities to develop the habits of critical collegueship. They must be involved in communities of practice where they can learn with and from reform-minded teachers working to improve the education and life chances of all students. We can only prepare teachers for schools as they should be in schools that are moving toward a shared vision of powerful teaching and learning. (Feiman-Nemser, 2001a, p. 1049)

Feiman-Nemser is suggesting the importance of experiences for developing teacher candidates into teachers who can and will contribute their voices, their critical reflections to the dialogue in education. Yet events in this study suggest how complex it can be to learn about critical reflection and apply it in school settings, particularly given its developmental levels, variety of interpretations (Hatton & Smith, 1995; King & Kitchener, 2004), and the potentially negative views teaching colleagues may embrace regarding its value. Yet, if teacher candidates have first-hand involvement in critically reflective communities early in the continuum of their professional lives, they are potentially prepared to continue that involvement throughout their careers and help promote and sustain critical collegueship (Feiman-Nemser, 2001a). The ultimate (and immediate?) goal of this endeavor is on enhancing the life chances of students in the classroom (Servage, 2008; Shandomo, 2010; Sockett, 2008). Nevertheless, promoting these characteristics in teacher candidates through interactions at their school placement sites is not without tension. Therefore, a discussion of the tensions that occurred in this

study will follow a summary of the study findings and the depiction of themes from the findings in light of the scholarly literature in teacher education.

### **Summary of Study Findings**

As explained in the prior chapter, from findings which emerged, I realized that rather than answering the initial main question with detailed descriptions of teacher candidate perceptions related to the explicit impact of individual and/or combined supervision experiences, the data had specifically answered the two sub-questions. Subsequently, I changed the research question by integrating the two sub-questions so the research questions would correspond with emergent findings:

*What specific supervision experiences focused on critical reflection do teacher candidates consider helpful to their development, and how do these manifest in teacher candidates' thoughts and actions?*

To answer the first part of this question, Chapter 4 presented the findings that all 11 teacher candidate participants in the study found Seminar #3 on Dialogue and Learning Communities to be the most helpful supervision experience to benefit their teacher development. Results of data analysis suggested that the three primary characteristics of Seminar #3 that promoted understandings and use of dialogue and learning community were that recommendations provided during the seminar were 1) specific and comprehensible, 2) applicable to a variety of dialogue and learning community applications, and 3) potentially beneficial to teacher candidates and their students. Evidence of these factors seemed to be embedded throughout the experiences presented in Chapter 4. The second half of the research question was answered through data representations of ways dialogue and learning community were manifest in teacher

candidates' thoughts and actions. These representations fell into three primary categories of dialogue with self, dialogue with students, and dialogue with colleagues—peers, mentors, and supervisor.

### **Depiction of Themes**

Four themes emerged that characterize the study's specific supervision practices focused on critical reflection and seem to build upon one another conceptually and effectually: (1) The variety of practices in this supervision format enhanced teacher candidate access to dialogue and learning community concepts presented in Seminar #3, (2) Dialogue and learning communities drew out teacher candidates' critical reflections on their situations and practices, (3) Nudges from supervision experiences prompted teacher candidates to focus on student dialogue and learning community, and (4) As teacher candidates developed dialogue and learning community abilities, their critical reflection and their students' critical reflection seemed to be enhanced. Within each discussion of these themes, I will raise questions, respond to them and suggest implications for teacher educators who value critical reflection and dialogue in teacher candidate supervision.

#### The Variety of Practices in This Supervision Format Enhanced Teacher Candidate Access to Dialogue and Learning Community Concepts Presented in Seminar #3

Like students in the classroom, teacher candidates each had different learning approaches and needs, and thus, seemed to require individual ways to construct their understandings of dialogue and learning community. Teacher candidates' comfort, desire, and readiness levels to run with concepts of dialogue and learning community varied widely. In that respect, the variety of supervision practices seemed to contribute support,

scaffolding, clarification, extension, and/or substantiation for the concepts introduced and explored during the seminar.

As presented in Table 6 in the previous chapter, there was evidence that a variety of pathways served as prompts for individual participants to implement dialogue and learning community concepts in their classrooms. For example, three teacher candidates stated that seeing their videotaped instruction helped them grasp how to apply dialogue and learning community into their instruction. From seeing primarily what they were *not* doing with their students in the classroom and comparing that with what they had learned about in the seminar, Candy, Elaine, and Haley enhanced their abilities with and application of dialogue and learning community. Eight of the 11 teacher candidates stated that trying the seminar recommendations for dialogue and learning community with their students helped them understand and use them more effectively. Ten of the 11 teacher candidates felt that interactions with colleagues helped them develop their dialogue and learning community abilities.

Providing a variety of supervision practices to meet teacher candidates' needs cooperates with teacher educators who recommend teacher educators meet the needs of all teacher education students so that none are "left behind or ignored" (Henderson & Gornick, 2007, p. 9). Meeting the diversity of teacher candidate needs through the use of a variety of supervision practices suggests that fewer needs may have been met without that variety. This need to meet the diversity of teacher candidate needs suggests the following questions:

- What range of teacher education experiences or differentiation need to be included to meet the needs of all teacher candidates?

- How do teacher educators provide such equitable instruction to teacher candidates?
- How does equitable instruction for teacher candidates filter down to students in classrooms?

If equity in teaching means meeting student needs (Achinstein & Athanases, 2005), it could be argued whether Wendy's needs were met and whether there were missing supervision practices that could have enhanced Wendy's development of dialogue and learning community with her students and her colleagues. Such critical reflection on teacher education pedagogy seems like an intrinsic role of the teacher educator—to meet the needs of teacher candidates so that they can in turn meet more of their students' needs. We know that as teacher candidates are able to develop effective pedagogy among students with diverse needs, their students' academic success can be improved (Sleeter, 2008).

#### Dialogue and Learning Communities Drew out Teacher Candidates' Critical Reflections on Their Particular Situations, Relationships, and Practices

The supervision practices provided during this study offered teacher candidates opportunities and experiences in critical reflection on their teaching practices as supported by teacher education research literature (Brookfield, 2004; Shandomo, 2010; Yost, Sentner, & Forlenza-Bailey, 2000). To accomplish this, teacher candidates used dialogue as a form of reflection individually and/or collectively. As was documented thoroughly in the prior chapter, participants employed dialogue with self, dialogue with students, and dialogue with colleagues to reflect on their individual situations, relationships, and teaching practices. These experiences cooperate with scholars (Hatton

& Smith, 1995; Schon, 1983, 1987) who specifically attribute *dialogic reflection* as a significant tool for teacher development.

Because dialogue was situated within participants' teaching context, teacher candidates' self-knowledge, and receptivity to critical reflection was potentially enhanced (Abt-Perkins, Hauschildt & Dale, 2000; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Zeichner, 1995). Thus, context became a focus of participant thoughts and conversations. Holly discussed the needs of her English language learners for background information during her instruction. Paula discussed the needs of her kindergartners who were accustomed to their mentor's sense of humor. Teacher candidates talked about mid-semester transfers to another class, about ending relationships in their first placement class, and the challenge of building new relationships in their second placement class. The dialogue was always situated in practice and relevant to teacher candidates' experiences and dilemmas.

Indeed, by the standards of Hatton and Smith's (1995) Developmental Levels of Reflection, some teacher candidates were at times able to go beyond the (1) technical rationality of instructional efficiency to (2) analyze why they were teaching something the way they were, to engage in (3) dialogic reflection in hearing one's voice individually or collectively with others in critiquing information and/or procedures, and even venture occasionally into (4) critical reflection, by evaluating short-term and long-term consequences of one's actions (such as a teacher's pedagogy) within the social and/or political context. Depending to some degree on teacher candidates' readiness for this process as well as the contexts in which they were immersed, some teacher candidates moved toward greater understanding of the effects of instructional types on students with an increased social awareness.

Potential considerations for teacher educators in terms of effective ways to use dialogue and learning community to draw out teacher candidates' critical reflections on their practice might include:

- How can the dialogue processes be memorable and applicable to teaching experience?
- How do dialogue and learning community relate to critical reflection?
- How can reflection processes be made sufficiently explicit for teacher educators?

In the context of this study, participants found supervision practices most beneficial that simply and directly helped them relate to dialogue, learning community, and/or critical reflection. For instance, some teacher candidates cited Quinn's Six Questions ([www.nsrffharmony.org](http://www.nsrffharmony.org)) as helpful reminders of the critical reflection questions they wanted to ask or were asking themselves in critiquing their instructional practices. Further, every teacher candidate seemed to value the seminar list of effective dialogue characteristics (Elinor & Gerard, 1998; Ryan & Cooper, 2006; Sparks, 2005) as helpful. Characteristics such as (a) inquiring into underlying assumptions, (b) listening without resistance, and (c) letting go of the need for a specific outcome were among those selected by teacher candidates to integrate into their pedagogy.

By way of contrast, however, Hatton and Smith's (1995) framework attached to each of my observation forms and a central reference point during debriefings to evaluate pedagogical practices was considered a complex and "heavy" representation. Indeed, three participants (and I as researcher/participant) felt the original language of the Hatton and Smith (1995) framework was not sufficiently clear and prompted simplifications and clarifications by changing the language and combining it with Quinn's Six Questions

([www.nsrffharmony.org](http://www.nsrffharmony.org)). The simpler frameworks proved to be more explicitly helpful to teacher candidates and provided them more equitable access to understanding and potentially developing their abilities with dialogue, learning community and critical reflection.

### Nudges from Supervision Experiences Prompted Teacher Candidates to Focus on Student Dialogue and Learning Community

The supervisor's observation focus and debriefing mostly concentrated on my lesson's effect on students – Elaine

The variety of pathways teacher candidates took to learning about and appreciating dialogue and learning community has already been thoroughly discussed in the prior chapter. As teacher candidates practiced their instructional strategies and experienced successful and unsuccessful moments with their students, they seemed to want to know more about how to engage their students more consistently. The needs teacher candidates had to improve their instruction fostered receptivity to ideas I could share at debriefings to promote critical reflection on specific ways to meet the needs of students in their classrooms (Feiman-Nemser, 2001a; Pultorak & Barnes, 2009; Stigler & Hiebert, 1999). I asked (and at times suggested) how specific aspects of their pedagogy could be enhanced by using dialogue with open-ended questions to generate critically reflective thinking in students and build community. My observation and debriefing comments and questions were nudges explicitly designed to prompt (Davidman, 1990) teacher candidates to critique their pedagogy relative to their students' learning.

As the teacher candidates were able to experiment with dialogue and learning community in the classroom, benefits to their students (and to themselves as teachers) could become apparent and promote continued teacher candidate effort in that direction.

Examples of benefits teacher candidates cited from using dialogue to build learning communities with their students included:

1. Student empowerment to answer questions
2. Student rapport with the teacher and other students
3. The meeting of specific student needs for :
  - Understanding other students and how *they* learn about content
  - Interacting with others
  - Satisfaction of contributing to the learning community
  - Validation of individual importance in the class
  - Motivation to explore and discover knowledge

Seeing and experiencing effects like these—among students individually and collectively--as a consequence of using and strengthening dialogue and learning community in the classroom cannot be understated. Teacher candidates who developed dialogue and learning communities with their students increased the potential to enhance students' academic experience as well as their behavior. Students' academic performance seemed to be visibly enhanced from developing dialogue and learning community with the instructional experiences of Brad, Candy, Haley, and Paula. Student behavior was improved as a consequence of building dialogue and learning community in Annett and Tana's teaching experiences. As teacher candidates developed dialogue and learning communities with students and saw student interest and engagement increase, there seemed to be other benefits. Teacher candidates seemed to feel better about their teaching identity and their ability to provide rich learning experiences for their students.

These types of teaching results with students cooperate with Banks' (2004) premise that instruction which empowers students also promotes equitable teaching as more student needs are met and they gain access to a richer learning experience. Thus, by talking about and reflecting on making dialogue and learning community changes to their pedagogy, teacher candidates seemed to feel and see that they could indeed enhance students' academic identities as learners in the classroom community (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

The results of this study suggest the following questions for teacher educators related to nudging teacher candidates to focus on student learning:

- How can teacher educators be as explicit as possible about connecting practice teaching to student learning?
- How can teacher educators avoid the assumptions that teacher candidates *know* to do this and *how* to do this?

This study suggests that instruction in and experience with dialogue and learning community have the potential to influence teacher candidates' focus on student learning in the classroom. The synthesized research literature teacher candidates received in seminars supporting why and how to use dialogue and learning community seemed to be a factor in helping them connect their pedagogy to student learning. But more research is needed on the potential role of supervisory prompts in debriefings (Davidman, 1990) for nudging teacher candidates to understand the important of connecting the pedagogy of their teaching practice to student learning.

As Teacher Candidates Developed Dialogue and Learning Community Abilities, Their Critical Reflection and Their Students' Critical Reflection Seemed to be Enhanced

When teacher candidates practiced using and developing their abilities to dialogue with themselves, with students, and/or with colleagues, they also seemed to develop critical reflection abilities in themselves and in students. There seemed to be a reciprocal and/or cyclical relationship between dialogue, critical reflection, and learning community in the way they interacted to promote one another in terms of teacher development and student learning.

Theme Discussion Conclusion

As cited elsewhere in this dissertation, unpacking the components of teaching practice to explicitly improve pedagogy for meeting student needs is powerful (Grossman, Hammerness, & McDonald, 2009). Doing so early in a teacher candidate's teaching practice helps support teacher candidates with multiple perspectives on effective ways and reasons to strengthen pedagogy (Yost, Sentner, & Forlenza-Bailey, 2000, p. 46). Dialogue with self, dialogue with students, and dialogue with colleagues—peers, mentors, and supervisors—can potentially promote critical reflection on pedagogy and help meet student needs by enhancing students' critical reflections and learning engagement. Dialogue within learning communities can take the teaching/learning experience to a deeper, more meaningful, interactive level. After all, as Ball and Forzani (2009) assert, teaching is not just about feeding students information, but rather about a continuous cycle of critical reflection on “how to ask students questions...and probe student ideas...” (p. 500). Teacher candidates, therefore, need not only understanding and practice in using dialogue interactively with their students in learning communities—but

the explicit inclusion of critical reflection throughout every aspect of their teacher education and practice-teaching experience.

### **Tensions to Explore in Critical Reflection, Dialogue and Learning Communities**

After considering the four themes that arose from teacher candidates' experience, I now reflect as a researcher and participant on the tensions among the various participants in this study. Since the study was structured around theories of critical reflection in teacher education, it is not surprising that tensions could arise that might suggest or nudge potential changes in pedagogy (Brookfield, 2004; Greene, 1988; Henderson & Gornik, 2007). By analyzing documents from participants' experiences, I acknowledge their perceptions (Merriam, 2001; Bogdan & Biklen, 2007) that dialogue and learning community practices during supervision were unanimously the most influential element in their teacher development. I recognize the power of examining one's teaching beliefs and working to evolve those beliefs toward what helps teacher candidates and their students. I know that in that process, teacher candidates can potentially provide more equitable instruction to magnify student learning. I understand that phenomenology is a framework for characterizing the essence of experiences for others (Patton, 2002). Nevertheless, I did experience tensions in my various roles during this study despite my efforts to step back from them.

I maintain particular beliefs about what I want supervision of teacher candidates to look like in terms of critical reflection of pedagogical practice to enhance student learning. My vision of critical reflection's purpose during intern and student teaching may differ significantly from the view others have of practice teaching—and teaching in

general. I enjoy an ongoing type of tension related to my belief in lifelong learning, in particular for all educators involved in promoting student learning.

In the supervision collegueship I observed in this study, there were three types of tensions among the teacher candidates, the mentors, and me as the supervisor that added complexity to the colleague dynamic: (1) role tensions, (2) power tensions, and (3) domain tensions. A discussion of those tensions will include my concerns and thoughts about how the tensions could affect student learning.

### Role Tensions

Teacher candidates, mentors, and supervisors see their roles in various ways depending in part on their beliefs and experience (Aulls & Shore, 2008; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Henderson & Kesson, 2004). Mentors may believe their role as the veteran and/or expert teacher is to welcome, praise, and/or protect their teacher candidate as Sally did with Haley and Candy in kindergarten. I never heard Sally say any constructive criticism during debriefing dialogues with Haley or with Candy, but rather Sally provided ongoing praise whenever we were together concerning the practice teaching Haley and Candy individually did in her classroom. Additionally, Sally appeared to have a desire to protect Haley and Candy from negative observation experiences by selecting lessons that would show them off as effective teachers—regardless of what student needs were at the time (TCJ, Candy, 10/20/2011). I don't know if this approach bothered Haley, but for Candy, this approach was frustrating and went against her desire for lessons to be connected to what students were currently learning.

Kay undertook similar approaches with Elaine and Wendy. There was to my recollection and from document analysis not a single thread of constructive criticism offered by Kay for either Elaine or Wendy. These teacher candidates were only praised when Kay and I talked or we had a 3-Way debriefing discussion with Elaine or Wendy. The problem with this role perception is that it does not put classroom students' learning as the top priority. Furthermore, it can send a "get-by" and "get-the-grade" message to teacher candidates.

When the mentor (and potentially principals and other school staff) send only glowing messages to teacher candidates, it can conflict with a supervisor who sees the supervisory role as supporting, critiquing, and nudging toward continued development (Yusko & Feiman-Nemser, 2008). These conflicting appraisals of teacher candidates' development can confuse them and make the supervisor look more like a threatening colleague. I recognize that teacher candidates are in the midst of learning their new roles during practice teaching (Darling-Hammond, 2006) and may want the security of praise and specific procedures (Cochran-Smith, 2002). Yet, a focus on only praising and protecting them as a matter of course doesn't allow them to begin entering the learning community of colleagues realistically. When critical reflection in debriefing dialogue is one-sided from the university supervisor, the nudges or tension toward critical self-reflection of pedagogy appear to be unwarranted and confusing to teacher candidates (Henderson & Kesson, 2004). Thus, as Yusko and Feiman-Nemser (2008) maintain, there is a continual flux of tension between the supervisor's role as evaluator of candidates' teaching practice, and supporter of their learning and emerging capacity.

### Power Tensions

This type of tension can be a perceived power and/or an exerted power. When Wendy felt that her first mentor was intimidating, Wendy didn't feel safe or able to initiate dialogue with her mentor about such necessary understandings as their teaching context or how to address specific student needs effectively (Shandomo, 2010). This condition caused Wendy to feel tense each day she was at her school site. Yet it didn't necessarily mean that Ardeth, her mentor, was actually exerting any power over her. From my work as a classroom teacher for many years and interacting with mentors, I recognize that mentors or veteran teachers may appear independent and powerful when they are preoccupied with their work and absorbed in meeting the demands of their teaching role. Nevertheless, Wendy perceived a power differential between her and her first mentor that neither of them was able to overcome. Wendy knew that Ardeth was very busy and preferred to talk with Wendy at specific times of the day. This defined window of opportunity combined with the fact that communicating with others could be generally challenging for Wendy made it difficult for her to get the help she needed to overcome this tension. In fact, the tension never got resolved before it was time for Wendy to rotate mid-semester to another class and grade level.

Likewise, Suzanne had tensions with Donna, her mentor. Suzanne perceived Donna as very busy and unapproachable. Suzanne perceived that she was a burden to Donna. The difference, however, was that Suzanne sought out dialogue with me as her supervisor and with Annett, as a teacher candidate peer, and through those discussions and her own reflections on the problem, Suzanne was able to overcome the tension she

was experiencing with her mentor. Suzanne gradually became very comfortable initiating dialogue with Donna.

Supervisor power is also a challenge to some, if not most, teacher candidates. Supervisors are responsible for determining whether teacher candidates are accomplishing the university's requirements and doing the quality of teaching that will demonstrate their ability to effectively educate classrooms of students. During the practice teaching experience, supervisors need to nudge teacher candidates toward developing in areas of weakness while complimenting areas of achievement. It is doubtful that this power differential can ever be erased given the responsibilities of the supervisor and the ways universities depend on supervisors to coach and appraise teacher candidate development. Yet, working toward a goal of greater parity between teacher candidates and more experienced colleagues, such as supervisors, cooperates with Lave and Wenger's (1991) call for "dethroning veteran teachers, mentors and supervisors as master pedagogues" (p. 94).

### Domain Tensions

When mentors' beliefs situate themselves as the experts over their classroom domain, they can be indisposed to contemplate teaching practices in their classrooms (Zeichner, 1983; 2010). At times, supervision issues arose which related to the fact that a teacher candidate had taught a lesson provided by their mentor, and one their mentor had taught many times. If an idea came up during a 3-way debriefing discussion between a mentor, teacher candidate and supervisor that suggested an instructional or environmental change to potentially benefit the mentor's students, the mentor was at times unwilling to scrutinize domain conditions that closely. For instance, when I did 3-way discussions in

sixth grade with Elaine and her mentor, Helen, Elaine looked to Helen to respond before responding to comments I made or questions I posed. Elaine seemed to automatically favor whatever Helen said in a defensive manner. Ideally, it could have been beneficial to the students if we could have openly participated in critical reflection as colleagues (Feiman-Nemser, 2001a). Another example of critical collegueship gone awry due to potential classroom domain issues occurred during a 3-way debriefing discussion with Holly and Marva, her mentor. At one point in the discussion about the challenges Holly had experienced with students yelling to each other in small group interactions, I wondered aloud if students might benefit from some sort of small-group discussion protocol. Marva immediately said she didn't think so and that immediately ended any consideration of the idea. Holly respected Marva's wishes and moved the conversation on to other ideas. Thus, an apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975) can be perpetuated in cultures of schooling where there is limited or no opportunity for critical reflection among teaching colleagues. In so doing, beliefs about a teacher's role and/or domain can go unexamined (Achinstein & Athanases, 2005)—from the mentor's perspective as well as the teacher candidate's perspective—and prevail over considerations of what pedagogy would be most effective to ensure teacher candidate and student success.

### **Researcher Study Reflections and Looking Ahead**

Looking back on the purpose for this study—critical reflection—in teacher education to provide all students access to the finest, most equitable education, I am reminded of the definition of reflection: the process of thinking carefully or deeply about the influence of one's past and present experiences while implying ensuing change (Oxford English Dictionary, 2011). I am more aware than ever of the effects of teaching

beliefs and the potential consequences those beliefs can have on supporting (or not supporting) development of critical reflection in teaching. Are educators willing to be reflective about potential change amidst tensions like those that emerged during this study? Should a willingness to engage in critical reflection of teaching be a prerequisite for a mentor's role?

I recognize reflective teaching as a basic component of transformational teaching to meet student needs for equitable instruction (Brookfield, 2003). Transformative teaching can require the painful process of reflecting on and changing teaching beliefs. Transformative teaching requires educators to examine the ways their pedagogy enriches or fails to “enrich the learning opportunities and life chances for all students” (Cochran-Smith, 2002, p. 17). In the context of this study, development of dialogue and learning communities seemed to promote teacher candidates' critically reflections on issues that arose in practice teaching and examine the ways their pedagogy affected student learning. At times, the act of dialogue and community-building helped to solve problems and navigate tensions in communicating with mentors, in generating improved student behavior, in knowing how to interact with students, in building student response capacity, in building dialogic reflection and discussion abilities in students.

I have to wonder what would happen if all teacher education focused explicitly on students in the classroom. I believe some of the role tensions created when mentors perceived themselves as protectors of teacher candidates might give way to considerations of what teacher candidates explicitly need to do to promote student success. The new norm under those conditions might need to become supervision and mentorship with shared responsibility to nudge teacher candidates. Mentors and

supervisors would need to collaborate to ensure that teacher candidates' perceptions and actions focused on promoting the successful learning of students in the classroom. And teacher candidates, mentors, and supervisors might openly discuss and recognize the formative nature of practice teaching and the mutual responsibilities that condition entails (Achinstein & Athanases, 2005; Feiman-Nemser, 2001a). Mentors might be willing to confront any constrictive classroom domain perspectives in favor of educational pragmatism to promote practices that enhance student access to rich learning opportunities and success (Ball & Forzani, 2009).

Though I was initially uncomfortable with the tensions that arose during the study, I believe the tensions are an inevitable aspect of promoting critical reflection (Achinstein & Barrett, 2004, Cochran-Smith, 2001; Henderson & Kesson, 2004) and can even serve a nudging purpose for educators at all experience levels to recognize potential, professional growth areas. I am looking ahead for ways to build professional learning communities, despite (or because of?) the tensions that can arise, in which teacher candidates, mentors, and supervisors dialogue together and create learning communities focused on students in the classroom. I essentially feel nudged in that direction and invite other educators to join me in further study on critical reflection to relentlessly engage in challenging teaching beliefs, assumptions, and practices in order to meet student needs in ever more transformative and empowering ways.

## REFERENCES

- Abt-Perkins, D., Hauschildt, P., & Dale, H. (2000). Becoming multicultural supervisors: Lessons from collaborative field study. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 16, 28-47.
- Achinstein, B. & Athanases, S. Z. (2005). Focusing new teachers on diversity and equity: Toward a knowledge base for mentors. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 843-862.
- 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), 716-746.
- Adler, S. (1991). The reflective practitioner and the curriculum of teacher education. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 17(2), 139-151.
- Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. *Journal of Education*, 162(1), 1-11.
- Athanases, S. Z., & Achinstein, B. (2003). Focusing new teachers on individual and low performing students: The centrality of formative assessment in the mentor's repertoire of practice. *Teachers College Record*, 105(8), 1486-1520.
- Aulls, M. W. & Shore, B. M. (2008). *Inquiry in education: The conceptual foundations for research as a curricular imperative*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Ball, A. (2009) Toward a theory of generative change in culturally and linguistically complex classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal*, 46(1), 45-72.
- Ball, D. L., & Cohen, D. C. (1999). Developing practice, developing practitioners: Toward a practice-based theory of professional education. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice* (pp. 3-32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ball, D. L., & Forzani, F. M. (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60, 497-511.
- Banks, J. A. (2004). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. In J. A. Banks & C. A. McGee (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 3-24). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Barr, R. D. & Parrett, W. H. (2007). *The kids left behind: Catching up the underachieving children of poverty*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- Bogdan, R. C. & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (5th Ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bolman, L. G. & Deal, T. E. (2002). *Reframing the path to school leadership: A guide for teachers and principals*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Britzman, D. P. (1991). *Practice makes practice*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Britzman, D. P. (2003). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. Albany: NY: State University of New York Press.

- Brookfield, S. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brookfield, S. (2003). Putting the critical back in critical pedagogy: A commentary on the path of dissent. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 1, 141-149.
- Brookfield, S. (2004). The getting of wisdom: What critically reflective teaching is and why it's important. Retrieved from <http://nlu.nl.edu/academics/cas/ace/facultypapers/StephenBrookfield.cfm>
- Brooks, J. B., & Brooks, M. G. (1993). *In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 249-305.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2001). Learning to teach against the (new) grain. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(1), 3-4.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2002). Inquiry and outcomes: Learning to teach in the age of accountability. *Teacher Education and Practice*, 15, 4.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). Learning and unlearning: The education of teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19, 5-28.

- Cochran-Smith, M., Barnatt, J., Friedman, A., & Pine, G. (2009). Inquiry on inquiry: Practitioner research and student learning. *Action in Teacher Education*, 31(2), 17-32.
- Cochran-Smith, M., Shakman, K., Jong, C., Terrell, D. G., Barnatt, J., & McQuillan, P. (2009). Good and just teaching: The case for social justice in teacher education. *American Journal of Education*, 115(5), 347-377.
- Cranton, P. (1996). *Professional development as transformative learning: New perspectives for teachers of adults*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Cranton, P. (2002). Teaching for transformation. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 93, 263-271.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into Practice*, 39(3), 124-130.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. London: SAGE.
- Dana, N. F., & Yendol-Silva, D. (2003). *The reflective educator's guide to classroom research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2005). Educating the new educator: Teacher education and the future of democracy. *The New Educator*, 1, 1-18.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Darling-Hammond, L. (2008). The case for university-based teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D. J. McIntyre, & K. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd Ed.), pp 333-246. New York: Routledge.
- Darling-Hammond, L. & Bransford, J. (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L., French, J., & Garcia-Lopez, S. P. (2002). *Learning to teach for social justice*. New York: Teachers College Press
- Davidman, P. (1990). Multicultural teacher education and supervision: A new approach to professional development. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 17, 37-52.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.
- Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dewey, J. (1997). *How we think*. Chicago: D. C. Heath. (Original work published in 1910).
- Dinkelman, T. (2000). An inquiry into the development of critical reflection in secondary student teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 195-222.
- DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & DuFour, R. (2005). *On common ground: The power of professional learning communities*. (Eds.). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- Elinor, L., & Gerard, G. (1998). *Dialogue: Rediscover the transforming power of conversation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001a). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 103(6), 1013-1055.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001b). Helping novices learn to teach: Lessons from an exemplary support teacher. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(1), 17-30.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., and Buchmann, M. (1985). Pitfalls of experience in teacher preparation. *Teachers College Record*, 87, 53-65.
- Foss, S. K. & Waters, W. (2007). *Destination dissertation: A traveler's guide to a done dissertation*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Freire, P. (2003). *Education for critical consciousness* (Rev. ed). New York: Continuum.
- Gay, G. (1998). Cultural, ethnic, and gender issues. In G. F. E. Pajak (Ed.), *Handbook of research on school supervision* (pp. 1184-1227). New York: Macmillan Library Reference USA.
- Gay, G., & Kirkland, K. (2003). Developing cultural critical consciousness and self-reflection in preservice teacher education. *Theory Into Practice*, 42(2), 181-187.
- Giroux, H. A. (1988). Teachers as transformative intellectuals. In H. A. Giroux (Ed.), *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning* (pp. 121-128). Granby, MA: Bergin & Garvey.
- Goldhammer, R. (1969). *Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Grant, C. A., & Zozakiewicz, C. A. (1995). Student teachers, cooperating teachers, and supervisors: Interrupting the multicultural silences of student teaching. In J. M.

- Larkin, & C. A. Sleeter (Ed.), Developing multicultural teacher education curricula (pp. 259-278). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Greene M. (1988). *The dialectic of freedom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Grossman, P. (2005). Research on pedagogical approaches in teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith and K. Zeichner (Eds), *Studying teacher education* (pp. 425-476). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Grossman, P., Hammerness, K., & McDonald, M. (2009). Redefining teaching, re-imagining teacher education. *Teachers and Teaching*, 15(2), 273-289.
- Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Habermas, J. (1972). *Toward a rational society: Student protest, science and politics*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hamilton, D., & McWilliam, E. (2001). Ex-centric voices that frame research on teaching. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (4th ed.) (pp. 17-43). Washington, DC: American Education Research Association.
- Hammerness, K., Darling-Hammond, L., & Shulman, L. (2002). Toward expert thinking: How case-writing contributes to the development of theory-based professional knowledge in student-teachers. *Teaching Education*, 13(2), 221-245.
- Hatch, T. & Grossman, P. (2009). Learning to look beyond the boundaries of representation: Using technology to examine teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(1), 70-85.

- Hatton, N. (1994). Towards a framework for professional preparation: Lessons from teacher and nurse education. *Vocational Aspect of Education*, 46(1), 61-79.
- Hatton, N., & Smith, D. (1995). Reflection in teacher education: Towards definition and implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 11(1), 33-49.
- Henderson, J. G. (1996). *Reflective teaching: The study of your constructivist practices* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Henderson, J. G., & Gornik, R. (2007). *Transformative Curriculum Leadership*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Henderson, J. G., & Kesson, K. R. (2004). *Curriculum wisdom: Education decisions in democratic societies*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers*. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.
- Howard, T. C. (2003). Culturally relevant pedagogy: Ingredients for critical teacher reflection. *Theory into Practice*, 42(3), 195-202.
- Intrator, S. M. & Kunzman, R. (2009). Grounded: Practicing what we preach. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(5), 512-519.
- Jacobs, J. (2007). *Coaching for equity: The transformation of field supervisors' pedagogy in a professional learning community*. (Doctoral dissertation). University of Florida.
- King, K. P. (2004). Both sides now: Examining transformative learning and professional development of educators. *Innovative Higher education*, 29(2), 155-174.

- King, P. M. & Kitchener, K. S. (2004). *Reflective judgment: Theory and research on the development of epistemic assumptions through adulthood*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Koerner, M., Rust, F. O., & Baumgartner, F. (2002) Exploring roles in student teaching placements. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 29(2), 35-58.
- Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in American's schools*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *Dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African-American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lampert, M. (2001). *Teaching problems and the problem of teaching*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lampert, M., & Ball, D. L. (1998). *Teaching, multimedia, and mathematics: Investigations of real practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lave, L. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Loughran, J., & Russell, T. (Eds.). (1997). *Teaching about teaching: Purpose, passion and pedagogy in teacher education*. London: Falmer Press.

- McLaren, P. (1995). *Critical pedagogy and predatory culture: Oppositional politics in a postmodern era*. New York: Routledge.
- McLaren, P. (2007). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education* (Rev. ed.) Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Merriam, S. (2001). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education* (2nd Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. (2011). Retrieved from <http://www.merriam-webster.com>
- Mezirow, J. (1995). Transformation theory of adult learning. In M. Welton (Ed.), *In defense of the lifeworld*. Albany NY: State University of New York Press.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (NCATE). (2010). *Report of the Blue Ribbon Panel on clinical preparation and partnerships for improved student learning*. Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.
- National School Reform Faculty Website. (2011). Retrieved from <http://www.nsrffharmony.org>
- Nieto, S. (2000). Placing equity front and center. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51, 180-187.
- Noddings, N. (2007). *Philosophy of education* (2nd Ed.). Boulder, CO. Westview.

- Nolan, J. & Hoover, L. (2004). *Teacher supervision and evaluation: Theory into practice*. New York: John Wiley and Sons/Jossey-Bass.
- Orland-Barak, L. & Yinon, H. (2007). When theory meets practice: Student teachers' reflections on their classroom discourse. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(6), 857-869.
- Oxford English Dictionary. (2011). Retrieved from <http://www.oed.com>
- Palmer, P. (1998). *The courage to teach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- Pinar, W. F. (1975). The method of "currere." *American Education Research Association*.
- Proce, H. (2006). Reflection in education: A Kantian epistemology. *Educational Theory*, 56(3), 237-253.
- Pultorak, E. G. & Barnes, D. (2009). Reflectivity and teaching performance of novice teachers. *Action in Teacher Education*, 31(2), 33-46.
- Rodgers, C. R. (2002). Seeing student learning: Teacher change and the role of reflection. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72, (2), 230-253.
- Rodgers, C. R., & Scott, K. H. (2008). The development of the personal self and professional identity in learning to teach. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D. J. McIntyre, & K. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd Ed.), pp. 45-65. New York: Routledge.

- Ryan, K., & Cooper, J. M. (2006). *Those who can, teach*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schon, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. & Starratt, R. J. (2002). *Supervision: A redefinition*. 7th ed. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Servage, L. (2008). Critical and transformative practices in professional learning communities. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 35(1), 63-77.
- Shandomo, H. M. (2010). The role of critical reflection in teacher education. *School-University Partnerships*, 4(1), 101-113.
- Sleeter, C. (2008). An invitation to support diverse students through teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(3), 212-219.
- Slick, S. K. (1998). The university supervisor: A disenfranchised outsider. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 14(8), 821-834.
- Smith, D., & Hatton, N. (1992). Towards critical reflection in teacher education. Paper presented to the annual conference of the Australian Teacher Education Association, Ballina.
- Smyth, J. (1988). A "critical" perspective for clinical supervision. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 3, 136-156.
- Smyth, J. (1989). Developing and sustaining critical reflection in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(2), 2-9.

- Smyth, J. (1992). Teacher's work and the politics of reflection. *American Education Research Journal*, 29, 267-300.
- Sockett, H. (2008). The moral and epistemic purposes of teacher education. In M. Cochran-
- Sparks, D. (2005). Leading for transformation in teaching, learning, and relationships. In *On common ground: The power of professional learning communities*. DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & DuFour, R. (Eds.). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- Stigler, J. W., & Hiebert, J. (1999). *The teaching gap: Best ideas from the world's teachers for improving education in the classroom*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Tichy, N. (2002). *The cycles of leadership: How great leaders teach their companies to win*. New York: Harper Business.
- Tse, H. (2007). Professional development through transformation: Linking two assessment models of teachers' reflective thinking and practice. In T. Townsend & R. Bates (Eds.), *Handbook of teacher education: Globalization, standards, and professionalism in times of change* (pp. 495-505). New York: Springer.
- van Manen, M. (1977). Linking ways of knowing with ways of being practical. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6(3), 205-228.
- Villegas, A., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 20-32.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

- Wagner, J. (1997). The unavoidable intervention of educational research: A framework for reconsidering researcher-practitioner cooperation. *Educational Researcher*, 26(7), 13-22.
- Walkington, J. (2005). Becoming a teacher: Encouraging development of teacher identity through reflective practice. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(1), 53-64.
- Whipp, J. L. (2003). Scaffolding critical reflection in online discussions: Helping prospective teachers think deeply about field experiences in urban schools. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 54(4), 321-333.
- Wiseman, A., & Fox, R. K. (2011). Supporting teachers' development of cultural competence through teacher research. *Action in Teacher Education*, 32(4), 26-37.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (3rd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Yost, D. S., Sentner, S. M., & Forlenza-Bailey, A. (2000). An examination of the construct of critical reflection: Implications for teacher education programming in the 21st Century. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51, 39-49.
- Yusko, B. & Feiman-Nemser, S. (2008). Embracing contraries: Combining assistance and assessment in new teacher induction. *Teachers College Record*, 110(5), 923-953.
- Zeichner, K. M. (1983). Alternative paradigms of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 34, 3-9.

Zeichner, K. M. (1990). Changing directions in the practicum: Looking ahead to the 1990's. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 16(2), 105-132.

Zeichner, K. M. (1993). Connecting genuine teacher development to the struggle for social justice. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 19(1), 5-20.

Zeichner, K. M. (1995). Reflections of a teacher educator working for social change. In T. Russell & F. Korthagen (Eds.), *Teachers Who Teach Teachers* (pp. 11-24). Washington, D.C.: Falmer Press.

Zeichner, K. M. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field Experiences in college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education* 61(1-2), 89-99.

Zeichner, K. M. & Liston, D. P. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57, 23-48.

Zeichner, K. M. & Tabachnick, R. B. (1982). The belief systems of university supervisors in an elementary student-teaching program. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 8(1), 35-54.

Zeichner, K. M. & Teitelbaum, K. (1982). Personalized and inquiry-oriented teacher education: An analysis of two approaches to the development of curriculum for field-based experiences. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 8, 95-117.

APPENDIX A

**Recruitment Email Letter to Teacher Candidates**

## Recruitment Email Letter to Teacher Candidates

Hi!

Thank you so much for your collaboration efforts and ideas in our seminars. I have enjoyed interacting with you about teaching beliefs, critical reflection, dialogue in learning communities and equity in schools. In teacher education research literature, there is a call for designing a process in which intern and student teachers can develop critical reflection skills for meeting student needs more equitably.

I wanted to let you know that I am going to do a research study on our reflection experiences as part of my dissertation. Participation in the study is completely voluntary. If you agree to participate, you will not be asked to do anything that you are not already doing at the present time. By agreeing to participate, you will be giving permission to use the data I collect from our reflection experiences in the dissertation research study. In order to protect confidentiality of all involved, pseudonyms will be used and identifiers will be deleted in the study report.

I will give more information at the end of Seminar #6 and have a designated assistant distribute, collect and store participation consent forms at the university. Be assured that I will not see the signed forms or know who is participating and who isn't until the semester is over and final evaluations are submitted.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Pam

APPENDIX B

**Consent Form to be a Research Participant**

## Consent Form to be a Research Participant

BOISE  
STATE UNIVERSITY

---

### A. PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

Pam Briggs, in the Department of Curriculum, Instruction is conducting a research study entitled “Developing Teacher Candidates’ Understandings of Critical Reflection by Participating in Reflection-Centered Clinical Teaching Practice.” The purpose of this study is to promote reflective teaching experiences which may enhance teacher candidates’ ability to recognize and respond to issues in the classroom and to improve learning for all students. You are being asked to participate in this study because you are a teacher candidate in your Professional Year.

### B. PROCEDURES

If you agree to be in this study, you will give permission to Pam to analyze the materials collected during the current semester of your Professional Year for her research study purposes. The materials collected may include journal entries, blog entries, video recordings, audio recordings, and lesson observation and debriefing notes. These materials are being collected as part of your participation in the supervision process. Pam is just asking for permission to analyze this data.

All findings used in any written reports or publications which result from this research project will be reported with no identifying information. It is, however, useful to use direct quotes to more clearly capture the meanings in reporting the findings from this research. A pseudonym will be assigned to any quotes used.

**C. RISKS/DISCOMFORTS**

Participation in research can involve the risk of a loss of confidentiality; however, your records will be handled as confidentially as possible. Only Pam and her faculty advisor will have access to your records as data sources. No individual identities or identifiers will be used in any reports or publications that may result from this study.

Pam will not know if you agree to participate in this study until all supervision is over and final evaluations of your teaching have been submitted for the semester.

**D. BENEFITS**

There will be no direct benefit to you from participating in this study. However, the information that you provide may help education professionals better understand how teacher reflection can be enhanced in clinical field experience.

**E. COSTS**

There will be no costs to you as a result of this study.

**F. QUESTIONS**

If you have any questions or concerns about participation in this study, you should first talk with the principal investigator, Pam Briggs, or her faculty advisor. You may also contact the Institutional Review Board, which is concerned with the protection of volunteers in research projects. You may reach the board office between 8:00a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, by calling (xxx) xxx-xxxx.

**G. CONSENT**

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep.

**PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH IS VOLUNTARY.** You are free to decline to be in this study, or to withdraw from it at any point. Your decision as to whether or not to participate in this study will have no influence on your present or future status as a State University student.

*I give my consent to participate in this study:*

---

Signature of Study Participant

Date

---

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent

Date

**THE STATE UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD HAS REVIEWED THIS PROJECT FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN PARTICIPANTS IN RESEARCH.**

**APPENDIX C****Intern and Student Teacher Learning Community Seminar Schedule****Distributed at the Introductory Meetings Before Seminars Began**

---

**Intern and Student Teacher Learning Community Seminar Schedule**

---

Session #	Dialogue Topic	Guiding Focus Questions	Reading/Activity Plan	Citations/Forms/Protocols
#1	Teaching Beliefs	<p>Who are we?</p> <p>How can our K-College schooling experiences influence our teaching beliefs and practices?</p>	<p>Preliminary discussion to unpack teaching beliefs.</p> <p>Inquiry Circles &amp; Storytelling Summary Sheet (adapt for smaller group size of 2-5).</p> <p>Teacher Candidate Belief Writing Prompts (BWP) and discussion.</p> <p>Assignment: Written reflection on this seminar theme &amp; teaching</p>	<p>Inquiry Circles &amp; Storytelling Summary Sheet (NSRF, 2011).</p>
#2	The Role of Reflection	<p>What role can our beliefs play in our reflections on teaching?</p> <p>Have you ever reflected for different purposes?</p> <p>What purposes for reflection does research cite?</p> <p>How might using the Levels of Reflection help you and your students?</p>	<p>Discuss the first focus question followed by each of the following:</p> <p>Reflection Writing Prompts (RWP).</p> <p>Reflection Info Sheet (synthesis by the researcher).</p> <p>Developmental Levels of Reflection (Hatton &amp; Smith, 1995)</p> <p>Assignment: Written reflection on this seminar theme and teaching.</p>	<p>Reflection Info Sheet synthesized from:</p> <p>Brookfield, 2004; Cochran-Smith, Barnatt, Friedman, &amp; Pine, 2009; Darling-Hammond, 2008; Oxford English Dictionary, 2011; Pultorak &amp; Barnes, 2009; Rodgers, 2002; Schon, 1983; Socket, 2008;</p> <p>Developmental Levels of Reflection: Hatton &amp; Smith, 1995.</p>

#3	Dialogue & Learning Communities	<p>What has our experience been with dialogue in learning communities?</p> <p>How do you think dialogue works best in learning communities?</p> <p>How might dialogue in the classroom give more students access to improved learning opportunities?</p>	<p>Discuss focus questions. Connect to using the following handouts. Discuss why and how to apply them with students in teacher candidates' classroom instruction.</p> <p>Pocket Guide to Probing Questions</p> <p>Assignment: Reflection on this seminar theme and how it might affect your instruction and your students.</p>	<p>Pocket Guide to Probing Questions, NSRF, 2011.</p> <p>Review in seminars as needed regarding teaching, dialogue and providing equity in schools:</p> <p>Developmental Levels of Reflection: Hatton &amp; Smith, 1995.</p>
#4	Students Needs and The Role of Equity in Teaching	<p>Who are our students?</p> <p>What are their unique qualities that influence our teaching pedagogy?</p> <p>How can we use critical reflection to meet student needs equitably?</p>	<p>Discuss focus questions. Distribute and discuss individually:</p> <p>Quinn's Six Q's</p> <p>Prompt for Discussion about Equity in Teaching (role play) (Ladson-Billings, 1994).</p> <p>Matching Activity: Equity Scenarios/ Teaching Theory.</p> <p>Assignments: Reflection on seminar theme and application.</p>	<p>Quinn's Six Questions, NSRF, 2011.</p> <p>Matching Activity with scholars cited. Pre-cut cards apart using one color for scenarios and another color for theory cards.</p> <p>As needed: Developmental Levels of Reflection: Hatton &amp; Smith, 1995.</p>

#5	Modeling Critical Reflection	<p>How is critical reflection a continual part of a teacher's continuum of professional development?</p> <p>How can equitable teaching have a transformative influence in the classroom and in society?</p>	<p>Discuss focus questions.</p> <p>Supervisor shares pre-lesson planning &amp; reflection along with overview of students in third-grade class in preparation for teaching a math lesson to the students that week.</p> <p>Assignments: Reflection on this seminar relative to reflection and your teaching.</p>	<p>As needed:</p> <p>Reflection Info Sheet from Seminar #2.</p> <p>Developmental Levels of Reflection (Hatton &amp; Smith, 1995) from Seminar #2.</p>
#6	Critical reflection as a skill for teachers and students to support democracy	<p>How were student needs addressed in the lesson?</p> <p>Was there a way the lesson could have been taught more equitably?</p> <p>How do critical reflection questions help students and teachers to support democratic principles?</p>	<p>Discuss focus questions.</p> <p>Supervisor video presentation and critical post-lesson reflection on a lesson the supervisor taught &amp; videotaped in a third-grade classroom the prior week.</p> <p>Assignments: Reflection on this seminar relative to reflection on your teaching practice during the professional year.</p>	<p>Review in seminars as needed regarding teaching, dialogue and providing equity in schools:</p> <p>Quinn's Six Questions, NSRF, 2011.</p> <p>Developmental Levels of Reflection: Hatton &amp; Smith, 1995.</p>

APPENDIX D

**List of National School Reform Faculty Protocols Used**

**List of National School Reform Faculty ([www.nsrharmony](http://www.nsrharmony.com), 2011) Protocols Used**

Protocol Name	Purpose	Study Application
Considerations for Responsive Facilitation	List of features for the facilitator to keep in mind for effectively supporting group interaction in the seminars.	For the researcher/facilitator's preparation before seminars began and as needed for review.
Inquiry Circles: A Protocol for Professional Inquiry (which includes Storytelling Summary Sheet).	To generate inquiry questions in support of teachers as learners and build awareness and respect for one another's stories in the learning community (adapt it to work with groups of 4-5).	Used in Seminar #1 when the group shared and responded to one another's written schooling experiences and the effects on teaching and learning beliefs.
Pocket Guide to Probing Questions	To help teacher candidates distinguish between clarifying questions and probing questions and their purposes for building dialogue and learning community with students in the classroom.	Given to teacher candidates in Seminar #3 to explicitly discuss the different purposes and specific applications of probing versus clarifying questions to engage student learning.
Quinn's Six Questions	Quinn's Six Questions are basic inquiries to good teaching: What am I teaching and to whom? Why am I teaching it? How am I teaching it? Why am I teaching it that way? What evidence will I collect to show my kids are getting it? How will my students know they are getting it?	Distributed and discussed in Seminar #4 to support seminar topic: Students' Needs and the Role of Equity in Teaching.  Used to discuss how questions like Quinn's Six Questions can help address issues in teaching in terms of equity and preparation for living in a democracy.

APPENDIX E

**Reflection Info Sheet Distributed and Discussed at Seminar #2**

## Reflection Info Sheet

---

### Reflection in Teaching Research Overview

Reflective teaching is a major focus or goal of most teacher education programs across the country, including State University. While there is not a cohesive or defined set of recommendations for how to assist teacher candidates in understanding the use of reflection, research from many teacher education sources suggests supervisors/liaisons do the following with teacher candidates during their clinical practice experience:

1. Provide opportunities for teacher candidates to unpack their teaching beliefs,
2. Make the meaning and process of reflection explicit,
3. Promote higher levels of reflection,
4. Provide explicit skill guidance, and
5. Establish systematic structures for skill development.

**Definition:** Reflection is a process of thinking carefully or deeply about the influence of one's past and present experiences while implying ensuing change (Oxford English Dictionary, 2011).

### **Significant Purposes of Reflection in Teaching:**

- To understand experience
- To foster a questioning disposition
- To enhance teaching proficiency
- To construct a professional identity
- To test education theory in school experience.

### **Ultimate Purpose of Reflection in Teaching:**

To continually consider and make changes to educational processes in order to enhance student learning.

### **Reflection and Teaching Proficiency:**

To enhance proficiency, the concept of reflective practice suggests that rather than teaching a lesson mechanically and moving on, educators continually examine the

quality and purpose of their instruction. As Sockett (2008) found, reflective teachers are constantly testing the theories behind their own teaching practices to help them become more proficient teachers. Likewise, teaching proficiency is enhanced when reflective teachers constantly evaluate what their students think and understand and then redesign instruction to adjust to what students have or haven't yet learned (Darling-Hammond, 2008). Thus, reflective teaching suggests modification to the curriculum based on the needs of students--all students.

The concept of reflective practice suggests that rather than teaching a lesson mechanically and moving on, educators continually examine the quality and purpose of their instruction.

**Reflective teachers are continually:**

- Testing the theories behind their own teaching practices to help them become more proficient teachers (Sockett, 2008).
- Evaluating what their students think and understand and then redesigning instruction to adjust to what students have or haven't yet learned (Darling-Hammond, 2008).
- Thinking about *what* is being taught, *why*, and to whom it is being taught all within the context *how* it relates to the culture of the students so that instruction is most effective (Pultorak & Barnes, 2009).
- Willing to continually consider and make changes to educational processes which will enhance student learning (Zeichner & Liston, 1987).
- Examining and reexamining instructional practices to meet all students' needs and to promote the life chances of students (Cochran-Smith, Barnatt, Friedman, & Pine, 2009).
- Dialoguing with others about teaching situations to understand the issues and problem-solve possible solutions (Schon, 1983).
- Interactively moving themselves and other learners from one experience to the next with increased understanding (Rodgers, 2002)

**Critically reflective teachers do what reflective teachers do as well as (Brookfield, 2004):**

- Consider power which can undergird, frame and distort many education practices for purposes of providing equitable learning opportunities.
- Question assumptions educators make about *what* is done and *why* in education practices and *who* benefits from those practices.

APPENDIX F

**Developmental Levels of Reflection (Hatton & Smith, 1995)**

**Distributed and Discussed at Seminar #2**

### Developmental Levels of Reflection (Hatton & Smith, 1995)

Reflection Type	Nature of Reflection	Possible Content
<p><b>Technical Rationality</b> (Schon, 1983; van Mannen, 1977), addressing concerns which initially prepare individuals for entry into a profession.</p>	<p><b>Technical reflection</b> dealing with simplistic decision-making about immediate behaviors or skills, drawn from a given research/theory base, but always interpreted in light of personal worries and previous experience.</p>	<p>Beginning to examine (usually with peers) one's use of essential skills or generic competencies as often applied in controlled, small scale settings.</p>
<p><b>Reflection-on-action</b> (Schon, 1983; 1990; Smith &amp; Hatton, 1992) addressing concerns in later stages of a teacher candidate program</p>	<p><b>Descriptive reflection</b> relating to social efficiency, developmental, personalistic, seeking what is seen as 'best possible' practice</p> <p><b>Dialogic reflection</b> which is deliberative, cognitive, narrative, weighing competing claims and viewpoints, and then exploring alternative solutions</p> <p><b>Critical reflection</b> (social reconstructionist), seeing as problematic, according to ethical criteria, the goals and practices of one's profession</p>	<p>Analyzing one's performance in the professional role (probably alone), giving reasons for actions taken</p> <p>Hearing one's own voice (alone or with another) exploring alternative ways to solve problems in a professional situation</p> <p>Thinking about the effects upon others of one's actions, taking account of social, political and/or cultural forces (can be shared)</p>
<p><b>Reflection-in-action</b> (Schon, 1983, 1987) reflecting concerns after some experience in the teaching profession</p>	<p><b>Contextualized reflection</b> from multiple viewpoints drawing on any of the possibilities 1-4 above, applied to situations as they are actually taking place</p>	<p>Dealing with on-the-spot professional problems as they arise (thinking can be recalled and then shared with others later)</p>

APPENDIX G

**Dialogue and Learning Communities in Teaching Info Sheet**

**Distributed and Discussed in Seminar #3**

## Dialogue and Learning Communities in Teaching

---

Assumptions can abound about the social nature of dialogue, such as the idea that dialogue is just talking and everyone knows how to do that. Yet there are specific recommendations (Brookfield, 1995; Elinor & Gerard, 1998; Ryan & Cooper, 2006) for making dialogue more effective, including suggestions that participants are:

- Inquiring into underlying assumptions
- Interacting at a slower pace with silence between speakers
- Letting go of the need for a specific outcome
- Listening without resistance
- Focusing on shared meaning and learning
- Suspending judgment
- Conversing to the group as a whole rather than to one person in the group
- Sharing the responsibility of the dialogue in a non-hierarchical way
- Suspending role and status distinctions
- Building on what others have said whenever possible
- Wanting to hear from each person in the dialogue community

To further clarify the role of dialogue in learning communities, Sparks (2005) suggested that dialogue does not try to convince others they are wrong, or advocate a particular point of view. Dialogue does not promote defensiveness, which can be a barrier to deeper understandings and transformational learning opportunities that can accompany dialogue.

APPENDIX H

**Prompt for Discussion about Equity in Teaching (Role Play)**

**Distributed and Discussed in Seminar #4**

**Prompt for Discussion about Equity in Teaching (Ladson-Billings, 1994)**

---

Teacher: Why do we care what race the Egyptians were?

Students: Because maybe they were black.

Teacher: Why would that matter?

Students: Because then we could show that black people made the pyramids.

Teacher: What would that prove?

Students: That black people can do incredible things. It seems like books only show the Europeans or whites doing great things.

Teacher: Why is that?

---

APPENDIX I

**Matching Activity: Equity Scenarios and Teaching Theory**

**Distributed and Facilitated at Seminar #4**

### Matching Activity: Equity Scenarios and Teaching Theory

**Scenarios: to be copied and cut apart on color paper if available.**

<p>The parents of one of your students rarely comes to the school and when they do come, they don't look at you and avoid talking to you. What could be issues to reflect upon and what actions might be appropriate?</p>	<p>You teach at a school with a wide diversity of student ethnicity. You test students and determine who has little to no understanding of English. What are the issues to reflect on and what are possible actions to promote student success?</p>
<p>In your first teaching job, a very experienced teacher is assigned to mentor you. She lectures and has her students do worksheets all day. What might be issues for your reflection and what possible actions could be appropriate when she gives you advice?</p>	<p>There are several students in your class who are doing very poorly on their daily oral language each week, most of whom have attended your school for years. What might be the issues to reflect upon and possible actions to take?</p>
<p>You receive a new student 2 months into the school year. She is inattentive, distracted in class and lacks social skills. You learn that she and her siblings were adopted from different countries. What might be the issues to reflect on and possible actions to take?</p>	<p>In keeping with the standards for sixth grade history instruction, you are planning a unit the explorers to the Americas. What issues might be involved in pre-reflective planning for this unit of instruction?</p>
<p>There is a student in your third grade class who is very high in every academic subject, has good social skills, has travelled extensively with her family and demonstrates confidence in asking and answering questions in class. What might be issues to reflect on and what possible actions could be taken?</p>	<p>You get your first job at a school in a part of town supported by low property taxes. You notice some children are arriving to school too late to get free breakfast. What might be issues to reflect on and what possible actions might be appropriate from what you have learned?</p>
<p>You are dialoguing with your first-graders to help them reflect critically about their knowledge-construction and understandings. In the teachers' lounge later you hear a fifth grade teacher say that almost none of the students in her class know how to think critically or dialogue as a learning community. What might be the issues here and what action might be appropriate?</p>	<p>As a new teacher, you are part of a grade level team which rotates groups of students to one another's class for instruction in math and science. You have noticed that the low-achieving students who go to another room are saying the discussions are too hard for them. What might be the issue(s) to reflect on and appropriate action(s) to take?</p>

### Matching Activity: Equity Scenarios and Teaching Theory

Equity concept/theory cards: to be copied on different color paper than the scenario cards, and cut apart. Each scenario card may relate to more than one equity concept/theory card.

<p>...analyzing assumptions underlying a teaching decision or action—that is the ethical, moral, political and historical implications involved</p> <p>(McLaren, 2007; Hatton &amp; Smith, 1995)</p>	<p>...teacher identity which does not include continually and critically reflecting on teaching for purposes of transforming it.</p> <p>(Giroux, 1988)</p>
<p>Different types of educational experience and curriculum knowledge are often made available to students in different social classes. For example, students from working class backgrounds are rewarded for docility and obedience. Students from managerial classes are rewarded for initiative and personal assertiveness .</p> <p>(Anyon, 1980)</p>	<p>...beginning teachers working for equity or social justice—part of which means insuring that every student has opportunities to learn rich content and engage in critical thinking;; providing social and intellectual supports that make learning possible; and having high learning expectations for everybody...</p> <p>(Cochran-Smith, 2003)</p>
<p>...Of course, teacher education for equity or social justice is political—it has to do with who has power and access to learning and life opportunities...</p> <p>(Cochran-Smith, 2001)</p>	<p>Good teaching challenges educational inequities so that everybody has the kinds of rich learning opportunities that have historically been reserved for the privileged...</p> <p>(Anyon, 1980)</p>
<p>Teaching students the skills they will need to support democracy.</p> <p>(Henderson &amp; Kesson, 2004)</p>	<p>Blindness to inequity in the systems of education and perhaps to the ways knowledge is traditionally represented...</p> <p>(Ladson-Billings 1994)</p>
<p>...where students lack advantages related to socioeconomic class, race, language, culture, age and ability...</p> <p>(Shandomo, 2010)</p>	<p>...cultural factors such as race, gender, ethnicity, language, disability, and social class as a basis for planning instruction.</p> <p>(Shandomo, 2010)</p>

APPENDIX J

**Researcher Journal Sample: Modeling a Critical Reflecting Cycle of Instruction**

**Distributed and Discussed During Seminar #5 and #6**

## Researcher Journal Sample: Modeling a Critical Reflection Lesson Cycle

### PRE-REFLECTION ON LESSON TO BE TAUGHT TOMORROW:

#### Seminar #6 Concepts to consider:

**Demographics:** Studied socio-economic and ethnic mix on this school and did classroom observation to study student response and behaviors. I wrote down student names and seating. Made mental notes of their personalities and approaches to learning. I'm planning a lesson on comparison of numbers with decimals—3 place value.

**Equity:** Caught myself making assumptions that students might already possess strategies for writing 3-digit decimal numbers in order at their desks from a series of 20 numbers on the board. Decided to follow our interactive game (where we put 3-digit decimal number cards in order on the board tray at the front of the room)

—with explicit discussion in how to write numbers in order at their desks using questions: How do we choose which are the very smallest to come first? (compare hundredths column for smallest digit and devise a code to only consider those at first) (Then consider tenths column).

--with a newly revised assessment instrument which has the 3-digit decimal numbers written on a paper where they can be crossed out after choosing and writing them in ascending order.

Still, using Hatton & Smith's (1995) Levels of Reflection, this is just **Technical Rationality** on my part as a teacher—analyzing HOW I will teach rather than including the humanistic WHY I am choosing to do it this way type of teaching in my reflections.

**Descriptive reflection:** I thought I had the lesson pretty well planned and printed to share with Teacher Candidates. But I began to wonder about my assessment instrument for our first math activity regarding low achieving students—where they are developmentally. I suspected that the mid and high performing third-graders could devise a strategy to know what numbers they have already put in numerical order. But what about the low-performing students? What would be the “best teaching practice” for them?

**Dialogic reflection:** I began an ongoing dialogue with myself—wondering if I would be teaching equitably—whether I would be providing what all students needed. Remarkably, I could imagine hearing third-grade student voices asking clarifying questions or silently to themselves wondering if they will EVER feel successful in school!

**Critical Reflection:** I feel an overlap here with Dialogic reflection--my inner dialogue is about my concerns for the social and cultural disadvantages and advantages of students. Research supports that if students learn how to think, reason and question, they are better prepared to handle the freedoms and responsibilities of living in a democracy. Of course, all students need opportunities to increase their capacity. That means I have a big responsibility within our democracy to foster reasoning and questioning skills conducive to a range of abilities when I teach.

Have I included meaningful probing questions in my lesson where students have chances to reason rather than just clarify procedures? If I can encourage and prompt students to do these things, I will be helping prepare them for living and for democratic interaction as adults.

Students functioning below grade level might need 2-digit decimal numbers and/or the concreteness of using pieces or manipulatives to make sense of math.

Students functioning above grade level need creativity with what they do know or another type of extension. Having them count by 3's if they finish early now seems absurd. I am going to ask them to make up their own mixed up set of ten 4-digit decimal numbers, placement lines, trade with someone, and put them in order.

**Contextualized “Reflection in Action”:** Having never taught third grade, and having not taught a whole class for three years, I am somewhat insecure. Still, I do have lots of experience to draw on from 15 years’ teaching experience.

I hope that I will have the mindfulness while teaching the lesson—or facilitating the lesson—to clarify and adapt as we go along. And I’m wondering about the amount of time for each activity.

Still, the words Hatton & Smith used to define their Levels of Reflection are not as easy to understand as I would like. I feel a need to review Quinn’s 6 Questions again alongside the Observation Form I will use with Intern and Student Teachers to be reminded of explicit objectives, pacing, smooth transitions, etc. in classroom teaching that I may have forgotten.

Overall, I am nervous and SO EXCITED for this opportunity to be teaching in the classroom!! This is what reflective teaching is all about! And post-reflection will allow me to learn and share it with others for future opportunities—which I hope will be more often!

### **Quinn’s 6 Questions:**

1. **What am I teaching and to whom?**
2. **Why am I teaching it?**
3. **How am I teaching it?**
4. **Why am I teaching it that way?**

5. **What evidence will I collect to show my students are getting it?**
6. **How will THEY know they are getting it?**

### **DURING-THE-LESSON REFLECTION Contextualized “Reflection in Action”:**

I really loved teaching this math lesson and watching for cues from students to address their needs. For example, it helped to listen to individual students’ comments within their groups, such as John saying softly when he saw the 3-digit number cards displayed at the front of the room for our game, “The numbers aren’t in order.” Hearing that comment triggered me to ask the class (rather than tell them), “Are these number cards in order from least to greatest, smallest to biggest? If you say ‘yes’ do this, if ‘no’ do this, if you’re ‘not sure’ do this.” When students responded with their thumbs up, down or sideways, I also observed their eyes, to see if they were confident or if they were looking around for what others were choosing. A quick scan of their eyes made me feel their individual and collective degree of confidence in their answer.

### **POST-REFLECTION ON LESSON TAUGHT Tuesday, October 18, 2011:**

All week I have held onto a slightly crumpled blue index card used by one team’s walkers as team members took turns collaboratively changing and correcting the order of any one 3-digit decimal card in the front of the room or choosing the option to add a new card. It is fascinating to recall how the various pairs of students came up to the front. Some clearly had discussed which card they would move and why—before they got to the front. Others had to figure it out after they got there. The numbers were 4 inches tall and easily legible from any student chair location. When I saw that some pairs hadn’t figured it out before, I added a “time element” such as 10 seconds with a warning when they only had a few seconds left. I also reminded subsequent teams to figure out what would be the next card in order before they came up.

I would definitely teach this subject using this activity again, but I would be more explicit about HOW the groups could collaborate. Of course I could tell them. But I would try asking them, “What strategy could each of your groups use to figure out which card comes next BEFORE you come up?” If no one had a clear idea, I could then scaffold the question for the class with “How could the practicing we did with four 3-digit decimal numbers suggest a strategy for teams?” If more scaffolding were STILL needed for students to come up with a strategy--not necessarily the strategy I am thinking of, but any strategy that would help them--I might ask “Could a few of the most likely numbers to be next in the series be written on scratch paper and looked at for place value clues?”

As a reflective teacher who knows the value of **dialogic reflection** (for teachers—and for students) in their problem solving, if I suspect that there is a chance there may be one or more students who have a strategy idea, it is best teaching practice to ASK for their ideas. Doing so meets my desire to be a **critically reflective** teacher who thinks about the effect my actions can have on individual students and the society they are in. Trying to ask

students higher level thinking questions whenever appropriate can demonstrate my respect for them and anticipation of their potentially creative ideas.

Giving students multiple opportunities to reason and collaborate demonstrates and promotes skills and dispositions for improving students' life chances and for promoting democratic processes and purposes (Cochran-Smith, 2003; Greene, 1988). Research suggests that teachers get developmentally better at this with ongoing practice (Hatton & Smith, 1995; King & Kitchener, 2004).

\*The other thing my mind has been working on is how to simplify the levels of reflection supported by Hatton & Smith (1995) by giving the levels quick, user-friendly questions suggested by Quinn's 6 Questions and adding a few questions suggested by education scholars.

APPENDIX K

**Adaptation of Hatton and Smith's (1995) Developmental Levels of Reflection**

**Distributed and Discussed at Seminar #6**

**Used in Supervision with the Intern and Student Teacher Observation Form**

**(Appendix O)**

### Adaptation of Hatton and Smith's (1995) Developmental Levels of Reflection

Cumulative Reflection Questions	Significant Considerations	Types of Reflection	Research to Support
1. <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;">             What am I teaching?              How am I teaching?           </div>	Beginning to examine one's use of basic teaching techniques	Technical Reflection- Simplistic decision-making centered on teacher's initial teaching skill, performance worries and prior experiences.	(Schon, 1983; van Manen, 1977).
2. <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;">             What am I teaching and to whom?              Why am I teaching it?           </div>	Deeper analysis of performance in the professional teaching role with reasons given for actions taken.	Responsive Reflection- Relating to social efficiency, developmental, personalized to students, beginning to seek best practice possible.	(Cochran-Smith, Barnatt, Friedman, & Pine, 2009; National School Reform Faculty, 2011; Schon, 1983, 1987; Hatton & Smith, 1995).
3. <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;">             Why am I teaching it that way?              What evidence will I collect to show my kids are getting it?              How will my students know they are getting it?           </div>	Consideration of the effects of reflection levels for teachers and for students.	Dialogic Reflection- Deliberative, cognitive, narrative, weighing competing claims and viewpoints, and then exploring alternative solutions (Voice/s alone or with another).	
4. <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;">             How do these learning experiences improve student's life chances?              How do these learning experiences support skills for democracies?           </div>	Thinking about the social, political and cultural short-term and long-term effects upon others of one's actions.	Critical Reflection- Social reconstructionist considerations of equity according to ethical and fairness criteria.	
5. <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;">             Comfortably addressing all questions listed above           </div> <p>Questions 2-3 adapted from Quinn's Six Questions (NSRF, 2011)</p>	Becoming reflectively adept at dealing with on-the-spot issues as they occur.	Fluent Reflection- Using reflection types 1-4 above spontaneously. Reflection in action.	

APPENDIX L

**Letter to Parents from Teacher Candidates about Videotaping Instruction**

**Letter to Parents from Teacher Candidates about Videotaping Instruction**

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Dear Parents,

As a State University Intern Teacher, it has been a great opportunity to practice teaching in \_\_\_\_\_ class!

Thus far I have had the opportunity to lead discussions, do student assessments, teach writing activities, do one-on-one work with students and co-teach. In the coming days in the classroom I will be videotaping instruction methods with my State University supervisor and substitute teaching for \_\_\_\_\_ [the classroom teacher].

I look forward to helping students and practicing instruction at \_\_\_\_\_ Elementary.

Best regards,

\_\_\_\_\_, Intern Teacher

\_\_\_\_\_, Classroom Teacher

APPENDIX M

**Recruitment Email Letter to Mentor Teachers**

## Recruitment Email Letter to Mentor Teachers

Date

Dear [Teacher]

Thank you for mentoring a State University Intern or Student Teacher! The weekly supervision seminars have provided opportunities for us to collaborate on teaching beliefs, reflection, dialogue practices, learning communities, meaningful instruction and equity. The teacher education research literature suggests there is a need for finding a cohesive system with the features we discuss in our seminars to insure intern and student teachers learn ways to be more deeply reflective on teaching and learning in the schools.

To that end I want to do a dissertation study on the effect of these seminars on intern and student teachers as the State University Supervisor at \_\_\_\_\_Elementary. Nothing will change in what Intern and Student Teachers are currently experiencing. I will merely be asking permission from the Intern and Student Teacher(s) to use the data gained from examining this process in a final dissertation report and in possible teacher education publications. In reporting and publication, pseudonyms will be used and identifiers deleted to protect confidentiality of all individuals and organizations involved. I will not know whether Intern and Student Teachers have given permission for me to use their data until after the semester is over and evaluations are submitted.

To include the benefits of technology in helping prospective teachers improve their instruction and reflection, lesson videotaping is suggested. To that end, Intern and Student Teachers will be or have been provided a Parent Letter template stating that along with their other specific teaching practice experiences in the classroom, videotaping of Intern, Student Teacher or State University Supervisor will occur to examine instruction.

Every effort will be made to focus videotaping on instruction rather than students. Still, if there are student cases where cultural factors suggest accommodations be made in the videotaping process, please let me know.

If you are supportive of this study to learn more about how Intern and Student Teachers can learn to be more deeply reflective on their teaching, please indicate this in your response to this email as required by the \_\_\_\_\_ School District along with any further questions you may have.

Best regards,

Pam Briggs  
State University Supervisor/Liaison  
for Intern & Student Teachers

APPENDIX N

**Principal Recruitment Email Letter**

## Principal Recruitment Email Letter

Date

Dear [Principal],

Thank you for help in providing mentoring for a State University Intern or Student Teacher! The weekly supervision seminars have provided opportunities for us to collaborate on teaching beliefs, reflection, dialogue practices, learning communities, meaningful instruction and equity. The teacher education research literature suggests there is a need for finding a cohesive system with the features we discuss in our seminars to insure intern and student teachers learn ways to be more deeply reflective on teaching and schooling processes.

To that end I want to do a dissertation study on the effect of these seminars on intern and student teachers as the State University Supervisor at \_\_\_\_\_Elementary. Nothing will change in what Intern and Student Teachers are currently experiencing. I will merely be asking permission from the Intern and Student Teacher(s) to use the data gained from examining this process in a final dissertation report and in possible teacher education publications. In reporting and publication, pseudonyms will be used and identifiers deleted to protect confidentiality of all individuals and organizations involved. I will not know whether Intern and Student Teachers have given permission for me to use their data until after the semester is over and evaluations are submitted.

To include the benefits of technology in helping prospective teachers improve their instruction and reflection, lesson videotaping is suggested. To that end, Intern and Student Teachers will be or have been provided a Parent Letter template stating that along with other specific teaching practice experiences in the classroom, videotaping of Intern, Student Teacher and/or university Supervisor is planned to study instruction. I have requested that you preview these letters.

Every effort will be made to focus videotaping on instruction rather than students. Still, if there are student cases where cultural factors suggest accommodations be made in the videotaping process, please let me know.

If you are supportive of this study to learn more about how Intern and Student Teachers can learn to be more deeply reflective on teaching, please indicate this in your response to this email as required by the \_\_\_\_\_ School District along with any further questions you may have.

Best regards,

Pam Briggs  
Intern & Student Teacher  
Supervisor/Liaison

APPENDIX O

**Intern and Student Teacher Lesson Observation Form**

**My Adaptation of Developmental Levels of Reflection by Hatton & Smith (1995)**

**Was Added as a Third Page to This Form**

### Intern & Student Teacher Lesson Observation Form

Student \_\_\_\_\_  
Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_  
Mentor/grade \_\_\_\_\_  
Lesson \_\_\_\_\_  
School \_\_\_\_\_

<p><b>Standard 1 – Knowledge of Subject</b></p> <p>The teacher understands the central concepts and <i>tools of inquiry</i> in the discipline taught, creates meaningful learning experiences and encourages students to recognize, question and interpret differing viewpoints, theories and ways of knowing.</p>	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
<p><b>Standard 2 – Knowledge of Human Development and Learning</b></p> <p>The teacher understands how students learn and develop, and provides opportunities that support their intellectual, social and personal development.</p>	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
<p><b>Standard 3 – Adapting Instruction for Individual Needs</b></p> <p>The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to students with diverse needs.</p>	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
<p><b>Standard 4 – Multiple Instructional Strategies</b></p> <p>The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students' <i>development of critical thinking, problem solving</i>, and performance skills.</p>	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>

<p><b>Standard 5 – Classroom Motivation and Management Skills</b></p> <p>The teacher understands individual and group motivation and behavior and creates a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.</p>	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
<p><b>Standard 6 – Communication Skills</b></p> <p>The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication to <i>foster active inquiry</i> in conveying ideas and asking appropriate questions to stimulate discussion and stimulate higher-order thinking.</p>	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
<p><b>Standard 7 – Instructional Planning Skills</b></p> <p>The teacher plans short-range and long-range instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.</p>	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
<p><b>Standard 8 – Assessment of Student Learning</b></p> <p>The teacher understands, uses and interprets formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and advance student performance and to determine program effectiveness.</p>	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
<p><b>Standard 9 – Professional Commitment and Responsibility</b></p> <p>The teacher is a self-reflective practitioner who demonstrates a commitment to equitable professional standards including presenting issues with objectivity, fairness, and respect.</p>	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
<p><b>Standard 10 – Partnerships</b></p> <p>The teacher interacts in a professional, effective manner with colleagues, parents, and other members of the community to support students’ learning and well-being.</p>	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>

APPENDIX P

**Color Codes Assigned to Teacher Candidates**

**Color Codes Assigned to Teacher Candidates**

<b>Teacher Candidate</b>	<b>Code</b>
Annett	<b>Lavender</b>
Brad	<b>Tan</b>
Candy	<b>Brown</b>
Elaine	<b>Peach</b>
Haley	<b>Black</b>
Holly	<b>Green</b>
Laura	<b>Blue</b>
Paula	<b>Gray</b>
Suzanne	<b>Red</b>
Tana	<b>Purple</b>
Wendy	<b>Yellow</b>

APPENDIX Q

**Codes Used in Constant Comparative Document Analysis**

### Codes Used in Constant Comparative Document Analysis

Many of the codes which emerged in this study seemed to relate primarily to the six seminars or to nudges toward change. However, terms listed are neither exhaustive nor exclusive to any one category and can apply to multiple situations depending upon the context.

#### **Seminar #1**

Teaching Beliefs  
Risk-taking  
Believe

#### **Seminar #2**

Reflection  
Thinking  
Critical Thinking  
Critical Reflection  
Journaling  
Asked myself  
Wondered  
Felt intimidated

#### **Seminar #3**

Dialogue  
Community  
Learning Community  
Discussion  
Discussed  
Collaboration  
Teamwork  
Responded  
Responses  
Asking  
Debriefing  
Responsive  
Questions

#### **Seminar #4**

Respect  
Demographics  
Equity  
Equitable  
Fair, Fairness

#### **Seminar #5**

Modeling  
Equitable instruction

#### **Seminar #6**

Videotaping

#### **Nudges for change**

Challenged myself  
Challenged me  
Prompted  
Changed  
Asked myself  
Started  
Tried  
Affected  
Needed  
Risk-taking  
Action  
Action plan

APPENDIX R

**Interim Case Study of Candy's Responses to Likert Rating Scale:**

**Prioritizing Supervision Practices**

**Interim Case Study of Candy's Responses to Likert Rating Scale:  
Prioritizing Supervision Practices**

3 = very helpful      2 = helpful      1 = less helpful      0 = not helpful

Intern Teachers:	3 = Very Helpful	2 = Helpful	1 = Less Helpful	0 = Not Helpful
Journaling			C	
Mentor Debriefing	C			
Supervisor Debriefing	C			
3-Page Observation Format		C		
Self-Videotaping		C		
Supervisor's Self-Videotaping		C		
Dialogue and Community Seminar and Handouts	C			
Levels of Reflection Seminar and Handouts		C		
Equity Scenario Seminar Activity			C	
General Seminar Format			C	
General Seminar Content			C	

**APPENDIX S****Interim Case Study of Candy's Responses to Exit Writing Prompts (EWP)****Regarding Supervision Practices:**

<b><u>Feature</u></b>	<b><u>Response</u></b>
Teaching Beliefs	It was beneficial to look at different perspectives and add to my own if I chose to.
Levels, purposes and use	<p>Knowing the different levels and purposes of reflection reinforced of reflection the importance and reason for reflective thinking and gave me the opportunity to take my reflective thinking to the next level.</p> <p>I think reflection will potentially be a great tool during my student teaching. Reflective journaling wasn't as helpful to me as the verbal debriefing. It was a lot more beneficial to say my thoughts out loud rather than posting them to the blog.</p>
Dialogue and learning Communities	The discussion of dialogue and learning communities reinforced the importance and benefits of including it in my students' learning. I have made a conscious effort to model discussion and engage my students in meaningful conversations.
Observing and debriefing Tools and processes	I like to see a combination of comments. The constructive criticism gives me a better understanding of the specific areas that I can work on to improve, but the positive comments definitely give me a boost—which is helpful. I'm satisfied with the ratio that is used now.
Videotaping	If given the opportunity, I'd videotape myself again when teaching new information because I think I could gain a lot of knowledge from the process, in particular, development of new material and new ideas between teacher and students.
Dialogue and questions in the classroom	<p>The process of teaching this semester has helped me make a connection between my use of questions and students' access to critical reflection. I feel I can literally see my students engaging in critical thinking when I dialogue and question them.</p> <p>I found myself constantly asking my students questions and encouraging critical thinking. I feel application of seminar topics was evident in my instruction because of the conversations that my students were having amongst themselves and the way they were able to respond to the questions I was asking.</p>

APPENDIX T

**Interim Case Study of Intern Teachers' Responses to a Likert Rating Scale  
of Supervision Experiences**

**Intern Teachers' Responses to Likert Rating Scale:  
Prioritizing Supervision Experiences**

3 = very helpful      2 = helpful      1 = less helpful      0 = not helpful

Intern Teachers:	3 = Very Helpful	2 = Helpful	1 = Less Helpful	0 = Not Helpful
Journaling	W	E C H	H L	
Mentor Debriefing	H C H L	W	E	
Supervisor Debriefing	H C H L	W	E	
3-Page Observation Format	H H	C W	E	L
Self-Videotaping	E	H C W	H	L
Supervisor's Self-Videotaping		H	E H W	L
Dialogue and Community Seminar and Handouts	H C W L	E H		
Levels of Reflection Seminar and Handouts	H W	C	E H	L
Equity Scenario Seminar Activity		H H W L	E	
General Seminar Format	H	W	E C H L	
General Seminar Content	H W	E	C H	L

**APPENDIX U****Interim Case Study of Student Teachers' Responses to a Likert Rating Scale:****Prioritizing Supervision Experiences**

**Student Teachers' Responses to Likert Rating Scale: Prioritizing Supervision Experiences**

3 = very helpful      2 = helpful      1 = less helpful      0 = not helpful

Student Teachers	3 = Very Helpful	2 = Helpful	1 = Less Helpful	0 = Not Helpful
Journaling	S P	T	A B	
Mentor Debriefing	T A P	S B		
Supervisor Debriefing	T S A P	B		
3-Page Observation Format	S P	T B	A	
Self-Videotaping		T S A		B
Supervisor's Self-Videotaping		T S A	B	
Dialogue and Community Seminar and Handouts	S A P	T B		
Levels of Reflection Seminar and Handouts	P	T	S A B	
Equity Scenario Seminar Activity	P	S	T A B	
General Seminar Format		T S A P B		
General Seminar Content	P	S B	T(1.5) A	