

**SCRIPTED AND STRATEGIC POWER RELATIONS
WITHIN STUDENT TEACHING TRIADS:**

**Experience, Understandings, Accommodation/Resistance and Transformative Possibilities
in Curriculum, Classroom Management and Evaluation Decisions**

by

Janet Helen Rodgers

BS, Art Education, Edinboro State College, 1973

M.Ed, Art Education, University of Pittsburgh, 1979

BS, Computer Science, Point Park College, 1986

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
School of Education in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

University of Pittsburgh

2004

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

**School of Education
Administrative and Policy Studies**

This dissertation was presented

by

Janet Helen Rodgers

It was defended on

April 7, 2004

and approved by

Noreen Garman

School of Education – Administrative and Policy Studies

Cynthia Coburn

School of Education – Administrative and Policy Studies

Janet Schofield

Psychology Department

Mark Ginsburg

Dissertation Director

School of Education – Administrative and Policy Studies

**Copyright © by Janet Helen Rodgers
2004**

SCRIPTED AND STRATEGIC POWER RELATIONS
WITHIN STUDENT TEACHING TRIADS:
Experience, Understandings, Accommodation/Resistance
and Transformative Possibilities in Curriculum,
Classroom Management and Evaluation Decisions

Janet Helen Rodgers, Ph.D.
University of Pittsburgh, 2004

Research Advisor: Dr. Mark Ginsburg

This qualitative descriptive study uses an intersubjective approach to examine relational aspects of the student teaching triad. Triad members include the student teacher, the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor. Beginning with a close reading of teaching socialization literature that focuses on the student teaching experience, various roles or scripted power relations, are carefully laid out. Working from the premise that conceptions of power may determine the quality of relationships, this interpretive study examines the power dynamics of eight specific student teaching triads from all three perspectives. The primary researcher was also the university supervisor in each of the triads studied. As an adjunct faculty member and former public school teacher, the researcher as supervisor brought a non-traditional ‘eye’ to the role of supervisor. Student teaching triad members were encouraged to consider and articulate the influence and control each triad member had in relation to decision-making concerning curriculum, classroom management and evaluation in an elementary classroom. Results reinforced much conventional wisdom about the student teaching experience and attempted to

establish that in the institutional context studied an ideology of reputation and dependability held sway. Strong personal connections were found to be paramount for optimal functioning of the triads studied. Power struggles were noted as triad members strategically maneuvered in efforts to hide various aspects of their scripted roles. Conclusions from this study included the difficulty of moving the student teaching experience beyond ritual, how a cooperating teacher's own student teaching experience may strongly influence their supervisory styles and the difficulty of establishing spaces for critical dialogue within the student teaching triad as constituted. Suggestions include the establishment and maintenance of sustained robust communication between triad members. Critical dialogue that includes the articulation and consideration of various scripted power relations or roles in relation to potential strategic power relations would be encouraged. This recognition and 'naming' of power in language more in line with the elementary public school context, as perceived by the elementary teacher, could perhaps precipitate modifications to the traditional student teaching triad that would benefit all triad members.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	viii
1. CHAPTER 1: BEGINNING THOUGHTS AND CONSIDERATIONS	1
1.1 Genesis of Research Initiative	1
1.2. Stories That Speak of Power.....	1
2. CHAPTER 2: CONCEPTUALIZING POWER AND THE SOCIALIZATION OF TEACHERS.....	13
2.1 My Voice and Others	13
2.2 Considering Power.....	14
2.3. Social Roles as Scripted Power Relations in General Social and Educational Contexts..	21
2.4 Scripted Power Relations of Student Teaching Triad Members in Teacher Socialization Literature.....	26
2.5. Moving from Scripted to Strategic Power Relations and Transformative Possibilities ...	36
2.6 A Summary of the Main Theoretical Points of this Study.....	40
3. CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH PARTICULARS	41
3.1 Epistemological Orientation and Stance.....	41
3.2. Participants, Procedures and Places to Look	44
4. CHAPTER 4: CONTEXTUALIZING A STUDY OF POWER IN/THROUGH STUDENT TEACHING TRIADS.....	50
4.1. Overview of the Student Teaching Experience	50
4.2. Institutional Contexts	53
4.2.1. The University	53
4.2.2. The Public Schools	62
4.2.3. Scripted Roles of Cumberland University Student Teaching Triad Members	63
5. CHAPTER 5: THE LIVED EXPERIENCE OF POWER IN STUDENT TEACHING TRIADS	73
5.1. ‘and Me’	73
5.2. Molly and Beth and Me	77
5.3. Molly and Ruth and Me	97
5.4. Heidi and Linda/Mary and Me.....	110
5.5. Heidi and Susan and Me	127
5.6. Troy and Tammy and Me	138
5.7. Troy and Penny and Me.....	151
5.8. Natalie and Betsy and Me	161
5.9. Natalie and Sarah and Me	169
6. CHAPTER 6: FINAL THOUGHTS AND CONSIDERATIONS.....	193
6.1. Addressing the Research Questions.....	193
6.2. Picking Up the Theoretical Threads	213
6.3. Implications for Policy and Practice	220
Appendix A.....	228
Student Teacher Weekly Reporting Packet	228

Weekly Schedule Form.....	228
Appendix A.....	229
Student Teacher Weekly Reporting Packet	229
Reflection Prompt Form	229
Student Teacher Weekly Reporting Packet	230
Conference Narrative Form	230
Appendix B	231
Interview Questions	231
First Cycle.....	231
Appendix B	235
Interview Questions	235
Second Cycle	235
Appendix C	237
INTASC Observation Form.....	237
Appendix C	239
INTASC Evaluation Form	239
Appendix D.....	243
Table of Research Results.....	243
Appendix E	244
Conceptualizations of ‘Role’ and ‘Power’	244
from Student Teaching Triad Members.....	244
BIBLIOGRAPHY	251

PREFACE

This Doctoral Dissertation is dedicated to my parents. “Now what is this word? Epis... Epistemology? Um, okay. You know when you give me this stuff to read and I can’t understand *any* of it, I will know you have made it!” (Helen) “Just get the damn thing done.” (Ray) Both passed on during this process. Helen Jeannette Rodgers (1929 – 1996). Raymond Charles Rodgers (1927 – 2002). My mother completed one year of college. My father finished the eighth grade. Both believed strongly in the value of an education. My heartfelt thanks to those who have so graciously supported me through this experience. Mark, it was a privilege and a pleasure to work with you. Linda, you are my sister in every way. Sarah, you have never underestimated my abilities. Cindy, my steady Eddie. My spiritual guides from The University of Pittsburgh; for Noreen, an attempt at “aesthetic coherence and verbal brilliance.” Maria, I hope this was “generative” enough. Roland, “tasty mouse tidbits” for you. Jean, you are missed. My special thanks to all of the research participants who shared so much with me, then and now. And finally, Eugenie. Your wise counsel has soothed and guided me more than once.

1. CHAPTER 1: BEGINNING THOUGHTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

1.1 Genesis of Research Initiative

“Does value inhere within the individual or the institution?”

Eugenie Potter

The journey began over thirteen years ago with my serious consideration of this question. Sage words placed before me by a consummate philosopher. This question forever altered my perception of reality and presented a boundless horizon of intellectual as well as spiritual possibilities. An awareness of and more importantly an appreciation of the ethical dimension of this distinction between the necessary social and the stubborn self set me on a course that brings me to this station. I believe there will be many stops as I pursue this intriguing line of inquiry.

1.2. Stories That Speak of Power

I will begin by portraying four vignettes that represent the manner in which I became socialized in terms of power and control within my role as student teacher and eventually teacher. These experiences brought into focus for me the parameters of my influence and control as an embodied educational actor, enacting my scripted role. These experiences also securely located me within a power context or grid that I was mightily attempting to navigate. They also brought to light for me important ethical considerations, especially in relation to those social actors who were somehow beneath me in terms of influence and control in my social contexts.

My own indoctrination into teaching, my student teaching experience, had indeed been dramatic with two diametrically opposed contexts and personalities. In my first placement my cooperating teacher was an itinerant elementary art teacher. She was full of spirit and energy. She had been teaching for only four years. I was her first student teacher and we both tentatively approached our new roles. She carefully shared with me the almost incomprehensible amount and nature of skills and savvy necessary to survive in a too many, too much environment. She had a wonderful down to earth attitude and caring quality. I bore witness to her gentle ways of guiding and molding all the young souls in her realm, including me. We laughed a lot and became quite close. Years later we remain friends.

My second placement was quite different. The high school environment demanded a total shift in my approach to survival/success as a student teacher. I found myself in a very political place. My cooperating teacher was obviously at odds with the other members of the art department. He was constantly criticized, sometimes overtly, for his laid back, basically hands off approach to teaching. Our first days together were spent perched atop high stools discussing various philosophical nuggets that he shared with me. Fostering independence in students was something he really believed in as well as the value of what he termed the “guiltless wrong.” He believed that true growth could occur only when mistakes were made in non-judgmental environments.

At his insistence on the importance of keeping a record I began a journal during my time with him. The entries indicate that much of my way of seeing the world *now* can be traced back to those interactions. His initial approach with me as my cooperating teacher, however, proved unsatisfactory as I struggled to teach and manage the classroom. He provided little or no suggestions and strategies and I was soon sinking fast as a student teacher. At this point he was

forced to jump in and I recorded many a prickly interchange. I resented his apparent dissatisfaction with his role as cooperating teacher and I am sure he did not appreciate my neediness. I recorded in my journal that he had forcefully told me, “Everyone will not love you. You are there to teach. If you have to be disliked to get across, then so be it!” Fortunately, the semester ended well and I received a final letter grade of A. As I recall, the university supervisor, a retired school principal, had little or no influence over my student teaching experience. I was not compelled to ask for his help in any way to see me through. He was a mysterious, distant figure.

The next year my high school cooperating teacher moved on to an administrative position at a local private school. I apparently harbored no hard feelings as I recorded in my journal over thirty years ago. “I saw him [my high school cooperating teacher] as a giant... so unique and lofty...yet so utterly touchable and huggable. So much a part of the everyday world... so simple, so easy to understand, so understanding.”

After my student teaching, I began my career as a teacher and my socialization continued. It was late afternoon and the school day was winding down for me. As an itinerant art teacher, my schedule required extensive planning and preparation done in the morning. This day, as I walked down the long hallway, I observed my principal approaching. He supervised three different schools and since we both were constantly on the move, our paths seldom crossed. I had been teaching art for about three years. I found this work draining as I visited four schools with a total of thirty-two classrooms. With the mainstreaming of various special needs students my art teaching touched nearly a thousand students a week. Never accorded a permanent location, my resources were contained on a large rolling cart that I moved between and within schools. I had the stamina and enthusiasm of the novice and was actively engaged in developing art lessons that

were generally acceptable. I was constantly mindful of my oft-perceived role as classroom decorator. Teachers were anxious for students to return to their classrooms with products that could be displayed. Sometimes this ran counter to my fondly held notion that I was a representative of all the wonderful possibilities inherent within the arts. Idealistic and sincere, I worked very hard, with much heart, at what I did.

My principal was an older man of Italian descent. I mention the latter only because he made his ethnicity an integral part of his worldview. We usually engaged each other on two occasions: approval of my anticipated yearly budget requirements and the review of a formal observation made once a year. The end of the school year was fast approaching and I had not yet been observed. I was in the midst of a curricular unit that the students were very excited about and I was anxious for him to see these lessons. After appropriately greeting him I made casual mention of the fact that the school year was winding down and I had not yet been observed. I invited him to come and see the current set of lessons I was teaching. Expecting perhaps acknowledgement of the situation, I was totally unprepared for his response. To say he overreacted was an understatement. I had clearly stepped over a line. He obviously perceived me as being impetuous and insolent since I had questioned his actions or his non-observation. His public tirade left me totally humiliated. His response clearly had demonstrated no regard for me as a person, let alone a presumed colleague. His reprimand stung deeply, and to make matters worse he never re-visited the incident let alone made any attempt to repair this now damaged relationship. To be fair I do accept some responsibility for the incident. He was as overworked as I was and providing him with a reminder of something he had to do was perhaps not the most wise decision, but I had attempted to present the issue in a non-threatening, respectful way. Everyone has a bad day, but the level of his anger and the fact that he could so freely vent it

indicated to me that I was clearly at the lowest level in his pecking order. I spent the rest of my time under his supervision in avoidance mode, timidly avoiding any contact with him. Thankfully, he retired soon afterward.

The story haunts me to this day. As I assumed the duties of a university supervisor of student teachers years later and began to assemble previous notions of what rational yet humane supervision might look like, my previous humiliation figured prominently in what I considered to be doing a good job as a supervisor. This story also marks the point when I began to seriously engage with this notion of power.

I was then limited to a hierarchal conception of power and I was at or very near the bottom. Only later as my experiences deepened as student/teacher/life participant did my notion expand and I began to sense a power grid with its dynamic potential for movement. I also began to sense the ethical import of how I related to the/my superiors as well as the/my subordinates.

During my time as an itinerant elementary art teacher, I was also supervised by another principal, Mr. Green. His outward style was very brusque and no-nonsense. Motivated by higher angels, this man shared with me many an insight that shaped my conception of power. I vividly remember his admonition one day after I had greeted him with a litany of requests. “Can’t you even tell me ‘Good Morning’ before you start in?” he said. I apologized and appreciated his gentle reminder to recognize and appreciate the humanity embodied in his role enactment. This theme was again played out when he taught me the most ethically profound lesson of my teaching career.

Billy, a student in one of my art classes, was an absolute dynamo. ‘Hyperactive’ was an underestimation of his potential to totally disarm and disrupt with his relentless energy. Week after week, I dreaded his class, during which inevitably, there was some confrontation. One day I

looked in the direction of the paper scrap box and saw a whirl of arms and head as Billy was gleefully emptying the contents of the box into the air. That was it. I ran to get the principal to paddle Billy. Mr. Green arrived with paddle in hand and, to my surprise and dismay, he announced that I was to punish the culprit. The three of us stood in the hall. Billy was face-to-the-wall. I was armed with a 6 x18 inch piece of wood and as I swung back to administer justice I noticed that my target was a tad narrower than the paddle width. As Mr. Green said later, “Man, you looked like you were going to hit a home run!” Well, Billy received a minor wallop on his backside. My ego, however, took a major wounding as well it should have. The obvious power differentials between Billy and myself were finally made viscerally obvious to me. I began to understand from deep within what I was about as a professional educator. The awesome responsibilities and the sacred potentials of what I was about came into focus as I targeted a small bottom. I was forever changed. Billy hung his head and returned to the classroom. I gathered up my withered ego and proceeded from that day forth to seek out humane ways to handle the disruptive student. I had begun to understand how the power, inherent in the role of disciplinarian and scripted into my performance as teacher, was indeed complex and challenging and vulnerable to corruption and abuse.

The final story relates an incident that occurred nearly fifteen years after the last. By that time I had moved from an elementary teaching position to one at the high school level. I had spent considerable time and energy pondering power.

My formal engagement with power began as a graduate student in a doctoral program at the University of Pittsburgh. As my academic studies picked up speed I began to seriously listen to voices from the literature that represented the critical perspective. I was at first very taken with the work of Henry Giroux, especially his conception of the teacher as intellectual. I struggled to

internalize this in my worldview but became increasingly frustrated by what I ultimately perceived to be its incommensurability. It didn't quite fit into my experience. I was also growing weary of what I began to detect... a shrill, strident insistence located in strict interpretations of the critical worldview. I grew weary of this too. At that point I believe I had the impatience of the novice academic and I still stung from years of on the ground experience. I did appreciate his eventual move to the cultural, however, and I anticipated returning to his work as I continued my scholastic pursuits.

Paulo Freire then caught my attention and I devoured his two seminal works. 'Naming' power really appealed to me:

Freire is known primarily in educational circles as a Brazilian adult educator who pioneered a form of literacy training based on breaking down the hierarchical teacher-learner relationship, thus allowing adults to learn to 'name' the power relations that define their social world. (Morrow and Torres, 2002, p. ix.)

I believe I was also drawn to the practical element in his theorizing. I also admired his efforts to pay attention to the stylistic in his prose. He cared about the way he wrote things as well as what he said. Being mindful/heartful of the qualitative nature of representations had become a strong urge for me as well.

Many other voices spoke with wisdom and courage... I think of Maxine Greene, Seth Kriesberg, bell hooks, Deborah Britzman, Tom Popkewitz, Ira Shor, Nicholas Maxwell, Parker Palmer... so many... such fascinating discourses... I was often overwhelmed with the richness of the menu.

I now had begun to strategically position myself within my teaching context to maximize my influence and control. I made deliberate attempts to pay attention to social cues especially in relation to the myriad of relationships I sought and maintained among my adult peers and

students. To be honest, I was able to let myself relax a little in my social positioning, especially in my educational contexts. This ability had been a long time coming for me and I was just beginning to enjoy its pleasant returns when an event occurred that again brought me up short. I have attempted to capture this experience in the following story. What caught my attention about this incident however, was the apparent prescience of the young man who figured prominently in it.

His question cut across the relative silence of a Friday afternoon study hall. Adolescent energy hummed along with the late spring insects massing outside the slightly cracked window. A warm breeze insinuated itself.

“Why don’t they teach us what we really need to know, Ms. Rodgers?”
“And just what would that be?”
“Who’s butt to kiss.”

There it was. I bristled at the crudeness of the remark in the context of a formal classroom setting but I could not deny the brilliance of his perception. He sensed a dynamic functioning around him of which he perhaps wished to be part. To thrive, not merely survive... the kid was definitely on to something. My young charge had perhaps not so innocently stumbled upon a reality that for years had been darkly lurking in the recesses of my teaching practice.

I now believe I missed opportunities as a social actor, especially in educational contexts, to more effectively navigate my social terrain. I had done school for many years as a student and as a teacher, yet I had been perhaps inept in my ability to effectively position myself socially and politically. How many opportunities had I missed to maximize my influence and control in relation to myself and consequently for the benefit of others? There is a cruel irony here. School, the mighty socializer, where all the social scripts are very neatly written, distributed and enforced, should perhaps have been where all of this came sharply into focus for me. It did not,

and I had *always* been a serious player. School, the relentless crucible, the ‘apparatus’, doggedly determined to fold the stubborn self into the necessary social, had withheld this mystery from me.

My young student had articulated a posture that I was only just beginning to appreciate and perhaps incorporate into my very being within my teaching context. I had become aware of the mindful cultivation of trust and credibility with peers and especially superiors. Consequently, I had also begun to carefully select points of contestation and negotiation that I surmised I could push with peers and especially again with superiors.

How was my student able to sense and articulate this sentiment at such a young age and more importantly for me, why had I been relatively clueless for so long? I thought back to prime opportunities where I could have acquired the social desire to truly know the political of my educational context and consequently use power in productive ways that contributed to my own good and enable the good for others. How did I miss this? What had worked against my acquisition of this perspective? What exactly had I missed? How did this oversight happen? Caught up in the flawless performance of various aspects of my perceived teacher role, had I missed other visceral connections necessary for true understanding? How many instances, like my inaccurate reading of Billy, could have provided me with the knowledge and courage to move boldly forward? How had my power soaked, strictly defined social context constrained me? What *in me* and *out there* had contributed to my strategic social ineptitude? Why did I lack the language and understanding of how social power worked?

Perhaps more importantly, why was I so determined to investigate this? I had navigated a successful twenty-five year career as a public school teacher. This intellectual itch was killing me. I began to trace back to those watershed experiences that seemed ripe for what I was looking

for. One of the first and most significant possibilities appeared located in the socialization process, especially my student teaching experience.

Many years after my student teaching... many years after my innocence had been dissolved in the harsh words of a ranting principal, I was vividly reminded of these stories. I had accepted a position as a university supervisor of student teachers. I came to realize as I enacted the presumed script the job required, that I was experiencing yet again an asymmetrical power relationship within an educational context that forced me to re-conceptualize and affectively accommodate my notion of power. I was washed over with conflicting, yet familiar rationales and emotions as I navigated this terrain.

My supervisory duties included supervising student teachers at all grade levels. I found myself again in the context of the elementary public school. My experience as an educator of small children had included tenure as an itinerant art instructor. While working in elementary schools for over ten years, I had moved between multiple buildings and classes. I had a sense of what played out in the self-contained classroom, but I had never been responsible for the day-to-day herding of a single block of students over a school year. During the semester of student teaching supervision that this study encompasses, the majority of my supervision was done at the elementary level. Since I lacked concrete experience in the self-contained classroom, I found myself focusing on a more broad view of what was happening in the teaching process. This perspective forced me to look for common threads that linked *all* teaching efforts. Moving outside of a nuts and bolts view brought home to me the importance of the relational aspects of power dynamics and signaled that this perhaps was an area worthy of inquiry and critique.

Relational aspects between educational actors, especially those that signaled power dynamics at work, would require focus on an educational arena that perhaps lent itself more than

others to crisply marked areas of influence and control. My access to and recent engagement with the student teaching experience predisposed me to look there. I believed that the student teaching experience, particularly the interactions between members of the student teaching triad as they performed their designated roles, could lend itself to a closer look at the power dynamics located within the experience. The educational actors that make up the student teaching triad are the student teacher, the school-based supervisor or cooperating teacher and the university supervisor. With inter-subjective perspective and analysis, specifically in relation to decisions made concerning curriculum, classroom management and evaluation I hoped to isolate aspects of the power relations between this set of educational actors.

Triad members embodied specifically delineated power or official designations/roles as well as personal or arrived at influence and control. Through an analysis of actual events that included perceptions and interpretations from each triad member, I believed I could craft a descriptive qualitative study that presented a comprehensive and robust portrayal of the inter-subjective power dynamics found within student teaching triads.

A review of teacher socialization literature indicated that the student teaching experience, especially the roles expected of student teaching triad members, had indeed been considered and articulated. I hoped that a study of this kind would be of special interest to student teachers, cooperating teachers, university supervisors and teacher educators.

I planned to focus on the university that prepared the student teachers that I supervised. This contextualization would include creating a sense of what student teachers brought with them in terms of what they came to believe, expect and assume, as undergraduate students, about their student teaching experience. I also wanted to present a rich explication of various

dispositions and attitudes embedded in the scripted power relations or roles *all* student teaching triad members were expected to embody and enact.

I selected the following guiding questions for my research: (1) From an inter-subjective perspective, how do student teachers, cooperating teachers and university supervisors located within designated student teaching triads perceive and define their own and other triad member's influence and control concerning issues related to, curriculum (i.e. what to teach), classroom management and instructional strategies (i.e. how to teach), and the informal and formal evaluation of the student teacher (i.e. how successful the student teacher was seen to be with respect to what and how s/he taught), (2) How do extra-triad actors, policy, curriculum, standards, and ideology constrain and enable decisions or actions by student teachers or other members of the triad?, (3) How, if at all, do triad members conceptualize and articulate the need and possibility for the strategic redefinition and reenactment of their scripted roles?

And finally, this study enabled me to more deeply engage with my own sense of power in educational contexts. I was also anxious to explore how other educational actors perceived and articulated their own notions of power in their idiosyncratic educational contexts. With direction and purpose firmly in hand I set off to begin this research initiative.

2. CHAPTER 2: CONCEPTUALIZING POWER AND THE SOCIALIZATION OF TEACHERS

2.1 My Voice and Others

As Foucault continually reminds us, power is not a static phenomenon; it is a process that is always in play. Put another way, power must be viewed in part as a form of production inscribed in the discourse and capabilities that people use to make sense out of the world. Otherwise, the notion of power is subsumed under the category of domination, and the issue of human agency gets relegated to either a marginal or insignificant place in educational theorizing. (Giroux, 1983, p. 63)

Learn the rules so you know how to break them properly. (Dalai Lama, 2004, New Year's Address)

The theoretical framework for this study involves both power and social roles. In the context of public schools and the world of the classroom teacher, especially at the elementary level, the notion of *power* stands very much like a disfigured close relative whose presence is acknowledged but seldom embraced. When spoken of, power becomes object and descriptor but seldom verb. Power can definitely create a sense of discomfort among those whose working social context is inherently mute on the subject. Power differentials are starkly played out in enactments of carefully scripted roles such as superintendent, school board member, principal, teacher, student and parent. (We could also include textbook authors, test developers, state legislators, National Department of Education Secretary, etc.) With the student teaching experience we include cooperating teacher, student teacher and university supervisor.

In the following sections I will gather together a set of voices that have informed my conceptions of power. I will present social roles as scripted power relations and locate various roles/scripted power relations as they are found in teacher socialization literature that discusses expectations and assumptions surrounding student teaching triad members (the student teacher,

the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor). I will then present strategic power relations as transformative possibilities located within reenactments of scripted power relations.

2.2 Considering Power

The voice of Michel Foucault, the French philosopher and intellectual, often sets the tone in discussions of social power. Like his contemporaries, Derrida and Lucan, Foucault was concerned with the role of language and textuality in social contexts. His unique contribution to this discourse, however, was his deliberate move to the “explicit consideration of the nature and role of power.” (Usher and Edwards, 1994, p. 83) Foucault (1972) maintained a dynamic versus static conceptual framework in his insistence that “power must be analysed as something which circulates... [I]t is never localized here or there, never in anybody’s hands, never appropriated as a commodity or a piece of wealth.” Power is not linear or causal, but is “employed and exercised through a net-like organization” of individuals who don’t just “circulate between its threads or stand as targets.” Individuals are “always also the elements of the articulation of power” and are the “vehicles of power, not its points of application.” (p. 98)

Individuals may be emancipated or oppressed, and “hide” power within modern discourses. Foucault claims that power is never removed, only “reinscribed”. Foucault’s definitions of power also expand conceptions of ideology as he claims that although major “mechanisms of power” have been accompanied by ideological productions, which include ideologies within education, power is located within the “production of effective instruments for the formation and accumulation of knowledge – methods of observation, techniques of registration, procedures for investigation and research, apparatuses of control.” (Foucault, 1972, p. 102) Power infused knowledge is constructed within discourses that “author-ise certain people to speak and correspondingly silence others.” According to Foucault, “everything is political and

there is no power-less discourse.” While various discourses attempt to “fix” or place individuals, the very fact that there can be “multiple determinations” opens up strategic possibilities. (Usher and Edwards, 1994, pp. 90-97) Consequently, power infused knowledge flows not *only* from the powerful to the powerless, but from and between all social actors.

Traditional social theory represented in the social theorizing of Durkheim and Merton, posited and reinforced the traditional conceptualization of power dynamics as a passive one-way dynamic from society to subject, especially when framed as socialization. Emulating scientific understandings and averse to subjective impulses, this way of viewing social interactions has been critiqued by many contemporary thinkers, including those who examine educational contexts. Their critiques argue that the flow of influence and control in the social/self nexus is never one-way. The whole process is dynamic and contingent.

Anthony Giddens (1977) offers a balanced critique that does not totally abandon social structures. He posits a duality or contradiction of subject/structure. He embraces transformative possibilities in his argument that “all actors have some degree of discursive penetration of the social systems to whose constitution they contribute” and states that “social systems have no purposes, reasons or needs whatsoever; only human individuals do.” (pp. 5-7)

Giddens formulated a theory of structuration that runs counter to the teleology of “cybernetic control through the feed back of information” and overtly recognizes “reflexive self-regulation” as possible for social actors. (pp. 115-116) This move enables transformative ways of viewing the formation of a social actor’s identity. Giddens theory looks to generative rules and resources that are produced and reproduced in social interactions.

Let us at this juncture reconceptualize 'structure' as referring to *generative rules and resources* that are both applied in and constituted out of action. Under the heading of 'generative rules' I group two analytically separate types of rules: semantic and moral. Semantic rules include those of syntax and grammar but also, equally important, the

totality of largely implicit, taken-for-granted rules that structure everyday discourse and mutual understandings of action as 'meaningful'. Moral rules include any sort of rule (or formalized legal statute) generating evaluation of acts as 'right' or 'wrong'. By 'resources' I mean whatever possessions (material or otherwise) actors are able to bring to bear to facilitate the achievement of their purposes in the course of social interaction: that therefore serve as a medium for the use of *power*. Rules and resources must be regarded as both the media whereby social life is produced and reproduced as on-going activity, yet at the same as produced and reproduced by such activity: this is the crucial sense of the 'duality of structure'. (pp. 117-118)

Giddens (1979) also expands the notion of roles in his assertion that “social systems are not constituted of roles but of (reproduced) practices; and it is practices, not roles, which (via the duality of structure) have to be regarded as ‘the points of articulation’ between actors and structures.” (p. 117)

Initial articulations and subsequent/consequent definitions/redefinitions of social situations among social actors are directly related to the climate and quality of communication. Writing from a critical perspective, Siebren Miedema and Willem Wardekker (1999) point out that Jurgen Habermas in his theory of communicative action “makes a move from a subject philosophical paradigm to an intersubjective position. No longer is the relation of the subject to itself central, but the relation of one subject to another is the issue at stake... all communication presupposes mutual understandings and consensus as its aim.” Habermas envisions “ideal” communication as “experiences of undisturbed intersubjectivity” and sees a tension between “freedom and dependency” as the communicative act embodies “ideas of felicitous interaction, of reciprocity and distance, of separation and of successful, unspoiled nearness, of vulnerability and complementary caution.” (Miedema and Wardekker, 1999, p. 70)

Social actors wade into this dynamic flux of communication, creating power-infused knowledge as they articulate and define/redefine their social surroundings. In the enactment of roles, social actors must perform within certain parameters, but it is in the necessary re-

enactments of roles over time that social actors may exploit the vulnerability Judith Butler (1997) claims is inherent in subject positioning.

A critical evaluation of subject formation may well offer a better comprehension of the double binds to which our emancipatory efforts occasionally lead without, in consequence, evacuating the political. Is there a way to affirm complicity as the basis of political agency, yet insist that political agency may do more than reiterate the conditions of subordination?... The temporal paradox of the subject is such that, of necessity, we must lose the perspective of a subject already formed in order to account for our own becoming. That ‘becoming’ is no simple or continuous affair, but an uneasy practice of repetition and its risks, compelled yet incomplete, wavering on the horizon of social being. (p. 30)

Colin Lacey (1977) looks to the possibility of strategic redefinition as an integral part of adult socialization as individuals transform themselves into “the kind of person the situation demands.” He locates this transformation in two “varieties of situational adjustments” or social strategies. “[S]trategic compliance and internalized adjustment. 1. Strategic compliance, in which the individual complies with the authority figure’s definition of the situation and the constraints of the situation but retains private reservations about them. He [she] is merely *seen* to be good. 2. Internalized adjustment, in which the individual complies with the constraints and believes that the constraints of the situation are for the best. He [she] really *is* good.” (p. 72)

Lacey (1977) questions the assumption that those with the most formal authority are the only ones to exercise power over others. Lacey claims that while social situations are usually defined by the “organizationally most powerful”, change can be brought about by those with less formal power as they may be able to cause or enable a different interpretation of the situation by

the more powerful. (p. 73) This suggests that interpersonal relationships have a direct bearing on how power is expressed in the social context examined.

Lacey's theory acknowledges the value of a *singular* well-performed social enactment by educational actors in relation to subsequent redefinitions of social situations. Less fully developed in Lacey's theorizing is contingency over time. Temporality provides an advantage for social actors who over time, with *multiple* reenactments of their social roles, establish trust and credibility with other social actors. This process creates opportunities for individual actors to mindfully/purposefully position themselves in myriad power relations. More productive uses of social power may also then be possible for them.

The work of Seth Kreisberg (1992) brings together power-infused knowledge construction with robust communicative contexts in his bifurcation of *power over* and *power with* as he addresses temporality in relation to social theorizing. Kreisberg "finds theories of power whose assumptions of what is natural are shaped by systems of domination... [He] clearly describes the way philosophical definitions of power as *power over* reinforce privilege, justifying the control of others (women, children, men of color) as part of the inexorable logic of power." (p. xiii-xiv) Kreisberg argues that power should not be viewed in limited quantities. He insists that theorizing should not be shy about addressing the positive and productive nature of power. Kreisberg puts forth the notion of *power with*: "[A]s we act for ourselves and with others, our need to control others diminishes. This suggests that the more one is capable of *power with*, the less one will seek *power over*...Power, then, is not by definition a win-lose situation. Power can be an expanding, renewable resource available through shared endeavor, dialogue, and cooperation." (pp. 63-64)

Kreisberg's conceptualization of *power over* and *power with* embraces communicative dialogue as the vehicle for the production of useful knowledge and notes how traditional power relations fall short: "In many groups 'consensus' is reached because people submit to the will of a leader. They avoid asking the hard questions and bury their own strong beliefs. The problem with this approach is that it inevitably leads to alienation, resentment, and domination. It is based on *power over* rather than *power with*." (p. 129) Power relations between social actors that embody *power with* become something quite different: "The goal was not to have one's own idea adopted, but for the organization to reach the best and most effective decisions possible... The synergistic dynamics of listening and being heard; of cultivating one's own and others' voices simultaneously; of developing new insights, new solutions; this is the process of dialogue, and it is characterized by *power with*." (pp. 130-131)

Kreisberg maintains that personal interactions strongly inform the construction of knowledge in definite ways or patterns and sees social reproduction firmly embedded within the nature of personal relationships.

I want to argue, though, that the process by which social practices become sedimented and reproduce themselves, while connected to ideological processes of reproduction, are also distinct from these processes. People tend to relate to others in the same ways others have related to them. We tend to act in ways we see and experience others' actions. Patterns of relationship reinforce and replicate themselves. Experience solidifies into habit. (p. 16)

Kreisberg acknowledges that although "relationships of domination saturate" administrative and student thinking and reside "deep within teachers" it is possible to move beyond. Kreisberg recognizes that in social contexts "disparities of power" may be necessary. His inquiry found that sometimes there is a "need to use *power over* [by the powerful] to create

and maintain empowering dynamics within organizations.” In this reconfigured social context, “[p]ower is being able to participate in dialogue and decision making... Within an empowering setting, power means being heard, having your ideas taken seriously and ‘folded into’ decisions. Power is conceived as participation rather than imposition, as collaboration rather than control.” (p. 134)

Traditional conceptions of power and who may wield it are thus redefined: “Although more powerful people generally speak more often, amount of participation is not directly proportional to degree of power. Rather, people listen because of the integrity of an individual’s words... Power here is the ability to make connections and to express not only one’s voice but a collective voice as well.” (p. 135)

Disparities of power also move away from traditional conceptions.

[I]n experiences of power with, not every member of the group participates equally. It appears that some people are better able to balance openness and conviction, to express their ideas, and to synthesize the group’s thinking. Others are more committed to the organization, more willing to act on their own words. Even others are better able to help others understand and act. The crucial distinction is that in this context, differentials in abilities and attitudes do not mean that people control others. Rather, the differentials can enhance the capacities of all individuals and the group as a whole. (p. 139)

Kreisberg also locates power in an *authority of expertise* that contingently recognizes the social actor’s power but does not give license to dominate: “The authority of expertise within the *power with* paradigm does not lead to domination, but rather to the fact that people listen carefully and take wisdom and experience into consideration as they make decisions. The authority of expertise enhances the capabilities of everyone.” (p. 183)

Kreisberg’s voice in conjunction with the other voices presented here, have informed my theoretical framework in relation to power. I maintain that power is located in the ability of social actors to construct knowledge and ways of acting within discourses as they

perceive/interpret and subsequently/consequently initially define and redefine social realities. This power-infused knowledge influences and controls actions taken by social actors. All social actors have the ability to generate or withhold information germane to a particular social event or situation. The quantity and quality of this information has direct bearing on communicative action and the subsequent interpersonal relations between social actors. Social actors articulate and define/redefine their social realities relative to their *scripted* power relations or roles/practices. Social actors may also attempt to redefine their social realities with strategic power moves relative to the people and events in play. They may strategically comply with the expectations of those in positions of authority, or they may internalize/adjust to the demands or recommendations of others; both those with whom they interact and those who define the rules and resources, the social structures, of the settings in which they work and live.

2.3. Social Roles as Scripted Power Relations in General Social and Educational Contexts

Working from my theoretical framework it becomes necessary to delineate the “points of articulation” that social actors use to initially perceive and define their social reality. These points are located within relevant discourses that “determine the underlying rules for both what and how things can be said as well as ‘who speaks with authority and who must listen.’” (Kreisberg, 1992, p. 34) These rules are explicitly and implicitly found within the articulation of social roles. Social actors are encouraged to conform to specific expectations and assumptions from a variety of scripts. During socialization, social scripts are presented to social actors in a variety of ways and in many forms. The ability to perceive/interpret/define/redefine one’s social position or exercise one’s social power is thus firmly located within the articulation, perception, initial enactments and iterative re-enactments of social roles. I wish to re-conceptualize and expand the notion of role as a *scripted* power relation that contains the possibility of a turn

towards *strategic* power relations resulting in re-enactments of the original scripted role in a manner that may be more in line with individual desire and realistic social necessity.

Oppressive uses of power that maintain systems of domination may be located within social roles and individual socialization into them. Social actors are expected to perform in specifically assigned and tightly scripted roles. Anthony Giddens (1977) highlights the crucial role of 'role'.

Two functions, logically implied in the conception of 'human society'... 'shared cognitive orientations' and 'role differentiation and role assignment'. In every society, 'members must share a body of cognitive orientations' which, among other things, 'make stable, *meaningful*, and predictable the social situations in which they are engaged'; and in every society, there must be different roles that are regularly performed, otherwise everyone would be doing everything or nothing - a state of indeterminacy which is the antithesis of a society. (p. 111)

The establishment and maintenance of compulsory public education satisfies the basic functional desire to maintain social equilibrium and also provides a rich stage for the maintenance of crucial social roles. As Feinberg and Soltis (1992) explain:

For the functionalists, *role differentiation* and *social solidarity* are the two primary requirements of social life. .. In highly complex, modern societies, however, where roles change from one generation to the next, a more formal structure is required to assure that the education of the young takes place and that role differentiation and group solidarity are achieved. A system of universal, compulsory, public education is established to accomplish this. (p. 17)

Schools are thus very specifically charged with the maintenance of sanctioned societal roles. Meyer and Rowan (1983) explain: "Education rests on and obtains enormous resources from central institutional rules about what valid education is. These rules define the ritual categories of teacher, student, curricular topic, and type of school. When these categories are properly assembled, education is understood to occur." (quoted in Baldrige, Deal et al. 1983, p. 63)

Emphasis on societal roles may imply little wiggle room for the individual teacher or student as far as the enactment of the role assigned. Baldrige and Deal (1983) point out that from a functionalist perspective, “there are elaborate rules for classifying teachers... educational organizations, then, have detailed, definitive specifications delineating which individuals may teach in which types of classes and schools. Schools are very tightly coupled organizations in defining who their teachers are and what properties these teachers have.” (pp. 65-66)

There exists a myriad of defined roles for the teacher; encompassing both in loco parentis and knowledge expert. Playing out these various roles are not simple enactments, however, as much power is derived from the *how* as well as the *what*. The legitimacy of the whole educational enterprise rests on the successful performance of roles carried out by various educational actors. Individual teachers stick to their scripts and may become institutionalized as they acquiesce to the educational system in which they find themselves. “Hoy and Rees's (1977) study on the bureaucratic socialization of student teachers drew on Merton's notion that bureaucratic structures might have the capacity to modify personality types... [S]chools are seen as determining the orientations of student teachers, who are viewed as passive or plastic.” (Zeichner and Gore 1990, p. 330)

With strong conservative moral shadings, there is often a disconnect between ‘What a teacher *should* do.’, as set forth by strict role definitions, and ‘What a teacher *can* do and *actually* does.’ The latter deals with messy social realities and clouds clear role boundaries. The whole notion of a role implies a thin representation, a contour, a harsh unyielding boundary, a simplistic one-way approach. Critically discussing the functionalist paradigm, Mark Ginsburg (1988) observes: “There is... a view of people's involvement in the process, but usually it is a role that is 'given' and thus they do what needs to be done. It is as if there is only one need or problem to

address and there is only one mutually agreed upon course to follow, and someone merely has to volunteer to lead in that direction.” (p. 28)

Others, too, are willing to problematize the nature of roles. Deborah Britzman (1991) views the strict binary construct of objectivity versus subjectivity as a serious impediment.

Views of objectivity and subjectivity also position how one thinks of the teacher’s identity. The repressive model of teacher identity expects teachers to shed their subjectivity to assume an objective persona. Here the teacher’s identity and the teacher’s role are synonymous. The lived tension, however, is that they are not. Role concerns functions, whereas identity presupposes investments. While functions can be bestowed, identity cannot... Identity is constantly affected by the relations between objective and subjective conditions and in dialogue with others. However, attention to these dialogic qualities are suppressed when objectivity and subjectivity are presented as dualistic. (p. 25)

Many critical thinkers are dissatisfied with dependence on traditional social roles and maintain that this tendency reinforces the status quo and reproduces oppressive social conditions. Even when social roles are intentionally articulated to be more inclusive and empowering, many social actors are still denied full participation in social contexts.

A host of deeply committed and passionate people signal and strongly object to this injustice in educational contexts. bell hooks (1994) is one of the most articulate and compelling voices to assert that indeed, schools and schooling have fallen victim to domination.

[S]ystems of domination – racism, sexism, class exploitation, and imperialism. They promote a perverse vision of freedom that makes it synonymous with materialism. They teach us to believe that domination is ‘natural,’ that it is right for the strong to rule over the weak, the powerful over the powerless. What amazes me is that so many people claim to not embrace these values and yet our collective rejection of them cannot be complete since they prevail in our daily lives. (pp. 27-28)

I was surprised and delighted to find that bell hooks had traveled down a path with which I was familiar.

Yet it was only when I began to interrogate my fear of ‘power’ – the way that fear was related to my own class background where I had so often seen those with class power coerce, abuse, and dominate those without – that I began to understand that power was

not itself negative. It depended what one did with it. It was up to me to create ways within my professional power constructively, precisely because I was teaching in institutional structures that affirm it is fine to use power to reinforce and maintain coercive hierarchies [of power and material privileges]. (pp. 187-188)

We also shared a common vision.

[T]here was the possibility of a learning community, a place where difference could be acknowledged, where we would finally all understand, accept, and affirm that our ways of knowing are forged in history and relations of power.
(p. 30)

Hooks is not alone in this observation as many educators, especially those whose loyalties are aligned with the critical camp, affirm her assertions (Giroux, 1981, 1983, 1988, McLaren, 1994, Shor, 1992). Writers who contribute to the feminist conversation (Belenky, 1986; 1991, Noddings, 1992) also reinforce the oppressive nature of power arrangements found in educational and other contexts. At times, these feminists hold those with critical and functionalist orientations accountable when noting heavy-handed or arrogantly assumed positions in relation to the equitable distribution of power in schools. Patti Lather singles out critical theorists, Stanley Aronowitz and Henry Giroux, and their strong advocacy for teachers assuming the role of transformative intellectuals. Lather insists that, unless problematized, such concepts produce a “hegemony over what theory is and themselves as the locus of what can be known and done.” (Lather, 1991, xviii)

The re-conceptualization of a social role as a scripted power relation thus involves the problematization of unquestioned enactments of traditional expectations and assumptions found in the definitions of various social roles. Deeper understandings point to the relational nature of social performances and the subsequent/consequent influence and control that may over time flow in reconfigured power relations between social actors engaged in meaningful, purposeful dialogue as they perform within their social context.

2.4 Scripted Power Relations of Student Teaching Triad Members in Teacher Socialization Literature

During the socialization process, through the articulation of various roles, social actors are made aware of what a “good” social performance should look like. At this point the actor comes to sense and accept what is encouraged and/or permissible in the enactment of each role. *Initial* social role enactments are sometimes attended to with much ritual. The student teaching experience can perhaps be viewed as just such a ritual, one that Zeichner (1983) suggests is part of a process of socialization, a term “that readily communicates an interest in understanding the continual interplay between individual choice and situational constraint.” (p.2) (Kuzmic, 1994, p. 15)

Teacher socialization literature that focuses on the student teaching experience provides a sense of what is expected and assumed about student teachers, cooperating teachers and university supervisors as they perform their roles. Teacher socialization literature usually portrays stereotypical renderings of the classic student teaching triad member roles. These include the basically powerless teacher candidate, the powerful mentorial cooperating teacher and the omnipotent yet incidental university supervisor. These stereotypes are perhaps in line with the realities of some cases, but such stereotypes ignore the issue of whether such role enactments represent internalized adjustment or strategic compliance.

Student teachers are called upon to embody a wide variety of attitudes and dispositions. A basic tension/contradiction concerning the appropriate role of the student teacher is captured in the following:

The student teacher is to be thought of as a distinct personality, capable of growth, sensitive to success and failure, and deserving of help and consideration. (Del Popolo, 1960, p.75)

The prospective teacher is viewed primarily as a passive recipient of this professional knowledge and plays little part in determining the substance and direction of his or her preparation program. (Zeichner, 1983, p. 3)

The position of the student teacher is usually represented as exercising the least influence and control in the student teaching triad as compared to that of the cooperating teacher and university supervisor. “While the literature on student teaching has addressed the relationships between student teachers, cooperating teachers, and supervisors, few definite statements can be made. The only statement on which all parties seem to agree is that the student teacher has little influence.” (Barrows, 1979, p. 10)

Student teachers, as novices, are forced to negotiate rough terrain: “[F]or different versions of reality do not take place among equally powerful participants, and student teachers often feel lost and powerless.” (White, 1989, p. 178) Social aspects of the student teaching experience present many challenges: “[N]ew teachers do not step out of our college classrooms onto firm ground. They step instead into shifting human networks of power and social positioning, into social contexts shaped by historical events, cultural and political understandings, and physical limitations.” (Berghoff, 1997, p. 2)

Even with this apparently overwhelming situation, some look to the student teacher to rise above. The Holmes Group (1986) report notes that for student teachers, “The emphasis is upon imitation and subservience to the supervising teacher, not upon investigation, reflection and solving novel problems.” (p. 36-37) A powerful expectation is articulated here that student teachers should move beyond the traditional power dynamics inherent in the student teaching triad and take a much more proactive stance in relation to their student teaching experience. This becomes problematic when the asymmetric power differentials inherent in the student teaching experience are not carefully considered and the individual, without material and structural support, is given sole responsibility in the prescribed lifting up.

Positioning teacher candidates to take more proactive roles in their student teaching experience ultimately becomes the responsibility of teacher preparation institutions. Many expect well-prepared student teachers to bring certain dispositions and types of knowledge with them when they student teach.

Shulman (1987) identified four major sources from which the professional knowledge base of student teachers is derived. These are scholarship in the subject disciplines; educational materials and settings; formal educational scholarship; and the wisdom of practice or the maxims which are rarely spontaneously articulated by even effective teachers, but guide their practice. (Lange, 1987, p. 7)

Recent literature calls for even more sophisticated and relevant knowledge processing. Student teachers should “map current conception and perceptions and shape schema so that they are in line with the findings of the best in current research and reflective practice.” (Lange and Burroughs-Lange, 1994, p. 6)

In addition to the tension/contradiction between being an active participant in the student teaching experience and a passive receptacle, another tension/contradiction may be found in the practical implementation of student teacher knowledge. Goodman (1988) points out that student teachers “organized their philosophy of teaching around two broad perspectives: (1) Teaching as a Problem of Control, and (2) Teaching as the Facilitation of Children’s Growth. These perspectives reflected the dilemmas that they were trying to resolve or goals they were hoping to implement as future teachers.” (p. 124) In the first instance, student teachers pay attention to what must be done to be successful in the classroom in terms of control. This alone presents a major challenge to the novice. In addition, the student teacher must and should meet the needs of the students. Moving to this second level depends on many factors, as Blank and Heathington (1987) point out:

[P]re-service teachers vary in their stages of development, maturity, and ability. Developmentally, some student teachers are concerned with self and survival. Others have progressed to the stages of concern for effectiveness of their teaching skills and for the impact of their teaching on student learning. An additional factor is the pre-service teacher’s general anxiety and stress that may intensify the insecurity experienced in supervision. (p. 3)

Another strong current that student teachers move against is the difficulty of transitioning from the role of student to the role of teacher. Shoultz (2002) looked closely at the difficulty many student teachers experience in the move from role of expert student to novice teacher. She found this challenge to be especially prominent in curriculum decision-making that involved lessons designed and implemented by the student teacher. In terms of personally expressed satisfaction with their overall student teaching experience, the most satisfied student teachers had adjusted their lessons to more adequately meet student needs instead of showcasing their own abilities to craft elaborate lessons. Shoultz also emphasized the difficulty of *becoming* in such a public venue as the student teaching experience: “As she [the student teacher] works to conceptualize her new role as teacher, she is doing so under a public gaze, intensifying the inevitable vulnerability that accompanies any new learning experience. Intertwined with learning to teach, then, is learning about oneself as well, as it is impossible to tease apart one’s teaching persona from one’s own personality at this early stage.” (Shoultz, 2002, p. 38) This teasing apart, I believe, contributes directly to one’s ability to effectively navigate one’s social terrain.

Cooperating teachers, as opposed to student teachers, are reported to exert considerable influence and control over the student teaching experience: “The important factor is that the cooperating teacher’s influence – good or bad – may be quite substantial.” (Barrows, 1979, p. 8) It is usually assumed that cooperating teachers have established themselves as successful educators whose attitudes, dispositions and behaviors are worthy of emulation: “Because of the potential impact a cooperating teacher can have on a student teacher’s philosophy, teaching strategies, and classroom behaviors are immeasurable, it is imperative to select the best teachers to help prepare beginning teachers.” (Cotton, 1992, p. 3)

A prominent role for the cooperating teacher is that of the primary socializing agent for the student teacher. Deborah Tannehill (1989) draws similarities “between a mentor/protégé relationship and a cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship. A mentor has been referred to as a teacher, coach, trainer, role model, planner, evaluator, protector, and sponsor... Many of these titles also describe a cooperating teacher.” (p. 244)

W. Robert Dixon (1962) notes that cooperating teachers must be willing to take on “an extensive set of additional responsibilities” and are perhaps motivated by a “deep concern...with professional problems... [They] view this role as one where they can personally advance the ‘cause’ of teaching. Secondary reasons include the fact that ‘good’ student teachers are very helpful: they can tutor individuals who have special problems, collect resource material, work with small groups, and assist in reading papers and examinations. Then, too, the colleges usually provide some financial compensation for working with student teachers.” (Dixon, 1962, p. 129) This compensation, however, is usually an insulting pittance whose acceptance may be the result of some sort of institutional swindle:

Over the years these experienced [cooperating] teachers have been carefully indoctrinated by the university system of teacher education into a belief that this uncompensated contribution of time and effort for the benefit of the next generation of teachers is a ‘professional’ obligation inherent in the job of teaching. To be ‘professional,’ inservice teachers repeatedly are advised, you must be ready and willing to accept this unpaid for extra duty. Since you once gained from free supervision of student teachers, inservice teachers are told, it is unethical for you to refuse to reciprocate. (Groff, 1986, p. 83)

Dan Lortie (1975) states that teachers in general are comfortable with such psychic rewards and notes that “fame and fortune are rarely the lot of the classroom teacher.” (p. 103) Contributing to the good of the teaching profession can be framed in rather noble terms: “If you work at being supportive, enthusiastic, pleasant, personable, and offer challenges, you will be a superior cooperating teacher and may make a big difference for a generation of student

teachers... Your role becomes an immeasurable addition to the teaching profession. Knowing that an excellent new teacher will be entering the profession because you put forth the extra effort is a benefit that can only be measured internally by the cooperating teacher.” (Balch, 1983, p. 3)

Teacher socialization literature (Clark 1962, Mercer 1963, Tanruther 1964) that focuses on the student teaching experience often presents detailed enumerations of a host of expected cooperating teacher behaviors. These laundry lists offer a variety of common sense suggestions that encompass very specific instructions such as: “Introduce the student teacher to members of the staff.” “During the orientation period, discuss the administrative organization, school policies and philosophies, and textbooks, and interpret the schedules.” “Share teaching [responsibilities] with the student teacher from the beginning.” More sublime recommendations include: “Try to understand the individual abilities, interests, and needs of the student teacher.” “The supervising teacher can make a unique contribution to the growth of the young teacher by providing help in the formulation of a working philosophy of student teaching.” “Show professional attitudes.”

The last two directives assume that the cooperating teacher has a responsibility to share with student teachers a sense of professionalism: “An opportunity to help the student teacher which is sometimes overlooked by supervising teachers is in the area of professionalization... [T]he supervising teacher can influence the thought and action of the neophyte that has to do with his [or her] development as a citizen of his community, his state, the nation and the world.”

More elaborate articulations of scripts or roles for cooperating teachers can also be found in teacher socialization literature. A cooperating teacher’s performance is made up of multiple roles, as noted in the following:

There are eight major roles that a cooperating teacher should portray throughout a student teacher’s experience. The significance and amount of time spent on each role will vary depending on the personality, strengths, and weaknesses of each student teacher. These role expectations include:

1. model teacher
2. observer
3. planner
4. evaluator
5. conferencer
6. counselor
7. professional peer
8. friend (Balch, 1983, p. 31)

Cooperating teachers are thus expected to base their performances on the needs of individual student teachers, but in terms of what the need is in order to take on the prescribed teacher's role. Successful performances may be rated by student teachers themselves: "In a recent study student teachers were asked to list factors that identified their cooperating teacher as superior. The first and most important single factor concerned the supportive nature of the cooperating teacher. The second factor of importance was enthusiasm shown by the cooperating teacher. Third in importance was a pleasant attitude and personality. The fourth factor cited was the challenging approach to learning used by the cooperating teacher." (Balch, 1983, p. 39) Student teachers in this case apparently prefer personal strengths and appear to highly rate the roles of counselor and friend in a cooperating teacher's performance.

The cooperating teacher's role as evaluator or supervisor of another person's teaching is perhaps one of the most challenging since this responsibility is unique to the role of cooperating teacher and not usually an aspect of the classroom teacher role. Most classroom teachers do not enact official supervisory roles unless they serve as lead or master teachers or if they are cooperating teachers for student teachers. Cooperating teachers are expected to successfully perform many supervisory tasks but, as Tannehill (1992) asserts, the "[supervisory] role of the cooperating teacher appears to be the most neglected aspect of the student teaching experience. Little is known about how to train [cooperating teachers] to be effective supervisors and how to meet their needs within the practicum setting." (p. 252) Albert Yee (1967) sees this neglected

area as one that fosters conservative tendencies. “For the most part, cooperating teachers and college supervisors have not had special training for their roles. Cooperating teachers have come through the same type of teacher education programs and may unwittingly reinforce ineffective emphases.” (p. 7) Tannehill (1992) further notes that “[t]oo often, the assumption has been that a teacher who has been shown to be an effective teacher will be an effective supervisor. Basing selection of cooperating teachers on teacher expertise may be faulty logic. Research on effective teaching does not address issues related to being an effective supervisor; observing skills, analyzing teaching performance, conferencing, to name just a few.” (p. 40)

The other member of the student teaching triad is the university supervisor. This role basically requires that the university supervisor serve “as a source of knowledge for the cooperating teacher, support for the student teacher, a sounding board for the cooperating teacher on supervisory problems, a check on expectations of the cooperating teacher, a teacher for learning how to code, provide feedback, and guide a student teacher, and one more source of feedback to the student teacher on teaching performance.” (Tannehill, 1989, p. 250) It is reported that in the student teaching experience the influence and control exerted by university supervisors is often marginal: “The role of the university supervisor is ambiguous at best, and that role in relationship to the expectations for the cooperating teacher is even more confused... The degree to which the university supervisor can affect the classroom practices of student teachers, given the structure of the experience, is questioned by supervisors themselves.” (Koehler, 1988, p. 32)

The ranks of university supervisors of student teachers are made up of full-time teaching university faculty, adjunct faculty who often are retired principals or teachers, and (in some institutions) doctoral students who tend to be former teachers. This duty may not be the most

sought-after task for university professors. As Brenda Power and Constance Perry (2002) point out: “The biggest obstacle to recruiting tenured faculty members to supervise student teachers is that the task is – boring.” (p. 406) They go on to describe their experiences as university supervisors. Often they were summoned to oversee traditional lecture-type presentations in subject areas they were not familiar with. Their evaluations were rote and offered little to the student teacher’s development in the classroom. Overall they were very disenchanted and found that the role of university supervisor, as traditionally enacted, to be not very “intellectually stimulating.” They sought out and participated in a collaborative inquiry-based project that more directly connected university faculty with classroom teachers in the context of the field experience. “We think the potential is virtually unlimited for tenured faculty members to form powerful new partnerships around mentoring pre-service teachers in schools. But that will happen only when we let go of a supervision model that contradicts the teaching and learning philosophy of many education professors.” (p. 413)

Alternate models of supervision for student teachers often include elements of clinical supervision. (Rikard 1990, Wilson and Saleh 2000) Ted Nettle advocates the re-conceptualization of supervision in teacher education as a way to help student teachers learn about teaching. He works from three popular approaches: traditional scientific management, neo-scientific management and human relations supervision. “Evaluation of the student teacher predominates. The authority position of the supervisor as the instrument of the educational establishment is evident.” Nettle includes Cogan’s (1973) definition of clinical supervision in which he “indicated that the heart of the redefinition of ‘supervision’, as ‘clinical supervision’, was in the way that authority is handled in the relationship between the teacher and the supervisor. He [Cogan] advocated that the clinical supervisor and the teacher should see one

another as colleagues. This clinical supervision should be about mutual helping not about evaluation of one person by the other.” (Nettle, 1988, p. 126)

Such innovative approaches to the supervision of student teachers are not common in practice. More traditional models of student teaching supervision prevail. Debra Anderson’s 1992 study revealed the following:

Findings indicate that: (1) the majority (86.8 percent) of institutions use a traditional model of student teaching supervision; (2) some institutions (16.8 percent) have changed their model of supervision in the past 5 years (changes were made to the traditional model, the clinical professor model, the teacher adjunct model, and the master teacher-apprentice model); (3) the role of university supervisors remains largely traditional. (Abstract)

Virginia Koehler (1988) asserts that “university supervisors do not feel particularly efficacious about contributing to student teachers’ classroom experiences. They seem much more satisfied with their role as facilitators of a process.” She cites various reasons for this abdication of a more active role in student teachers’ learning, including the overall lack of time available as well as the perception that experiential learning usually trumps theoretical orientations. Attempts by university supervisors to more proactively influence student teacher learning becomes problematic when “placed within the context of an environment and set of processes and routines [which have been created] by the host cooperating teacher” (p. 28), but which likely have also been shaped as well by school, district, and state policies and curriculum guidelines. She explains: “I found that there were extremely awkward aspects of the clinical process with respect to the cooperating teacher. In the feedback sessions, I could easily focus on more micro student teacher behaviors such as student/teacher interaction, questioning, and transitions. However, a discussion of routines constituted a potential criticism of the cooperating teachers’ performance.” (p. 32)

2.5. Moving from Scripted to Strategic Power Relations and Transformative Possibilities

As social actors we enact our defined roles in specific mindful ways. When we enact and reenact our social roles we assume their inherent social power. Normative behaviors are implicitly and sometime explicitly linked to strict enactments of scripted roles. However, norms are not necessarily as straightforward and confining as we might expect. We are not totally held hostage by the 'norm', as Judith Butler points out:

Assuming power is no simple process, however, for power is not mechanically reproduced when it is assumed. Instead, on being assumed, power runs the risk of assuming another form of direction... the psychic operation of the norm offers a more insidious route for regulatory power than explicit coercion, one whose success allows its tacit operation within the social. And yet, being psychic, the norm does not merely reinstate social power, it becomes formative and vulnerable in highly specific ways. (Butler, 1997, p. 21)

Social power once assumed in the initial role enactment thus presents the possibility of transformation in the next reenactment of the role.

This transformative process is played out with other social actors. Deborah Britzman (1991) places power in tension with relationship and insists that, "[a]ny theory of power must also be sensitive to the capacity of persons to interpret and intervene in their world. Such a view of human agency allows us to raise the question: Could persons have acted and interpreted differently? That is, what enables or constrains particular forms of practices and discourses that legitimate or challenge them?" (pp. 18-19) Stephen Appel (1996) suggests that mindful "positioning" requires better understanding of the "interrelationships between group psychology, the functioning of institutions, and individual psychology." (p. 117) And finally, in his articulation of the strategic options of "compliance" and "redefinition", Colin Lacey (1977), notes that how *well* a social actor is able to perform a social role is also a salient factor: "Social strategies are, therefore, selected or created and guided by a wide range of factors including, as

we have seen, the individual's interpretation of the situation, but one factor that must not be neglected is *the ability of the performer*. A good performance can result in a strategy being acceptable in a situation where it had previously been unacceptable." (p. 73) Lacey also provides a very useful definition of a social strategy: "A social strategy is reducible to actions and ideas but it is only interpretable in the context of a specific situation. A social strategy involves the act or in the selection of ideas and actions and working out their complex interrelationships (action-idea systems) in a given situation." (p. 67)

These ideas foster the conceptual move from scripted power relations to strategic power relations and introduces a dynamic that is lacking in flat renderings of a social role. A variety of authors have sought to define and locate this transformative process. They speak concerning general social as well as educational contexts. Writers who seek out areas of contestation and possible negotiation include Foucault (1972) in his definition of discourses, especially those that dominate. Paying attention to *who* may speak the truth and *how* the truth must be spoken in certain discourses offers two possibilities: the continuation of existing relations or the possibility of disruption. (p. 12) "Foucault argues that a discourse can be a focus for resistance, a basis for an oppositional strategy". (Usher and Edwards, 1994, p. 99) Similarly, Buendia (2000) notes that preservice teachers "may find instances in which they can rework and shift the discourses and practices that are typically produced within settings such as schools." (p. 156). And Boler (1999) sees a "challenge within education to provide creative spaces to develop flexible and creative modes of resistance involving emotional breadth and exploration that are not prescriptive." (p. 4)

The concept of resistance and accommodation is a strong theme present in much discourse surrounding critical pedagogy (e.g. Anyon, 1983, Giroux, 1983). For instance, hooks (1994) places great emphasis on the self-actualization process and its potential for change. She

articulates this as a necessary component for any teaching career. Berghoff (1997) uses the concept of stance, theoretically and pedagogically, to handle the messiness she has found working in the context of teacher education.

Some have sought to label this transformative power process as empowerment. Much literature has focused on this complex, and at times overworked conceptual nugget. Some locate empowerment in caring, relational interdependence. (Noddings, 1992) Some advocate the establishment of school communities created and nurtured by empowered faculty. (McBride and Skau, 1995) This turn enables teachers and students to reinvent the “cultures they learned in an unequal status quo. In that mutual reinvention, they create a critical culture... With a new language for learning and mutual communication, they can begin transforming their alienation from each other.” (Shor, 1992, p. 203) Ira Shor also points out that “understanding reality is not the same thing as changing it. Knowledge is not exactly power. Knowledge is the power to know, to understand, but not necessarily the power to do or to change.” He noted an effort to empower a group of students to reduce their alienation from intellectual work. Students thus gained an “‘empowering’ relationship to the teacher, to writing, and to the act of studying. But while their writing and thinking developed, the testing policy remained the same. Literacy and awareness by themselves do not change oppressive conditions in school and society. Knowledge is power only for those who can use it to change their conditions.” (Shor, p. 6)

The tendency to minimize or essentially ignore material constraints in relation to empowerment has also been pointed out by DeMarrias and LeCompte (1992).

There still is no clearly defined link between the empowerment of individuals and changes in the larger institutional and society context, and no sense that collective action by teachers is either possible or potent. To our knowledge, few, if any, educational theorists have addressed how such mechanisms might be established and made workable for grassroots individuals in educational systems... Empowerment entails addressing

pain, confusion, power imbalances, strong emotions, deep differences, and ambivalence. (pp. 22-27)

Patti Lather (1991) urges more complete understandings of the nature of empowerment with her suggestion that we look carefully at such processes: “We have much to learn about why some people move from privatized discontent to struggle toward a more broad based cultural renewal.” (p. xviii) The problematization of material/structural constraints by disenfranchised social actors can not automatically be assumed.

Seth Kreisberg’s (1992) addresses the issue of empowerment in his conceptualization of *power over* and *power with*. He contends that power is not simply transferred or accumulated in simple cause and effect terms. More importantly he notes that while relationships shape notions of power, conceptions of power may also impact personal relations:

[N]ot only are relationships of domination pervasive throughout our experiences of work, politics, education, and family, but these experiences of domination and submission create and at the same time limit our understanding of power. But I want to argue the opposite as well: *our particular conceptions of power also create and limit our experiences of relationship*. Thus we are caught in a conceptual and experiential straightjacket. (p. 33)

Kreisberg notes that empowerment discourses often shy away from direct confrontation with the notion of power. They often fail to embrace the productive nature of power, thereby excluding possibilities for the disruption of the culture of domination in educational contexts. The conceptualization of strategic power relations as mindful/heartful iterations of scripted power relations or roles, played out in relation to others over time, I believe, directly addresses the productive nature of power in the educational context.

Kreisberg’s last contention, however, truly drives this interpretive inquiry. Can we somehow free ourselves from Kreisberg’s “conceptual and experiential straightjacket”, or at least

loosen its bonds? I do believe that how we relate to each other is shaped by our interpretations of social power. And conversely, social power may be transformed, as well as reproduced, by our engagements with it in relation to other social actors. Perceiving ourselves as productively powerful social actors, we utilize our abilities to initially define and (perhaps) redefine our social context to more effectively enable the construction of knowledge that fosters robust relationships helping us to maximize our potentials to negotiate for and gather up resources. We can hopefully then position ourselves to use these various resources for the good of others and ultimately ourselves.

2.6 A Summary of the Main Theoretical Points of this Study

- *Power* may be conceptualized and articulated in relation to social roles, as *socially constructed power*.
- Strategic power relations as transformative possibilities are located within reenactments of *scripted power relations or social roles*.
- Individuals, emancipated or oppressed, *hide* power within modern discourses. (Foucault)
- *Power* flows between *all* social actors. (Giddens)
- Social roles are *reproduced practices*. (Giddens)
- Strategic redefinition by social actors involve situational adjustments and various social strategies which include *strategic compliance* and *internalized adjustment*. (Lacey)
- Interpersonal relationships have a direct bearing on how power is expressed in a social context – value of *communication* and a robust communicative environment. (Habermas)
- The concept of *power over* and *power with* (Kresiberg) considers temporality in conjunction with *power infused knowledge construction*. (Butler)
- *Power* is not in limited quantities – social theorizing needs to address *positive/productive power* within context of personal relationships. (Kreisberg, Britzman)
- *Our particular conceptions of power also create and limit our experiences of relationship.* (Kreisberg)

3. CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH PARTICULARS

3.1 Epistemological Orientation and Stance

Human beings are because they are in a situation. And they will be more the more they not only critically reflect upon their existence but critically act upon it. (Freire, 1999, 90)

[W]e do research to understand. We try to understand in order to make our schools better places for both the children and the adults who share their lives there... Although we are making headway toward that end, there will continue to be difficulties and uncertainties, frustrations and obstacles. Working at the edge of incompetence takes courage. (Eisner, 1993, 10)

The unknown retains a certain innocence... the stuff of imagination and dreams... the wonder of existence... balancing the known with the unknown. With the loss of innocence, when the unknown becomes known, it's a whole new game. Some retain a certain innocence believing that you can really know, with absolute certainty. This creates a restlessness in those who seek this certainty, and fuels certain forms of representation especially, I believe, educational determinism. These folks march onward and upward, delighting too often in the destination, not the journey. Knowledge becomes simply... how to get there from here. I believe much educational discourse resides in this place.

Other folks, far fewer, are concerned that perhaps the journey is proceeding too rapidly and some are falling behind. Knowledge is infused with power and becomes mindfully and purposefully manipulated.

Knowledge is not treated as simply problematic, *it becomes* the vehicle for teachers and students *to discuss* its problematic grounding and meaning. Knowledge in this instance becomes situated in ideological and political choices; in other words, knowledge becomes de-reified in terms of both its content and the social context in which it is mediated... Moreover, as a social construct, knowledge would also be defined through the social mediations and social roles which provide the context for its production and distribution. (Giroux, 1981, p. 68-81)

Knowledge as a social construct in this context is meant to get attention in very specific ways. Deliberate, humane choices by concerned participants motivate progress. These choices flow from rich conversations that consider the *me* in tension with the *us*.

Their [Friere's and Habermas'] approach presumes a 'dialogical subject' because it rejects a monological and transcendental theory of the subject, that is, one based on an abstract, metaphysical 'I' that individualistically 'knows' the world. Instead, they locate selfhood and identity formation in contexts of intersubjective communication. (Morrow and Torres, 2002, pp. ix, x)

With the crafting of this study, I sought to tune into some of these rich conversations between the *me* and the *us* and the *me* and the *me*.

The research style I have chosen may be categorized as qualitative. I have wearily trudged beyond the fractious place where qualitative came into its own and I embrace it as a worthy way to listen in on those who speak about schools and schooling. I also strongly believe that we should pay particular attention to conversations that have not really been attended to, especially those of teachers.

I also wished to counter the perception and perhaps defend the value of qualitative descriptive studies. Some demand certainty and insist that:

Although there are a number of research studies directed at the questions posed above, the research [on student teaching] overwhelmingly consists of *descriptive studies*. Thus while the research is often suggestive, it fails to provide the kind of evidence necessary to answer the questions with any confidence and ultimately has to be considered **inconclusive**. (Allen, 2003, p. 41)

I would counter this with:

Individuals' consciousness gives access to the most complicated social and educational issues, because social and educational issues are abstractions based on the concrete experience of people. (Seidman, 1991, p. 1)

I recognize the tension between being absolutely sure and right and perhaps in some way understanding. I lean toward the latter but vigilantly guard against my disposition and desire to know for sure.

I listened to three guides from the qualitative camp as I chose my methods. The first pointed to where experiential knowledge could be found: “[T]hrough examining personal and institutional documents, through observation, through exploring history, through experimentation, through questionnaires and surveys, and through a review of existing literature. If the researcher’s goal, however, is to understand the meaning people involved in education make of their experience, then interviewing provides a necessary, if not always completely sufficient, avenue of inquiry.” (Seidman, 1991, p. 4) This process, of necessity, involves an intimate relationship between researcher and researched: “[Q]ualitative study is forged in the transaction among what is done and learned and felt by the researcher. It is an intensely recursive, personal process, and while this may be the hallmark of all sound research, it is crucial to every aspect of the qualitative way of looking at life.” (Ely, 1991, p. 1) This research intimacy, however, may involve a certain tendency to spin things our way: “It is important to note again, that the goal was not to squeeze people’s experiences into my theoretical framework, but rather to see whether the framework is able to lend insight into the nature of the experiences.” (Kreisberg, 1992, p. 224)

My study seeks an ideal: “This integrity [of high quality ethnographic research] necessarily involves the observance of ethical principles in the conduct of the power relations between the researcher and the researched, as well as an ability to suspend personal and ideological agendas in a quest to render the familiar, strange.” (Duncan, 2000, pp. 460-461)

I am hopeful that my research will “resonate”:

At the heart of the inquiry is the researcher’s capacity for encountering, listening, understanding, and thus ‘experiencing’ the phenomenon under investigation. Rather than assuming the traditional stance of a detached and neutral observer, an interpretive inquirer, much like a tuning fork, resonates with exquisite sensitivity to the subtle vibrations of encountered experiences... Reconstructing the meaning of experience is, in essence, the interpretive act at the heart of interpretive inquiry. (Piantinada and Garman , 1998, p. 142)

3.2. Participants, Procedures and Places to Look

One of the most difficult tasks I had encountered in the crafting of this study was the narrowing of the prospective pool of research participants. During my tenure as university supervisor, I worked with twenty-five student teachers. Each had completed two eight-week sessions. This had brought me in contact with fifty cooperating teachers in fifty different student teaching triad configurations.

As I sifted through the twenty-five names of the student teachers I had supervised during my three semesters of supervision, I noted that I had engaged in four types of interventions. Twelve student teachers made unremarkable transitions (without major problems) during their field experience, and thus my interventions were routine. Six student teachers had required somewhat more than routine interventions on my part, and with such remediation, they met expectations by the end of their student teaching. Six student teachers experienced notable tensions with a cooperating teacher, and such situations required extensive interventions by me as their supervisor before they were recognized as meeting expectations. Finally, one student proved to be totally ill-suited, and was unable to meet even minimal expectations, and received a failing grade, even with tremendous amounts of time and energy invested by the Office of Field Services and myself.¹

My work as a university supervisor spanned three consecutive semesters: Spring 2001, Fall 2001 and Spring 2002. I decided to select triads from the last semester in which I was responsible for the supervision of ten student teachers.² During the semester, four of the student teachers were assigned two elementary placements (Grades K-5), two of the student teachers had one elementary placement and one at the middle school level (Grades 6-8), two of the student teachers were assigned one middle school and one secondary placement (Grades 9-12) and two student teachers were assigned two secondary level placements. I decided to focus on the four student teachers from my last semester of supervision whose student teaching experience was entirely at the elementary level. Of these, two had required routine intervention from other triad members, one had required somewhat more than routine intervention and one had required extensive intervention.

I utilized three primary sources of data. The first was a collection of artifacts from my university supervisory experience. I had maintained a folder for each student teacher containing materials from and information about the members of each student teaching triad. These artifacts also included various university documents. The second source of data was drawn from orchestrated interviews with individual student teaching triad members. I developed sets of comprehensive questions and conducted interviews. The third was my own processing of events in the form of recollections and self-interrogations/confessions. (Kanpol, 1998) As university supervisor I had maintained a journal of anecdotal references and reflections in reference to specific people and events that occurred during the timeframe under study.

The artifacts contained in each student teacher folder included *Weekly Reporting Packages* submitted to me electronically during each of the fifteen weeks by each student teacher. This set of materials included a *Weekly Schedule Form*, a *Reflection Prompt Form* and a

*Conference Narrative Form.*³ (Appendix A) Journal entries included in the *Student Teaching Notebook* were also carefully examined. Other artifacts analyzed are the formal *INTASC Observation and Evaluation Forms* (Appendix C) completed by cooperating teachers and myself. At times I referred to *Personal Data Sheets* that I had received from each student teacher prior to their student teaching. I also closely examined sections of the official student teaching handbook, and other relevant contextually rich university materials. I also included portions of various email correspondence with triad members as well as university personnel.

For the interviews, I worked from a series of interview questions (Appendix B) that focused on how triad members had perceived their own and other triad member's influence on decision-making in relation to what is taught, how it is taught and how the success of such choices is evaluated. From this first cycle of questions I developed a second set that participants responded to via email. (Appendix B) With these questions I had sought to develop dialogue around the relational dynamics of the student teaching triad. The first cycle of questions proved to be quite successful in this respect. They offered the opportunity to discuss a wide range of situations and personal interactions with participants. I was especially sensitive to areas that indicated that power relations were at work, especially when the dynamics had been altered. Responses from the first set of questions helped me develop the second set of questions that focused more on individual perceptions of role definitions. This second set of questions also spoke of power in a very direct way and attempted to elicit conceptualizations surrounding influence and control in the triad member's context.

Interview techniques put forth by various qualitative researchers (e.g. Carspecken, 1996; Mishler, 1986) emphasize the skills necessary to interview participants. Like Seidman, I recognized that the interviewing process presented significant challenges:

The interviewing relationship is fraught with issues of power - who controls the direction of the interview, who controls the results, who benefits. To negotiate these variables in developing an equitable interviewing relationship, the interviewer must be acutely aware of his or her own experience with them as well as sensitive to the way these issues may be affecting the participants. (Seidman, 1998, p. 66-76)

My experience as supervisor in all the student teaching triads under study afforded me the opportunity to build upon previous working relationships with all participants. The interview process involved a re-articulation of these relationships. I found that a residual measure of trust and confidence held forth. I conducted face-to-face taped initial interviews, using the first cycle of questions, with seven of the twelve participants. Four participants responded to the first cycle of questions with lengthy and complete responses via email. One cooperating teacher declined to participate in the interview process. All but two remaining participants responded to the second cycle of questions via email. Participants were both thoughtful and candid. I found the interview data to be very rich indeed.

These retrospective interviews worked quite well even though considerable time had passed since the actual student teaching experiences. Strong emotional investments had in most cases subsided. The passage of time had allowed for a more thorough processing of events. I sought to guide discussions a little deeper when it was evident that emotions surrounding certain issues were still relatively intense. All participants, especially the student teachers, had experienced greater involvement with their educational practices and often offered newer more refined interpretations of actual events.

In my position as researcher I did not hold the tremendous valence of power that I had in my previous position as supervisor. However, I found that although a high level of candor was usually operating during the face-to-face interviews, at times participants held back in deference to my previous position as university supervisor. I found that participants rarely attempted to

manipulate their answers to present themselves or a situation in a better light. Their responses seemed for the most part to be thoughtful and sincere.

I contacted the twelve members of the student teaching triads under study by telephone to begin the interview process. I briefly explained my research proposal and their prospective involvement. At that time, I arranged initial one-hour interviews at mutually agreeable locations and times. Logistics and weather constraints prohibited face-to-face interviews with all participants. As previously noted, four participants, one cooperating teacher and three student teachers, completed the first cycle of interview questions via email. I obtained a signed consent form from each participant personally or by mail. Each face-to-face interview session was audio-taped and portions were directly transcribed or paraphrased.

The presentation of my data was in the form of individual case studies. Since I am not comfortable with the distance implied in the term case study, *portrayal* seems more appropriate to describe these representations of my data. My own experiences as an active member of the student teaching triads studied enabled me to present what I believe to be, a rather rich and robust interpretation of the student teaching experiences considered here. I have captured my research results in narrative that established dynamic connections between my conceptual framework and what I found as a result of my inquiry into the student teaching experience. And, finally, as a nod to the implied practicality of any research initiative, I suggested future possibilities for policy and practice from study results.

¹ When conflict had surfaced, it often appeared to cluster around disagreements as to what was appropriate communicative behavior. It appeared that assumptions had not aligned with expectations and miscommunication often was the cause as well as the result. Consequent decisions made by triad members concerning what and how things should be resulted in strained relations. I was at times specifically positioned, because of my role as supervisor, to orchestrate the arbitration and eventual resolution of these difficult circumstances. Alternately, when things went well and many successes were noted, it was apparent that communication was robust and decisions were made that resulted in good things for all. Examining decision-making processes and eventual results, especially in terms of power and control as exercised and perceived by student teaching triad members, was a fruitful direction.

² During this semester, I supervised a total of ten student teachers. I chose the four whose student teaching experiences were entirely at the elementary level. With two separate placements each, these eight triads consisted of thirteen individuals (including myself), and involved seven separate elementary public school settings. The teacher education department at the university studied focused primarily on the 'self-contained' elementary classroom. Anticipating this study, I had made a concerted effort during that semester to collect and maintain a comprehensive set of records for each student teacher.

³ As a university supervisor, I found the Weekly Reporting Package to provide a very useful 'snapshot' of the day-to-day student teaching experience. The Weekly Schedule Form enabled me to schedule my observations of student teachers. This task was particularly challenging considering the number of student teachers I was in charge of, as well as the geographically far-flung nature of my assignment. Electronic messaging was also very helpful with the scheduling process since student teachers could immediately update any information concerning daily classroom schedule changes. The Reflection Prompt Form provided a condensed version of the daily reflections all student teachers were expected to complete. The form, developed by a full-time faculty member, attempted to elicit reflections consistently around certain areas. This may seem arbitrary, but encouraging student teachers to limit their reflections in certain ways contributed to the bureaucratic utility of reflection. The Conference Narrative Form, completed by the student teacher, was the written record of the weekly meeting each student teacher had with their cooperating teacher. This document traced the meeting highlights and again was a very valuable supervisory tool, providing a sense of the flow of interchange between the student teacher and the cooperating teacher.

4. CHAPTER 4: CONTEXTUALIZING A STUDY OF POWER IN/THROUGH STUDENT TEACHING TRIADS

4.1. Overview of the Student Teaching Experience

[Institutions] solemnize beginnings, surrounding them with a circle of silent attention; in order that they can be distinguished from far off, they impose ritual forms upon them. (Foucault, 1972, p. 215)

Numbers of questionnaires and surveys abound testifying that teachers in the field believe that student teaching was the most valuable professional course undertaken in college. (Yee, 1967, 3)

In some ways, student teaching is a sophisticated juggling act, in which a student teacher must manage a number of variables at the same time. At other times, student teaching is a perfected recipe, in which the amount of freedom, risk, tension and reflection must be doled out in a quantity appropriate to the sensibility of individual student teachers. Still, in other ways, student teaching is a magical act of illusions, where boundaries may actually be liberating and moments of success may feel like failures. (Shoultz, 2002, p. 255)

In *A Brief History of Student Teaching*, Jim Johnson (1968) traced the inception of student teaching back to the middle ages and the establishment in Europe of the apprenticeship concept.

“Apprenticeship rested on the basic premise that learning results from observation and emulation.” (p. 2) Johnson positioned apprenticeship as a close relative of practice teaching.

Based on the European model, many young Americans served lengthy apprenticeships with an experienced teacher as indicated in the following indenture of apprenticeship recorded in New York City in the year 1722.

This indenture witnesseth that John Campbell Son of Robert Campbel of the City of New York with the Consent of his father and mother hath put himself and by these presents doth Voluntarily put and bind himself Apprentice to George Brownwell of the Same City Schoolmaster to learn the Art Trade or Mystery ... for and during the term of ten years... And the said George Brownell Doth hereby Covenant and Promise to teach and Instruct or Cause the said Apprentice to be taught and Instructed in the Art Trade or Calling of a Schoolmaster by the best way or means he or his wife may or can. (p. 35)

Johnson pointed out that although apprenticeships did “embody the concept of learning to teach by gaining practical experience under the supervision of an experienced teacher” (p. 35) that was where the similarity ended since the apprentice did not receive any other type of training or preparation other than his time spent with the master.

Student teaching as presently constituted came into being as the result of the evolution of normal schools into state teacher’s colleges during the first half of the twentieth century. About 1920 some states began requiring practice teaching for teaching certification. These states passed laws making it possible for “teacher training institutions to enter into agreement with public school systems to provide observation and practice experiences for the teacher trainee.” (p. 167)

Teacher training institutions sought to establish standards for good teaching to effectively prepare good teachers. The accreditation agency that has exerted considerable influence over teacher education is the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) which was formed in 1956. “Teacher preparation institutions have highly cherished the approval of various accrediting agencies, and the standards for student teaching which have been established by these accrediting agencies have exerted considerable influence upon student teaching programs.” (p. 196-197)

During the 1920’s there was a dramatic shift in the location of the student teaching experience. Previously practice teachers served in model schools that were components of the normal schools of the time. As the ranks of potential teachers swelled, public schools were increasingly used as sites for student teaching. This move was also seen as advantageous since the “public school could provide a more typical teaching situation for the practice teacher.” (p. 197) As student teaching evolved to its present form it established and retained a core of essential ingredients such as:

[A]n almost universal acceptance of this part of teacher education; allowing the student teaching to be the center of the professional education core; full time student teaching; more off-campus student teaching; the awarding of more credit hours for student teaching; longer student teaching assignments; the use of higher standards in student teaching; the provision of more and higher quality supervision; and increased research activities in student teaching. (p. 197)

Presently, student teaching remains the initial socializing experience for most teachers. It is in this place that attitudes, dispositions and behaviors are very deliberately forged. Much attention has been given to this important event. Located within a variety of carefully scripted roles, expectations and assumptions abound.

Michael Allen (2003) wrote a report, *Eight Questions on Teacher Preparation: What Does the Research Say?*, that was “based on a review of 92 studies that were selected, using rigorous criteria, from a total of more than 500 originally considered.” (p. i) In it he established a list of characteristics “important for solid field experiences”:

- Student teachers have an adequate grasp of the subject they are learning to teach.
- Student teachers’ pre-placement coursework has practical components and helps them understand the realities and meet the expectations of their student teaching.
- Student teachers are encouraged to work on classroom-management skills early in their placement experience.
- The ‘cooperating’ veteran teachers who supervise the student teachers are well-trained and understand their roles and expectations.
- Cooperating teachers give student teachers considerable responsibility and autonomy.
- Cooperating teachers or university faculty encourage and help candidates to evaluate and reflect on their student teaching experience.
- University faculty, as well as cooperating teachers, provide supervision to candidates.
- Student teachers are provided the opportunity to support and learn from one another.
- The field experience is well-coordinated and organized.
- Ideally, a variety of field experiences is provided. (p. 45-46)

Allen also pointed to some major constraints inherent in the student teaching experience:

Most student teaching assignments, even those of the highest quality, invariably involve some compromise in the length and intensity of supervision. Limited resources and the simple fact that a prospective teacher can learn only so much in a given period of time mean that while more field experience is almost always better, it may not be practical or ultimately cost effective. (p. 43)

The student teaching experience with all of its inherent flaws nonetheless remains the narrow portal that most prospective teachers must of necessity pass through.

4.2. Institutional Contexts

Two types of educational institutions provided the backdrop for this study: the regional public university and public elementary schools. Cumberland University¹ prepared the student teachers that participated in this study. Seven public schools served as sites for the student teaching experiences interpreted in this project. To create a context for Cumberland University, I will provide two levels of analysis. The first will provide basic information from university-prepared sources. The second will be a brief discussion of two relevant discourses associated with the teacher education department. I have attempted to describe the seven public schools in a very broad sense. The characteristics of these schools were very similar and a more complex analysis of each of them was beyond the scope and intent of this study, except as participants made reference to their institutional and community contexts.

4.2.1. The University

According to its website:

Cumberland University enjoys an excellent reputation for educating quality teachers since its first graduating class in 1875. Our teacher education programs are a comprehensive mixture of the latest in theory and application, practical experience, and personal observation of master teachers in action. Our programs are nationally recognized. In fact, our National Council for

Accreditation of Teacher Education accreditation renewal was accepted on first review – an action reserved for only the strongest education programs in the country.

The recruitment pamphlet prepared for prospective students and their parents presents the essential facts about Cumberland University, a regional public university in a mid-Atlantic state. This pamphlet makes the case for a school location that resonates with a rich historical past as well as close proximity to major cities, thus offering students access to many cultural opportunities. Situated on 200 acres of rolling land overlooking a beautiful mountain range, Cumberland University “benefits greatly from its tranquil surroundings.” Founded in 1871, enrollment currently in the university as a whole is 7,000 (6,000 undergraduate and 1,000 graduate students). Of these, in-state students make up 93% of the school population. The rest come from 24 other states and 38 countries. 55% are women and 45% are men. Education majors make up one-third of the total student population; 85% are women and 15% are men. State residency for education majors follows the general student population pattern. 40% of the Cumberland University students live on campus. The student/faculty ratio stands at 20:1. Nearly 90% of the 297 full-time instructional faculty members hold a doctorate or other terminal degree in their field. “Our faculty’s main focus is teaching. All classes are taught by faculty, not graduate assistants.” The three main colleges are Arts and Sciences, Business, and Education and Human Services. Secondary education majors are affiliated with specific departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, according to their subject specialization. The teacher education department offers one of the 50 undergraduate academic programs available at Cumberland University and is one of the five academic programs in the College of Education and Human Services. Counseling, criminal justice, ROTC and social work make up the rest.

The sprawling green campus includes 37 buildings. Cumberland University is part of a state system of comprehensive regional public universities and for years has been recognized as a premier institution for the preparation of teachers.

Cumberland University's *Undergraduate Catalog* (2002) outlines academic expectations. The elementary education curriculum in the teacher education academic program at Cumberland University is a four-year program, requiring at least 125 credit hours leading to the degree of Bachelor of Science in Education, Elementary Education. Successful completion of this course of study qualifies the graduate for a variety of professional employment possibilities. The basic program qualifies the student to apply for an elementary teacher certificate, thus making the graduate eligible for employment at any level, i.e., kindergarten through sixth grade (K-6) as well as grades seven and eight if these grades are part of a state approved middle school. Students in the elementary curriculum are taught to be reflective educators. They learn to plan and guide the child's program; observe the child's application of skills and knowledge; and see how growth in one area of a child's life is reflected in growth in other areas. Their program emphasizes knowing how and when to help the child learn using diagnostic-prescriptive models. By study, direct observation, and participation, students grow in understanding various methods of teaching and become skillful in the use of instructional materials and specialized equipment. They critically examine various courses of study and the newest techniques of measuring and judging the child's social and academic growth. Students share in the broad programs of general education provided for all students at the university, including courses in the humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences. They are also required to take an elective concentration or minor in some academic field.

Students admitted to the elementary education program are expected to maintain an adjusted quality point average of at least a 2.5. To be admitted to the Professional Semester [the precursor to student teaching] a student must have attained or exceeded the cut scores on the approved basic skills test. In addition, the student must have met the approved writing competencies, achieved a minimum of a *C* grade in all courses required by the department, and achieved an overall quality point average of at least 2.5.

The university recruitment literature proudly proclaims: “Our elementary education majors do well in the job market. Representatives from school districts in our state as well as four neighboring states recruit our graduates on campus. In addition, other districts call our job hotline as vacancies occur.” This last assertion was born out among the four student teachers that were research participants for this study; two years after completing the program three are now employed as full-time teachers, two in-state and one out-of-state and the fourth is in a full-time substitute position that promises to soon become a permanent position.

During the semester studied, Cumberland University assigned each of the 200 student teachers to two separate placements in school districts across the southern portion of the state. Supervisory personnel were drawn from full-time faculty as well as a cadre of adjunct faculty, who except for myself and another teacher, had served as principals in public schools. The Office of Field Supervision directly managed the student teaching field experience. The Director of Field Services was also the Assistant Dean for the College of Education and Human Services. The Field Services Office employed an administrative assistant who was the primary contact for students and faculty.

This basic description of Cumberland University presents a rudimentary sense of what students experience as they attend the institution. To enrich this study, however, I wish to

explore some elements of two ideological discourses that inform the teacher education department at Cumberland University.

I embrace the concept of ideological discourse which encompasses ideology as the “assumed right way of seeing the world” (Adams, 1998, p. x.) and discourse, as including certain characteristics which “determine the underlying rules for both what and how things can be said as well as who can speak with authority and who must listen.” (Kreisberg, 1992, p. 34, citing Foucault, 1972). I agree with Stephen Appel (1996) who describes ideological discourses as “systems of social practices constituted by beliefs, values, norms, myths, customs, common sense, philosophy, and all the activities that enact and constitute them.” (p. xx) More importantly, I strongly believe as Appel does, that human beings are positioned by ideological discourses, a contention that is at the heart of this study.

Cumberland University in part can be categorized as a traditional teacher preparation institution. The term ‘traditional’ captures the essential spirit of the teacher education department and points to a conservative ideology that has been in place for quite some time. This ideological discourse speaks of reputation and dependability. Cumberland University has been consistently recognized as the premier teacher preparation institution in the state system of which it is a part. For many years, Cumberland University has had a profound effect on education in the region, not only supplying large numbers of trained teachers, but providing graduate education and professional development opportunities for educators. The university is known for producing a reliable, high quality product. Nearly all of the fifty cooperating teachers I worked with had only accepted student teachers from Cumberland University and often volunteered that they “would only take student teachers from Cumberland University.” A few had experiences with student teachers from other institutions and found that the level of preparation and support was far below

what one could expect from a Cumberland University student teacher. Also, just as cooperating teachers were unwilling to accept student teachers from neighboring higher education institutions, university supervisors expressed essentially the same sentiment with regards to supervising. A few had done supervisory work at these other colleges and universities and found that the Cumberland University student teacher had been much better prepared for the student teaching experience.

This perhaps lent itself to a general perception I held of the student teachers under my supervision. Cumberland University's student teachers for the most part exuded a strong self-confidence and self-assuredness. This attribute was not apparent among other groups of pre-service teachers with whom I had worked at other institutions. Cumberland University student teachers were expected to perform well and for the most part they did. This overall confidence in the teacher preparation program was reflected in the *Student Teaching Handbook*. In the section that informed student teachers of their responsibilities, the final directive, on a list of forty-seven, exhorted the student teachers to "RELAX a little. You will be successful in the classroom!"

To offset entrenched ways of thinking and being that become parts of well-established discourse communities,² reflection may perhaps provide an ameliorative.

With roots in the work of John Dewey and recent permutations explicated by Donald Schon, the discourse that incorporates reflective practice is wide and deep. "The reflective teacher is analytic and a student of teaching rather than a technician performing mechanically correct teaching acts." (Blank and Heathington, 1987, p. 2)

The *Cumberland University Handbook for Student Teachers* (2002) strongly embraced the reflective teaching model positioning the teacher as a reflective co-learner. "[Reflective teaching] focuses upon quality instruction, problem solving, critical thinking, self-evaluation and the application of values to action." (p. 2) This reflective theme ran through methods courses

and all student teachers were expected to maintain a journal of reflective pieces during their student teaching. This journal was part of the comprehensive notebook each student teacher was required to assemble, maintain and present to me when I observed them. In addition, I also required my student teachers to submit a *Student Teaching Weekly Report Form: Reflection and Self-Assessment Prompts*. (Appendix A) Developed by a full-time faculty member, this standardized form posed the same five questions/prompts each week for the student teacher:

1. *Discuss your most successful teaching experience this week and why you feel you experienced such positive results.*
2. *Describe your least successful teaching experience. Again, reflect on the causes behind the problem.*
3. *What future goals will you set based upon this experience? Be specific...*
4. *What risks did you take in trying new instructional strategies, developing innovative forms of assessments, or in integrating technology into your teaching?*
5. *What did you learn about your students this week?*

The pervasiveness of this reflective mindset at Cumberland University was made abundantly clear to all. The term came to signify the very essence of teacher preparation. During my tenure as a supervisor I was included in a session scheduled as part of the process to gain accreditation by NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education). One of the evaluators was very surprised to find that *all* students she had queried, claimed to be “reflective practitioners” when asked how they would describe themselves as future educators. Apparently students were very comfortable aligning themselves with the reflective approach.³

On a personal and micro-interpersonal level, I came to view the reflective pieces, especially the ones specifically formulated and assigned, to be a very good supervisory tool. During interactions with my student teachers, I often referred to parts of their submitted reflective responses. Their weekly offerings provided snapshots into what was actually happening in the classroom. Also, student teacher reflections were used as discussion points during meetings between student teachers and their cooperating teachers. However, I also found

that reflective entries written by student teachers very seldom moved beyond the technical and most often incorporated accounts of successful and failed lesson and classroom management techniques. This technical approach was occasionally abandoned in the personal reflections that some of the student teachers shared with me for this study.⁴ A few student teachers kept private journals that were not formally reviewed. These reflective pieces were much more thoughtful and questioning and sought to consider social contexts.⁵

In the teacher education department, the ideological discourse that surrounded reflective practice extended itself into the area of student teaching evaluation as well. In the *Student Teaching Handbook* (2002) under the heading of *Professional Education Principles* was the following:

In addition to the Teacher Education 'Reflective Educator' knowledge base education majors are introduced to the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards and assessments during their methods courses. These [This] common core of teaching knowledge and skills needed to teach in the 21st century assist us in preparing future teachers who are able to clearly reflect on teaching challenges and make wise decisions that benefit diverse types of students. During methods courses and student teaching, **future teachers are expected to reflect** [Emphasis mine.] on the following INTASC principles :

PRINCIPLE 1:

- The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

PRINCIPLE 2:

- The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social, and personal development.

PRINCIPLE 3:

- The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

PRINCIPLE 4:

- The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

PRINCIPLE 5:

- The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation

PRINCIPLE 6:

- The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

PRINCIPLE 7:

- The teacher plans instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

PRINCIPLE 8:

- The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

PRINCIPLE 9:

- The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

PRINCIPLE 10:

- The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well being. (p. 5)

It should be noted that the last principle is the only one that focuses beyond the interpersonal dynamics of the teacher-student relationship.

These INTASC principles were directly incorporated into an official form that was used for the observation of student teachers by university supervisors. They were also indirectly incorporated into an evaluation form used both by cooperating teachers and university supervisors. [Appendix B] During the semester under study, both cooperating teachers and university supervisors were encouraged to begin using these forms in their evaluations of student teachers. The INTASC forms had been distributed on a limited basis and were relatively new. Most cooperating teachers and university supervisors were not aware of them. The previous observation and evaluation forms had required much narrative text. After converting the INTASC forms to a computer spreadsheet format, I shared the forms on computer disks with my cooperating teachers. They were very pleased with the new observation/evaluation forms. They expressed that the forms enabled more focused dialogue with student teachers and “freed them from having to write so much stuff.” Their only objection appeared to be discomfort with the

designation of *4=Distinguished* on the evaluation form. Many cooperating teachers did not consider student teachers to be eligible for a rating of 'distinguished' in *any* area of the INTASC form. The cooperating teachers felt that such a rating could/should never be applied to a novice just "learning the ropes." They did indicate that perhaps a more seasoned teacher would deserve such a rating.⁶

4.2.2. The Public Schools

The seven public elementary schools that were sites for the student teaching experiences utilized in this study were located in six separate school districts. Of these seven schools, six could be categorized as essentially rural schools located in agricultural areas or suburban schools located on the outskirts of mid-sized communities. The one school in an urban setting had a student population of over 600 students. The other schools averaged about 400 students each.

School populations were essentially homogenous. Nearly all students and teachers were white. There was minimal representation of various ethnic groups except for the urban school that had a large contingent of non-English speaking [mostly Hispanic] and African-American students. The socio-economic status of most students appeared to be middle-class except again for the urban school that contained a majority of economically disadvantaged children.

The physical condition of most of the school buildings appeared good with four that were new or recently renovated. Three were older and showed considerable wear and tear. Classrooms, for the most part, were well-equipped, and except for a few that were seriously overcrowded, most appeared to be well-organized and conducive to learning.

The elementary schools were at various distances from the Cumberland University campus. Two were less than ten miles from campus. Four were more than ten miles but less than

sixty miles away from campus. Only one, the urban school, was greater than sixty miles from campus. Three student teachers from this study had long distance placements. These schools, however, were located near their homes enabling them to live at their own residences during the semester. This eliminated an extremely long daily commute from campus to the student teaching setting.

Moving from establishing a sense of place, the next section will present in broad strokes some of the roles that educational actors in this study were expected to enact.

4.2.3. Scripted Roles of Cumberland University Student Teaching Triad Members

One of my initial impressions of the student teaching experience at Cumberland University was one of familiarity. Thirty years earlier, I had attended another higher education institution that was part of the same state system. During my senior year I had successfully undertaken and completed my student teaching. I located my own student teaching handbook from thirty years ago and found the similarities in regard to expected rituals and performances to be strikingly similar. One exception was that the new student teaching evaluation form was different, not only from the previous Cumberland University form, but also from what was used during my era of student teaching. The newer evaluation forms, again, required less narrative text. I found it rather disarming that the nature of the student teaching experience had changed so little, especially the do's and don'ts.

The *Student Teaching Handbook* (2002) at Cumberland University was prepared by the Office of Field Services and was *much* more comprehensive than the one from my student teaching experience. At Cumberland University, this handbook was routinely distributed to all prospective student teachers and cooperating teachers. Prior to their student teaching, elementary

education majors were expected to have thoroughly read all aspects of this manual. They were held strictly accountable for its contents. We as supervisors were very actively encouraged to go over the handbook with not only our student teachers, but with all of the cooperating teachers we would be working with in the field. The quantity and specificity of the directives in the current *Cumberland University Handbook* left nothing to chance and appeared to cover any exceptionality that the novice might encounter. The *amount* of directives formulated for each student teaching triad member seemed to be geared to the level of influence and control the member was perceived to have. Student teachers had 47 suggestions, university supervisors had 29 and cooperating teachers had 16. The university more directly attempted to shape student teacher beliefs and behaviors than university supervisors or cooperating teachers. Since this handbook was such an integral part of the student teaching experience, an in-depth analysis appears to be of value.

Expectations and assumptions for student teachers at Cumberland University are embodied in the official *Student Teaching Handbook*. This section of the handbook specifically for student teachers follows the sections for cooperating teachers and university supervisors in that order. Student teachers are reminded that:

Student teaching is the ‘capstone’ experience for pre-service education majors. Student teachers are encouraged to reflect on teaching/learning processes and develop their teaching style. A focus on ‘learn how to learn’ and ‘success for all’ should be a top priority for maximum success during student teaching and when entering the profession of teaching.

Student teachers are then given forty-seven directives in four different areas: Professional Responsibilities, Time Commitments, Classroom Management/Teaching Responsibilities and Getting Started /The first week of each eight week experience. Various policies with regard to

topics such as attendance, attire and other required processes and documents are then explicitly stated.

Professional Responsibilities

- *review the Cumberland University Handbook. Become familiar with the content.*
- *establish positive working relationships with all personnel in the cooperating school district and with the university supervisor.*
- *respect the rules and regulations of the school district.*
- *perform the same teaching and non teaching duties as the cooperating teacher. This includes attending faculty meetings, parent-teacher conferences, in-service workshops, etc.*
- *complete all professional assignments given by the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor.*
- *furnish the university supervisor with a complete classroom schedule.*
- *prepare a professional portfolio, including lesson plans, units and materials developed during student teaching. Include a videotape of a “super” lesson.*
- *become active in professional organizations.*
- *be professionally attired at all times. Check with building principals and cooperating teachers for suggestions related to dress, grooming, and hair length.*
- *be a reflective practitioner-self-evaluate your lessons on a regular weekly basis. Keep a reflective journal of your experiences.*
- *take time to thank those who helped you enter the teaching profession (written and/or verbal)*
- *observe other teachers in the building.*
- *be responsible for your own professional growth.*
- *encourage a principal to observe you teaching.*

Time Commitments

- *introduce yourself to cooperating teachers prior to the beginning of the student teaching experience.*
- *devote full time to student teaching.*
- *manage family and financial responsibilities.*
- *report for all school appointments on time.*
- *follow the school district calendar.*
- *be at your assigned school everyday the school is in session.*
- *report every absence and its reason to the cooperating teacher and university supervisor as early as possible.*
- *Give prior notice to the cooperating teacher if a planned absence has been permitted by the university.*
- *Attend all professional meetings in districts and scheduled meetings with supervisors or at the university.*

Classroom Management/Teaching Responsibilities

- *review the curriculum.*
- *check out textbooks and other teaching materials from the cooperating teacher.*
- *obtain school district Faculty Handbook and Student Handbook and review them.*
- *become familiar with the district discipline plan.*
- *submit all lesson plans to cooperating teacher prior to teaching the lesson.*
- *plan with the cooperating teacher for assuming teaching responsibilities.*
- *confer with the cooperating and university supervisor regarding your progress or special problems. Use their suggestions.*
- *assume control of the class gradually.*
- *plan cooperatively for instruction. Share information with your cooperating teacher.*
- *use a variety of teaching materials and strategies. Be resourceful and creative.*
- *be aware of individual differences in students and plan developmentally appropriate instruction.*
- *participate in the evaluation and documentation of student progress and attendance. (i.e. tests, portfolios, projects, conferences with students)*
- *assume greater responsibilities in the classroom and total school each week you're there.*
- *always be willing to "go that extra mile" to help students succeed.*
- *develop classroom management procedures that offer students maximum potential for success.*
- *actively participate in observation conferences with your cooperating teacher and university supervisor.*

Getting Started: The first week of each eight-week experience

- *get to know the building.*
- *meet with members of the staff, i.e., principal, teachers, librarian, nurse, counselor, custodian, secretaries, etc. Introduce yourself!*
- *learn the names of your students and something positive about each one.*
- *observe and discuss class interactions with your cooperating teacher.*
- *be open to all suggestions.*
- *discuss lesson planning and student teaching requirements with your cooperating teacher.*
- ***RELAX a little. You will be successful in the classroom! (Emphasis mine.)***

This section culminates in a list of **Requirements for Student Teachers:**

1. Lesson and unit plans
2. Develop original tests and other forms of assessment
3. Develop portfolios
4. Videotapes and analyze several lessons (at least one required per assignment)
5. Keep reflective response journals of their experience⁷
6. Review textbooks and curriculum materials
7. Attend professional conferences

8. Participate in parent conferences
9. Create instructional bulletin boards
10. Exhibit a project for Exhibition Day

The *Student Teaching Handbook* from Cumberland University also provides what is expected of cooperating teachers who supervise/mentor student teachers from Cumberland University:

The cooperating teacher is an invaluable resource person for the student teacher. The main responsibility of the cooperating teacher is to assist the student teacher in understanding and assuming the role of the professional classroom teacher. This requires supportive supervision, modeling, guidance, and feedback on the part of the cooperating teacher. Successful student teaching experiences are most frequently the result of specific intentional actions by the cooperating teacher such as:

PERSONAL CONFIDANTE

1. *acquaints the student teacher with the school, staff, students, teachers, and community.*
2. *orients the student teacher to classroom rules, organization, and management.*

Instructional Guide

3. *provides a desk or workplace, necessary instructional materials, resources, supplies, and equipment.*
4. *guides lesson planning and material development, requires written plans in advance of teaching the lesson.*
5. *provides for positive learning experiences.*
6. *models assessment of student performance through appropriate diagnostic testing, record keeping, grading, standardized tests, portfolio and other forms of authentic assessments.*
7. *acquaints the student teacher with routine tasks.*
8. *requires an instructional unit that uses materials other than that provided by the text or by the school district.*

Professional Advisor

9. *provides continuous support, conferences, and feedback opportunities. When possible uses the 5 step Reflective Conferencing Plan.*
10. *shares opportunities for observation/participation and related activities.*
11. *promotes personal/professional growth.*
12. *has student teacher maintain a Professional Reflective Journal.*

Assessment Responsibilities

13. *attends cooperating teacher training sessions.*
14. *completes Mid-Term Evaluation Form during the fourth week and Final Evaluation Form seventh or eighth week of assignment.*

15. *completes and submits a Student Teacher Recommendation form at the end of the eight-week experience.*
16. *uses a classroom observation form and provides feedback for improvement.*

In this set of expectations, there are *no* references that suggest that cooperating teachers should urge student teachers to pay attention, not only to the *micro* of the individual classroom but also to the *macro* structure of the school community.

At Cumberland University, university supervisors were divided between full-time faculty and adjunct or part-time faculty. Student teachers who were assigned to elementary placements were supervised by professors from the teacher education department and adjunct faculty who, except for two, were retired public school principals from the region. I was one of two semi-retired school teachers. In contrast, secondary level (grades 9-12) student teachers were usually supervised by full-time faculty from specific subject area departments.⁸

The *Student Teaching Handbook* from Cumberland University once again provides what is expected of university supervisors:

The university supervisor observes, evaluates, and confers with student teachers and cooperating teachers. The university supervisor collaborates with cooperating teachers in supervising and assessing professional competencies of the student teacher.

Specific Responsibilities:

Visitations and observations by the supervisor

- *provide cooperating teachers with supervisory/assessment strategies.*
- *provide student teachers with a syllabus.*
- *visits and observations of student teachers occur at least six (6) times during the student teaching experience. More visits/observations may be required if the student teacher is experiencing difficulty.*
- *the initial visit should occur during the first week of the student teaching experience.*
- *a formal observation should occur prior to the first four week evaluation.*
- *two formal observations should be scheduled when the student teacher assumes full responsibility for the classroom during each eight-week evaluation.*
- *the final observation should occur shortly before the final evaluation.*
- *the university supervisor assists cooperating teachers in evaluating student teachers and composing the narrative section of the type written letter of recommendation.*

Components of observation

Observing student teacher instructional performance is critical for continued professional development. Specific, objective feedback needs to be given to all student teachers.

Observations consist of:

- *review and assess lesson plans. (Require notebook with plans)*
- *observation and documentation of the actual 30-60 minute lesson.*
- *when possible a three-way conference at each formal evaluation session with the cooperating teacher and student teacher.*
- *identify areas of instructional strengths and provide suggestions for refinement.*
- *identifying two or three strategies to improve instruction.*
- *a review of reflection journal and/or other requirements specific to content areas.*

Informal Discussions

- *supervisors should provide at least four opportunities for their student teachers to meet to informally discuss issues.*
- *supervisors should announce the time and place for discussions early in the semester.*
- *content of discussions depends on the specific needs of the student teachers.*

Establishing rapport with cooperating teachers

- *meets cooperating teacher and exchanges telephone numbers and E-Mail to facilitate communication.*
- *provides observation, lesson plan requirements and supervisory information for cooperating teachers.*
- *frequently asks cooperating teacher for informal input about student teacher's progress (by phone, mail, E-Mail or classroom visits).*
- *is sensitive to the needs and concerns of the cooperating teacher.*

Evaluation Responsibilities

- *completes mid-term evaluation at end of eight weeks and final evaluation at completion of 16 weeks.*
- *completes a recommendation form at conclusion of the student teaching experience.*
- *participates in three way conferences when possible.*

Professional Advisor

- *promotes personal and professional growth by sharing information about workshops, publications, and organizations.⁹*
- *offers suggestions for improvement of lessons and encourages student teacher to take risks in implementing new ways of teaching material.*
- *participates in opening session for cooperating teacher and student teacher and in exit interviews with student teachers.*
- *assists with exploration of career opportunities.*
- *provides follow-up assistance to graduates.*

The next chapter will attempt to portray the experiences in the university and school contexts of student teachers and their cooperating teachers as interpreted by their university supervisor... me.

¹ Specific names of institutions and research participants have been changed.

² The ideological discourse of reputation and dependability also demonstrates the tremendous influence Cumberland University exerts over teaching and consequently schooling in the entire region. The teacher education department at Cumberland University maintains an excellent reputation in the region and exerts tremendous influence in the area's public school systems. However, such ingrained ideological discourses perhaps should be viewed warily, as Joe Kincheloe (1993) points out: *A crude practicality characterizes technically-oriented teacher education programs. Course work that does not impart 'how to' information is deemed impractical, superfluous, or too theoretical. Schools-as-they-are are taken as natural – the role of teacher education is simply to fit the neophyte to them. Questions of the nature and purpose of schooling, the connection between school and society, the relationship between power and teaching, schools as social organizations, or curricular questions of what is worth teaching or the nature of school knowledge are infrequently asked. Rarely considered are the implicit meanings of commonly used terms such as educational excellence or quality education.* (p. 12) Beth Berghoff (1997) frames this in a more general way: *Much of what we do by virtue of being a member of a discourse community is unconscious, unreflective, and uncritical. We think that our ways of being, acting, writing, and talking are 'intelligent' or 'natural'.* (p. 6)

³ There is a very rich discourse surrounding reflective practice and its utilization within educational contexts. Whether Cumberland University's model proved to be effective or even practical is beyond the scope of this study. Shoultz (2002) however does articulate a tension in relation to reflective practice that has some relevance here. She quotes Calderhead and Gates (1993) who argue that: *[T]he aims of preservice reflective teaching programs are quite often highly ambitious and set targets that are probably impossible to achieve with the majority of students in the time available. Becoming a teacher who is aware of one's own values and beliefs, able to analyze their own practice and consider its ethical basis and its social and political context involves considerable ability and experience and may well be beyond the capabilities of most student teachers in the span of a preservice program.* (pp. 4-5) Reflections used in this study were often limited to the circumscribed and practical. The student teachers for the most part steered clear of political and ethical implications and remained individualistic in their approach to their musings: *Not only has reflection focused on teaching skills and strategies that have been founded in university-sanctioned research, but the emphasis promotes isolation and personal responsibility, as reflection is conceptualized as an inward and individual process, without acknowledging the outside influences that serve to shape the boundaries of a teacher's domain.* (Shoultz, 2002, p. 25)

⁴ The individualistic, inward bent of student teaching reflection was repeatedly born out in the musings of my student teachers. One poignant and powerful example of this inward focus can be found in the reflection provided by Natalie who was struggling with the relationship she had with

her cooperating teacher. After relating a tense encounter she responded to the prompt “*What future goals will you set based upon this experience? Be specific...*” with the following, “Most of all I am going to be as kind and catering as I have ever been. I am in a position in which I must swallow my pride and get through each day without feeling as though I have let myself down.” Sadly, Natalie never even acknowledges that perhaps she is not the only one to blame for the impasse. Neither does she sense in the remotest way that perhaps the material conditions of her situation lend themselves to her predicament. With this orientation any transformative possibilities, especially on a structural level, remain out of the question. Survival is the only goal, a sensible one given the precarious position in which her role places her, as Shoultz (2002) points out: *For many reasons, then, a focus on proficiency, success and ‘getting it right’ dominates the learning process of student teachers, as they view the classroom in black and white terms of success vs. failures, proficiency vs. ineptness, wrong vs. right. Perplexed with the peculiar and ambiguous nature of the situation, as well as influenced by the established convention of their particular contexts, student teachers reconceptualize their assignment as one of survival rather than deliberation. (p. 39)*

⁵ I once asked a student teacher why she had not been so open in her formally evaluated reflections and she forcefully asserted that she knew I would read them and factor them into my final grade for her, so of course she could not seriously question aspects of her student teaching experience. This sentiment appears to be consistent with research presented by Linda Barrows (1979) that reinforced the notion that: *One of the major functions of the cooperating teacher and supervisor is to evaluate student teacher performance. The evaluative function of these two immediately gives them power over the student teacher... The need to obtain a positive evaluation from their cooperating teachers leads student teachers to initiate, and not experiment, to conform and not challenge, and to accept and not question. (pp. 24-27)* My student teachers apparently had been hesitant to include their more passionate and intense insights for fear of being judged. However, this may also suggest that even though deep reflective thinking may not be evident in formally evaluated reflective pieces, critical reflective processing was perhaps occurring under the radar.

⁶ Actually, I was quite surprised with the level of discomfort the cooperating teachers had with this term. The term apparently represented to them a quality that was definitely not appropriate for the description of a student teacher but could possibly be reserved to describe an accomplished colleague. The initial discomfort cooperating teachers had with the ‘distinguished’ designation evaporated during the semester. All but one cooperating teacher used the ‘distinguished’ or highest rating on the INTASC final evaluation rubric in *every* category.

⁷ As previously discussed, student teachers were actively encouraged during their pre-student teaching preparation to be ‘reflective’ in their journal writing. These reflective pieces were maintained in two forms: the Student Teacher Notebook journal and entries in response to the Reflection Prompt Form. Some students also maintained their own private journals during their student teaching.

⁸ Over the course of the three semesters in which I supervised I was assigned to supervise both elementary and various secondary content areas. When I was beyond the range of my expertise, I

was forced to focus more on the ‘how’ of teaching instead of the ‘what’. I do not know how this impacted my supervision, but I found that I could usually adapt.

⁹ This directive offers a very vague reference to the community/school context. This minimal treatment falls in line with previous sets of expectations for student teachers and cooperating teachers.

5. CHAPTER 5: THE LIVED EXPERIENCE OF POWER IN STUDENT TEACHING TRIADS

5.1. 'and Me'

[Q]ualitative researchers do not attempt to separate themselves from what they know tacitly or, for that matter, openly. Indeed, they use their tacit knowledge in important ways. (Ely, 1991, p. 104)

Serendipity brought me to Cumberland University as a supervisor of student teachers... a chance reunion with a former colleague, now a professor, at a conference... the introduction to an assistant dean of an education department who mentioned an opening... the winding down of a meeting with the department head about a possible position, during which I had surmised I would not be suited and my off-handed remark that perhaps I could assume a part-time position... his enthusiastic acceptance revealed too many teacher candidates with too few supervisors... I was in.

I proceeded into my new position, armed with a wealth of written resources and directives. I had made initial acquaintance with many helpful and friendly university people at a series of meetings. The weight and reality of my new responsibility, however, did not register with me until the first meeting I had with my cohort of student teachers. My former engagements with power had left me very sensitive to power differentials. It had been quite a while since I had been so intimately involved with a role that was infused with such obvious issues of influence and control. My power antennae were definitely up.

During that first meeting with my student teachers I was reminded of the fragile nature of my novice status as well as the amount of power I was about to wield. One of the student teachers abruptly raised a question for me; "This isn't the *first* time you have ever supervised student teachers, is it?" Desperate panic was evident in the voice of this young woman who had

obviously invested very heavily in the student teaching process. Tension was palpable. Student teaching was definitely viewed as a make or break experience by the young woman. As I surveyed the room, it became apparent that the others shared her anxieties. The hushed group anticipated my reply and I soothed them with a partial truth: “Well, I have worked with teacher candidates at the University of Pittsburgh...”, invoking the name of a neighboring mighty institution and intimating much closer involvement in the supervisory role than was actually the case. I had been a Teaching Fellow for two semesters. My duties included the teaching of a *Social Foundations of Education* class, but no traditional student teaching supervision. I had embellished the truth. They collectively took the next breath and we moved on. I was struck with how they had attended to my every word. This initial impression was consistently reinforced as I assumed my supervisory duties in the field. The student teachers acquiesced to my suggestions at almost every turn. Cooperating teachers treated me with much deference most of the time. I truly began to feel like the ultimate power of the universe.

When I began my graduate work, I had aspired to an administrative position, but one semester of shadowing my high school building principal had raised serious reservations for me. During this time I had also taken a few graduate courses that focused on public school administration. It was there that I found a voice that gave me guidance and perspective as I approached this new position.

Noreen Garman taught the *Fundamentals of Supervision* course. Her work focused on supervision, especially the discourse surrounding clinical supervision. A prominent element of Noreen’s supervisory perspective is captured in the following:

The taken-for-granted procedure of observation, judgment, and prescription, done in a single visit, makes the supervisor accountable for obvious questions. Is the supervisor a specialist in teaching? Does he or she understand how to characterize the teaching act being observed and to speak the language of instruction? Has the supervisor sufficient

understanding of how teachers change their teaching habits? By acting out the role of supervisor, are we pretending to know what effective teaching is while we judge the classroom action and hastily determine what the teacher can do to improve. The infrequent visitations by supervisors only add to the questionable practice. Do we honestly believe we are improving instruction by appearing in the teacher's life space for a brief moment? The old clichés about unskilled supervision in this era of professional accountability may render that kind of pretense a form of quackery. (Garman, 1986, pp. 150-151)

Often, much thoughtful dialogue and good-hearted intent can be encapsulated in just a few words and Noreen provided this for me with her piercing question to us all... "*Who gives you the right to judge?*" This became my silent mantra as I began to navigate my new social terrain.

How I perceived the thoughts and feelings surrounding my own student teaching experience significantly influenced my initial supervisory role enactment. I believe my previous experiences as a student teacher and teacher had a direct effect on what I noticed and cared about as I supervised. My student teaching experience had been a very significant one and greatly influenced my later career as a teacher. Virginia Koehler (1988) points out that my experience was not a singular one:

The cooperating teachers felt that the strongest influence (both positive and negative) on their learning to teach was their student teaching experience. Only one could not recall it. Several recounted, in detail, the ways in which their cooperating teachers had run their own classrooms, and what they retained or rejected from those classrooms in their own teaching. For one teacher, the experience was too short and just a blur at this time, and for another, the experience was so negative that it kept her out of public school teaching for several years. (Koehler, 1988, p. 30)

During interviews with the cooperating teachers in this study, I found they often mentioned and referred, without my prompting, to their own student teaching experiences in relation to an issue being discussed. These veteran teachers usually became quite animated when describing those distant events. The emotional levels they displayed during these references indicated that

very strong connections, both intellectually and viscerally had been forged. I completely understood.

My initial supervisory role enactment also drew upon my own cooperating teacher experience. During my twenty-five plus year teaching career, I had only worked with one student teacher. I had found the cooperating teacher role comfortable. My student teacher had been very mature, articulate and well prepared.

Helpful supervisory guidance also came from Paula Hanson, the Director of Field Services. Paula had been very encouraging and kind with me, especially at the beginning of my first assignment. As I worked with her over the course of three semesters and twenty-five student teachers, I came to appreciate her genuine concern for the students in the field. She expressed to me more than once how “pressure-filled” the student teaching experience was. Paula appeared to appreciate how vulnerable student teachers often were in their placements. This belief was apparent in her interactions with student teachers that were unable or unwilling to conform to the general expectations of the student teaching program and/or specific requirements of cooperating teachers. When I had occasion to consult with her concerning a troubling or even explosive issue, she was always available with judicial perspectives and encouragement and always backed me up with an assortment of university resources. I truly attempted to keep her apprised of possible trouble spots, usually with email interchanges. When I had to deal with particularly challenging situations, we worked together to satisfactorily resolve the issue.¹

In the following sections, as I portray events and people, I will attempt to create a sense of what transpired between myself and the other members of the student teaching triads under study. Each triad member exercised a form and quantity of social power inherent in their initially enacted and subsequently reenacted scripted roles. This power was embodied in how triad

members were able to define and influence/control events and issues contained within each triad configuration in relation to other triad members. Each student teaching triad presented a unique overall power dynamic contingent upon individual triad member's attitudes, dispositions and experiences. The power dynamics of each triad also reflected general and idiosyncratic material and structural considerations.

The "and Me" was an integral part of each triad. While remaining essentially what I previously described and what I am, the "and Me" became qualitatively different with each new triad configuration. As I perceived/interpreted/defined/redefined transpiring social realities, especially in relation to my own ability to influence and control events and people, I made both subtle and pronounced shifts in the performance of my role. In each triad configuration portrayal, I have attempted to capture these personal shifts. The more challenging task, however, was to discern and articulate role changes/power shifts for other triad members.

5.2. Molly and Beth and Me

[There are] two critical steps that dominate the student teaching experience. The first is imitation and identification. The student teacher views the cooperating teacher as a model of good teaching and will imitate the teaching style of the cooperating teacher closely – patterning procedures, routines and style. The second step that dominates the student teaching experience is socialization using dependence attachment because the cooperating teacher is not only the supervisor but evaluator as well. (Cotton, 1992, p. 4)

Molly Harcourt's first placement was in a second grade classroom at a suburban school. Her cooperating teacher, Beth Nolan, had worked with many Cumberland University student teachers. Beth Nolan had recently received an award from the university for having had the most student teachers over the course of her teaching career. She was very proud of this

accomplishment, as she related, “at the young age of forty-seven.” Mrs. Nolan was enthusiastic, energetic, likable and quite articulate.

I supervised Molly during my third semester with Cumberland University. By that time I had successfully supervised fifteen student teachers. Molly’s cosmopolitan outlook stood in stark contrast to that of the other student teachers who, like Molly, had grown up in this rural, rather conservative community. Molly had traveled in Europe, Africa and the Caribbean and openly shared stories and insights about her adventures. She was also very willing to share her perspectives on the responsibility schools had to fairly and justly meet the needs of all students no matter what, as she insisted, “they brought to the table.” This sensibility was evident in Molly’s response to a question on her *Personal Data Information Form* that was included in the initial packet of information I received:

[M]any of today’s students come from less than desirable backgrounds and I want to offer them hope for a better life. I am a firm believer in the power that learning can have and I believe that learning does not only exist in the classroom, but you can learn from all aspects of life. I want to show my students that learning never stops.

Molly’s minor was *Ethnic Studies* and she commented that this coursework influenced her teaching:

Middle-class white students all have the same experiences. That’s why I try to bring more multicultural perspectives in... especially since we are becoming more ‘global’.
(Interview Tape/A, 154)

After graduation, Molly had taught for a year at one of two Christian private schools in Haiti. Ninety percent of Haitian schools are private. This school of two hundred Haitian students had more resources than most. The parents of these children for the most part held government jobs. Although Molly found the position to be initially satisfactory, she eventually became dissatisfied with the nature of instruction. All class work was driven by the use of workbooks.

The teacher was, as she stated, “a facilitator and did little or no direct instruction.” Molly returned home after a year and was employed by the local private, K-12, Christian [Mennonite] school that she had attended and graduated from. The class she now teaches includes fourteen students. Molly Harcourt has been very pleased with her new job.

During her student teaching Molly was consistently student focused. This was reflected in her journal entries:

I am always learning things about my students. I guess the biggest thing I've learned this week is although they are all good children, they may try to test me to see what they can get away with. I need to [be] firm, yet fair and that is sometimes a bit hard for me. I also learned how much they value my time and my opinion. I want to make each of my students feel loved, no matter what they may act like, or how they perform academically. (Reflection Prompt Form, 01.28.02)

I think I have learned to love my students more this week. I am learning to understand their personalities. I am looking beyond the exterior of the children who are giving me problems and trying to understand why they do the things they do. I think that is so important as a teacher. I only hope I treat them with respect and fairness. (Reflection Prompt Form, 02.18.02)

These sentiments foreshadowed Molly's later struggles with establishing and maintaining classroom order.

Tensions over discipline issues began to surface during the third week of Molly's placement:

[Mrs. Nolan] did stress that I need to continue to 'lay down the law' so to speak. I've really tried to make the students understand that I am the teacher and I am the authority in the classroom. On Tuesday, one of the boys flipped a red card² and had to write a note home to his parents. There is such a fine line between a discipline problem and just typical second grade behavior. I want to be fair, but sometimes it is so hard. Teaching is more difficult than I ever imagined. (Conference Narrative Form, 02.01.02)

In another reflective entry Molly noted that Mrs. Nolan had warned her that a disruptive student was “trying to take you for all he's worth.” Molly disagreed. Realizing that she was young and inexperienced, she wrote “he just needs someone to believe in him and treat him with kindness

and respect.” Molly viewed the discipline system that forced children to draw a different colored card at each level of offense to not be working very well. “I feel very frustrated, because I know that I have to follow Mrs. Nolan’s cues.” At this point, Molly wrote that:

She [Mrs. Nolan] doesn’t give a whole lot of feedback, but I think she would really tell me if there is something I need to improve on. So by her not saying anything, I think she believes I’m doing a good job. (Conference Narrative Form, 02.15.02)

During her initial interview for this study, Beth Nolan had commented on Molly’s initial difficulty with classroom discipline. Apparently, she knew Molly would require rather direct intervention to get her classroom management in shape, but Beth knew how sensitive Molly was and did not want to offend her. Beth was waiting for an appropriate opportunity to step in. That moment came during a classroom lesson that Molly was totally in charge of teaching. As Molly looked on, Beth abruptly stopped the lesson and reminded the students about appropriate ways to behave. Molly was shocked and a bit miffed, but she acknowledged that the incident had gotten her attention.

She [Mrs. Nolan] just stopped... stopped the kids. She talked to the kids and said, ‘Look, you need to listen to Miss Harcourt.’ It was embarrassing but I was thankful at the same time... I was not doing a good job... It was humbling to know that you, the student teacher, don’t have all the answers and can’t control everything. I really appreciated it [Mrs. Nolan’s intervention]. By that time I really appreciated her, as a person and a teacher. So I was able to take that kind of criticism... not really criticism... to have her override me. She handled it well. Didn’t berate me in front of the kids... she wanted to show them their error and then privately said to me ‘okay this is something you could have done... should have done.’ (Interview Tape/B, 40)

From that point on Molly successfully worked on specific areas of her classroom management.

Molly Harcourt’s presentation style was laid back and this often appeared less than enthusiastic. She actively worked at showing enthusiasm, as she stated, “about everything I teach, not just those lessons that I find personally enjoyable.” She struggled with stopping all

activities when classroom ‘noise’ rose above acceptable levels. Molly did not want to deny students the full benefit of any lesson. During her initial interview for this study, Molly had spoken at length about various classroom management techniques. She recalled what she felt was perhaps the most effective discipline tip she had learned from Mrs. Nolan. When the class was not attending or on task, the teacher instructed the students to put both their hands on their heads. Molly said she found this strategy to be very effective and uses it now with her own students. Molly’s reflective entries indicated that she was actively working on improving her classroom management:

This week my goal is to once again work on classroom management. I think there are some behaviors I let go that should probably be addressed. I also need to be consistent. Some students can get away with things that other students can’t, primarily because they are not ‘multiple offenders’, but that isn’t fair and I really need to work on that.
(Reflection Prompt Form, 02.18.02)

Molly had written a *Classroom Management Philosophy* as part of a methods class at the university. She had prepared a folder for the course that she shared with me for this study. Molly had entered the following at the beginning of the semester: “I feel it is vital to a healthy classroom environment that behavior problems be at a minimum, but I’m not exactly sure how to keep them there, so I’m hoping this [classroom management] class will give me the tools I need to be a successful classroom manager.” Molly went on to explain her desire to “learn how to spot behavior problems and what the response of the teacher should be. Should some behaviors be ignored, [the professor had inked in an emphatic ‘YES’] addressed promptly, [another ‘YES’] or addressed at a later time [‘YES’ again] when the teacher and the student can meet one-on one?” The professor was apparently indicating that classroom management was a complex, contextually sensitive area. Molly also wrote that she thought that if “teachers can get a handle

on classroom management, they have a good chance at succeeding in their chosen profession... Classroom management is the key to a successful and positive classroom experience.”

Molly developed another statement of her *Philosophy of Classroom Management* at the end of the semester. Molly had moved far beyond a conception of classroom management as simply discipline. Her course work had greatly expanded her notion of classroom management to include, as she shared, “...building a community, allowing students to have choices, inviting conflict, and [maintaining] high expectations.”

Molly Harcourt’s sense of self-assuredness was typical among the Cumberland University student teachers that I had worked with. Molly confidently assumed that she *could* overcome classroom management challenges. She closed her methods journal with the following: “For the first time, I feel confident in my abilities to manage a classroom.” This was written before her actual student teaching experience and her interactions with Mrs. Nolan. Molly was apparently primed for the challenges ahead. She perhaps anticipated having much more power to define and influence/control classroom management than actually occurred.

Molly had come to her student teaching with a set of specific attitudes and dispositions developed during her classroom management methods class. She had to bracket much of this knowledge, however, and redefine classroom management more in line with Beth Nolan’s expectations. This move inhibited her ability/power to define/redefine the classroom management issue but enabled her to maintain a good working relationship with Beth. Also, Molly could not incorporate more enlightened approaches from the methods class since building community takes more time and attention than the student teaching experience allowed. And finally, Beth often had mentioned to both Molly and me how student teachers were essentially “guests” in the cooperating teacher’s classroom. Beth’s perception placed Molly in a role that

apparently allowed only limited influence and control. Molly had hidden her university knowledge of classroom management techniques from Beth Nolan. She also submerged her desire to have an opportunity to try these enlightened approaches out in Beth's classroom. Molly only mentioned one occasion where she had any influence over Beth's classroom management. Molly had suggested to Beth that a different student desk arrangement might improve student behavior. Beth agreed and Molly's strategy had proven successful. Even though Molly had the knowledge and desire to more directly influence and control Beth's classroom management, she apparently acquiesced in order to establish and maintain a good working relationship with her cooperating teacher. This strategic maneuver by Molly may have denied Beth the opportunity to learn about recent classroom management research and thinking. Molly was also denied the opportunity to collegially interact with Beth in an area that was clearly defined and effectively controlled by Beth. Beth's very territorial approach to classroom management enabled her to strictly define and enforce her discipline policies and maintain a very *power over* relationship with Molly.

Molly was apparently able to maintain her sense of justice and fair play even after the necessary imposition of draconian disciplinary measures. Her actions indicate that she may have only *strategically complied* with Mrs. Nolan's classroom management techniques. At the end of her time with her second graders she wrote:

I've learned how proud they are of their individual work, especially when it comes to art. We were learning about how slaves used quilts as codes to talk about escaping slavery. I wanted each child to make a quilt patch. I was going to sew them together and create a class quilt, but as one boy put it, 'I will be so mad if you do that.' He wanted to keep his patch. Because I believe that students should have a say in what goes on in the classroom, I decided to give them their individual patches and not make a class quilt. (Reflection Prompt Form, 03.08.02)

This entry indicated that although Molly Harcourt had been faced with some bitter realities concerning student control, these experiences had not extinguished her desire to establish more egalitarian and just learning environments. Molly later indicated that she eventually incorporated her expanded vision of classroom management into her own classroom. Her initial interview responses, two years later, indicated that she had worked hard to craft discipline techniques that suited her and her students. Her pride in the accomplishment of establishing her own approach to classroom management was apparent, as had been Mrs. Nolan's comfort with *her* own approach. Since this was an area that Molly Harcourt knew Beth Nolan had assumed total influence and control it appeared that Molly now also had assumed a similar stance in relation to classroom management.

As the university supervisor, I was unaware that Molly Harcourt had struggled with these discipline issues to the extent that she had. Molly had mentioned a few issues concerning discipline policies in her reflective writing. I had assumed that these issues did not seriously challenge her. During our post-observation discussions, without Mrs. Nolan, Molly had never specifically focused on classroom management. Molly had also hidden from me, like she had from Beth, her knowledge and desires concerning classroom management. Neither Beth nor Molly had brought up specific discipline issues during the two meetings we had as a student teaching triad. Neither had ever solicited my opinions or suggestions concerning classroom management. I was aware of Beth's very strong opinions concerning classroom management, but I did not choose to influence or control these since Molly appeared to me to have *internally adjusted without reservations* to Beth's ways of managing a classroom.

I observed two classes during Molly's time with Mrs. Nolan's second graders. One was a math lesson and one was a social studies lesson. Both lessons had been planned and presented

very well. Ironically, the only **4=Distinguished** designation I had given Molly was on the second observation evaluation form and was in the area of ‘*Maintains effective classroom management for student positive behavior, social interaction, and active engagement in learning.*’ Apparently the attention of both Molly and Beth to Molly’s ability to manage the classroom had paid off. Beth’s final evaluation of Molly included a narrative section that contained the following:

*Miss Harcourt is going to make an outstanding teacher. She already has most of the pieces in place to set up and run her own classroom. She is wonderful with the students and they love her in return. **She has had the best classroom control from the beginning that I have ever seen in any of my student teachers** [Emphasis mine]. She is well prepared, knows where to go for help planning or just help dealing with the day-to-day problems. She keeps on learning and gaining insights through other teachers, texts, professional magazines and computer usage. I was happy to have her in my classroom this year. She will be sorely missed by all of us. (INTASC Final Evaluation Form, 03.15.02, Emphasis mine.)*

It appears curious that Beth would include classroom control as an especially strong feature of Molly’s performance as a student teacher “from the beginning.” This must have been a major area of concern for them both since the incident in which Beth had interrupted Molly’s class was mentioned and elaborated on during both of their interviews two years later. Perhaps, Beth had been less than candid about Molly’s struggles with classroom control to protect her student teacher. Beth knew that Molly’s future employment opportunities could be restricted because of less than stellar formal evaluations.

When I had begun to supervise student teachers for Cumberland University another supervisor had explained the protective attitude that cooperating teachers sometimes displayed towards their student teachers. Apparently this more experienced supervisor had found that cooperating teachers often would attempt to hide any weaknesses of the student teacher from the university supervisor. This strategy was apparently used to shield the student teachers from the university supervisor’s influence and control over the final grade, the assumption being that any

inconsistency would result in a bad evaluation. Cooperating teachers must hide information from university supervisors to implement this strategy. Cooperating teachers that employ this protective strategy apparently assume the university supervisor's role as basically one of an enforcer of university standards especially in relation to evaluation. University supervisors are then assumed to be there to find fault and not actively contribute to the growth of the teacher candidate. This move appears to seriously inhibit the ability of university supervisors to more realistically participate in and define the evaluative process. Again, cooperating teachers are able to maintain their *power over* status in the triad – in relation to the university supervisor as well as the student teacher.

In retrospect, I believe that I too in some ways had perceived of myself as a guest in Beth's, (and other cooperating teachers') classrooms especially in relation to classroom management. During my supervisory experiences, I was reluctant to try, directly and without prompting, to influence and control *any* cooperating teacher's discipline policies. I believed it was assumed in my scripted role as university supervisor that I possessed useful teaching knowledge and skills and should attempt to share and possibly impose this information as I worked with cooperating teachers as well as student teachers. This was a tension/contradiction that I had experienced often as I sought to enact my role as a university supervisor. My interventions were guided by the specific needs of the student teachers as they adapted themselves to cooperating teachers' methods of managing a classroom. I did not perceive of myself as an active agent of change for the cooperating teacher, like I did with the student teacher. Instead of seeking to open up spaces for student teachers to redefine classroom management, pedagogy, curriculum, student evaluation procedures, etc. I for the most part encouraged and facilitated *strategic compliance* if not *internalized adjustment*. I had apparently

totally *internally adjusted without reservations* to the ultimate power and control that cooperating teachers held - at least in the realm of classroom management.

The knowledge that cooperating teachers very often successfully hide information to protect student teachers brought a new level of awareness to me as a supervisor who evaluates. In retrospect, I believe that even though I may not have had particularly germane or effective ideas and strategies concerning classroom management techniques, which would be appropriate for Molly Harcourt in this particular classroom, I believe it would have been valuable for me to be aware during that semester of how Molly had interpreted and processed Mrs. Nolan's guidance. I feel my supervision of Molly was impoverished because I had been denied these insights. Both Molly and Beth had effectively shut me out of the student teaching triad, at least with respect to the important issue of classroom management. The issue had figured prominently in both of their recollections and neither expressed any remorse about my exclusion. Of course, this knowledge is only *now* apparent to me. At that time I assumed I was working as an integral member of a team and that perception, in hindsight, was not the case at all. That Molly and Beth felt the need to exclude me indicates that they saw me primarily as a representative of a system/institution that would not look kindly on the struggling of a student teacher.

Perceived as a weakness, Molly Harcourt's classroom control issue may have left her very vulnerable. However, I brought to my role of supervisor a specific, and I believe unique, understanding and perspective... my years of experience as a public school teacher. Molly shared with me during her initial interview that she understood my sympathetic stance in her comment: "You were fair, you know what it's like to teach." I believe Molly did perhaps perceive me to be less judgmental than perhaps my scripted university role would indicate, but

she could not ignore the inherent power of my position. This sentiment is reflected in her observation.

I felt you did a fair job in assessing weaknesses and strengths, but you would only evaluate one lesson when [student teachers] teach tons of lessons! (Interview Tape/B, 137)

Molly's reservations may have been warranted since my relatively novice status as a supervisor may have prompted me to rely on the evaluative aspects of my role, which were more clearly defined, as I exercised my weight as a university supervisor. Thus I would have been more inclined to tightly follow my role script and perhaps judge her more harshly if I had been aware of her struggle with classroom management – something I may have considered as a deficit, especially since at that time I placed great value on Mrs. Nolan's opinions and experience, as a practicing classroom teacher, perhaps to the detriment of university inculcated notions about classroom control.

Beth Nolan's apparent protection of Molly made sense to me and appeared to be a direct result of a very strong personal connection between Molly and Beth. At the end of my initial interview with Molly she had enthusiastically volunteered that "Mrs. Nolan... she was special! She was awesome!" More tempered but no less heartfelt sentiments ran through Molly's reflective entries:

She was so flexible... laid back... [she] gave me lots of freedom even when she thought, I'm sure, that the idea was not a good one. (Interview Tape/A,94)

I think part of the reason I've had a positive experience teaching math is because Mrs. Nolan really likes teaching math and has passed that excitement on to me. (Reflection Prompt Form, 01.28.02)

I definitely feel blessed to be able to work with Mrs. Nolan. I feel in the few short weeks that I've been student teaching that I've grown professionally. (Reflection Prompt Form, 03.02.02)

Beth had also felt a strong connection to Molly. She had said that, “Molly was one of the strongest student teachers I had ever worked with.” This was a mixed signal, in that Beth perhaps was pleased with Molly’s unquestioning acceptance of Beth’s guidance. Molly consistently exercised her considerable ability, and limited power, to define and consequently redefine her student teaching on Beth’s terms as she *strategically complied* with and/or *internally adjusted* to various aspects of Mrs. Nolan’s definition of the classroom experience.

During Molly Harcourt’s time with Beth Nolan, all triad members met together on two occasions. The tone of the first meeting was set by Beth who related much about former student teachers and how Molly had settled into her new role as student teacher. I paid close attention to what Beth had to say, especially in regard to how she had perceived other university supervisors. I knew that this particular information would help me to better relate to Beth. Beth had not attended the cooperating teacher reception at the university and I had not had a chance to meet with her previously. Molly concurred with Beth’s assessment of Molly’s initial performance as a student teacher. Over the course of her time with Beth, Molly had occasionally made attempts to redefine the passive aspects of her student teacher role. Beth’s open receptive nature greatly facilitated this move for Molly. I had made a mental note of the apparent chemistry between Molly and Beth. During the meeting, I went over university expectations, especially concerning cooperating teachers. Beth definitely had command of her role as a cooperating teacher and was willing and very able to express herself. Molly and I were much less willing to articulate our expectations and assumptions perhaps due to our lack of experience as triad members, as well as to our general reticence. Beth Nolan was an enthusiastic engaged speaker.

During our second meeting together, triad members discussed Molly’s successes and foreshadowed her next placement. Again, Beth confidently related how she had perceived

Molly's performance as a student teacher. By that time Molly had finally attended to some missed requirements for me, but I still had reservations about her apparently cavalier initial attitude. Molly Harcourt's behavior appeared at odds with what I had experienced with other student teachers and I was not comfortable dismissing it. I believe my willingness to adopt a more judgmental attitude with Molly versus Beth was also due to my awareness that after the semester I would not have a working relationship with Molly. Working again with Beth Nolan was more likely. This type of thinking appears to further marginalize the student teacher as an influential member of the student teaching triad. I had apparently *internally adjusted* to this asymmetrical power balance in the student teaching triad.

Much useful information surfaced during the initial interviews that I conducted with Molly Harcourt and Beth Nolan for this study. Molly's responses to the initial set of interview questions indicated that she had perceived the cooperating teacher's influence and control to be the most prominent in decisions made about *what* and *how* to teach:

I didn't do anything that was different from what they already do.
(Interview Tape/ B, 90)

[I] assumed I would just take on their style... [I] was comfortable with... was something that worked. (Interview Tape/B, 28)

I had anticipated that Molly and Beth would indicate that I may have had *some* influence and control in all three areas, the *what*, the *how* and the *evaluation* thereof, but this was not the case. They indicated that my strength was in the evaluation realm, none in the *how* and a marginal amount in the *what*. This last area included the development and implementation of a unit plan. Student teachers were required to develop an original unit plan that basically was a set of lessons that followed a central curricular theme. In my syllabus, I had included very specific

requirements for the assembling of the unit and an evaluation rubric. When I asked Molly about this she replied:

*Oh yeah... I do remember following it...
it [syllabus requirement] didn't make much of an impression I guess.*
(Interview Tape/A, 135)

Molly Harcourt had prepared a unit plan with a multicultural theme that minimally met my syllabus requirements. She obviously had been less attentive in her attempts to please me by strictly following my unit plan guidelines than she was in her efforts to please Mrs. Nolan. I had assumed that I had the ability and power to define the unit plan for the student teachers with whom I worked and I had expected them to carefully adhere to the outlined specifications. Molly and I had never attempted to negotiate the unit plan. Like the discipline issue, Molly had hidden information from me. She felt that there were just too many bookkeeping requirements and that she was overwhelmed with them.

I knew my personal bond with Molly Harcourt was not as strong as the one she had with Beth Nolan. Molly, with her general acquiescence to Beth's demands, had *internally adjusted* or *strategically complied*, and thus positioned herself positively in relation to Beth. Was this an area where she could forgo her distrust of me as a supervisor because she was sure Mrs. Nolan could protect her or was Molly just worn out from all of the bookkeeping demands? Molly exercised her ability to redefine my role in relation to herself and Beth and perhaps minimize the only area where it was assumed I held almost absolute power.

As for the influence of outside sources on decision-making in the classroom, Molly Harcourt's responses indicated non-existent or minimal influence and control:

[I was] not influenced by much policy outside of my particular classroom. (Interview Tape/B, 7)

Molly apparently did not view textbooks and curriculum guidelines as outside policies, or she assumed that such definitions of *what* to teach were givens or unproblematic.

Beth Nolan agreed that the cooperating teacher essentially determined what must be taught within the given curricular framework and existing policies. This was also the case with *how* things should be taught. Mrs. Nolan, like most of the other cooperating teachers, had very definite ideas about this *how*. They had spent considerable energy developing successful models of classroom management and other aspects of their instructional role in relation to students, and they would not entertain any suggestions for change, except for perhaps marginal adjustments.

Molly Harcourt and Beth Nolan expressed essentially the same sentiments concerning the influence and control exerted by educational actors in the greater school community as well as parents and other members of the general community. Beth mentioned the influence and control of parents only once and that was in reference to decision-making concerning *how* things are taught. Beth talked about how visiting parents often comment on how the kids are so well behaved in her class (i.e. classroom management). This was obviously a source of pride for Beth and she was pleased that Molly heard these parent comments. Beth also indicated that she had included Molly directly when accepting these accolades from parents. She wanted them to know that Molly was an integral part of the class and was also responsible for the student's exemplary behaviors.

When queried about assessment issues, in relation to her formal evaluations, Molly indicated that:

[I] appreciated the evaluations a lot... a lot. The INTASC form was helpful. (Interview Tape/B, 190)

You feel like you have to live up to these expectations, but... it [evaluation process] was empowering... great for my self-esteem... I like a lot of feedback... not harsh but 'this is something you could be doing better'. (Interview Tape/B, 215)

As Molly Harcourt's university supervisor, I noted that Molly had not attended to a major university requirement: the *Student Teaching Notebook*. Again, I sought to exercise my power as enforcer of university standards by explicitly setting out in my syllabus what I had expected. Molly had not assembled and maintained this necessary artifact. I had noted this on the formal midterm evaluation that I prepared for her and warned her that her final grade would reflect this omission. During the enactment of my university supervisor role, an important symbolic event occurred at the beginning of each formal observation session. This was the presentation of the *Student Teaching Notebook* to me by the student teacher for inspection. It was expected that all required components of the notebook would be present. This notebook requirement had been strongly emphasized to all student teachers prior to the student teaching field experience. Molly had not had one to turn in during either of the two times I had formally observed her.

I now believe that Molly Harcourt's resistance concerning this issue was partly the result of an overall resentment she harbored concerning the inordinate amount of paperwork required, especially the meticulous and detailed lesson planning. During our initial interview for this study, when prompted about the constraints she felt while enacting her student teacher role, she had shared:

*The only constraint I had was writing those lesson plans. That was my huge frustration. My friends had gone to block planning [an abbreviated form of lesson planning]... talk about time-consuming. I had **no** social life. (Interview Tape/B, 99)*

During her student teaching, I had sensed Molly Harcourt's frustration with the required paper work but I didn't take the time to adequately explore this with her. As university

supervisors, we were given leeway to move student teachers into the more relaxed block lesson planning after consulting with the cooperating teacher. I don't know if I would have done this for Molly since she had not attended to the notebook requirements. I'm not sure if this posture represented my desire to act as a bureaucrat or whether it was because I believed the detailed plans would have helped her. I am inclined to think the former. However, I certainly would have factored her frustration into my decision if I had been aware of the depth of her discomfit. Molly had successfully hidden her true feelings from me. Her *strategic noncompliance* had perhaps denied her a more empathic understanding from me, but again, to her I was still the official representative of a very demanding institution who could judge her harshly and actually I did.

During her initial interview for this study, Beth Nolan expressed that she felt very empowered as a grade-giver. She acknowledged that a "poor grade meant no future employment." Beth spoke of a marginal student teacher [not from Cumberland University] that had received a B- grade from her. She felt she could do this since the individual already had a job at a private school. Mrs. Nolan had written an elaborate letter for any future employer of this student teacher explaining strengths and weaknesses. Mrs. Nolan's responses clearly indicated that she saw her role as gatekeeper to the teaching profession as a vital one. Mrs. Nolan employed an interesting evaluation technique. She established what she referred to as a "sort of wait time" when she presented a student teacher with her official evaluation form. Mrs. Nolan would schedule a session to review the results the next day, after the student teacher had, as she stated, "some time to think about it." She felt this dynamic created a less-stressful environment for discussion. Mrs. Nolan stated that she used this strategy to promote more "honest exchanges." Although it may appear that the student teacher could have had some real control over the final evaluation decisions made by Mrs. Nolan, this was not the case. Indeed, Mrs.

Nolan indicated that she had never felt compelled to change or even alter her original evaluations after these discussions.

During the semester I had struggled with my gatekeeper role as far as grades were concerned. Although the *Student Teaching Handbook* indicated that letter grades of A, B, C, etc., were to be given at the end of the student teacher experience, during my previous semesters of supervision I had found that this scheme was not adequate. Everyone with whom I spoke indicated that letter grades other than an A were perceived as “the kiss of death” in terms of future employment. In Molly’s case, I anticipated the denial of a solid A since she was not meeting my notebook requirement. I definitely did not want to give her a B. I had previously approached Paula Hanson, the Director of Field Services, relatively secure in the fact that I had proven my competence as one of her university supervisors. I had approached this issue in an electronic interchange. Ironically, I had drawn upon my rookie status hoping that in case she found my request unacceptable she would still view me favorably since I was new at the supervisor game. My need to please was in full bloom. I had opened with a litany of worthiness in the following:

>>> 12/04/01 06:28AM >>>

Hi Paula,

It's been kind of nice not to hear from you - no fires to put out! Things have settled down a bit. [Mike] is doing well at Hunter so far, [William] has not contacted me with any problems this week - his coop. has returned and [Alan] is working hard with [Todd Kessel] who is insisting that [Alan] get an A in student teaching. [Janice's] coop. would like to see her get an A -, which leads me to my question... do supervisors ever give + or - ? I have never been real keen on this, but I find it difficult to rank all of the ST's with a solid A, since a couple of them have really struggled. I guess I wish to qualify my endorsements for future employers. Any thoughts?

JR

>>> 12/04/01 09:37AM >>>

Janet,

As far as - and + ... we do give those in student teaching. A, B- or B+ or A- or B+ or C+... no C- as that's failing. As far as the cooperating teachers... of course the second one is going to pull for the A as they develop a relationship with the student... only the supervisor can give the grade for both experiences and that's strictly your call. Look at all that happened during the first experience and go with your "gut" level. Ask yourself how much they have grown during the second part... also consider whether the cooperating teachers in the 2nd 8 weeks are "easier" on them... what are the factors making the difference... if they truly have grown and you see marked improvement, then an A- or B+ is fine to give.

Hope this helps.

Paula

Paula alluded to how cooperating teachers shelter or are easy on their student teachers, especially when they have established close positive relationships with them. She reminded me that I was to consider both placements for the final grade. She also reinforced my scripted role as final arbiter of the grade, but she had given me some leeway in the enactment of it. This policy was not stated explicitly in the handbook. I had to personally negotiate it with her. I was afraid to use my power to define the grading structure without Paula Hanson's approval. I don't know why this issue was not handled more directly and perhaps made part of official university policy. If Paula had denied my request, I am sure I would have strategically complied and made peace with an inflated grade.

Apparently, there was a de facto pass/fail grading system in place. The university's silence on the issue may be seen as an attempt to hide information from student teaching triad members about how grading really worked. Teacher candidates needed to succeed and the grade of A meant they had successfully completed the program at Cumberland University. Also, university supervisors had little *but* the final grade as a basis for influence and control within the student teaching triad with respect to classroom decision making.

This interchange concerning grades with Paula Hanson resolved the tension I was experiencing in my gatekeeper role. I was very relieved to be able to tweak the letter grades. I utilized this de facto pass/fail system. In the evaluation of twenty-five student teachers, I had only ever once assigned a grade other than an A+, A or A-. That student had consistently demonstrated poor performance and made only modest efforts to improve. With Paula's approval I gave the student teacher a very low grade.

Molly Harcourt concluded the first half of her student teaching experience in stellar fashion. I was very pleased with her progress and, except for her lack of detail in regard to my notebook requirements, expected her to receive an excellent final evaluation at the conclusion of her second placement. In the last weekly packet she had submitted during her first assignment, Molly had included the following:

Well, this is it. My first placement is over. It's so hard to believe. Mrs. Nolan gave me a great final evaluation and told me that I did an excellent job and will make a great teacher. I was so happy to hear that. When I left yesterday I felt like I was floating on air.
(Conference Narrative Form, 03.16.02)

5.3. Molly and Ruth and Me

Molly Harcourt's second placement was with a class of fourth grade students again at a suburban school. Her cooperating teacher, Ruth Bailey, had supervised thirteen student teachers over the course of her twenty-nine year career as an educator. All of these student teachers had been women and only one had not been from Cumberland University. Ruth Bailey embodied for me the Cumberland University ideological discourse of reputation and dependability... solid, steady and very predictable. Ruth Bailey appeared to have *internally adjusted* to all aspects of her role as cooperating teacher. When interviewed, she shared that she had never had *any* conflict with any student teacher she had supervised.

During Molly Harcourt's initial interview for this study, she had definitely favored Mrs. Nolan (Beth) over Mrs. Bailey (Ruth) as a cooperating teacher when responding to most questions. When I asked Molly about this, she had said she thought it was because of the *Professional Seminar*, during which she had spent time in Beth's classroom. The strong personal bonds Molly and Beth had established undoubtedly also colored Molly's responses:

For some reason, mostly when I'm talking its about Mrs. Nolan because I knew her longer... because of Prosem... I knew Mrs. Bailey too, but not quite as much. (Interview Tape/B, 120)

Molly, however, did recognize that Mrs. Bailey was an accomplished, seasoned cooperating teacher with much to offer:

She [Ruth Bailey] is an experienced teacher and I've already learned some great ideas from her. I think this will be another successful teaching/learning experience. (Conference Narrative Form, 03.24.02)

I don't think she [Mrs. Bailey] was necessarily not as good [as Mrs. Nolan], but I just didn't know her as well, so it was probably more difficult for me to talk things over with her. We just didn't have the same 'chemistry'. I think it was more of a personality issue than a better/worse cooperating teacher scenario. (Email, 02.19.04)

Ruth Bailey considered Molly Harcourt to be average in comparison to the other student teachers she had supervised. She stated that Molly was very organized and good at locating outside resources. She also felt that Molly had good control of the classroom. Ruth reported they had a good rapport between them and she could not recall any area of disagreement since as she stated, Molly wasn't "that kind of personality." Although Ruth saw Molly's student teaching performance as "run of the mill" she nonetheless had included the following in her final evaluations:

A combination of [Molly's] calm personality, sense of responsibility, conscientious attitude, and creativity enhances her attributes as an excellent teacher. (INTASC Final Evaluation Form, 05.02)

I recommend [Molly Harcourt] for any teaching position. A district will benefit from her expertise. She is a competent teacher, one a district would be pleased to have as a member of the teaching staff. (Student Teacher Recommendation Form, 05.08.02)

During the initial interview for this study, Ruth Bailey had carefully explained how she introduced student teachers to what was expected of them and she also indicated how the student teaching experience would flow:

First of all, I told her what had to be taught according to the curriculum. And then, I sort of give a lot of free reign making sure they teach what has to be taught but how they want to teach it is up to them. I offer them a lot of my different plans. I say you're welcome to use these, but if you can do [it on your own], that's fine. Now, with Molly she found a lot of things on her own, she went on the Internet to find activities, she was pretty creative on her own. I actually tell them what lessons they have to teach. I don't say here's the manual go through it and teach. I say I want this taught, this taught, and this taught, but they can teach however they want to. (Interview Tape, 52)

We planned every Friday...we always get a reflection on Friday...she always has that filled out ahead of time. I can't remember if this was the year I filled one out too. Some years I have to fill one out [required by university supervisor] and then we discuss all together... I can't remember ... We always talked about that and then each time we talked about the scope for the next week and then we got into specific days what we are going to try and cover each day and what you didn't cover that day, just goes to the next day. And each day at the end of the day I would tell her I thought went well, what maybe she could improve on, or maybe try this it might work better. She had good control of the class. (Interview Tape, 119)

When questioned about decision-making concerning *what* was taught, Ruth Bailey's responses were very similar to Beth Nolan's and most other cooperating teachers. She felt that the curriculum, as framed by the state and determined more specifically by the school district, had to be strictly followed. Mrs. Bailey expressed that she was feeling pressured by the current emphasis on standards-based instruction and especially the stress on testing. She readily admitted that now she had to "teach to the test." When Molly Harcourt had been with her the move to this new posture had just begun.

Ruth Bailey had provided a curious response when I asked her if she could recall a student teacher that had brought new ideas and techniques that Mrs. Bailey may have found beneficial. She had paused and began speaking of the only student teacher she had supervised who was not from Cumberland University. “I actually learned from *her*...” Except for this instance, Mrs. Bailey indicated that she for the most part saw herself as knowing much more than her student teachers. She comfortably exercised her power to define and redefine her role in relation to her student teachers.

Molly Harcourt continued to actively develop classroom management in her second placement. Her *Reflection Prompt Forms* indicated that she had maintained her student-focused orientation. She now more directly attended to individual students as she began developing specific strategies to meet their needs:

I learned a lot about one of the girls in my class. She constantly says she is stupid. I disagree and tell her so. I think she could be very bright, but she is discouraged with school. My goal is to reach her and build her confidence. I realize that I only have a few more weeks with her, but I think some positive attention and encouragement could really benefit her. (Reflection Prompt Form, 03.29.02)

I am continuing to learn how showing a student positive attention can really boost a student's self-esteem. Some of my students come from families that leave much to be desired³ and they require lots of love and attention. I try to talk to many of them about the things they are interested in. I want to let them know that I truly do care. (Reflection Prompt Form, 04.05.02)

Molly Harcourt's ability to be more specifically student-focused was perhaps because of the highly managed nature of Ruth Bailey's classroom. Unlike Mrs. Nolan's second grade where she had spent considerable energies on effectively managing the classroom, Mrs. Bailey's older students were very controlled and required minimal effort from Molly to maintain this pattern. Mrs. Bailey had very strict and explicit requirements for behavior. The fourth grade class had over thirty students and the physical space was extremely cramped.

During her initial interview, Ruth Bailey expressed that she felt previous teaching experience had played a “big role” in her discipline style since she had “made all the mistakes.” Mrs. Bailey signaled that she had redefined her disciplinarian role many times as she forged her own style of classroom management over her teaching career. When queried about possible empowerment or constraints that her role might engender, she stated that she “felt empowered, yeah, I feel like I’m in charge of it.” At this point in the interview, I remember Mrs. Bailey had displayed an uncanny flash of emotion as she enunciated, and tapped out with her finger, that “*You have to be consistent [tap], firm [tap] and fair [yet another tap]... exactly... And if you’re that, that’s about all you have.*” (Interview Tape, 187-250) As the interview had wound down, Ruth relaxed a bit. She admitted, “*I’m pretty structured... I like things to flow well... Sometimes I think, maybe, I didn’t give them [student teachers] enough slack.*” (Interview Tape, 284)

Ruth Bailey’s supervision style can perhaps be discerned more fully from Molly Harcourt’s observation that:

Mrs. Bailey offers feedback at the end of each day about my lessons. I believe she is satisfied with my teaching so far. I had several questions to ask her about my [full time] teaching the week after next and she was able to answer all of them for me. (Conference Narrative Form, 04.05.02)

Mrs. Bailey said that my first science lesson went well. She didn’t actually come out and say it but I think she thought Tuesday’s lesson wasn’t nearly as good. She’s right. It wasn’t. I tried a new strategy for learning vocabulary and it did not go smoothly. However, I am using this as a learning experience and I am not discouraged. (Conference Narrative Form, 03.29.02)

Apparently, Mrs. Bailey had a very reserved supervision style. Molly had sensed that Ruth would only comment directly on successful lessons. Molly had previously worked with Beth Nolan, whose supervision style was very open and qualitatively different from Mrs. Bailey’s. Molly and Beth had also developed the capacity for robust dialogue between them.

Unfortunately, Molly had interpreted Ruth's silence on the vocabulary lesson to imply that the lesson had not worked out very well, yet Ruth had shared a different perspective with me in her interview concerning the vocabulary lesson.

Ruth, who had struggled to recall specific information about Molly during her initial interview two years later, did remember that she and Molly had attended a workshop together and brought many interesting language arts ideas back to try in the classroom. Ruth was very pleased that Molly had attempted some of these new strategies in her vocabulary lesson, although at the time Mrs. Bailey had not been compelled to mention her satisfaction with Molly's attempts. Instead of working together to get the bugs out of the new lesson, Mrs. Bailey's reticence caused Molly to internalize the defeat as her own. Ruth's sharing of how to adapt new ideas and techniques in the classroom could have helped Molly here. Why had Ruth not been willing to take a risk and move beyond the tightly scripted role of expert? She too was not familiar with the innovative new techniques. Perhaps she preferred to work those bugs out without the student teacher present. Did Mrs. Bailey perceive that her role as master teacher would somehow be compromised by tentatively sharing knowledge and skills with a novice and thinking out loud about how to present new materials and ideas? Had a teachable moment been squandered? Mrs. Bailey had chosen to exercise her power to reinforce her own perceptions of what she should do as a proper cooperating teacher as she had *internally adjusted* to it. Hiding her apparent satisfaction with Molly's lesson maintained and reinforced Mrs. Bailey's strict, structured way of supervision as she maintained her *power over* Molly. This strategy however, created considerable self-doubt for Molly.

This interpretation is perhaps too narrowly focused since in the context of their time together Ruth Bailey and Molly Harcourt no doubt had productive interchanges. It just appears

that Mrs. Bailey would seek to control the parameters of such interactions, and with her power she could and perhaps would. Molly did describe such a productive interchange in the following:

For social studies we are learning about the Southwest. Yesterday's lesson was about discovering oil. I was not looking forward to teaching this lesson, because it is hard to make a lesson on oil interesting. Even Mrs. Bailey said how hard it was for her to teach this lesson. I found a demonstration on a website that showed how oil mixes with water and rises to the surface of the ground. Mrs. Bailey said that this lesson went really well. She told me it was better than any one she ever did. That made me feel really good. (Conference Narrative Form, 04.27.02)

In this type of informal evaluation, Mrs. Bailey's power appears located in her reluctance to provide many positive strokes. Molly was grateful for any approval since Ruth did not grant it liberally.

When I first visited Molly Harcourt at her second placement, it was obvious that she was in an entirely different context. In Beth Nolan's second grade classroom, she had worked at appearing more enthusiastic, but now she had reverted back to her original low-key manner. Older, more mature learners and a measured, exacting cooperating teacher had apparently prompted this change. Seeking to please Ruth as she had pleased Beth, Molly *strategically complied* and/or *internally adjusted* to various aspects of her performance to reflect Ruth Bailey's expectations.

As a university supervisor, by the time I had met Ruth Bailey I had begun to categorize various cooperating teacher styles. In terms of these categories, I viewed cooperating teachers, like Ruth, to be mechanically articulating and enacting their roles. Ruth had set the tone of our initial three-way meeting. It was over in a short time and consisted entirely of our making sure that all university requirements were being addressed. Ruth Bailey's confidence in her role as cooperating teacher was as strong as Beth Nolan's even though she lacked Beth's natural effervescence.

Molly Harcourt appeared to be much more submissive in her second placement. She made no attempts to utilize her albeit limited power to stretch or redefine the passive aspects of her student teacher role in relation to Ruth Bailey. I too assumed a passive stance in relation to Ruth. This was due in part to the fact that I had never before worked with Ruth. As was the case in my interactions with Beth, I sought to understand what Ruth expected of a university supervisor. Also, my novice status as a university supervisor compelled me to hold back in the face of Ruth's self-assuredness in the enactment of her cooperating teacher role. I sensed that Ruth would not take kindly to any deviation of what she perceived as a proper role performance by *any* student teaching triad member. Both Molly and I basically deferred to Ruth Bailey's smooth well-practiced role performance.

I also believe that I drew upon my past elementary student and teacher experiences. From both sides of the desk I had interacted with women like Ruth Bailey whose teaching and supervision styles were strict, self-assured and seldom questioned in their realms. In a curious way, in relation to these women, I drew upon familiar elements of both my role as an elementary student and a novice elementary teacher.

I had observed Ruth Bailey exercise an imperial manner, expecting to be treated in a deferential way, both with Molly Harcourt and later when being interviewed for this study. This later interchange reinforced initial perceptions I had come to during our interactions as student teaching triad members. I had witnessed a curious interchange when I initially interviewed Ruth Bailey. A female custodian, who was in the room when I arrived, commented that since I had chosen to interview Mrs. Bailey for my research, she now should consider herself a "celebrity." Ruth had smiled demurely and appeared quite comfortable with the comment. I had not responded to the comment at that time and was quite surprised that my interviewing would be

viewed in such a manner. Speaking perhaps more to my perceived power as a researcher, Ruth Bailey's response to the incident indicated to me that she was quite comfortable with power differentials and her place within them. Ruth consistently demonstrated this with those who held less social power than she did. I did not have the opportunity to observe her interactions with her principal or others who were above her in the pecking order of school relationships, as she perceived them.

I perceived that Ruth Bailey's relationship with me was influenced by my novice status and lack of experience as a university supervisor. Her worldview included the perception that social power was properly earned and accumulated over time. I believe in her eyes my lack of experience diluted my power potential as a representative of the university. I realize now that I could have utilized more of the power inherent within my scripted role and perhaps have offset my weakened position. I definitely did not take opportunities to question and perhaps problematize areas that would have benefited Molly Harcourt as she student taught with Ruth Bailey. Hopefully, with these more recent insights, and given the opportunity to work again with Ruth Bailey, I could encourage her to more openly share her knowledge and skills with student teachers even when such information may be tentative. As our working relationship deepened over time and trust built between us this could perhaps occur. Would Ruth then perceive such a process as a way to work more collegially with me or would she ultimately interpret such a situation as my coming to terms with the *full* assumption of my scripted powers? Either way I would perhaps be able to take a more proactive stance with her. How would future student teachers benefit from such a maneuver? If Ruth Bailey continued to believe that the maintenance of strict power codes of behavior brought the most good to her student teachers, collaborative approaches would remain tough to sell to her. Her *internal adjustment without reservations* to

her place within the student teaching triad appeared to be made up of both a proud, almost egotistical ownership as well as a sincere desire to be doing the right thing(s) as a mentor. These issues present complex motivations and challenging possibilities for the student teaching experience.

My relationship with Molly Harcourt deepened during her second placement. I appreciated her attending to her notebook and lesson plans. I also admired how she had adapted to Ruth Bailey's strict ways. Working with two cooperating teachers who displayed such different styles would challenge any student teacher.

Molly still apparently was anxious about my influence and control concerning evaluation. My second formal observation visit proved to be disastrous for her:

My least successful teaching experience was during Monday's math lesson. I accidentally starred the wrong day for Ms. Rodgers to come in, so I sort of panicked when I saw her walk in the classroom. Then I couldn't find the papers I had photocopied for the lesson (I found them later at home, because I had accidentally picked them up with some other papers). To top it off the worksheet that I used turned out to be different than I thought. I have learned my lesson. It doesn't pay to be unorganized! (Reflection Prompt Form, 05.03.02)

What I noticed that day was that Molly's performance definitely was not her best. Her lack of attention to detail did seem out of character, but I knew that we all have bad days and I am sure by that time in the semester her energies were pretty much depleted by the grinding nature of the student teaching experience. I did not view the incident as darkly as Molly assumed I would. I placed the less than perfect lesson in the context of what I believed to be a successful student teaching performance. I gave Molly a solid A for her student teaching efforts.

As I considered the power relations within both of the student teaching triads that represented Molly Harcourt's student teaching experience, it became apparent that even though the tone of each was qualitatively different, the flow of power among triad members was very

similar. Beth Nolan and Ruth Bailey both maintained *power over* stances in relation to Molly Harcourt. Neither appeared to deviate from their well-practiced and performed roles, exercising considerable control over Molly as a student teacher and me as the university supervisor. Beth Nolan never interrogated her motives and behaviors in relation to her mentoring of student teachers. Ruth Bailey at one point referred to her perhaps too strict stance with her student teachers but did not indicate that she intended to loosen up in any way.

Even though it was apparently scripted that my relationship with both Beth and Ruth would embody a more *power with* orientation I felt that, especially with Beth, this had not been the case. Molly's struggles with classroom management had been deliberately hidden from me. In both triads, because of my novice status as a university supervisor, I had held back from more directly questioning the motives and behaviors of both cooperating teachers. Neither Mrs. Nolan nor Mrs. Bailey had challenged my final assessment of Molly Harcourt. Her overall compliance had enabled the establishment and maintenance of good working relationships with both her cooperating teachers, albeit Beth's may have been a more animated one.

Nevertheless, Molly appeared to have decided to resist my influence and control as university supervisor by not immediately complying with my notebook expectations. This may have occurred because she felt emboldened by her close collegial relationship, as she perceived it, with Mrs. Nolan. Perhaps Molly had also interacted enough with me to determine that, drawing from my practice-based teaching experience, I may have had some sort of sympathy with those currently teaching. Her allegiances to her university methods professors may have been degraded by practice-based, hands-on, real teaching experiences. They may also have been influenced by overt cooperating teacher comments that devalue the university experience creating a definite *us* versus *them* mentality. I may not have represented a pure professorial

university or supervisory type to her who would strongly reinforce university directives. Either way, Molly Harcourt definitely took a chance in her mild resistance to me. I also believe that Molly, with her more student-focused way of viewing education, may have seen *herself* as the client/student deserving fair, just treatment by compassionate teachers/supervisors.

In conclusion, it would appear that the power dynamics of the first triad, Molly Harcourt, Beth Nolan and me, were guided by fairly close adherence to traditionally scripted roles. This was especially the case for Mrs. Nolan. She had enjoyed the luxury of performance over time to hone her role performance. She exercised a great deal of influence and control over most aspects of the student teaching experience, except for the *formal* evaluative process. Even here, however, she had exercised considerable influence by hiding potentially negative information about Molly from me. Beth related to both Molly and me as she had with her other student teachers and university supervisors. I had minimal experience as a university supervisor and consequently framed my attitudes and actions around my perceived need to know what was acceptable and desirable in my performance, especially my ultimate control over the final grade. My novice status also inclined my adherence to the tightly scripted expectations and assumptions I had found in the *Student Teaching Handbook* and the counsel and advice from colleagues and superiors at the university as well as signals from cooperating teachers. Molly, whose position according to the student teacher script, was apparently the most fragile and contingent, appeared to utilize her ability to forge a close alliance with Beth as a means to exercise some measure of influence and control over her student teaching experience. Molly stuck mostly to the behaviorally passive posture embedded within her stated role. She mildly resisted me as the representative of the university and not I believe for strictly personal reasons.

In the second triad of Molly Harcourt, Ruth Bailey and me, the power dynamics also appeared to basically flow according to scripted roles. Ruth's role appeared to be a bit more fossilized than Beth's, but upon further consideration I believe it would be safe to assume that *neither* would be anxious to seriously examine and consequently alter the power dynamics of the traditional student teaching triad. Beth with her energetic style appeared to be more amenable to change, but that was not necessarily the case. Ruth Bailey related to both Molly and me as she had numerous other student teachers and university supervisors. As we related with Ruth in the second triad, Molly and I appeared to have become more submissive and passive. Molly reverted back to what may have been her more normal low-key personality in contrast to the constantly upbeat behavior that working with Beth Nolan had required. The establishment and maintenance of a good working relationship with Ruth had demanded this strategic maneuver. To her credit, Molly Harcourt had sensed the need for this social adjustment and acted accordingly. During this time, Molly also made peace with my university requirements and enhanced her relationship with me. I felt a familiarity in my relations with Ruth Bailey as she represented for me from my past experiences, many other traditionally oriented teachers. Her clipped, rote way of doing things was not foreign to me. I never seriously questioned her methods and attitudes, perceiving myself as a guest in her classroom as I had in Beth Nolan's.

In retrospect, I believe that most student teaching triads do not really function in a *power with* mode. Power differentials are purposefully maintained. In such a climate any questioning of curriculum and classroom management would not be seriously entertained and could cause misunderstandings among triad members, thus perhaps hurting the relational dynamics of the triad. Getting beyond the existing *power over* social dynamics that flow in the traditional student teaching triad presents a formidable challenge.

Ultimately, Molly Harcourt perceived her student teaching experience to be successful:

I definitely came out of student teaching feeling encouraged... I felt positive.
(Interview Tape/B, 237)

5.4. Heidi and Linda/Mary and Me

Analyzing the nutrition of a marshmallow, examining how blue jeans came to be, exploring the geometry of a gingerbread house, counting nickels and playing pretend instruments... Heidi Mason addressed this eclectic mix as she crafted and presented a broad assortment of science, math and language arts lessons during her student teaching experience. Heidi Mason's overall performance was typical of the Cumberland University teacher candidates I had worked with. Just as I grew to categorize various cooperating teacher styles, I had also begun to recognize and appreciate, from a supervisory perspective, what appeared to be familiar similarities among these student teachers. I had found that they, for the most part, arrived at their placements with *(strategically complied/internally adjusted)* dispositions and information necessary to succeed in their student teaching assignments. During student teaching they, again for the most part, paid scrupulous attention to what was expected of them.

Just as Molly Harcourt had confidently anticipated success with her classroom management, Heidi Mason had expected to be mentored during her student teaching by experienced, helpful, professional educators. Molly's experiences with discipline in the classroom proved to be substantially different from her expectations. Heidi, however, found her mentoring expectation fulfilled satisfactorily.

In her initial interview for this study Heidi Mason had related that:

I talked every day with my cooperating teachers about what I was going to teach and how I was going to teach it. They helped me to take my ideas and make them great... I cannot think of a time when we did not agree. I knew I was there to learn and improve and grow,

and that is why I always looked at what my cooperating teachers said to me as the best advice... I knew that my cooperating teachers and my university supervisor were there to help make my student teaching experience the best that it could be. I knew that my cooperating teachers and university supervisor had much more experience and knowledge than I have, and I was greatfull [grateful] for all the help that they could give me. (First Cycle Interview Questions, Email, 02.23.04)

Heidi Mason's expectation that her mentors would be knowledgeable and helpful positioned her to accept and work within a unique situation that surfaced when she arrived at her first assignment as a student teacher. Heidi's first placement was with Linda Bishop's fifth grade class at Norris Elementary School. During our first meeting as a student teaching triad, I found the power dynamics to be similar to both of Molly Harcourt's student teaching triads, especially in relation to the cooperating teachers' willingness and ability to define their place within the triad. At that initial meeting, Linda Bishop confidently defined her intended relationship with Heidi and implicitly her relationship with me, as she placed this new triad in the context of her former experiences with student teachers. During this initial exchange, Mrs. Bishop's comments surprised me as she redefined her mentoring role to include working closely with the other fifth grade teacher who taught with her, Mary Grant. Mrs. Bishop informed me that Heidi would be teaching Mrs. Grant's subjects as well as hers. Previously, I had supervised student teachers in schools that were more than one deep, teacher-wise, at various grade levels. In this situation, I had found that student teachers remained in the cooperating teacher's classroom and taught the subjects assigned, usually repeatedly, to separate groups of students. Teaching the same lesson more than once usually afforded the student teacher a chance to fine tune instruction and gain experience getting the lesson just right. These student teachers worked exclusively with *one* cooperating teacher and did not venture into the other grade level teacher's classroom to teach their subjects. The arrangement that Linda Bishop was suggesting was a novel one in my

experience as a university supervisor. Heidi Mason, as a student teacher, would also teach with/for Mrs. Grant as Mrs. Bishop shared her cooperating teacher role with Mrs. Grant.

My lack of experience forced me to draw primarily from my scripted role as university supervisor, especially *my perceived* role as an advocate and if necessary a protector of the student teachers I supervised. I was immediately concerned about Heidi simultaneously working with/for two cooperating teachers, especially if their teaching styles, in regard to expectations and assumptions were significantly divergent. I found myself, with my perceived novice status as a supervisor, struggling with Linda Bishop's redefinition of her mentoring role. I was also at that time experiencing difficulty, as a novice university supervisor, with the expectations and assumptions of Molly Harcourt's cooperating teachers, Beth Nolan and Ruth Bailey. These cooperating teachers had also confidently and assertively presented *their* conceptions of the cooperating teacher role, and consequently the role of the student teacher and university supervisor, as they clearly defined what they expected the power dynamics of the student teaching triad to be, in relation to other triad members. They maintained strict *power over* stances. I often held back with these triad members, not really sure of my proper role even though I desired to establish more *power with* perspectives.

I was also unsure about how the university viewed dual cooperative teacher mentoring. The *Student Teaching Handbook* had not directly addressed this unique (for me) arrangement. I made a decision to hide, or not call attention to Heidi's unusual situation, because I was afraid that Paula Hanson, the Director of Field Services, would not permit it. While I did entertain some skepticism about the proposed dual nature of Heidi's mentoring, I also recognized a possible opportunity for Heidi to work in a more collegial atmosphere. I was afraid that my alerting the university of this issue would pinch off a chance for Heidi to experience a valuable teaching

arrangement. I was also concerned about appearing *too* helpless as a beginning supervisor. I wanted Paula to expect/assume that I could make independent, reasonable judgment calls and think for myself. This positioning would hopefully help me to establish my credibility with Paula Hanson as I continued to supervise student teachers for Cumberland University.

Linda Bishop's presentation of this new arrangement for Heidi Mason created doubt and tension for me at that initial triad meeting as I hid my reservations from both Heidi and Linda. I spoke with Linda, away from Heidi, after the initial triad meeting. Linda reassured me that this unique arrangement would benefit all parties. I accepted Linda's reconfiguration of the triad and tentatively assumed a wait and see attitude. Linda Bishop thus became the official cooperating teacher and signed off on all formal evaluations. Mary Grant became a sort of shadow cooperating teacher in terms of formal evaluations but was a model and source of ideas and influence.

Through dialogue with Mary Grant and observations of her classroom, I found Mary's teaching style was very similar to Linda Bishop's. This was not by coincidence as Heidi Mason related:

While I was at Norris Elementary a lot of my decision-making was also influenced by Mrs. Grant. Mrs. Grant teaches Social Studies and Math while Mrs. Bishop teaches Science and English, Reading, and Writing. Not only did these two teachers work together as a team, but Mrs. Grant had been Mrs. Bishop's student teacher about 10 years earlier. I worked very closely with Mrs. Grant, and I used a lot of what she taught me in my lesson plans as well. (First Cycle Interview Questions, Email, 02.23.04)

Mary Grant was living proof that Linda Bishop's methods and style as a teacher could be very successfully modeled. This powerful double messaging reinforced Heidi's desire to please as she unquestioningly modeled herself after both of her cooperating teachers. Heidi Mason clearly was willing to strategically position herself as a pleaser not only to demonstrate that she

was a good student teacher but also to endear herself to her evaluators. I was not the only one seeking to please my superiors:

Today I talked [separately] with Mrs. Grant and Mrs. Bishop for a little while. We were so busy with meetings and projects that we did not have much time for conferencing, and we knew that we would not have much time any of the other days this week either. Therefore we only talked about a couple of things. When I talked with Mrs. Grant, she said that I am doing very well with everything. She doesn't really see any problems... She [Mrs. Bishop] told me that I have improved a lot over the six weeks that I have been student teaching with her. She feels that I have worked hard and that I have done a good job. I told her that I am happy with my experiences so far and that I have learned a lot not only from her and Mrs. Grant, but also from the students as well. (Conference Narrative Form, 03.05.02)

My first formal observation evaluation for Heidi indicated that I too found Linda Bishop's teaching style to be worth emulating: "Ms. Mason has very effectively modeled Mrs. Bishop's classroom environment, which is especially well organized and productive."

Heidi Mason indicated that except for initial and final conferences, she usually met separately with each cooperating teacher. My acceptance of this dual cooperating teacher arrangement had indeed presented an extra set of expectations for Heidi. She now had to please two cooperating teachers:

Today I had two different conferences. The first one was with Mrs. Grant. The second one was with Mrs. Bishop. During these conferences I talked about what I will be teaching in Social Studies and Math, what my improvements are, and what I still need to work on. (Conference Narrative Form, 02.12.02)

Heidi had internally adjusted to this dual arrangement at the time and later related:

I felt that I had two wonderful cooperating teachers that were very knowledgeable, and I wanted to learn as much from them as I could.
(First Cycle Interview Questions, Email, 02.23.04)

During Heidi Mason's eight-week placement, I met formally with Linda Bishop and Heidi as the officially designated members of the student teaching triad. When I was at the

school, however, I sought out and spoke informally with Mary Grant concerning Heidi's progress. Mrs. Grant's verbal assessments of Heidi's performance echoed Linda Bishop's. They shared similar expectations and assumptions concerning Heidi as a student teacher.

Heidi did not teach any of Mrs. Grant's classes until the fourth week of the eight-week placement. At first, Heidi taught social studies each afternoon. Mary Grant had prepared these lessons. Mrs. Grant taught these lessons in the morning to her own students. Heidi taught them in the afternoon to Linda Bishop's students. Heidi had expressed a bit of frustration with this arrangement in her observation that:

Even though we read about and talked about all of these people, my lesson ended too early. I think this happened because for one thing, I did not plan this lesson, so I had nothing extra to fall back on if I needed more. (Reflective Prompt Form, 02.22.02)

Heidi Mason had occasion to meet at times with both Linda Bishop and Mary Grant:

This afternoon I sat down with Mrs. Bishop and Mrs. Grant. Since I did not teach any lessons last week, we could not discuss my progress. Instead, we decided that I am ready to do all of the little things in the classroom at any time...They told me that they would help me to decide what to teach, but I can teach the material any way I want. We discussed how I do not have to teach the subjects in the same ways they do. I can do what I want, and I should not be afraid to try new things. (Conference Narrative Form, 01.30.02)

Mrs. Bishop and Mrs. Grant's encouragement to "try new things" turned out to be a positive aspect of Heidi Mason's student teaching experience. As Heidi reported her success with trying new things, my initial apprehension lessened about Heidi working with/for two cooperating teachers. Heidi indicated that on at least two occasions she had successfully attempted new (for her) teaching strategies and techniques:

One area where I have not had many experiences with is integrating technology into my lessons. I would like to change this. In doing so I will be working with things that I have not had much practice working with. Therefore, integrating technology into my future

lessons will be taking a big risk, but it is something that I am willing to work on. (Reflection Prompt Form, 01.23.02)

Heidi had subsequently taken her social studies class to the computer lab to work with the commercial software program, *Oregon Trail*. She had successfully paired students who had previously used the program with those who had not. This experience with technology proved to be a good one as she related:

I feel this was a great way of using technology in the classroom and a great way of introducing the westward trails to the students. Besides, they were having fun while learning at the same time. (Reflective Prompt Form, 03.01.02)

Heidi also was anxious to develop her abilities to construct assessments for her students. She wrote and administered a quiz on her own:

This week I took a risk in developing my own form of assessment in Language Arts [Mrs. Bishop's class]... This was a risk for me because I never made up something on my own to assess students before. At first I thought that my quiz was too hard because when I graded them, many students did not do so well. I did have a few one hundred percents though, which helped me feel a little better. Then when I talked to Mrs. Bishop, I felt a lot better. She told me that the grades were what she expected them to be. She said that she has found out many times that the students do not bother to learn the vocabulary words as they go along. At first, I did not think I wanted to make my own quizzes again. I thought that I was making them too hard or something. But, seeing that the students play a part in how well they do, I will make my own forms of assessment again sometimes. (Reflective Prompt Form, 02.15.02)

As this passage indicates, Heidi Mason had established a good working relationship with Linda Bishop. She relied on Linda to help her through rough spots as she tried new things. Heidi subsequently constructed and experienced success with another quiz:

Many of the students improved on their grades from the last quiz... the students have a much better understanding of figurative language now. Overall I was happier with the second quiz than I was with the first one. (Student Handbook Reflective Journal, 02.21.02)

Heidi Mason was a meticulous recorder of detail. Over her total fifteen-week student teaching experience, Heidi elaborately described the ebb and flow of classroom instruction. Her final daily *Student Teacher Notebook Reflective Journal* contained over 300 pages. This was in addition to the *Reflection Prompt Form* that she sent to me in her weekly reporting package. Heidi's extensive reflective journal entries were a boon to my supervision since Heidi's school was almost a two-hour trip from the university, and I knew I should actively monitor the dual cooperating teacher nature of Heidi's placement. With the additional burden of nine other student teachers to supervise that semester, I did not visit Heidi as much as I would have liked.

I had immediately noticed the exceptional nature of Heidi Mason's reflective journal entries. Her attention to detail created realistic snapshots for me as the absent supervisor. Although not in direct contact with Heidi most of the time, I was able to sense what she was experiencing through her reflections and comments. Heidi's ability to carefully and diligently describe and record what was happening for her greatly enhanced our relationship as student teacher and university supervisor. I was certainly pleased by her attention to detail. One outstanding example is contained within Heidi's recollection of a final meeting she had with both Linda Bishop and Mary Grant. This lengthy passage demonstrated Heidi's ability to reflect and record and its value for me as a supervisor:

Today I talked with Mrs. Bishop and Mrs. Grant for a little while. We spent the whole time discussing my overall student teaching experience with them. We discussed how I have grown a lot as a teacher over the past eight weeks. Mrs. Bishop and Mrs. Grant told me that I have done very well. It was evident that I worked hard, and I was always prepared. They told me that I did well with incorporating standards into my Math lessons and Language Arts lessons. They said that I did a good job asking students questions throughout my lessons. I asked a variety of questions where the students had to use higher-level thinking skills. Mrs. Bishop and Mrs. Grant also said that the timing and pacing of my lessons has improved a lot from the beginning to the end of my student teaching, and they have seen that I am able to adapt well to changes in school schedules...Mrs. Bishop, Mrs. Grant, and I also talked about my relationship with the students. I have become very comfortable working with the students and they can see

that. They said that I have worked well with the needs of various types of learners. I have also done a good job with communicating my expectations to the students and the students have done a good job working up to them... Mrs. Bishop and Mrs. Grant said that I have done well with grading and returning papers and tests in a timely fashion. This was good because the students benefit from that. Mrs. Bishop and Mrs. Grant said that I have worked well with all of the students over the past eight weeks. At the end of the conference, I explained to Mrs. Bishop and Mrs. Grant how I thought my experience with fifth grade went. I told them that even though it was a lot of hard work, I had a lot of fun teaching. I feel that I have learned a lot not only from them, but from the students as well. I enjoyed working with everyone, and I am happy with my experience. I think that everything went well, and I am going to miss everyone. My first student teaching experience was a success. (Student Teacher Notebook Reflective Journal, 03.13.02)

Heidi Mason's very open journaling style also prevented much hiding of information that might jeopardize her evaluations in my eyes. Molly Harcourt and her cooperating teacher, Beth Nolan, had effectively hidden useful information from me concerning Molly's student teaching. Molly and Beth's silence about Molly's difficulties with classroom management stood in direct contrast with what Heidi was willing to share. Heidi candidly related her struggles with classroom management, especially the clerical aspect of a teacher's job:

The one thing that I still need to work on is behavior management. Mrs. Bishop's class uses a money system and money is taken away from the group when a student is not prepared for class or does not behave. Mrs. Grant's [separate] class uses [another type of] ticket system where the students lose a ticket when they are not prepared for class or they misbehave. I need to work on following these systems with the classes. Mrs. Bishop suggested that I let the students know that I will take money or a ticket and I need to show them this by actually doing it. She said that if I do not start from the beginning then the students would walk all over me. The trouble that I have with this right now is that I forget to actually take money or a ticket from a student who misbehaves. I told Mrs. Bishop that I will try to work on this. Mrs. Bishop told me that I also have to start ringing the bell more to get the attention of the class. Sometimes I try to talk over them because I forget about the bell. Mrs. Bishop and I both noticed that I am starting to do this [using the bell] more and more though. I just need to make an effort to remember to do these two things [collecting the tickets/money and ringing the bell] at all times. (Conference Narrative Form, 02.06.02)

Another thing that I need to improve on is instructional and non-instructional record keeping. Since I am picking up more subjects now and actually taking some grades on things, I am responsible for recording those grades. This has not been a problem for me so far. The main problem is that there are students who are absent and need to make up

work. I need to become more responsible about knowing who those students are and getting them caught up on their work. Up until now, Mrs. Bishop did all of that. Mrs. Bishop said that this is hard to do and it can become time consuming. This is where I need to make notes of everything. Mrs. Bishop commented that every teacher should have a secretary in their classroom to do these kinds of things. I thought that was funny. What I need to do from now on is to find time to get students caught up on all their work. (Reflection Prompt Form, 02.04.02)

Heidi Mason also used journal writing to express general feelings about her experiences. She openly shared her anxieties and helped shape my perceptions of her as a student teacher. This enabled me to more fully define/redefine my relationship with her as her university supervisor. The following passages entered in Heidi's reflective journal reinforced the (expected/assumed) passive, sincere, eager to please nature of her role in relation to my (expected/assumed) role of kind, understanding, basically non-judgmental, supervisor (mentor/coach/evaluator):

As of right now I feel very nervous about student teaching and somewhat overwhelmed. It helps though to know that some of my friends feel the same way. I am sure that after some time I will begin to feel differently and those feelings will go away. Every now and then I am excited about it, but I am looking forward to when I am excited all the time. (Student Handbook Reflective Journal, 01.23.02)

I realize that this was only my second lesson, so I was not expecting it to be perfect. I know that with more practice it will come easier and lessons will go better. What is most important though is the fact that I am always doing my best and working hard. (Student Teacher Notebook Reflective Journal, 01.31.02)

I wonder how it is going to be teaching full days and all the lessons because two was hard for today... the excitement that the children have for the book makes me excited to be doing the unit. I hope the lessons go as well as the one today. (Student Teacher Notebook Reflective Journal, 02.07.02)

Heidi Mason's reflections also captured the nature of the relationships she established and maintained with both Linda Bishop and Mary Grant. In anticipation of her first full week of teaching she related:

Then [after meeting with Mrs. Grant] I talked with Mrs. Bishop for a little while. We also went over everything that I am going to be doing next week. She said that I will be in charge of doing everything, but that she will be in the room sometimes when there needs to be an extra person helping... She also explained that she would help me with grading writing pieces, since I have not had the opportunity to do this before. We are going to sit down and grade the writing pieces together. That way I can learn how to correctly grade them... The other thing we discussed was leaving me in the room alone while I am teaching. She has been doing this for short periods of time already, but she now wants to start doing it for long periods of time. She said that she feels that I will do fine with this, and I told her that I agree. Other times she will be working on things in the back of the classroom, and she told me to just pretend that she is not there because she won't be paying much attention to what I am doing anyway... After talking with Mrs. Grant and Mrs. Bishop, I feel ready to start my full week of teaching. I know what I am going to be doing, and I feel comfortable with it. I know what they plan on doing, and that they will both be there to help me out during times when they need to be there to see what the students are doing. Therefore, I should not have any problems with my full week of teaching. (Conference Narrative Form, 02.26.02)

Heidi Mason consistently wrote about her cooperating teachers and how she related to them. Her initial mentoring expectation, that her cooperating teachers would be knowledgeable and helpful, influenced her relationships with Linda Bishop and Mary Grant. She was a willing and very attentive acolyte:

When Mrs. Bishop and Mrs. Grant leave the room I am learning what it is like to handle a classroom on my own. When they are present in the room, they can tell me what went really well, and what I could have been done a little differently. Both situations have their benefits. (Student Teacher Notebook Reflective Journal, 02.22.02)

One particularly disappointing lesson brought Heidi to her mentors for support and affirmation and demonstrated that Linda and Mary also provided caring guidance:

I was upset at first that I messed up my lesson, but I talked to Mrs. Grant and Mrs. Bishop and they helped me to feel better. They said that all teachers draw blanks sometimes and that making a mistake is alright. We learn from our mistakes, so it is not all that bad. (Student Teacher Notebook Reflective Journal, 02.27.02)

Heidi also recorded how she perceived her relationship with me, her university supervisor:

My university supervisor played a big part in my decision making of classroom management and instructional strategies. Every time she came to observe me she would tell me and or write down comments and suggestions of ways in which to improve my strategies for when similar situations would occur in the future. I always took this advice and tried to find ways to use it because she was looking at the situation from a totally different viewpoint than what I had. So she may have seen things that I had no idea of... My university supervisor was also very influential to my evaluation because she observed me several times and in two different atmospheres. She was able to see how I used my previous evaluations to try to improve. She was also able to see how I could adapt to different grades and different levels of students. (First Cycle Interview Questions, Email, 02.23.04)

The advice that Heidi Mason “always took” could be found in my formal observation evaluations. Basically regulatory in tone, the following passage indicated that I was primarily focused on the correct implementation of planned lessons and the sacred *Student Teaching Notebook*. How Heidi should attend to her disruptive class may have been an opportunity for me to encourage her to look outward at issues such as how school/society plays a role in shaping student behavior. Such dialogue was very difficult with such a bureaucratic orientation and with very limited opportunities to sit and talk. I had also apparently *internally adjusted* to my primary role as the strict enforcer of university standards maintaining the unquestioned *power over* stance.

Ms. Mason provided no formal closure to the lesson. It would have been appropriate to sum up or share some pertinent information from the lesson, especially since the students had almost five minutes wait time lined up at the door. In her plans, Ms. Mason indicated that she would review with the class (Item 4) but she failed to complete this part of the lesson plan... Ms. Mason had forgotten to bring her student teaching notebook to school today. An evaluation of her notebook will be completed the next time I visit... Classroom management has also been a concern; Ms. Mason is now attending to disruptive behaviors immediately. (INTASC Observation Form/Rodgers, 02.20.02)

Heidi Mason, however, did receive her share of kudos from me:

Ms. Mason asked questions as she read; student responses were very thoughtful and creative. They obviously are asked to constantly reflect and consider at deep levels. This

is a wonderful thing to observe. All students were actively engaged with the text... Ms. Mason has demonstrated that she is very willing to improve her instruction; she and Mrs. Bishop have developed a very good working relationship. (INTASC Observation Form/Rodgers, 02.20.02)

I had initially hoped that Heidi Mason would get the opportunity to work collegially with her cooperating teachers. It appeared to some extent that she did. Heidi's reflective writing indicated that she occasionally offered suggestions and techniques concerning technology, assessments and cooperative learning. I was never present at a three-way meeting between Heidi, Linda and Mary, so I am unsure as to the true nature of their interactions. Did Heidi have the opportunity to work as a true partner with Linda and Mary, or was she merely given two sets of procedures and methods to faithfully parrot? Reality probably falls somewhere between the two. Both cooperating teachers had taught lessons designed exclusively by Heidi. Both cooperating teachers expected similar and explicit behaviors from Heidi.

Heidi Mason seemed to have *internally adjusted without reservations* to all aspects of her student teaching experience with Linda Bishop and Mary Grant. As she indicated two years later:

I always wanted to do my best and be really good, so I think I was hard on myself. I wanted to learn as much as I could from everyone and be a great student teacher. I always wanted to know what my weaknesses were and things that I could improve. I wanted help to become better. But, at the same time, it felt good to know what my strengths were and the things I did well. (First Cycle Interview Questions, Email, 02.23.04)

Unfortunately, Linda Bishop declined to participate in this study and I did not seek out Mary Grant's input. The sense of the collegiality they possibly felt with Heidi Mason would have affirmed or negated my initial decision concerning the nature of the dual mentoring arrangement. Even without this conclusive information, however, I anticipate that I, as university supervisor,

would again permit the redefinition of the cooperating teacher's role if I thought the student teacher would benefit.

Heidi Mason responded to my first set of questions for this study using an electronic format and in her typical copious style offered twenty-three pages of responses. She indicated that her cooperating teachers determined what was taught. They worked within the established school curriculum that was aligned with state standards:

At Norris Elementary I followed the curriculum that the school district was using as to what information I had to teach and what the students needed to know. However, my lesson plans and unit plan could be done in any way as long as I worked within the curriculum. Standards were also a major influence for my decision making. All my lesson plans centered around standards. Every lesson plan that I wrote had the standards listed near the top. (First Cycle Interview Questions, Email, 02.23.04)

Heidi Mason perceived my influence concerning what to teach to be contained within my directives concerning the design of her lesson and unit planning:

*My decision making [about what to teach] was also **influenced a little** [my emphasis] by my university supervisor. I followed the lesson plan format that she had given me and incorporated enough information to cover all the parts. I also had directions about all the different parts that my unit plan had to consist of, but the topic, the information, and the way I presented it was my own decision. (First Cycle Interview Questions, Email, 02.23.04)*

Heidi indicated that she felt that she had more leeway in how things were taught:

The information that I was going to teach was already given to me, but I was free to present the information in any way that I chose. My lesson plans and unit plan were mostly my own ideas... I was free to use whatever [instructional] strategies I wanted as long as my cooperating teachers felt that the strategies would work with how I wanted to use them. (First Cycle Interview Questions, Email, 02.23.04)

Heidi expressed satisfaction with her informal and formal evaluations:

My cooperating teachers were a large part responsible for how I was evaluated during my student teaching because they were the ones [who] talked to me, observed me, and helped me every day throughout my experience. And, they were the ones who saw how much I grew and improved over the whole eight week time period. (First Cycle Interview Questions, Email, 02.23.04)

My university supervisor was also very influential to my evaluation because she observed me several times and in two different atmospheres. She was able to see how I used my previous evaluations to try to improve. She was also able to see how I could adapt to different grades and different levels of students. (First Cycle Interview Questions, Email, 02.23.04)

One of the main theoretical premises of this study involves an individual's conception of social power and how subsequent/consequent perceptions create and limit relationships as they are established and maintained within specific social contexts. I found Linda Bishop's power orientations to be very similar to Molly Harcourt's cooperating teacher, Ruth Bailey. They viewed and interpreted their power webs and their places within them in basically the same ways, especially in relation to the productive and reproductive uses of their social power.

When I had initially interviewed her, I found Ruth Bailey's obvious pleasure with the deferential remark made by the custodian in reference to Ruth's perceived "celebrity status" to be indicative of Ruth Bailey's acceptance of and comfort with obvious and strict power perimeters. One of Heidi Mason's journal entries had provided an interesting insight into how Linda Bishop viewed, conceived of and exercised her social power. Mrs. Bishop had deliberately called Heidi's attention to a potential pitfall in the social dynamics of the fifth grade classroom:

This afternoon I talked with Mrs. Bishop for a little. She told me that fifth grade girls always have this power control thing. This is where one girl wants to control everything and say who can do what with. Often times this causes problems at home and at school in the classroom. She explained all of this to me because she sees this going on a little. She wanted me to be aware of all of this. She told me who she suspects. I can somewhat see this too. The important thing right now is that I am aware of it, and I know what's going on. (Student Teacher Notebook Reflective Journal, 02.14.02)

This passage revealed Linda Bishop's very structured way of interpreting social power dynamics in relation to herself and those educational actors around her. The notion that an uppity fifth grade female student may be somehow directing (misdirecting) the proper flow of

classroom procedure caused distress for Linda Bishop. Mrs. Bishop overtly recognized this power anomaly and actively sought to put it right. By stressing this situation to Heidi Mason, Mrs. Bishop decisively utilized her power to attempt to extinguish, if not on her own, with Heidi's help, this unwanted (as perceived by Mrs. Bishop) social behavior. By soliciting Heidi's compliance and vigilance, Mrs. Bishop presented this situation as a red flag event. Heidi, the ever-willing acolyte, always attentive for clues as to how to become the good teacher, apparently accepted Mrs. Bishop's interpretation of this power imbalance. Mrs. Bishop, the all-knowing mentor, presented Heidi Mason with a dangerous situation to pay attention to and guard against.

The limited nature of this particular study precluded a more in-depth treatment of this event. Key pieces of information were missing here. What was the exact nature of this "power control thing" exercised by fifth-grade girls? Why was this situation so troublesome for Mrs. Bishop? What exact "problems" at school and home resulted from fifth grade girls attempting to influence and control classroom events? How would Mrs. Bishop have ameliorated this threatening situation? And, perhaps most importantly, would Heidi Mason now guard against and work to quell such behavior with her own students some day?

This passage from Heidi Mason's reflective journal also reinforced my perceptions of how Linda Bishop viewed her ability to realign social power dynamics when she decided it was necessary. Just as she confidently attempted to quash any uppity behavior in her classroom, she had confidently taken the initiative to redefine her mentoring role to include Mary Grant as a co-mentor. Along with years of successful and confident re-enactments of her role as a cooperating teacher, I believe my novice and relatively absent status as a university supervisor emboldened Linda Bishop to make her unorthodox request. My refusal to grant this request could have

resulted in her viewing me as a supervisor who had exercised my power as a representative of the university. Perhaps she would have resisted my decision in some way.

Other than the dual mentoring issue, we all followed our assigned scripted roles as triad members. My novice and absent status may have deviated somewhat from what Linda Bishop and Heidi Mason had expected, but they did not overtly indicate this to me. When I had the opportunity to question and possibly deny the dual mentoring arrangement, I had ultimately deferred to Mrs. Bishop's confidence and experience. Heidi Mason's diligence with her reflective writing had provided me with useful snippets of her student teaching experience and from my perspective, helped offset my novice and absent status. Heidi Mason had experienced positive, predictable mentoring in the fashion she had come to expect. As for Mary Grant, the shadow cooperating teacher, her influence and control may not have been as direct as Heidi's official cooperating teacher, Linda Bishop, but what she did control appeared to fall within the expectations and assumptions set out by Mrs. Bishop, Mary Grant's original mentor and current colleague. Along with marginal responsibility for Heidi Mason's student teaching experience, Mrs. Bishop had also shared with Mrs. Grant some of the inherent benefits of having a student teacher. The dual arrangement had benefited Mary Grant, as Heidi took over the design and implementation of Mrs. Grant's lessons and relieved Mrs. Grant from her classroom duties.

Linda Bishop's final university student teacher recommendation gave Heidi Mason the confirmation of her success as a good student teacher and potential good teacher:

... Perhaps Heidi's greatest strength was in her planning of lessons. She created lessons that were meaningful to the students, using a variety of strategies to engage students in critical thinking and problem solving in all subject areas. Her lesson plans were extremely thorough, showing a knowledge of subject matter, curriculum goals, and an understanding of State Standards. I never hesitated to leave my students under Heather's supervision, feeling comfortable that my expectations and goals, as well as the district's, were being met on a daily basis. Therefore, I highly recommend Heidi Mason for an elementary teaching position. (Student Teacher Recommendation Form, 03.15.02

5.5. Heidi and Susan and Me

The first half of Heidi Mason's student teaching experience had proceeded rather smoothly and predictably. With her second assignment, however, Heidi moved into an urban school context that had many different aspects than her first experience. Grady Elementary was a large urban public elementary school. Compared to the other schools in the study, with stable, homogenous, relatively affluent student populations, Grady's student population was multicultural, multilingual, and migrant. A lot of children moved from school to school within the city. Most of the children received free or reduced price lunch. Grady Elementary, unlike any of the other schools studied, had been identified as a distressed school and was on the state's list of troubled schools. Everyone at Grady was dedicated to getting the school off this list soon.

Because Grady Elementary was geographically even further than Norris Elementary, the long travel time again became a significant constraint in relation to my on-site observations. This proved to be unfortunate since in Heidi Mason's second assignment, her cooperating teacher, because of health issues, was gone for a significant portion of Heidi's student teaching. I would have liked to have visited more, but again Heidi's meticulous reflective journaling continued to provide me with her perceptions of what was occurring on the ground and assisted in my interpretations of her student teaching experience.

Heidi proceeded cautiously into her new context:

As today went on, I found out that first grade is very different from fifth grade. That alone worries me some. Plus, there is the fact that all of my students speak Spanish, and I am in an ELL [English Language Learners] classroom, which I had already known. Now, my minor is Spanish, but that did not prepare me for any of this. These students speak Spanish so fast and they have an accent. I can't really understand any of them. The good thing is that they can all speak English, and they are supposed to use English as much as possible. Because of all of this, I am worried about teaching these 16 students, but I know once I am there for a little while I'll do fine. For now though, I am very nervous. (Student Handbook Reflective Journal, 03.20.02)

After the past two days I have realized first grade is a lot less structured than fifth grade. Because I student taught in fifth grade first, I am used to the structure. Therefore, I think it is going to take me a while to get used to the less structured environment of first grade. (Student Handbook Reflective Journal, 03.20.02)

At the end of the first week, Heidi Mason's cooperating teacher, Susan Miller had to attend an educational conference and Heidi worked with the assigned substitute teacher:

Today was a crazy day. The students were wound up all day for some reason. The substitute had to use the discipline system a lot. And once again, the day was different than the previous ones... As of right now, I am still nervous about teaching first grade. After what I saw today I think that it can be very frustrating at times. However, I think that once Ms. Miller returns, things will get a bit better. (Student Handbook Reflective Journal, 03.22.02)

Heidi Mason's new classroom context was significantly very different from what she had experienced with Linda Bishop and Mary Grant. Heidi anticipated Susan Miller's return to help her make sense of what she was experiencing.

Susan Miller was Heidi Mason's cooperating teacher at Grady Elementary School. Susan had been teaching for nine years. It was her third year at Grady Elementary and Heidi was her first student teacher. Over the course of our time together, I observed that Susan Miller demonstrated remarkable sensitivity and expertise as she subtly navigated the cultural divide that her classroom represented. She was firm and fair. She demonstrated good people skills and these were apparent in our meetings together.

Susan Miller, unlike most other cooperating teachers, had not dominated the discussions during our first meeting as a student teaching triad. Heidi Mason, working as usual to please, was very deferential to us both and rarely made unsolicited comments. I had listened carefully to Susan for cues as to her expectations of a university supervisor and found that since Heidi was Susan's first student teacher, she was tentative in areas that other cooperating teachers were not. Susan Miller listened attentively to my comments and suggestions. She asked many questions,

often referring to the *Student Teaching Handbook*. Susan was especially concerned about when and how to evaluate Heidi's performance. She obviously perceived this to be a crucial aspect of her role as a cooperating teacher.

Susan Miller was very articulate and had no trouble relating her basic teaching/learning orientation in the following:

I believe in using multiple learning styles to teach and try to get the students actively involved. My experiences have taught me that all students learn differently, so I try to cover the same material in different ways. (First Cycle Interview Questions, Email, 02.17.04)

In a conversation with Heidi Mason, Susan Miller had also shared a bit of her perspectives on classroom management:

At the end of the day I talked with Ms. Miller for a little. We talked about how some of the students are learning very well and how others just don't get it. Some of the students who just don't get it try really hard, but for some reason they can't make the connection. Then there are those who are smart, but don't do well either because they can't focus or they just don't want to try. I am finding out that a lot of time is spent on behavior management and a lot of it has to do with the attitudes of these students. As Ms. Miller says, these students are so cute, but so naughty. I thought that was a good one. (Student Handbook Reflective Journal, 03.25.02)

In this second assignment, Heidi Mason dramatically increased her references to her students in her journal. During her fifth grade student teaching experience she had never mentioned students except in relation to how they were reacting to her teaching. She had very rarely written about individual students.⁴ Encouraged by Ms. Miller, who Heidi faithfully emulated, Heidi began to directly focus on student attitudes and how they influence student behaviors. Her journal entries began to overtly pay attention to student differences, especially with respect to the cultural dimension:

The final thing that Ms. Miller and I talked about was the students' homework. She explained to me that the only homework that gets graded is Math. This is because it is written in Spanish and there is a better chance of the parents helping their children to do

Math homework at home. She also told me that any Reading homework that the students have cannot be graded. (Conference Narrative Form, 03.26.02)

Heidi Mason also related that many of her students were economically and socially impoverished.

This week I learned that the students love to do fun activities for holidays. They really enjoyed doing all of the Easter activities and listening to all of the Easter stories. They did a good job writing a story together as a class about what all they did for their Easter Egg Hunt and how they prepared for it. This was very special to a lot of the students because at home they do not get to participate in such activities.⁵ That is why it is important to do fun things for holidays in school but also to have an educational purpose behind them. (Reflection Prompt Form, 03.25.02)

This afternoon we also received a new student. The boy seems nice, but he has a lot of energy. He was put into our ELL class, but it sounds like he can speak English quite well. We were told that he does well academically. He just has trouble sitting still. Ms. Miller also said that we probably won't have much support from home because this boy's mother was 13 years old when she had him.⁶ That is so sad. What we are going to have to do now is help him to learn the routine of the classroom. I don't think he will have trouble making friends because the other students were all helping him this afternoon. I am sure everything will work out. (Student Handbook Reflective Journal, 04.11.02)

Heidi Mason, in her reflective journal entries, eventually began to recognize that certain student attitudes and “naughty” behaviors were perhaps connected to external macro/structural constraints:

Grady Elementary was another story. Because of the backgrounds of most of these children, parents were not too concerned with school. Most of the children were living in single parent homes or the parents only spoke Spanish [key issue again for her] and very little if any English. Therefore, the influence of the parents here was almost zero. (First Cycle Interview Questions, Email, 02.23.02)

In her reflective writing, Heidi also continued to openly express a wide range of perceptions and feelings concerning her student teaching experience. Her writing again provided me, her novice and absent university supervisor, with valuable information. I had begun to feel quite comfortable with judgments and assessments concerning Heidi Mason that were primarily based on her journaling:

After today I am beginning to feel a little more comfortable in this classroom. I also think that the students are beginning to get used to me. More of them are asking questions for help now. I am still nervous somewhat about teaching first grade, but once I begin I think that will gradually go away. (Student Handbook Reflective Journal, 03.26.02)

Heidi, totally trusting her wise and kind mentors, hid very little:

I was nervous about teaching Math, but after I talked with Ms. Miller that went away some. I was still a little nervous the whole morning before I taught though, but as soon as I began teaching, that feeling went away. Now I feel a lot better about teaching Math since I got through my first lesson. (Student Handbook Reflective Journal, 04.02.02)

I am beginning to like this placement in first grade more and more. I feel comfortable with what I am teaching, for the most part, and the students like when I teach which makes me feel good. Everything seems to be going well. (Student Handbook Reflective Journal, 04.03.02)

Heidi Mason, true to her mentoring expectations, was actively modeling Susan Miller's teaching style. Susan Miller saw this as a congruence of their basic teaching philosophies. However, with the power differential at play and Heidi's penchant for pleasing her superiors, it is hard to determine if Heidi's teaching was a true reflection of her own basic teaching/learning orientation or an effort at parroting Ms. Miller's teaching style:

I believe that Heidi saw this [how Susan taught] and either had the same philosophies as me or modified her activities to fit what the children were used to. Her activities were child centered and required active participation. (First Cycle Interview Questions, Email, 02.17.04)

Susan Miller's preferred teaching/learning orientation, and consequently Heidi's mentoring may have been constrained by enforced curricular standards, an issue that figured prominently, since Grady Elementary had been placed on the state's troubled list:

I taught the curriculum that was set forth by the school district. The math series is the same series the entire district used. The reading series I used at the time was chosen by the supervisor for Special Services (which includes English Language Learners). The language series, Into English!, was also chosen to support the ELL students... Our curriculum was chosen so that it aligns with the state standards. State standards influenced the choosing of the curriculum to a great extent... We followed the curriculum as it was laid out in the teacher editions. ...We used some ideas from the teaching

manuals/texts and incorporated some of our own ideas. The math lessons were more scripted and we had more flexibility with the reading and language series. When I had to miss a week and a half of school due to illness, Heidi took the manuals and continued with her teaching with little guidance from me. (First Cycle Interview Questions, Email, 02.17.04)

Heidi Mason indicated in her journal that she was frustrated with the strictly enforced nature of the curriculum:

The only problem I had with this lesson was the fact that it was long, and the students were having a hard time sitting still and concentrating by the end. I can not change this at all because I have to follow the Saxon Publisher's lessons, which is what the school uses. (Student Handbook Reflective Journal, 04.03.02)

Ms. Miller dealt with Heidi's frustrations:

The school follows the Saxon Math series, so I was doing what that lesson said to do. Ms. Miller said that we are not supposed to cut a lesson short or stop it in the middle but that sometimes you need to. The students will benefit better, and that is what is most important. You want the students to understand. This was a relief to hear because I could tell that my lesson was going really long and I was starting to get a little frustrated because the students were confused, but I thought I had to finish the lesson. (Conference Narrative Form, 04.03.02)

Heidi Mason, as well as Susan Miller, had apparently *strategically complied with reservations*, to the enforced curriculum:

As of now, I have to stick with the Saxon way of teaching Math with the first graders. I guess I could say that if I ever teach adding 9 to a number to students again, I will avoid this method as much as possible. I am sure that I could come up with an easier way to teach it so that the students could understand better. I would most likely use manipulatives and have the students figure out the answers. Then with more and more practice the students will be able to learn the facts and they will no longer need to use the manipulatives. Something else that I would like to try to work on with the students is one more than and one less than. This is not necessarily so that they can understand the method of adding 9 to a number, but so that they will know which way to count when they are doing other things as well. I am not even exactly sure when I will work on this with the students. I do know that I will try to practice it with them whenever the Saxon Math program⁷ gives an opportunity to incorporate it into a lesson. (Reflection Prompt Form, 04.15.02)

Heidi definitely felt constrained by the strict curriculum and summed up her frustration in the following passage:

With the programs that I have to use at this school and with the ways I have to teach a lot of subjects, I do not get too many opportunities to take risks in instructional strategies, forms of assessment, or using technology. (Reflection Prompt Form, 04.15.02)

At Norris Elementary, Heidi Mason had been actively encouraged to try new things and take risks. Heidi did not experience this level of freedom at Grady Elementary, although she did contribute somewhat by suggesting and implementing modifications of Ms. Miller's lessons. Those at Grady Elementary apparently sought to minimize risk, or at least limit instruction that fell too far beyond the enforced curriculum, since teachers and students operated in a perceived deficit school environment. *What* was taught and to some extent *how* it was taught, was tightly controlled. Teachers were encouraged to stay on proven, approved, tested grounds.

The enforced curriculum may have had positive ramifications, however, in relation to establishing and maintaining instructional continuity. Susan Miller was quite pleased with Heidi Mason's overall student teaching performance, especially with her ability to take over when Ms. Miller was forced to miss school because of health issues. As Ms. Miller stated previously, "When I had to miss a week and a half of school due to illness, Heidi took the manuals and continued with her teaching with little guidance from me." Heidi had maintained a sense of order and connection when Ms. Miller was gone.

When alerted about Susan Miller's intended absence, I intervened and determined that Heidi was up to the challenge:

*Dear Susan,
Sorry to hear you are having health issues. Hope you feel better soon. I just read over Heidi's Weekly Report and it appears that she is able to handle your class in your absence. She says that since you two are closely communicating by phone, she is confident she can proceed. Heidi is a strong teacher candidate. I am sure she will be okay.*

Thanks,
Janet (Email, 04.22.02)

Heidi Mason, a talented and energetic student teacher, was still challenged by this new aspect of her assignment. Things did not go smoothly at first:

Several other teachers told me not to worry because I did my best. They said that for some reason the students think that they only have to listen to their regular classroom teacher. This made me feel better at the end of the day. (Student Handbook Reflective Journal, 04.16.02)

The whole day did not go so well. I have no idea why the students refused to listen. Ever since I have been here, they have never acted this way... maybe it is because they miss Ms. Miller so much. I really don't know, but I hope we have a better day tomorrow. (Student Handbook Reflective Journal, 04.23.02)

In spite of her misgivings, Heidi Mason successfully took over for Susan Miller:

Today was a good day. The students decided this morning that they were going to try really hard so that everyone could stay on a [classroom discipline system] green apple. I told them that if they could do that then I could call Ms. Miller to surprise her with the good news. At first they tried really hard, and this worked for a little while, but by the end of the day we had a couple yellow apples, an orange apple and even a red apple. I thought it was neat that the students thought of this on their own and actually tried for a while to do it. I think I will talk to them tomorrow morning and see if they want to try it again. I am sure they will say yes. (Student Handbook Reflective Journal, 04.25.02)

Heidi Mason anticipated the beginning of her official full-time teaching when Susan Miller returned. In her fifth-grade assignment she had assumed full-time duties after being carefully coached and prepped by both Linda Bishop and Mary Grant, her cooperating teachers. Heidi was not afforded this support here, but her reflective journal entries indicated that she was ready, willing and able to proceed:

We did accomplish everything that we were supposed to today. It just took us a while to do some of the things because the students were very talkative. At the end of the day Ms. Miller stopped in, and the students got very excited when she told them she will be back on Monday. Even though I am going to be teaching, I think the students will listen to me better since Ms. Miller will be back. (Student Handbook Reflective Journal, 04.26.02)

I believe, because of the novice status of both Susan Miller and myself, the power dynamics of this student teaching triad were significantly different than the others in this study. I felt Susan and I related more as equals. Another contributing factor may also have been that Susan had not been teaching as long as the other cooperating teachers in this study. Her teaching and planning style appeared to be more open and contingent than most veteran cooperating teachers I had worked with. This may also have been the result of the declared marginal status of Grady Elementary. All teachers at Grady met together on a regular basis and were specifically encouraged to consider forces external to their previously perceived insular classrooms. Susan Miller was used to participating in dialogue that directly fostered change. She appeared to be more comfortable in a *power with* environment.

There was a refreshing openness and trust operating as we all worked together on a *relatively* equal playing field. Heidi Mason's role, as she perceived and enacted it, was the passive ever-attentive acolyte. Susan and I remained for her, knowledgeable, helpful mentors. She appeared to be comfortable with our role enactments, even though we were both rookies as student teaching triad members. We were consistently encouraging and supportive of Heidi's efforts.

Because of our absent status, Susan and I did not exercise the level of influence and control over Heidi Mason that Linda Bishop and Mary Grant had. This arrangement was acceptable to both Susan and myself for various reasons. For me, I believe that since Heidi had been so successful in the first half of her student teaching, and I had come to rely on Heidi's reflective journaling to fill in the supervision gaps, I expected and assumed that Heidi would also do well with the new challenges. For Susan, the realities of her health situation precluded anything else but taking time off. As long as I assented to this, as the representative of the

university, it was acceptable. Also, I believe Susan knew that the enforced curriculum made teaching rather transparent. If Heidi maintained classroom control, the material could pretty much teach itself. Susan also had made sure that Heidi received help and encouragement from the other teachers at Grady Elementary.

In Susan Miller's absence, Heidi Mason had worked with various substitute teachers assigned to Ms. Miller's first grade classroom as well as other teachers at Grady Elementary. Mrs. Miller had directly told Heidi what "teachers to borrow books from." Apparently, Heidi had taken the opportunity to forge relationships since, as noted previously, Heidi had stated that "several other teachers" had reassured her about a lesson she thought she had "messed up." Heidi even took the opportunity to speak candidly about one substitute teacher:

Mr. Patterson seems like a nice guy. He tries really hard to do what he is suppose[d] to do, and he loves the kids. It's just that he reads a little slow. I feel a little sorry for him, especially when the other teachers talk about him. He likes to talk and tell stories about substituting, and he always has nice things to say about Grady Elementary and its teachers. I have had no problems teaching with him and he has been very nice. (Student Handbook Reflective Journal, 04.18.02)

I believe Susan Miller and I shared a conception of power that relied heavily on the value of experience. This perception recognizes the possibility that social power may be increased and enhanced by meaningful personal relationships over time. Susan and I treated each other with deference and anticipated working together again in future student teaching triads. This mutual recognition, that we were both new at enacting student teacher triad roles, engendered a power dynamic that was unique among the other triads I worked with. I perceived that Susan Miller attempted to reach beyond my role as the representative of the university. I found that she did much more listening and questioning than the other cooperating teachers, and not just in the interest of aligning herself with university requirements.

Even though Heidi Mason was Susan Miller's first student teacher, I observed that Susan mentored Heidi with the same confidence and type of direction that I had witnessed with the more veteran cooperating teachers. Another area that Susan Miller shared with most other veteran cooperating teachers was her recollection and strong identification with her own student teaching experience:

My experience with Heidi reminded me of my own student teaching experience. My cooperating teacher and my supervisor both supported me to incorporate my own ideas into my teaching. My cooperating teacher told me I was a 'natural' and that is how I felt about Heidi. She knew how to connect with children and how to get them excited about learning. (First Cycle Interview Questions, Email, 02.17.04)

Heidi Mason was also obviously aware of the novice status that Susan Miller and I shared. This knowledge apparently did not dent her unwavering faith in her mentors. Apparently, our designation as official representatives of the university was all Heidi needed to validate our role enactments for her.

In response to questions for this study, Susan Miller had indicated similar feelings about the dynamics of the student teaching triad. Two years later she expressed the following:

I felt empowered [as a member of the student teaching triad]. All parties involved seemed to be enjoying the experience. Heather is a 'natural' and Janet was encouraging and supportive in all aspects. I believe we worked very well together. I cannot think of a specific example of such a situation [when Susan was applauded by other members of the triad] but I do recall feeling very well supported. It was encouraging to know that Janet and I were 'on the same track' regarding Heidi's teaching. I believe that I still would've given my opinion if it had differed from hers. It was refreshing to work with Heidi and Janet... I remember feeling a sense of harmony between all members of the triad. (First Cycle Interview Questions, Email, 02.17.04)

Heidi Mason summed up her student teaching experience in the following way:

I always wanted to do my best and be really good, so I think I was hard on myself. I wanted to learn as much as I could from everyone and be a great student teacher. I always wanted to know what my weaknesses were and things that I could improve. I wanted help to become better. But, at the same time, it felt good to know⁸ what my strengths were and the things I did well. (First Cycle Interview Questions, Email, 02.23.04)

Currently Heidi Mason is seeking permanent employment. She has been working as a substitute teacher in various elementary schools and at a Preschool as a regular employee.

5.6. Troy and Tammy and Me

I love sitting on tiny kindergarten chairs. Posterior pressure reminds you that this place demands a ‘special’ness. ‘Adult’ness becomes the exception. Those that care for the children here are privy to a way of being most adults have left far behind. The children were seated in a circle, anxiously awaiting Troy’s next cue. As the young man broke into song, I was reminded of my namesake, minus the ‘D’, Fred Rogers, who took great care with any young soul he touched. I was touched listening to Troy interact with his kindergarten students.

Troy Peter’s student teaching experience followed a trajectory that I had come to expect of Cumberland University student teachers. He had been among the majority of my student teachers who had required very minimal intervention. Troy’s student teaching trajectory began with a written response that addressed why he wanted to teach as well as what his educational philosophy might be:

I want to make a difference in children of today hoping that problems I saw in my teachers that I had will change with my hard work...I view the student’s mind as a problem solver and feel it needs to be taught how to think, rather than what to think... The students in my classroom will be working in cooperative groups to help themselves as well as others around them. They will explore simple learning projects and gradually exceed to mastering ideas. (Student Teaching Personal Data Information Sheet)

Tammy Sullivan was Troy Peter’s cooperating teacher. She had taught kindergarten for twenty-eight years at Harrison Elementary School. Harrison was a rural/suburban school that had recently been renovated. During the initial interview for this study, Tammy emphatically expressed that “I don’t change much [as a cooperating teacher]... It just stays pretty much the same.” Like most other veteran cooperating teachers who participated in this study, Tammy had

apparently *internally adjusted* to her role as cooperating teacher and was quite comfortable enacting it.

Our first meeting as a student teaching triad unfolded predictably at first. I remember sitting around a small table and generally discussing what kindergarten teaching involved. I had become very familiar with the litany of expectations and assumptions that cooperating teachers expressed at this initial meeting. Mrs. Sullivan did not stray too far from this familiar ritual. I was also used to the mild acquiescence of the student teacher as they attentively listened to what transpired and rarely asked questions. Troy Peters followed the usual regimen here as well. I intoned the established reiteration of what I, as representative of the university expected, especially with regards to formal evaluation procedures and forms.

I was then mildly surprised when Tammy Sullivan, at the end of the first meeting, began to speak very candidly about what she perceived to be inherent weaknesses in the way Cumberland University prepares its student teachers. She thought that the university was woefully lacking in helping student teachers write a good lesson plan. She had observed that most could not write measurable objectives adequately and Mrs. Sullivan bemoaned the fact that she was then forced to initially spend a good bit of time with all of her Cumberland University student teachers addressing this deficit. I was not familiar with exactly how teacher candidates were prepared to write lesson plans. This was the first time, for me, that a cooperating teacher had expressed frustration over a student teacher's ability to write a good lesson plan. Not wishing to alienate Tammy and lacking salient information, I remained silent on the issue.

Tammy Sullivan's explicit critiques of the university at that first meeting also revealed that she felt comfortable with her role enactment within the triad. Like Linda Bishop, she had felt the need for and comfort with perhaps redefining the power dynamics of the triad. She was not

concerned about dressing down the university in front of Todd or myself. Her pointed criticisms of university policies and practices perhaps created doubt in Todd's mind as to the value of his previous university preparation. This move also appeared to give ascendancy to Mrs. Sullivan's practice-based mentoring. In retrospect, it appears ironic that at the same time that Tammy expressed her desire to be more of a teacher educator, she was actively diluting the value of what teacher educators attempted to impart at the university. Her self-assurance and outspokenness bore witness to her entrenched sense of herself as a cooperating teacher. I believe that my novice status as a university supervisor was again a determining factor. Was she testing me? With my non-defense of university policy and practice, I may have been perceived as a rather weak representative of the university. I came to find out later that Mrs. Sullivan would have liked to work more collegially with university supervisors, but perhaps not with me since she had hidden this desire at that first meeting. We never revisited this issue. Over the course of our time together, however, I noted that Tammy Sullivan took the teacher educator aspect of her role as cooperating teacher very seriously and would often articulate ideas and suggestions that reflected this tendency.

Tammy Sullivan, teacher educator/cooperating teacher/classroom teacher, had very specific procedures and rituals to introduce student teachers to the experience of kindergarten teaching. Mrs. Sullivan initially spoke with student teachers about the "procedure and measurable objectives" that she expected student teachers to attend to during their *Professional Seminar*. This pre-student teaching experience included working with the prospective class and cooperating teacher. Mrs. Sullivan had worked closely with Troy Peters at that time, as she had other student teachers, to help him develop a sense of what she would expect in the way of planning. At the beginning of their student teaching, all of Mrs. Sullivan's student teachers

focused on the report card that kindergarten students would ultimately receive. This report card had been developed over time by the school district. Mrs. Sullivan and her student teachers then planned weekly activities to meet each area as designated on the report card.

Tammy Sullivan felt that the kindergarten experience lent itself particularly well to the student teacher's learning experience. Double sessions permitted everything to be taught twice. What Mrs. Sullivan really liked about the double sessions was that the student teacher had the opportunity to re-teach a lesson immediately after joint discussions about the first attempt. Ideas and suggestions, discussed and agreed upon, could then be tried out in the second iteration. Mrs. Sullivan thought this was quite beneficial. She felt this was a very useful and unique opportunity for student teachers at the kindergarten level. Troy Peters had recorded an instance where the opportunity to re-teach a lesson had worked quite well:

Today I taught a lesson on sorting with people. The lesson was very well organized and the pace was smooth in the beginning. The problem that occurred in the morning class was that the children were asked to sort by sweatshirt and no sweatshirts. The students were unable to understand what a sweatshirt was[. It took away from their attention in the lesson. I also had students too jumbled up at the carpet area. In the afternoon, I made my sorting categories more age appropriate and positioned the students differently. The students understood the lesson better and it was very successful. I was pleased with my results do [due] to my accommodations for the afternoon. (Student Teaching Notebook Reflective Journal, 02.06.02)

Perhaps, the interchanges possible when two sessions are taught back-to-back each day, gave Tammy Sullivan the opportunity to operate more as a teacher educator as she perceived the role.

Mrs. Sullivan set herself apart from the other cooperating teachers in this study, by stressing "properly done lesson plans" and her very emphatic championing for the kindergarten student teaching experience. These two facets of Tammy Sullivan's role of cooperating teacher, as she enacted it, again demonstrated her perceptions of herself as a teacher educator as well as a cooperating teacher/classroom teacher. Cooperating teachers are often seen to be at a

disadvantage as teacher educators, since their context is really not designed to prepare teachers and cooperating teachers are not necessarily focused on this aspect of their role. Tammy Sullivan appeared to be. Much of her interview for this study was taken up with references to aspects of her mentoring of student teachers. Her comments, unlike the other cooperating teachers, often explicitly addressed how *her* specific attitudes and strategies directly helped student teachers in comparison to other cooperating teachers and teacher educators located at the university. At one point Mrs. Sullivan had said that there was a lot of freedom in kindergarten as far as being required to follow specific texts, etc. She was constantly challenged with locating instructional materials from a variety of sources. Of necessity, she was the constant learner who on her own assembled lesson materials and constructed activities with the report card as her guide. This unique curricular approach perhaps involved a measure of freedom and creativity that fostered more open thinking/approaches that most other cooperating teachers did not experience. For the most part, cooperating teachers/classroom teachers taught curriculum selected by others. Perhaps this particular curricular orientation contributed to Tammy Sullivan's focus on the growth and maturation of her student teachers. She was comfortable with creative resourcefulness and contingency. Seeking to actively operate more as a teacher educator, as she perceived it, within her role of cooperating teacher/classroom teacher came easily to her.

Tammy Sullivan actively sought to work collaboratively with Troy Peters. This tendency displayed a *power with* stance instead of a dominant *power over* perspective. I had found, for the most part, that the *power over* stance appeared to operate most often between cooperating teachers and student teachers. More pronounced levels of collegiality were perhaps window dressing, as in the case of Heidi Mason's dual mentor arrangement with Linda Bishop and Mary Grant or serendipitous as was the case with Heidi Mason's assumption of Susan Miller's

teaching duties when Susan was ill. Tammy Sullivan and Troy Peters appeared to have had a strong level of collegiality that was precipitated by Tammy. Troy's reciprocity may have been motivated by his desire to please his cooperating teacher, however, Troy's conception of his own social power appears to have directly contributed to this as well. As the semester unfolded and Troy shared more of his insights in his journals, his perceptions of the social construction of power and his relation to it became quite evident.

Troy Peters had commented that with Mrs. Sullivan, he had the opportunity to contribute substantially to final outcomes, especially in regard to two students who were developmentally and behaviorally challenging. Mrs. Sullivan had listened to Troy's on-going observations and suggestions concerning these specific students. They had then worked together to develop and implement a host of strategies to address the special needs of these problem kindergarten students. This may have resulted from Tammy Sullivan's perception of herself as a teacher educator as well as a cooperating teacher/classroom teacher.

Tammy spoke of how she and Troy would spend the time between sessions discussing the morning class and reinforced her *power with* inclinations:

We had a really good 'back and forth'. He valued my opinion... I valued his suggestions of ways he really wanted to do things... and I think it worked well that way... I was very much open to 'try'... If you want to try this... go ahead see what happens. (Interview Tape, 392,338)

Tammy stated that there were no tensions or conflicts between them:

He was very open. He would ask me sometimes different questions about why I did something a certain way... I felt that he was very comfortable with the classroom... He was very positive... I think his personality was very early-childhood oriented. It made it a lot easier for him. He had a lot of prior experience with young children which is a plus. I didn't have to show him how to interact with a young child. He had that skill. ⁹ (Interview Tape, 230)

Troy also appreciated and soon came to depend on Tammy's insights and advice:

My cooperating teacher explained that not every lesson is perfect and that the important thing is finding ways to improve each lesson. This failed lesson was definitely an eye opener and I hope to not have that experience again. (Student Teaching Notebook Reflective Journal, 02.26.02)

Mrs. Sullivan's morning kindergarten session was particularly challenging. Two students seriously challenged them with constant disruptions and Mrs. Sullivan noted that, "We struggled together with classroom management." The disruptive children in Troy's morning session were as Mrs. Sullivan recalled:

Two problem children... I didn't have the answers for those two children after many years...¹⁰ Troy and I would bounce things off and apply different types of behavioral adjustments with those children. (Interview Tape, 270)

Unlike Molly Harcourt's cooperating teacher, Ruth Bailey, Tammy Sullivan was not afraid to appear tentative in front of Troy:

I tell them its as much learning for me from what they have picked up to try and if they have been in other class environments and have seen some things... it's good to see even with experience we go through what the new teachers do sometimes. (Interview Tape, 340,110)

Another reason that Mrs. Sullivan may have more actively sought out Troy Peter's input was that she was in the midst of a radical departure from her established program. Mrs. Sullivan's school district had recently changed the kindergarten report card to align it with newly adopted district academic standards. One important element of the new measure involved much more emphasis on specific reading and writing skills for kindergarten students. In response, Mrs. Sullivan had taken on a dramatic curriculum change as she explains:

After 28 years of doing kindergarten you know you have to go with the kids... I asked permission to change things as far as curriculum goes. I went to the administrator [building principal] and the [school district] reading specialist... Troy was at the

beginning of that when I started to change [her teaching to reflect the new school district curricular expectations]... so of course when I do that then the planning is more extensive because it's new to me. Some things take more time. Troy and I would talk about it like peers. (Interview Tape, 60)

Mrs. Sullivan had also stated that she felt the experience of collegially working together would later help Troy in his teaching career. Troy later recalled this aspect of his student teaching experience:

I remember that she had created her own curriculum for her kindergarten class to best incorporate what learning was expected on the report card. Her teaching matched the report card standards. She was very good at incorporating what was best for the children and adapting new district standards. For example, the children were expected to start writing more in Kindergarten, so she adapted her day to make a time fit for them to write. (Email, 03.02.02)

I had asked Mrs. Sullivan, if during their robust and obviously very productive interchanges, Troy had brought ideas and insights from any of his methods classes. She could not recall any. Troy Peters had never referenced any specific methods courses to me, as Molly Harcourt had with her classroom management class. Mrs. Sullivan did not think Troy's previous undergraduate methods courses were as instrumental in his development as a student teacher as Troy's exceptional ability to reflect and process. In Mrs. Sullivan's formal midterm evaluation, Troy had received '4=Distinguished' in three areas on the INTASC form: *Providing Feedback to Students, Reflecting on Teaching and Showing Professionalism*.

Another quality that Tammy Sullivan displayed as a cooperating teacher, that set her apart from most other cooperating teachers, was her willingness to move beyond her own classroom environment. She was very aware of the school climate outside of her classroom and actively incorporated this orientation into the enactments of her role as cooperating teacher/classroom teacher. Most cooperating teachers in this study appeared to sense their existence as a rather insular one. Rarely, when answering the interview questions did the

responses of cooperating teachers indicate any sort of external dynamic at play outside of their own classrooms. I interpreted that Tammy Sullivan's generous, expansive style as a teacher and a person lent itself to this outward focus. She extended this basic style to her supervision of student teachers:

I like to see how student teachers react to other people on the staff. I've had student teachers who don't say a word and I've had other student teachers who have felt like they can tell teachers in a faculty room... you know... what's going wrong. I talk to them [the student teacher]... I want them to be comfortable... share things, but just be careful what you're sharing... Other teachers and even the principal will comment on your student teacher... they notice their personality... watch how they [the student teacher] are with the kids outside of class. (Interview Tape 412)

Mrs. Sullivan had spoken more than once with Troy Peters about these comments from other teachers and the principal concerning him. She had shared both positive and negative comments.

Tammy Sullivan also paid attention to what parents said about her student teachers. She indicated that if children shared classroom events with parents and spoke specifically of the student teacher it would mean the student teacher was having an impact. Mrs. Sullivan did not indicate a specific instance where she had directly incorporated informal parental feedback in the evaluation of a student teacher. Using parent comments about student teachers, as well as comments made by colleagues and principals, however, apparently helped Mrs. Sullivan assess the performance of her student teachers.

Tammy Sullivan actively encouraged Troy Peters to be mindful of parental opinions/judgments:

I need to realize that I have a wide range of ability levels and that all of them should be covered during a given lesson. I[t] was explained [to me by Mrs. Sullivan] that if I do not, parents could come back to me and ask why their child is doing simple tasks that are too easy for them, rather than complex tasks on their ability level. (Conference Narrative Form, 02.15.02)

Tammy Sullivan's satisfaction with Troy Peters as a student teacher/colleague was reflected in her formal evaluations of his performance as a student teacher. Mrs. Sullivan's evaluations of Troy were consistently positive. She felt that by the time she did a formal evaluation he was well aware of how she thought he was doing.

My evaluations of Troy Peters were also very positive. My relationship with Troy was cordial. I found him to be very respectful and attentive and an especially effective student teacher:

Mr. Peters did an exceptional job of communicating with his young students. He used songs, spoken limericks and other age-appropriate devices to focus student attention and assist learning. (INTASC Mid-Term Evaluation Form/Rodgers, 02.21.03)

Mr. Peters has a wonderful classroom presence and connects very well with the students. He is well prepared and has good classroom control. He is able to deal with students who are off task. His approach is firm but caring. Overall, Mr. Peters is an exceptional teacher candidate. (INTASC Observation Form/Rodgers, 02.15.02)

Troy Peter's student teacher journal entries had again provided me as a university supervisor, with valuable snapshots into what he was experiencing as a student teacher. Like Heidi Mason, he hid very little from me:

I was once again praised for my pacing as well as my classroom management. (Student Teaching Notebook Reflective Journal, 02.13.02)

My cooperating teacher feels I am becoming more comfortable in the classroom and I have better speech with the students because of this. I used to have more of a scripted speech, and now I have more of a relaxed talk with the students. This makes the students and me more comfortable during discussions. (Conference Narrative Form, 02.22.02)

I had to be very patient, calm myself down and focus the class back on task. It was hard because I was so angry. This would have to be the first time that I was truly angry from the class's behavior. I saw how easily it is for a teacher to get upset and lose control. It was a learning experience and I am happy how I handled the experience. (Student Teaching Notebook Reflective Journal, 03.05.02)

What set Troy Peter's reflective journal entries apart from most other student teachers' was the deeper level of analysis that was predominantly psychological and interpersonal versus sociological and structural. He consistently teased apart all aspects of his student teaching experience. Troy's writing was often cryptic and to the point, unlike Heidi Mason's sometimes, rambling entries, but the level of detail and evidence of deep consideration were, I believe, quite impressive. What was remarkable was how he masterfully and consistently built upon his musings, and strategically altered his instructional *and* social strategies. The following examples from Troy's reflective journal speak to this ability:

I learned [by observation and information from cooperating teacher] that I have two students in my classroom that I am going to have to keep my eye on. One student has a bad home life, so my goal is to be a good father figure for him and encourage him to make good decisions rather than bad. The other student is a follower of the first student. He is a good kid that is wrapped up in the popularity game and is trying to play along with the other child. They both try to pull sneaky things to test me as a teacher. I am trying to gain their respect and interests in me as a teacher gradually to help make this an easier process. (Reflection Prompt Form, 04.01.02)

I learned [by observation and information from cooperating teacher] that some students just need some extra support by the teacher to help them succeed. I had two students this week that were very upset about school and were afraid that they were not doing well. Through my encouragement and support, they are becoming more and more successful. I had one of those children go from hiding during questions to raising his hand all the time. I also had the other child tell me he enjoys writing more than coloring. (Reflection Prompt Form, 03.04.02)

I learned that my one student, who is being considered for testing for special education, is really improving. I learned that he is progressing in his discipline very well. He used to be disruptive and call out. Now he wants to please me as the teacher and show that he is going to work to the best of his ability. I feel he needed that extra attention that I gave him and show him that someone cares. I also was sure that I did not frustrate him. I only expected what he was capable of. Some students can't be at the level they are expected to be at. (Reflection Prompt Form, 03.04.02)

Troy Peters' very open journaling style often enumerated specific deficiencies that he, with Mrs. Sullivan's guidance, worked to address. Troy, like Molly Harcourt and Heidi Mason, initially struggled with classroom management:

Today, the morning class began challenging my authority. I was struggling with keeping them on task as well as rushing to get everything finished in the short amount of time. My teacher [Mrs. Sullivan] explained to me that everything doesn't have to be finished and squeezed in. She gave me some ideas and some areas of things she wanted to see me change. For example, during center time, my teacher [Mrs. Sullivan] would like to see me move around more (Student Teaching Notebook Reflective Journal, 02.21.02)

We discussed that I need to be stricter with the morning class. She [Mrs. Sullivan] feels that the children are in the stages of testing me as an authority in the classroom. I was told that I have a nice strict voice when I use it. It is a tone where it sends silence though the room. I explained that I was afraid of using the voice too much in concern of scaring the kids too much. She [Mrs. Sullivan] said that I should use it more often, since it is effective and it is necessary. (Conference Narrative Form, 02.22.02)

Troy Peters eventually established his authority in the kindergarten classroom:

There was a substitute today. I thought there would be more discipline problems, but they were great. The children were very well behaved and it showed that they truly respect me as the authority figure of the room. (Student Teaching Notebook Reflective Journal, 03.01.02)

As a university supervisor, I especially appreciated Troy Peter's thorough recording of the interchanges he had with Mrs. Sullivan. The following passage speaks not only to Troy's ability and willingness to provide me with an accurate assessment of his performance but also to Tammy Sullivan's mentoring style. She had provided clear and attainable goals for Troy and he had met them:

When I met with my cooperating teacher this week we discussed my overall experience during the full eight weeks. We discussed that I was well off in my professional ethics. I was always well dressed and well prepared for everything I did. I was on time and worked diligently. I was given praise for my ability to understand the children's ability levels as well as how to accommodate for each child. I was given praise for my change in my disciplining of the class. She [Mrs. Sullivan] felt I greatly improved on my classroom management from when I first came to K[k]indergarten. I was given praise for being very positive with the children and giving them encouragement. I had good relationships with the children and I even played with them during recess to develop their sharing skills. I was told that the only thing that I need to improve is that I need to work on researching for this level. There are no textbooks or resources for K[k]indergarten, so you have to do all the creation on your own to meet the children's needs. Overall I feel it was a great experience and I learned a lot. (Conference Narrative Form, 03.14.02)

I found this passage to be eerily similar to the one Heidi Mason had written about her final interchange with her cooperating teachers, Linda Bishop and Mary Grant. Cumberland University student teachers apparently had no trouble providing specific lists of student teaching expectations and subsequent outcomes, as they perceived and enacted them.

I observed Troy Peters twice during his stay with Mrs. Sullivan's kindergarten class and stuck pretty close to my scripted role of university supervisor. Unlike Molly Harcourt, Troy Peters carefully adhered to my syllabus expectations. Troy appeared to have control of the kindergarten classroom. Mrs. Sullivan had not expressed any major areas that Troy was having difficulty with. My formal visits resulted in positive evaluations of Troy's efforts.

At the end of our time together Tammy Sullivan had overtly expressed her dissatisfaction with another area that she felt the university did not address properly. Tammy stated that she would have appreciated more three-way meetings during the eight weeks. We had one at the beginning and end of Troy's eight-week assignment. This was typical with university supervisors, especially when student teachers were proceeding smoothly through their student teaching experience.

At our initial meeting as a student teaching triad, Tammy had hidden from me her desire to meet more often as a triad. Tammy had apparently *strategically complied with reservations* since she still wanted to be more connected to the university through the university supervisor.

I would like to see a little more sharing between the teacher and the university supervisor. At times in the past, especially when there was a problem, I felt I was left in a lurch until I saw the supervisor. Confirming expectations from the university level, with my own expectations, was necessary and important for me.
(Email, 02.22.04)

Since Tammy had not spoken up at our initial triad meeting, I did not attempt to meet more often with her triad than I did with the others. Tammy apparently envisioned a more

collegial approach to the traditional power dynamics of the student teaching triad. She appeared to have attempted to establish and maintain a more *power with* stance in regard to Troy and had desired this with me as well. Material/structural circumstances for me as university supervisor may have precluded an intense level of triad interaction, but I would have attempted more than what we experienced. As previously noted, I appreciated Tammy's very active engagement with the mentoring process and would have also appreciated opportunities to share more directly with her.

At the end of his assignment, Mrs. Sullivan had sent Troy off to observe fifth grade classrooms in the building. He spent a good bit of time in various rooms and saw a variety of subjects taught. His reflections began to consider what his new assignment might hold for him.

5.7. Troy and Penny and Me

Troy Peters was assigned to Bentley Elementary School for the second half of his student teaching. He worked with a fifth grade classroom in this rural school. Troy anticipated the need to firmly establish his authority with the older children:

I will have to use my firm voice to let them understand that I am the authority of the room right off. (Student Teaching Notebook Reflective Journal, 03.21.02)

Troy elaborated on his intended strategy as he began to recognize and articulate elements of his emerging teacher style:

I am a teacher who likes to have a lot of participation. If you are[a student and] not participating then I am going to call on you to respond. (Student Teaching Notebook Reflective Journal, 03.21.02)

Penny Taylor was Troy's cooperating teacher. Penny had supervised a total of nine student teachers during the latter part of a teaching career that had spanned nearly thirty years.

Penny greatly valued and sought out subject content ideas and skills student teachers brought with them:

I learn as much from them as they do from me. One [of my student teachers] taught me how to use the computer. Some had organizational ideas. (Interview Tape, 174)

The first meeting we had as a student teaching triad proceeded very predictably. Troy Peters had been very well received by his fifth grade students and had established his classroom authority. Mrs. Taylor made a point of elaborating on Troy's success in this area. She had been concerned about his shift from kindergarten to fifth grade and the possibility that the older students would "walk all over him." At the initial meeting, Troy was relaxed and confidently shared that he really enjoyed the new placement, especially the focus on content and the quality of the relationships he had begun to forge with his students. I also noticed immediately that Troy had already established the level of collegiality with Penny Taylor that he had shared with Tammy Sullivan, his previous cooperating teacher. As Penny related during her initial interview for this study:

It was such a good relationship with Troy. We [Penny Taylor and Troy Peters] were a team. No conflicts... quite a wonderful experience. (Interview Tape, 170, 153)

Penny Taylor and I had immediately connected during the initial student teaching triad meeting. We shared many similar teaching experiences and had a very good communicative relationship during Troy Peter's student teaching. I never sensed that Penny was especially influenced by my novice status as a university supervisor. I felt that since we strongly connected with our sharing of many a war story concerning our own teaching experiences, Penny Taylor saw me as more of an equal. All of the other cooperating teachers in this study regarded my own teaching experience in various ways. Most recognized and appeared to appreciate what they saw as my ability to *truly* understand their positions since I at one point had been one of them. Penny,

however, spent a great deal of time developing our relationship through questions about my former teaching. Another reason I felt particularly expansive and open with Penny may have been her support of Cumberland University's teacher preparation program. Unlike Tammy Sullivan, Penny Taylor had found no major areas wanting in the student teachers she had worked with. And finally, Penny was very interested in my scholarship and research initiatives as they were unfolding at that time. She often inquired along those lines as well.

My relationship with Troy Peters, during the second half of his student teaching, moved beyond the rather formal tone it had during his time in kindergarten. Perhaps he was secure in my consistently positive assessments of his performance. Perhaps Tammy Sullivan's downplaying of the value of his university preparation had created a need for him to distance himself. For whatever reasons, Troy noticeably opened up with me when I visited Mrs. Taylor's fifth grade classroom.

I had come to really appreciate his direct style, both verbally and in his reflective writing as he confidently promoted himself and his efforts:

The children are always eager to learn and like how I am very positive and enthusiastic while I teach. They know that I am going to be honest and fair with them and will try to make the lessons as fun as possible. (Reflection Prompt Form, 04.22.02)

I was given praise [by Mrs. Taylor] for my classroom management and also my ability to keep organized and calm during the student's social studies projects. It is a long and difficult process to organize and set up a project that I made and grading will be the same. (Conference Narrative Form, 04.25.02)

My teacher [Mrs. Taylor] is still highly impressed with my ability to keep organized and remember all the different tasks I have to complete in a given day. I was also praised on my pacing of lessons and how I walk around the room to see if children are successfully working on task. (Conference Narrative Form, 04.12.02)

Todd Peters became especially animated as he recounted for me, during our post-observation meetings how he had conceived of, designed and eventually implemented his lessons. He wrote of a specific set of lessons:

The big risk I took this week was when I taught my social studies lesson and allowed the students to dress up and do fun activities to learn the War of 1812. I could have easily taught the children through the textbook, but I used a unique strategy instead. (Reflection Prompt Form, 04.15.02)

Troy's "unique strategy" had involved a host of resources, written and visual and the children had come that day in period costumes and acted out various roles. Troy had also dressed up for the day. Troy Peters was obviously very comfortable with his role of student teacher and his place within Penny Taylor's fifth grade classroom. I perceived that Troy saw himself as being very effective and successful as a student teacher.

Even though Penny Taylor wasn't as explicitly focused on the teacher educator aspect of her role as cooperating teacher, as Tammy Sullivan had been, Mrs. Taylor still had definite ways of introducing student teachers to their experience with her. Troy and Mrs. Taylor both shared their perceptions of Troy's initiation into the second phase of his student teaching. As Mrs. Taylor related:

We [would] have a conversation... What would you feel comfortable teaching? We had a discussion. I didn't say to him, you're gonna teach reading and then math and then spelling. It was a mutual agreement. I almost treated him like a fifth grader in that the options that were available to him were okay with me. [My question... 'But they were your options?'] Yeah... okay. I did limit his range of lesson choices [based on her preferences]. I knew if he would take a certain subject [at the beginning], he would have success. It would build his confidence. (Interview Tape, 25)

Troy recounted his initial meetings with Mrs. Taylor:

This week when I met with my cooperating teacher we discussed the student's individual abilities and difficulties. We also discussed the classroom structure and the schedule of the day. I was told at the beginning of the week to try to find the children who are learning support. I also worked on remembering all the children's names. I was

successful in remembering the names, but did not realize that there were so many learning support children. There are a combined 12 children in learning support between the two 5th grade classes. I was given the school's standard discipline plan [that relied on positive reinforcements instead of the 'take away' mentality Molly Harcourt worked with in Beth Nolan's classroom] and worked on understanding it. I also worked on the schedule of the day and got a feel for how long each class lasts. The one thing about this class is that the schedule of the day never stays the same. The schedule is always changing. I have to get used to that, because in kindergarten everything was very structured and usually never changed. (Conference Narrative Form, 03.26.02)

Mrs. Taylor had urged Troy to develop his own style:

We spent some time... We looked at what the teacher edition did and how they wanted it presented and then I said to him, every teacher has their own [instructional presentation] style. Whatever you have watched me do that doesn't mean that's what you need to do. This is the subject matter that needs to be presented. There should be some written work, some performance work... but how it should be presented was up to Troy. (Interview Tape, 96)

Penny Taylor, like the other cooperating teachers in this study, deemed classroom management as a crucial aspect of effective teaching. This became apparent as she talked about one of her student teachers that had been overly zealous at the beginning and wanted to “jump in” and “start teaching right away”:

She [Penny Taylor's student teacher] told me 'I can start right in... I just had my first assignment. I can teach all this week. I want to do that.' I thought, WOW, I wish I had that confidence even now. I slowed her down. I stressed the importance of watching how the children interact with me. Seeing what my behavior expectations were. Subject matter is not the most important thing going on in the classroom. You know... classroom management. They [student teachers] needed to know what my children were comfortable with. (Interview Tape, 128)

Penny Taylor's comments again reinforced the high premium cooperating teachers placed on their classroom management knowledge and especially techniques. Mrs. Taylor definitely had a sense of what she permitted student teachers to do in this area and she confidently exercised her ability/power to define this as she maintained her *power over*.

Penny Taylor managed to eventually subdue the over zealous, as perceived by Mrs. Taylor, student teacher. She did temper the young woman's enthusiasm. Instead of just two full

weeks of instruction, as was the norm, this student teacher had added another week and taught for three. The student teaching experience had ended successfully for both Mrs. Taylor and the young woman.

Penny Taylor confidently used her ability/power to define power relations in her perception and articulation of how student teachers start out with her. I had asked Mrs. Taylor if she perceived her role as cooperating teacher as empowering or constraining in this regard:

The first two and a half weeks they are scared to death. They'll do whatever you say to do. I tell them, 'No you teach your lessons, I'll teach mine, and correct my own papers.' So there's not a feeling of empowerment as a person... no I don't feel that. (Interview Tape, 182)

Penny Taylor was apparently averse to acknowledging that her very definite ideas and expectations about the initial socialization phase of her student teachers did represent a deliberate use of the social power inherent in her scripted and enacted role of cooperating teacher. This was consistent with her apparent discomfit with expressions of language that focused on power. For this study, I had specifically asked study participants to share with me their notions of roles and social power [Appendix E]. Prompted two years later with questions for this study, Penny had responded to her conceptualization of power in an educational context with the following:

I don't know what this is asking----- asked a few in my hallway---- no ones seems to know----- remember this is menopause hall!!!!!-- either we forgot, we're too old, or we never did know!!!!

In response to the same question, Troy Peters had replied:

My conception of power in an educational context is that of knowledge, experience, and the ability to use my various resources. Having the knowledge of how to teach and what to teach gives me the power to be a better educator. The more experience in the actual school setting makes me a more powerful problem solver when dealing with different situations that arise. When given the chance to use various resources such as other educators and other teaching techniques, you are given unlimited power.

In retrospect, Troy Peter's response, which indicated his notion of the construction of social power, provided much insight into attitudes and behaviors he evidenced during his student teaching experience. During his student teaching, Troy had written about his notion of discipline/classroom management. In Troy's recounting of how he intended to establish his classroom authority he seldom dwelled upon the existing discipline regimen (i.e. colored apples, cards, name tags) but would articulate specifically how he, the storied *I*, intended to gain control. Often these strategies involved relational aspects:

I was also given positive [reinforcement] for my relationship with the students. My teacher [Mrs. Taylor] explained that she [has] had student teachers who never spook [speak] to the class, and that I have been talking with the students from day one. (Conference Narrative Form, 04.19.02)

I learned that I have one student who has different mood sets. She is cooperative in class some days and she is really difficult on other days. She was expected to be working on her project in class and she was just sitting there. I asked her what she was doing and she said that she didn't know. I led her in the correct direction on what she should be doing. I feel that I have to watch out for this girl[']s actions for the next few weeks and work on developing a better relationship with this particular student. (Reflection Prompt Form, 04.15.02)

I realized that I have a few students who just need some special attention in order to succeed. I have one student who never raises her hand to respond. I have made it a goal to call on her at least once a day and encourage her to do it more often. I want to make her feel comfortable when she is in the classroom setting as well. I hope to have her raising her hand and answering questions through her own will and desire. (Reflection Prompt Form, 04.08.02)

Troy Peter's notion of social power, as stated above, not only valued experience, but also the opportunity to establish and maintain effective relationships. During the second half of his student teaching, Troy paid specific attention to how various educational actors related to each other. Troy recorded details about a particular meeting during which various inter-relational social power dynamics were at play. Troy was beginning to attend to social cues that signaled how teachers interacted with other teachers and their principals:

Today I attended a teacher meeting. I was able to see how the teachers related with the principal. It was interesting to see the concerns of the teachers and how the principal dealt with them. The principal handed out some information to teachers about interesting articles, possible resource materials, and ways to extend professional credits earned. The principal was very laid back on his answers to concerns by the teachers and basically left a lot of the answers to the problems up to the teachers as a whole. The teachers had to work together on ways to improve in areas they struggled in as a school. For example, the teachers felt that they needed to improve on dealing with the ESL students and the learning support students in the regular classroom. Most teachers teach to the middle of the class and never really extend lessons to meet other needs. They asked me and the young teachers about ways to improve since we were fresh out of college ¹¹ and learned about those concerns. (Student Teaching Notebook Reflective Journal, 04.17.02)

Penny Taylor in her formal and informal evaluations noted how Troy Peters was able to get along with both her and her students:

He was tough without being mean. There's really a big difference. Whenever he taught, the children were really interested. When he was teaching, if something didn't go well or somebody responded in a certain way, he handled it. He didn't look at me and expect me to take over. But he did ask afterward what else could [he] have done. He had very few discipline problems. (Interview Tape, 250, 435, 340)

*Troy asked me lots of questions. Nice thing about the questions that he asked, he never made me feel threatened... like sometimes when someone asks you 'Why **did** you do that?'* (Interview Tape, 200)

At one point, I had questioned Penny Taylor about the possibility that the students attended so diligently to Troy because he was a man and they rarely had male teachers. She thought that was irrelevant. Mrs. Taylor believed a more plausible explanation might lie in Troy's social skills:

He acquired a respect and a rapport with the children quickly. That leads to them being interested in his lessons. (Interview Tape, 444)

Even though Penny Taylor had minimized the possibility that Troy Peter's gender had served him well in his classroom management, Troy apparently had thought of the gender angle in

relation to the issue of motivating students. Troy had indicated in his reflective writing that he was very aware of gender in the context of his classroom:

I still had a dominated class by the boys. I am working on getting the girls to respond more and have the class be equally responsive. (Student Teaching Notebook Reflective Journal, 04.25.02)

I learned that I have a class where the males are the dominating force in the room at the moment. The girls are quiet and never raise their hand to answer questions. The males are very outspoken and take charge a lot. I would like to change that and make it more of a balanced class by the time I leave. (Reflection Prompt Form, 03.25.02)

Mrs. Taylor also was impressed with Troy's curricular planning and reflection skills:

He really knew... probably one of my most insightful student teachers. He knew what he was going to do for the week. Some of them [student teachers] are so wrapped up in one lesson they don't see the whole picture. He did... he was very good with self-evaluation... we discussed so much there were no surprises. (Interview Tape, 371, 472, 466)

My formal evaluations of Troy Peters were very similar to Mrs. Taylor's. I regarded Troy as an exceptionally strong teacher candidate. I struggled to find superlatives to describe his strengths.

Even though Penny Taylor and I shared a very congenial relationship, and she was more positive in her assessments of Cumberland University's teacher preparation program than Tammy Sullivan had been, Penny did not hesitate to share some definite ideas about my role as university supervisor:

The ideal [university] supervisor would have time to spend in the classroom viewing overall teaching throughout a [whole] day rather than looking at specific lesson plans or one specific lesson. Feedback from the [university] supervisor about strategies to use in the classroom or suggestions for areas that show need for improvement should be given either through conferencing at school or through email. Some students just need encouragement, a new perspective, or feedback, while others need more specific recommendations. These are also responsibilities of the CT [cooperating teacher], but the [university] supervisor has the advantage of being about to compare/contrast with other STs [student teachers]. (Email, 02.19.04)

Penny Taylor, like Tammy Sullivan, had also strongly advocated for *much* more three-way dialogue among student teaching triad members during the student teaching experience. Penny expressed this desire towards the end of Troy's student teaching, as Tammy had done. Troy, Penny and I had met together only twice just as Troy, Tammy and I had. These exchanges had all been very open and productive but too infrequent as both Tammy Sullivan and Penny Taylor eventually expressed to me.

I felt I had established good working relationships with both Tammy Sullivan and Penny Taylor, although I sensed that Tammy was more critical of my role as a representative of the university than Penny had been. Both of Troy's cooperating teachers appeared to embody very similar mentoring/supervisory styles. Perhaps this similarity was due in part to how Troy responded to their guidance and his sense of his potential power as a social actor in an educational context. Troy Peters consistently demonstrated many fine qualities. These included the ability to deeply ponder and process all aspects of his student teaching experience, especially the social dynamics that surrounded him. Troy also perceptively utilized his ability/power to define and influence events, especially in his relations with all of the educational actors he interacted with.

Penny Taylor offered a final assessment of Troy's student teaching performance in a recent email to me.

I feel that Troy has a natural ability to teach and learn from his mistakes and he would have had a successful experience with or without us!!!!!! I feel that he probably worked to meet our expectations of him and followed the suggestions that we gave him and that in itself helped him to be more successful. (Email, 02.19.04)

Troy Peters eventually secured a full time position and now teaches at the kindergarten level.

5.8. Natalie and Betsy and Me

Natalie Marshal was, and still is, a palpable force. A tall, statuesque blonde, she was intensely passionate about her student teaching. This zeal reflected an almost religious fervor and dedication. Her reflective writing captured the intense emotional extremes she experienced and expressed during both phases of her student teaching:

The students have shared so much with me I felt it was time to share myself with them. I created a poem that contained a line about each and every one of the students. I had to hold back my tears when I was reading it. Each student was waiting for their name to be said in the poem. I tried to look at them when I read their line. This was difficult for me because I love those kids so much. However, I felt that they got to see another side of me. I gave them a copy of the poem to take home so they remember how much I care about them... I feel that in some way that I have touched each student's heart and made a difference in their life for the better. I will miss them dearly. (Reflection Prompt Form, 03.11.02)

What a day! I am sick as a dog, I can barely talk and not to mention the fact that my nose started bleeding during language arts. My nose probably bled for about 20 minutes. A little unexpected. I thought I had all of the unexpected situations under control... But boy am I tired. I think tonight would be a good night to rest. Take time out for me. I always say that but I am never able to do it. Maybe tonight. (Student Teaching Notebook Reflective Journal, 04.17.02)

These passages begin to capture the drama and passionate intensity that Natalie Marshal consistently demonstrated during her student teaching experience.

Natalie Marshal's first placement was at Harrison Elementary, the same school where Troy Peters had taught kindergarten. Betsy Jones taught the second grade class that Natalie was assigned to. Mrs. Jones had over twenty years experience as an elementary teacher and was quite comfortable in her role as cooperating teacher. She often compared her student teacher's performances with those of other student teachers working in the building and noted that she paid attention to "[W]hat other teachers talk about [concerning] what their student teachers are doing." Her teaching style was simple and direct as reflected in her observation that:

If the children sense that you don't know what is going on, that's when you start to lose that classroom management. (Interview Tape, 245)

During our initial meeting as a student teaching triad, Betsy Jones had spoken very highly of the Cumberland University student teachers she had worked with over the years. She indicated that she would not accept student teachers from any other institution. My novice status did not appear to affect how Betsy regarded me. She spoke highly of the other university supervisors she had worked with. Betsy had perceived them all to be very helpful and attentive. She appeared to anticipate that our relationship would follow a similar course.

I immediately noticed that Natalie Marshal and Betsy Jones had established a very close working relationship, much the same as Molly Harcourt had with her cooperating teacher, Beth Nolan. Mrs. Jones was very happy to have Natalie Marshal as her student teacher and had actively recruited her. Mrs. Jones shared in her initial interview for this study that she had first noticed Natalie among a group of visiting Cumberland University students who had spent some time working with teachers and students at Harrison Elementary during the *Professional Seminar* phase of their undergraduate work. Mrs. Jones had deliberately sought Natalie out. She encouraged Natalie to visit her second grade classroom. At that time, Mrs. Jones had suggested that Natalie might consider doing her student teaching with her. As Mrs. Jones related:

Some you can just kind of tell that they just have that 'teacher quality' about them.
(Interview Tape, 165)

We really... I thought worked quite well together. Natalie was very creative.
She was excellent. She was my best. (Interview Tape, 95)

Natalie Marshal was even more anxious to please her mentors than Heidi Mason had been. She had gotten my attention early on with the large amount of emails she sent my way, usually to clarify an assignment or firm up details concerning her *Weekly Reporting Package*. Natalie's bounding spirit was not to be missed. Her meticulous attention to *every* university

requirement also set her apart from the rest of my student teachers. Natalie Marshal's reflective journal entries were especially involved and abundant, even more so than Heidi Mason's had been. She faithfully recorded every day for her *Student Teaching Notebook* and weekly for the *Reflection Prompt Form* she sent to me. Natalie's writing often went beyond mere technical description as she colorfully described the peaks and valleys of her student teaching experience.

Natalie Marshal wanted to become a teacher due in large part to her experiences with teachers from her past. As she related:

When I reflect on my experiences as a student, I remember the teachers in my life that have made me feel valued and accepted. The memories that I have of the teachers who have displayed enthusiasm and sincerity motivate me to model the same behaviors. I hope to make a positive impact on my students and instill in them a feeling of self-worth and the will to accomplish anything they put their mind to. (Student Teaching Data Information Form)

Early in Natalie's first assignment, Mrs. Jones had given Natalie the support and sense of self-worth she wished for all students:

She [Mrs. Jones] said that I am doing a wonderful job and that she has confidence in my ability to teach all of the subjects. (Conference Narrative Form, 02.18.04)

Like Heidi Mason, Natalie Marshal strongly identified with her mentors and looked to them to be for the most part nurturing and caring:

Overall, talking with my cooperating teacher this week has allowed me to understand how she feels about the way I teach and discipline. It was comforting for me to hear her feedback and know that she feels I am doing a good job. I must admit that there are times that I get nervous and feel that I am not teaching the students what they will need to know. Mrs. Jones provides me with advice and support which helps me make appropriate decisions and lesson plans that will help the students. (Conference Narrative Form, 02.01.02)

Natalie Marshal's desire and willingness to please those placed to guide her, also extended to me. She was consistently attentive and enthusiastic with me about all phases of her

student teaching experience. By the time I formally observed Natalie Marshal for the second time, I had already placed her performance as a student teacher far above the others. I brought my full weight as a supervisor to bear on how she would be perceived. I found myself struggling, as I had with Troy Peters, to keep up a supply of superlative adjectives to interject into my written observations and evaluations. I perceived Natalie Marshal to be singular and almost too good to be true as a student teacher. My first formal observation of her teaching included accolades usually reserved for exemplary student teachers at the end of their field experience:

Ms. Marshal [Natalie] has a very confident and relaxed manner as she instructs. She pays close attention to her students and consistently monitors their responses. Her interventions are done firmly and with a caring attitude. Ms. Marshal's notebook was superior. All sections were very well done, especially the lesson plans and reflective journal entries. She obviously has spent a great deal of time in preparation and her success in front of the classroom is a definite result of this. Ms. Marshal has made an excellent start in her initial placement. Her planning is timely and comprehensive. Her thoughtful reflections trace her growth as she matures into a very successful professional educator. (INTASC University Supervisor Classroom Observation Report Form, 02.15.02)

During my second formal observation, I observed Natalie Marshal teach a lesson that remains for me the best lesson I had ever witnessed taught by a student teacher. This did not happen by chance since Natalie had deliberately arranged my visit:

I am beginning my dinosaur unit on Monday. Tuesday I am going to be doing an interesting lesson with the students about paleontology. This lesson includes audio-visual aides as well as a hands-on activity. It incorporates the subjects of math, science, art and language arts. I think you would enjoy seeing this lesson. (Student Teacher Weekly Schedule, March 4-8, 2002)

It was obvious that she had spent considerable time and effort in the development of her unit and this lesson. I remember that the students carefully excavated fossils, which were various candy pieces, from cookies. The playful nature of the experience was tempered with a wealth of information and insights about paleontology. I know, as a student, it would have been a lesson I

would have remembered for a long time, and it definitely would have endeared her to me.

Natalie Marshal subsequently processed her lesson in the following manner:

I think that the reason the dinosaur unit received such a warm welcome and good behavior is that I incorporated the student's input into the unit. I asked them what they wanted to learn. I allowed them to share the facts that they found to be amazing. In addition, I incorporated many books into the unit. This second grade class has an appetite for reading! Lastly, the students really enjoyed listening to dinosaur music. I feel that music, if used in the correct manner can create a peaceful ambiance for children. (Reflection Prompt Form, 03.04.02)

Natalie's effort demonstrated creativity and attention to detail as well as consummate organization. Any university supervisor would appreciate such effort in the performance of a student teacher. I certainly did.

Betsy Jones had encouraged Natalie to be creative in her lesson design:

[Mrs. Jones] allowed me to utilize and draw upon my own creativity and my instinct as a future educator... most of my decisions were based on my own ideas. I discussed my ideas with my cooperating teacher [Mrs. Jones] and she was very supportive and accepting of my plans. She provided me with additional resources such as Teacher Editions and past materials that she had used. (Initial Interview Email, 01.12.04)

This process of attending to how decision-making concerning what to teach, was similar to the other student teaching triads in this study. It appeared that most cooperating teachers suggested rather broad topics, which aligned with approved curriculum, and student teachers designed individual lessons and sets of lessons, the unit plan, that fell into various degrees of creativity and resourcefulness. All of the student teachers in this study had demonstrated the ability to plan and implement solid, well-designed instruction. Natalie, however, was especially gifted at coming up with novel and appealing ways to present information.

Like most other cooperating teachers, Betsy Jones placed a very high value on the ability to manage a classroom. This essential element of decision-making concerning how to teach was

at the core of Mrs. Jones' basic philosophy which keyed on students' perceptions that teachers always know what they are doing and never appear tentative. The first major hurdle that beginning student teachers apparently must clear, as perceived by cooperating teachers, is the establishment and maintenance of classroom authority. Natalie Marshal, like most other student teachers, struggled with this initial challenge. Natalie's open journaling style did not hide from me her attempts to gain classroom control:

My least successful teaching experience this week was that some of the students are beginning to be too defiant and I feel I am having trouble disciplining them. The past couple of weeks I have noticed that the boys in particular are becoming more outspoken. They are calling out, calling other student names and not paying attention to the lessons that are being taught. When I am teaching a lesson and they misbehave I feel like they truly do not care if they miss a recess or have to put their heads down. I feel like the cause of the problem may be that my cooperating teacher and I have not found a privilege that the students prize. I feel that if we could find out what is of value to them they will decrease their troublesome behavior. (Reflection Prompt Form, 03.04.02)

Unlike Molly Harcourt and her cooperating teacher, Beth Nolan, Natalie Marshal and Betsy Jones did not hide Natalie's attempts to manage the classroom. Molly and Beth apparently hid Molly's struggles from me as university supervisor sensing that I would censure Molly. Natalie and Beth may have perceived my role as less of an enforcer of university directives and more of a nonjudgmental triad partner. In her initial interview for this study, Natalie had shared that she thought that we, as university supervisor and student teacher, had communicated about her experiences "very openly."

As Natalie Marshal's student teaching experience unfolded, I began to sense an interesting dynamic developing between us. Natalie consistently interacted with me much as she would a parent. I later found that Natalie had a very strong connection with her own mother. She often sought my advice and counsel in areas that were much more personal in tone than other student teachers.

Overall, I believe that Natalie Marshal was very focused on proper roles for *all* social actors in her world. In the first half of her student teaching, I had noticed that Natalie had specifically focused on parents. This high level of reflective processing on correct parenting had not been as apparent among my other student teachers. Natalie expressed early on a general conception she held about the nature of parenting:

I feel that the students who are causing problems are in need of attention that they may not be receiving at home. (Reflection Prompt Form, 01.28.02)

As she proceeded into her student teaching experience, she focused on more specific tasks good parents should exhibit:

When the parents do not reinforce good study habits and manners, it makes the teacher's job so much more difficult. I think that is going to be one of the greatest challenges in my future teaching career. (Notebook Student Teaching Journal, 02.29.02)

And finally, she questioned the motives of a parent in her classroom:

While I was racing between the library and the classroom I overheard someone saw Dawson threw up in his hand on the bus. That is where the morning began. I had to figure out how to get Dawson cleaned up considering the nurse was not present right away in the morning. Finally she came in and Dawson was sent home to get a shower. His father insisted that he return to school. I found that to be a little strange to me. (Notebook Student Teaching Journal, 03.14.02)

I suspect that Natalie Marshal interacted with Betsy Jones in a similar surrogate parent fashion. Natalie had bonded very strongly with Betsy. At the conclusion of their time together, Natalie had penned a special poem for Mrs. Jones:

*Mrs. Jones you are a very special woman who has taught me so much.
You have shown me the ways to be successful when times get tough.
You are a wonderful teacher with the ability to reach your students in a warm way.
Mrs. Jones the knowledge that I have gained from you I will carry with me and use each day. You have helped shaped(sic) me into a future teacher with the strength to succeed.
I hope that you will remember me when you pick up this poem to read.*
(Conference Narrative Form, 03.11.02)

Both Natalie Marshal and Heidi Mason had come to student teaching with very pronounced and definite expectations and assumptions about how they would be mentored. This greatly influenced their conceptions of their place and power within the social dynamics at play during their student teaching experiences and determined to a great degree how they related to their cooperating teachers and myself, as their university supervisor. Natalie Marshal's mentoring expectations, however, included more specific ideas about how *good* teacher/mentors should be, especially in relation to their students. Natalie's fervent hope was that she could make a real difference in the lives of her own students some day. Natalie Marshal apparently expected all teacher/mentors to share this committed worldview. Natalie Marshal and Heidi Mason harbored similar mentoring expectations, but Natalie appeared to be motivated by a purist quest for *ideal* teaching performed by the *ideal* teacher. Natalie especially perceived the student teaching experience to be a significant milestone in her eventual becoming of that ideal teacher, raising the stakes considerably. Natalie Marshal consistently sought perfection, from herself and others. This precipitated, I believe, a very judgmental attitude that Natalie exhibited at times. Natalie's conception of her place and power within the student teaching experience was informed to a great degree by this notion of right things done by good, just people, as she perceived it. Therefore, Natalie Marshal enacted her role of student teacher exactly as it was scripted for her and she expected that all other social actors would enact theirs in the same manner. She struggled with role enactments that strayed from what she perceived to be *correct*. I believe Heidi Mason, and to some extent all of the student teachers in this study, were also very careful to remain true to their perceived roles. Unfortunately for Natalie Marshal, during her second assignment, she bumped into a very, for her, troubling situation that threw into doubt all of her preconceived notions about proper mentoring.

Of all my student teachers that semester, I had assumed that Natalie would experience the least difficulty with student teaching. That myth was shattered well into Natalie Marshal's second placement. The odd timing of the phone call and her trembling voice indicated that she had indeed become undone.

5.9. Natalie and Sarah and Me

Natalie Marshal had apparently experienced quite a culture shock when she arrived for her second placement at Grover Elementary. She was assigned to work with Sarah Murphy's fifth grade class. Grover Elementary and Hadley Elementary, Natalie's first school, were similar. Student populations were comparable in size and characteristics. Facilities and resources were nearly identical. The students in Natalie's second placement classroom were older and the classroom structure was much tighter. But most importantly, Sarah Murphy, her second semester cooperating teacher, was *definitely not* Betsy Jones. Natalie recorded the following on her second day at Grover Elementary:

At Hadley I felt that there was a very warm atmosphere. At Grover I do not have that same feeling or comfort. My cooperating teacher at Grover is not what I had expected at all. Her mannerisms toward me are such that I feel stupid and incapable of doing the simplest task in the classroom. I have realized that I am going to have to make everything perfect exactly the way she does things.

(Student Teaching Notebook Reflective Journal, 03.21.02)

The relationship between Natalie Marshal and Sarah Murphy had begun with an unfortunate incident that Natalie recalled two years later:

I am going to be super honest here. From day one, there were conflicts. It all began with myself and another student teacher carpooling to Grover Elementary School. It was possibly the second day of student teaching and it was well after dismissal. The girl who had driven that day was very sick and could barely stand up straight. She came over to my classroom and said that when I am ready to leave to come get her. I have never received such a look as I had from Mrs. Murphy that very second. She turned to me and the other student teacher and said... I hope you are not trying to skip out when the

children do. I have had student teachers who have tried that. She also said... teachers stay after dismissal and you must stay until such and such a time (I don't quite remember what time it was). Well the girl came back over after the "teacher dismissal time" and looked horrible. She looked so sick and could really not stand up straight. She came over and asked if I could drive her home when we did decide to leave. Once again Mrs. Murphy was kind of snippy with us. We ended up finally leaving and the girl ended up having her appendix removed that night, she was rushed to the hospital after school that day. I made sure to tell Mrs. Murphy the next day that I was sorry for leaving (although it was late after dismissal... but at this time I was seriously seeking her approval) [strategically complying with serious reservations]. I also told her about the other student teacher's emergency surgery. Mrs. Murphy's response was, "well I have had student teacher's (sic) who have tried to leave early." No sorry, no nothing from her. That incident in itself, basically told me what type of person she was. From that point on, I believe that she looked at me as someone who didn't want to be dedicated or spend the extra time to do things... Overall, I feel that Mrs. Murphy was resentful towards me and at times very bitter. However, her attitude towards parents, teachers and even the children was similar. I think that I just took it a little harder than the parents and the teachers, I hope the children didn't take it as hard as I did. (Initial Interview Email, 01.12.04)

This initial incident set a definite tone for the remainder of Natalie Marshal's second assignment. Natalie had been insulted that Sarah Murphy implied that she, Natalie Marshal had been trying to get away with something. This intimation struck at the core of Natalie's conception of herself as a truly good student teacher. Natalie also assumed, because of Sarah's reactions to the event, that Sarah Murphy was not a good teacher/mentor. Natalie had become accustomed to exercising her social power by pleasing supervisors, meeting all expectations and earning from this posture caring, as she perceived it, guidance and support. Sarah Murphy's unorthodox mentor behavior signaled to Natalie that this successful formula might not work and Sarah, not impressed with Natalie's efforts, might jeopardize the success of Natalie's student teaching. Natalie also assumed that she would have to really step up her pleasing and good works to impress Sarah. Unfortunately, Natalie at that time, for whatever reasons, did not conceive of or attempt to employ any other type of strategy but compliance with reservations. Trust in Sarah Murphy as a

good and wise mentor was definitely diminished. Fortunately, some of that trust was rebuilt later as Natalie Marshal recorded in her reflective journal:

Our [Natalie and Sarah's] level of communication has improved dramatically. We are speaking more often and she seems to be more accepting to [of] my ideas and contributions. I have been trying to be extremely helpful to her and aiding her with materials for her upcoming lessons so that she [is] aware that I care about teaching and I care about the successes of the students. I have also begun working on my new unit. I am so excited about being responsible for planning and executing it. I really hope that I receive her approval and impress her with my ideas. Overall, I am feeling more confident and able. (Notebook Student Teaching Journal, 04.04.02)

Natalie assumed that the level of distrust was mutual between herself and Sarah Murphy:

I had the whole day to myself, which was nice. My cooperating teacher was cleaning the closets in the hallway. I could be wrong with my thoughts here, but I am thinking that because she has left me on my own all day today that there is some level of trust even if it is minute. I enjoyed being on my own, I didn't feel as though I was being scrutinized or interrupted at times. Today although it was hectic [it] was peaceful. (Notebook Student Teaching Journal, 04.04.02)

At the end of her time as Sarah Murphy's student teacher, Natalie finally portrayed a more optimistic perception of their time together:

My cooperating teacher has allowed me a significant amount of time with the students on my own which I could not thank her enough for this time because it helps me feel more independent, assertive and I do not doubt myself as much. When I am observed I am very critical of my every move because I am concerned about her opinions. However, due to the time that I have had with the kids, I have a better feeling about my abilities as a future teacher. I hope that the students feel the same way. (Notebook Student Teaching Journal, 04.04.02)

At our first meeting as a student teaching triad, I had noticed that Sarah Murphy was a bit brusque, but as she herself described her style:

I feel I'll be honest with people and sometimes I know they're not gonna like what I'm going to say, but I feel that's my job. (Interview Tape, 509)

Sarah Murphy appeared, like other cooperating teachers, very much in command of her role in relation to her place within the triad. Sarah presented her intended plan for Natalie's

student teaching experience. I remember at the time that she had commented on how she felt student teachers were at a definite disadvantage the second semester since the school schedule was impacted by testing, field trips, etc. This initial bit of information would become a very important issue later.

My novice status as a university supervisor did not appear to figure prominently in how Sarah Murphy attempted to relate to me. Sarah and I had a connection through Sarah's son, who was attending the university where I am doing my doctoral study. Overall, Sarah had been solicitous and very out-going and appeared to be a very engaged educator. She made mention of many committees and initiatives she was part of as an active member of her school community. Sarah Murphy consistently worked at establishing a feeling of collegiality with me during our subsequent interactions. She often attempted to impress me, as the representative of the university, with her experiences, accomplishments and opinions.

At the time of the initial student teaching triad meeting, Natalie Marshal appeared to have adjusted well. She did not verbally express any reservations to me about her relationship with Sarah Murphy. I did notice that Natalie and Sarah did not share the close bonds that Natalie and Betsy Jones, Natalie's first cooperating teacher, had. The thorny incident that had initially framed their subsequent interactions had been totally hidden from me at that time. I left the first meeting secure that Natalie would experience a productive and uneventful second half of student teaching.

What I had neglected at that time was a more attentive reading of Natalie's *Student Teaching Notebook*. I had skimmed over her notebook, since I assumed that it would be complete and had missed the journal entries that recorded details of her struggle, as she perceived it, to relate to Sarah Murphy. I only became aware of the severity of the broken trust

when Natalie called me unexpectedly and finally voiced her concerns in a way that got my attention. I believe I misread Natalie's basic orientation of being very people focused. She brought the personal in whenever possible. I came to understand that just because she paid such close attention to the social or personal around her, this did not necessarily give her the knowledge and skills to get on well. Her attention was directed at how she could please, not negotiate, when her expectations were not met.

There were structural constraints at play as well. I was supervising ten student teachers and in one instance traveling over two hours to get to my furthest assignment. For whatever reasons, I knew I had dropped the ball and I quickly intervened in the ways that my position allowed. After Natalie Marshal's distressed phone call, I had immediately arranged for a visit to Grover Elementary. Natalie appeared a bit reserved. Sarah Murphy was surprised by my unexpected visit and did not seem to be aware that Natalie had called for my assistance.

I met privately with Natalie and counseled/consolated her. We discussed various coping strategies which included my basic encouragement to be as gracious as possible and attempt to ride this challenging situation to its conclusion. I stroked her ego with a litany of my superlative qualifiers, this time verbally and not written on an evaluation form. Betsy Jones and I had both been very generous with our support and praise of Natalie Marshal's student teaching efforts during the first half of her assignment. Our suggestions and critiques had addressed relatively minor adjustments of Natalie's emerging teaching style. Used to heaping praise upon Natalie, I was loathe to suggest that perhaps it was she who should examine her assumptions about Sarah Murphy and own some of the responsibility for the breakdown in communication between them. I also believe that I drew upon my own past experiences with overbearing supervisors in educational contexts who harshly judged me, according to my perceptions. My timidity and

acquiescence in these instances led to feelings of doubt and vulnerability that took years to ameliorate. This played into my sense of myself as I emphasized the protector aspect of my role of university supervisor. I saw so much of myself in Natalie at that moment. I wanted to be for Natalie, the caring, compassionate, rational voice that I had not had during my own travails. In retrospect, I now see that I had missed a wonderful opportunity to open a critical dialogue with Natalie that perhaps moved beyond extreme emotional attachment and addressed possible strategic moves that tapped into the inherent social power contained within Natalie's enactment of her role as student teacher. It could be argued that Natalie had indeed utilized a form of social power when she covertly solicited my support, away from Sarah, to help her. I, however, envision a form of social power that could be more proactive and not draw so heavily upon the victimization conception that Natalie apparently held. At the time, Natalie had listened carefully to all of my counsel and was very appreciative of the attention and support I provided her. As she noted, two years later, in response to initial interview questions:

I felt very comfortable expressing my frustrations with the situation with you [Janet Rodgers, university supervisor]. I felt as though you were there to support me and provide me with encouragement and understanding when I did [not] receive encouragement or understanding from my cooperating teacher [Sarah Murphy]. (Initial Interview Email, 01.12.04)

Natalie Marshal reflected her *strategic compliance with reservations* in relation to the realities of her student teaching experience:

I am trying my best to have a positive attitude about this placement. Each day I try to focus on the ways in which I feel successful. In addition, I am going to put a lot of time into my planning. I feel that I am really going to have to prove my abilities to my cooperating teacher [Sarah Murphy]. Most of all, I am going to be as kind and catering as I have ever been. I am in a position in which I must swallow my pride and get through each day without feeling as though I have let myself down. (Reflection Prompt Form, 03.18.02)

Mrs. Murphy has a set way of completing lessons. She has started a new language arts book so those lessons are fairly new to her as well. More or less, the lessons are an

experiment. I am going to do my best with them. Most of all, I am going to be very enthusiastic. (Conference Narrative Form, 03.25.02)

Through this placement I have learned that the ability to cope with an uncomfortable situation is an ability that I will need to develop through my years of actual teaching. I have come to the conclusion that I will soon be graduating and entering the “real world”, whatever that may be. In my opinion college was a preview of the situations and challenges that one may face in the real world. I feel that an experience, good or bad has its strengths. I will learn from whatever experiences I have weathered. My successes in my daily job will be a product of my ability to cope and learn. (Reflection Prompt Form, 03.25.02)

I did not at that time make any attempt to get a more accurate reading of Sarah Murphy and her perception of how the relationship with Natalie was unfolding. I apparently did not wish to directly confront Sarah Murphy. This new wrinkle in Natalie Marshal’s student teaching experience was confusing for me, not only because Natalie had not initially captured my attention and support, but also because Sarah had overtly indicated to me that things were going well. My first sense of how Sarah Murphy viewed Natalie Marshal as a student teacher came after I had forwarded a copy of my first formal observation of Natalie’s to Sarah. Mrs. Murphy had replied with the following email:

*Janet,
Thank you for the copy of Natalie's evaluation. I would agree with your observation of Natalie's progress. This is been a somewhat less than ideal start for a second placement due to the irregular schedule. Natalie has adjusted well, given the fact that she was not as familiar with the building, the schedules, and the students and staff as in her first placement.¹² She has been able to design individual, grade appropriate lessons based on given objectives in our district curriculum. Ms. Marshal is an exceptionally easy person with which to work. She is very warm and friendly and always professional in her behavior and appearance.*

I hope in her second half of this placement that she will continue with her planning to include adjustments needed to meet individual and/or class needs, integrating concepts across the content area, and the entire day/week of planning and teaching.

*Sarah Murphy
(Email, 04.16.02)*

At this juncture, all members of the student teaching triad had apparently succeeded in hiding information from other members of the triad. Natalie and I had hidden Natalie's distressed phone call from Sarah and worked on our own to come to some resolution of the situation shutting Sarah out of the process. Like Beth Nolan, Molly Harcourt's cooperating teacher, I wanted to protect Natalie from what I assumed was Sarah's unpredictable and contradictory behavior. I based this perception on what Natalie had shared with me in contrast to Sarah's positive email concerning Natalie. I was honestly perplexed. I did not want to make a bad situation worse. I was also timid because I felt my novice status did not position me to be more direct and forceful. I now regret missing the opportunity to have gathered needed rationales in a forthright manner.

Sarah Murphy had hidden her initial reservations about Natalie Marshal from me. I became aware of how Sarah had perceived Natalie as a student teacher two years later as I interviewed Sarah for this study:

I don't think of her [Natalie] as being real, real, outgoing or dynamic... or animated person... [I had experienced a very different Natalie!] not that she didn't do a good job, but some people, by their nature can be the showman or show woman right away....
(Interview Tape, 194)

One thing I remember about Natalie... [she] went to a lot of different interviews, job fairs... went to quite a few... [Natalie had gone only to two and missed a total of three days of her student teaching.] (Interview Tape, 330)

During Sarah Murphy's interview I sensed that she somehow had resented Natalie's attitude toward student teaching in general. Sarah had gotten the impression that Natalie was just putting in time:

This second semester was not important in her student teaching... she was looking for the job and not still working to make herself qualified for the job. I've never had a student teacher that during the latter part of their placement when they are doing the hands-on

teaching and planning...I really truly did feel that she thought this assignment wasn't all that important... she was ambitious... didn't want to stay in the state... what you do when you are young... young people have lives and this will impact their student teaching. (Interview Tape, 136)

I guess I'm really old [fashioned] about this. I feel student teaching is a needed experience, even for the best people, so yes I feel she needed to be here. (Interview Tape, 376)

I believe now that Natalie Marshal may have initially presented herself to Sarah Murphy in an overbearing way. Buoyed up by the accolades of both Betsy Jones and myself, Natalie may have over stated her ambitious goals and appeared much too full of herself. Natalie obviously did not fit Sarah's notion of how a good and proper student teacher should act. Sarah's conception of this proper role was firmly forged during her own student teaching experience. Sarah Murphy's cooperating teacher had demanded exacting professionalism from her student teachers:

Dress [not an issue with Natalie] then was the big thing... you are not a friend, you are the teacher... she [her cooperating teacher] was tough... she was fair...[we] knew what she expected...(Interview Tape, 400)

At this point in the interview, Sarah Murphy had recited a litany of student teaching do's and don'ts. Natalie making attempts to leave school early or miss entire days for job fairs, as Sarah perceived, would not have been tolerated at all by Sarah Murphy's cooperating teacher and apparently Sarah felt justified holding the same standards for Natalie's behaviors, as Sarah perceived them. It was obvious that Sarah had closely modeled her own mentoring/supervision style based on her perceptions of her own cooperating teacher. This demonstrated a rigid version of an *internal adjustment without reservations*, on Sarah's part. Sarah's cooperating teacher had exercised ultimate power over Sarah and Sarah Murphy in turn maintained this stance with her own student teachers, especially, it appeared with Natalie.

Natalie Marshal may have at first been very bold with Sarah, as Sarah perceived it, because Natalie assumed she had attained the high moral ground as a result of the incident in which Sarah Murphy had apparently not been sympathetic enough with Natalie's ailing friend and cohort. Natalie's openness may also have been the result of her feeling more like a teacher/colleague than a student. Natalie Marshal during the initial phase of her student teaching had begun the transition from "expert student" to "novice teacher" (Shoultz, 2000). When asked about how she was evaluated during her student teaching experience, Natalie Marshal had responded during her initial interview that:

Overall, in my first experience, my cooperating teacher was very influential in defining how I was evaluated. The students were learning as well. I know that they should be learning but as a first experience my greatest fear was that they would fall behind when I took over. They did not, they excelled. So in a way, the students reinforced my feelings of how I was evaluating or viewing myself. They took to me and were gaining knowledge from me. In addition, my supervisor was very influential of how I was evaluating or viewing myself. This was my very first experience of being critiqued or having two adults in the room watching me teach. I received positive input and I felt that I was spoken to in a professional manor [manner]. In this way, I did not feel belittled or like a student...I felt like I was an aspiring teacher working towards becoming independent and capable of having my very own classroom full of little minds. (Initial Interview Email, 01.12.04)

For whatever reasons, Sarah Murphy was definitely put off by how Natalie Marshal had initially presented herself and subsequently/consequently perceived Natalie as an over confident upstart.

Sarah Murphy obviously did not share Natalie Marshal's perception that their relationship was in serious trouble. This basic disconnect was, I believe, a direct result of how Natalie and Sarah differed in their basic orientations about the nature of the proper relationship between a student teacher and a cooperating teacher. Their conceptions of social power had direct bearing on how they related to each other. Both Natalie and Sarah would no doubt agree that the power dynamics between a cooperating teacher and a student teacher often reflects the

expertise of the former and the earnestness of the latter. Basically hierarchal in nature, the traditional power differential places the cooperating teacher above the student teacher in rank and quantity of social power, located especially in formal evaluations of student teacher performance. Natalie Marshal's conception of social power, however, included an intensely personal spin and connectedness that Sarah Murphy's lacked. Natalie expressed this tendency often in her reflective writing:

I think if I had a classroom of my own I would take time each week to discuss how we should treat one another. I would also have class meetings at the end of the day to create more of a family atmosphere. I observed this being done [before her student teaching] and it seemed to make the students truly reflect on their behaviors. Each week students would have roles that they would have to be responsible for assuming. I really like this idea. It gives the students ownership for their classroom and their friendships. (Notebook Student Teaching Journal, 02.07.02)

My least successful teaching experience this week was possibly my lack of confidence. Leaving this second grade class is not easy for me. I was afraid that the students would not care so much if I left. However, through their reactions, I have a true testament of just how much they care. I didn't realize how attached you can become to a classroom of students after only eight weeks. My shortcoming was most likely that I underestimated the emotions of the students. At the end of the day today my desk was covered in little crafts and notes. I do not feel the same way as I did before. My future goal based on this experience is that I will be more aware of the student's emotions. I will understand that they care for me just as much as I do for them. In addition, I will make every student feel loved and appreciated. Throughout my eight weeks I have made that a daily goal. That goal will continue to be enacted. (Reflection Prompt Form, 03.11.02)

Sarah Murphy assumed a more distant and abstract posture in her professional relationships, especially those with student teachers. This may have been due to fact that Sarah had mentored many student teachers and the process had become unexamined. Sarah Murphy also displayed a dispositional reticence that lent itself to a more measured way of relating. Natalie apparently read this approach as being very uncaring and she struggled against what she interpreted was unorthodox and unacceptable.

Evidence of this difference in assumed proper ways of relating as cooperating teacher and student teacher was evident throughout the artifacts I collected for this study. I found contradictions throughout. One area that both Natalie Marshal and Sarah Murphy held different perceptions was that of communication. Natalie Marshal appeared to value communication as a way to improve relations and saw this as a key component of how she conceptualized power in an educational context:

If you are asking me now what my concept of 'power' is, it is communicating effectively. Power, is the ability to communicate effectively with coworkers, students and parents. Most of all, power is the ability to instill confidence in a child who has very little. Power is also the ability to challenge the students who are more advanced to reach yet a higher standard. (I do not view power as a hierarchy of adults, I view it as your ability to do your job well. The adults around are in the periphery). (Appendix E)

Early on, Natalie Marshal had described in her reflective writing how Sarah had not “communicated” very well with the parents of her students:

Today was the first class field trip I went on as a student teacher. It was in a way a relief for me. The reason being is because I found out that my teacher [Sarah Murphy] talks to the parents in the same manner she talks to me. So today I realized that I am not the only one. The parents did not interact with my cooperating teacher the way I expected them to interact. The communication was minimal. I enjoyed this day because I spent a lot of time with the parents. They were very warm and welcoming and I am happy that I got to know them. (Notebook Student Teaching Journal, 04.04.02)

During Sarah Murphy’s initial interview for this study, she had stressed how important it was to establish good parent relations, “I’ve learned how important parent communication is.” She then went on to describe the steady stream of formal notices she sent home to parents about class procedures, grades, etc. Natalie Marshal’s conception of “communication” with parents was definitely different from Sarah Murphy’s. Natalie expected teachers to interact with parents in a personal way with prolonged, lively exchanges. Sarah saw her role as providing necessary information through timely notices of classroom activities. The personal component was far less

important to Sarah Murphy who valued objectivity and appeared averse to getting too subjective.

This was apparent in Sarah's comment about the role of the university supervisor:

The supervisor is responsible for making sure the placement fits both parties; to be sure both know what is a necessary requirement for the experience. Provides a second source – someone removed from the class dynamics and can provide a true outsider's view of the lesson. (Initial Interview Email, 02.24.04)

Sarah Murphy clearly perceived me as a “true outsider” and signaled that my role as a member of the student teaching triad should be as objective and dispassionate as possible. Ironically, because of Natalie's needs and expectations, my tentativeness as a novice supervisor, the weight of my previous negative supervisory experiences along with my past interactions with pinched and mean teachers, I found myself anything but objective at that time. The face I presented to Sarah Murphy, however, was in retrospect a calm, measured and rational university supervisor, which is exactly what she expected. This stance contradicted the emotionally charged investments I was living at that time.

Sarah Murphy provided a powerful contradiction to her supposed valuing of objectivity, however, when she expressed that she felt that when she mentored student teachers, “They almost become a reflection of me.” This comment by Sarah indicated a rather strong personal and perhaps subjective identification with the molding, in her image, of a future teacher.

The concept of “parent” was perceived differently by Natalie and Sarah, just as the concept of “communication” had been. Sarah Murphy's perception of the role of a parent lacked the emotionally charged expectations and moral overtones that Natalie harbored in regard to parenting. Sarah had referred to the role of a parent in conjunction with the role of a cooperating teacher in the following way:

The role of the student teacher is to put into practice the theory that she has learned in the college classroom. It's like learning to drive a car – you learn all the rules, what makes a car run and all it's (sic) button and pedals and student teaching is when you

really turn on the engine and put your foot on the gas. The co-op is mom or dad sitting beside you in the front seat. (Initial Interview Email, 02.24.04)

Sarah Murphy maintained a professional distance fostered by her quest for objectivity and apparent discomfit with overly emotional bonding between educational actors. This posture was similar to the stance assumed by Ruth Bailey, Molly Harcourt's cooperating teacher. Just as Ruth's distanced approval and support had caused Molly to experience self-doubt concerning her ability to craft and execute good lessons, Natalie found Sarah's apparent lack of caring, emotionally connected support to constrain her:

In this placement [with Sarah Murphy] I was not comfortable making creative lessons and experimenting with new ideas. I definitely had the urge to do so, however, I thought my evaluation by my cooperating teacher would suffer. Several times I had expressed my interest in trying new things. These ideas were turned down in order to continue with the "norm" and "routine" of the cooperating teacher. Therefore, most, if not all of my teaching choices were based heavily upon the cooperating teacher's discretion. (Initial Interview Email, 02.24.04)

Sarah Murphy's interpretation of Natalie Marshal's efforts in the area of decision-making about what to teach was again at odds with how Natalie had perceived it. Sarah had related in her initial interview that she was very comfortable as a classroom teacher, with making decisions about what to teach, according to the approved curriculum structure. At that point she had noted that Natalie had been very gifted at developing lessons, "She [Natalie] could take a basic idea and really take off with it."

Sarah Murphy had eventually rated Natalie Marshal very favorably, just as Betsy Jones had:

The quality of the lessons that she has presented has been superior. She [Natalie Marshal] is an extremely pleasant person to work with. She is very child centered in her work in the classroom. I'm looking forward to her full time teaching. Her language unit is very creative; I know my class will love it! Natalie is committed to teaching and I feel she has selected the right profession. (INTASC Midterm Evaluation Report Form, 04.19.02)

Sarah Murphy had maintained her professional distance throughout most of Natalie's time with her:

I feel that my cooperating teacher's attitude towards me is not a positive mentor attitude. She seems to expect me to know her routine and the way in which she grades papers, handles the children and many other things without my prior knowledge of her method of managing a classroom. When I ask her a question she seems to get frustrated with me, even if it is a simple question that has significant importance. (Reflection Prompt Form, 03.18.02)

Sarah Murphy waited far into the semester to finally signal that she was satisfied with Natalie Marshal's performance as a student teacher:

This week was probably my worst and best week. I have been sick all week so I have not had my voice and have been coughing throughout lessons. However, I put a lot of time into my planning and I feel that my cooperating teacher [Sarah Murphy] has praised [me] for doing so, not that I haven't put time into my lessons but I feel I have been better able to prove myself lately and doors of communication have been open. We will see if this continues. Our discussions focused mostly on how I will be taking over full time this coming week. I am very excited about this and I shared my ideas with my cooperating teacher [Sarah Murphy] many times. Our discussions this week were very motivating to me because I feel that I have gained her approval. She had said that my lessons are superior and that I am excellent with the kids and that I am doing a great job. I have never heard this before so it was nice to hear. Her comments definitely made me feel refreshed. (Conference Narrative Form, 04.15.02)

Besides the initial incident involving Natalie Marshal's attempt to leave with her sick friend, another event loomed large in the relationships between triad members. This was Natalie's supposedly taking off excessive time to attend job fairs. Sarah Murphy had signaled at our initial meeting that she believed that student teachers were definitely at a disadvantage in their second placement since instructional time was at a premium due to testing, field trips, etc. Sarah had voiced her objections to me:

*Janet,
Natalie told me yesterday evening that she was planning to attend a job fair in North Carolina on May 3-6. I'm a bit concerned as to how this effects (sic) her student teaching experience. I know that our school's spring break, a day long class field trip, and the state*

testing has already impacted her teaching time. This is the first full 5 day week that Natalie has been here and we are testing 4 of the 5 days. Her full time teaching begins next week and that will be the first full week of regular school that she will be here to experience. Teaching is made of so many components - scheduling, lesson planning, implementation, transitioning, reteaching, evaluating, plus the many professional activities that extend outside the classroom and I'm not sure that there has been enough time as is to fully work in these areas.

I know that these dates for job fairs have been approved and it's always commendable that students take the initiative to look for teaching positions. I felt that I did need to express a concern since I feel that the classroom experience is also important to the development of teaching professionals.

*Sarah Murphy
(Email, 04.17.02)*

I proposed a compromise for Natalie to take one less day off for the job fair. All parties seemed content with the outcome, but Sarah Murphy later used the incident to downgrade Natalie Marshal on a recommendation form for a prospective employer. There she indicated that Natalie had not taken her attendance seriously and had missed too much time as a student teacher.

Sarah Murphy was more than willing to participate in this research study. We had a very good first initial interview after two years of not being in contact. Again, she was professional and very eager to help me with this research. Unlike Natalie Marshal, whose emotions still run very high about her student teaching experience, Sarah was very diffident about Natalie. She appeared to have difficulty recalling specific details about Natalie's time with her. I did find it a bit disconcerting to hear her consistently refer to Natalie as "that one." During the interview, when we explored some of the rough spots in Natalie's student teaching experience, Sarah had been rather sanguine in her assessment of how she had perhaps treated Natalie. She noted that her own son, a recent college graduate, was seriously seeking employment and she could now

perhaps understand Natalie's focus on finding a job when she was only just student teaching. She also acknowledged that some of her other student teachers had been affected by changes in their personal lives. Sarah Murphy said she had always taken this into consideration when she worked with them. She indicated that Natalie's attitude had surprised her and was very inconsistent with what she expected from a student teacher.

Sarah Murphy had let down a little at the end of the interview. It was apparent that Sarah had been put off by Natalie's exuberance about wanting a glamorous job, somewhere else. She tried to understand, what she perceived to be Natalie's preoccupation with finding a job in the context of her own son's recent searches for employment. Sarah did admit that perhaps the missed job fair days, a total of three, had not been that significant, at least for the students:

[Because of missing three days for job fairs] There wasn't any negative impact on the students or education program. (Interview Tape, 364)

During that first interview, it was apparent that Natalie Marshal had seriously challenged Sarah Murphy's perceptions of what student teachers should believe and how student teachers should act. Sarah admitted that she had never encountered anyone like Natalie as a student teacher. She also seemed to indicate that next time she might "handle things a bit differently" suggesting that she could possibly entertain some reservations about her choices with Natalie. Other than the two incidents mentioned concerning going home early and job fairs, Natalie Marshal had apparently not committed any other major transgression except initially being too opinionated and outspoken, as perceived by Sarah Murphy.

At the time, I was seriously concerned about Sarah Murphy's suitability as a cooperating teacher. I had registered my misgivings with Paula Hanson, the Director of Field Services at Cumberland University:

Hi Paula,

Just wanted to make you aware of something. I received an unsolicited message (see below) from Natalie Marshal's mother. Natalie was an outstanding teacher candidate and received an A+ from me. Her second placement could very well have been her undoing and I spent much time easing her through this difficult experience... I believe you should also consider removing Sarah Murphy from the list of acceptable cooperating teachers. It appears that while some mentors are weak, some appear to have a malicious 'hazing' mentality!

Take care.

Janet

(Email, 05.22.02)

To bolster my argument I had also sent along the letter I received from Natalie's mother:

I want to thank you [Janet Rodgers] for all you have done to help my daughter, Natalie, map her way and accomplish her goal of earning a teaching degree. As you know, this last placement was not the best for her (or any other student). I thank you for your support of my daughter. I do realize that you, even though a part of her student teaching experience, are a surrogate mother/counselor for all students under your care. Picking them up when they are down and building them back up as well as guiding them in the right direction when they have a misstep. This all takes patience and understanding on your part and for that I will be forever grateful to you.

My daughter was such a positive person under your care as well as Betsy Jones' care. We all know that a positive environment is more conducive to learning and you both have enabled Natalie to learn and model that lesson through example.

I would hope, that in the future, no other parent has to watch their child suffer the way my daughter had emotionally under the watch of Mrs. Murphy from Grover Elementary. I would hope that Cumberland University would take advice from their professional staff members and not 'use' her again for any other student. On the positive side, which was slim, that experience has taught Natalie what she should never do and how she should never treat other people. It is a shame, however, that all her evaluations were exemplary with the exception of Mrs. Murphy's. That, more than anything, has marked my daughter's employment chances. I want to thank you for composing the letter for my daughter regarding that evaluation and it's scores and your explanation for the discrepant numbers from all other evaluations my daughter received. That had eased her mind a great deal, more than anything I could have said or done.

Well, enough said. Not really, but I must end here... Natalie will be home before she proceeds with one of the most exciting times of her life: her goal of her 'own' classroom. She is leaving for Florida Thursday 5/16/02 morning.

*Again, thank you and I wish you all the best life has to offer,
Lydia Marshal*

Paula Hanson never responded to my email message. I never followed up to see if Paula had read or even considered my suggestions concerning Sarah Murphy. When I recently met with Mrs. Murphy for our initial face-to-face interview for this study, she was with her new student teacher from Cumberland University.

During Natalie Marshal's student teaching experience, the major challenge I had faced as university supervisor was the resolution of the attendance issue. Natalie agreed to cut back on the travel time needed to get to her second job fair, thus requiring only two days off instead of three. At this job fair she had been interviewed favorably by the school district that ultimately employed her.

Dear Miss. Rodgers,

I just wanted to let you know that I am okay with the job fair situation. I think that it is best if I abide by my cooperating teacher's request. I agree with you that compromise is absolutely necessary in this case. Thanks for being supportive. I will talk to you soon!
(Email, 04.21.02)

Sarah Murphy had definitely preferred that Natalie not take any time off, but I had overruled her on that. Later I felt some repercussions from my decision. I received two separate calls from Natalie Marshal and her mother soon after Natalie had graduated. They had difficulty reaching me. My father had just passed away after a long illness and I was out of town. At that time, they both related to me that Natalie was in the final stages of perhaps securing a teaching job. Apparently, Natalie's packet of credentials included something in which Sarah Murphy had noted the attendance issue. Natalie and her mother felt Sarah's action would harm Natalie's chances for a job. They asked me to send along an addendum that would cover Natalie, since I had been the one to override Sarah's concerns about Natalie and her job fair attendance. On the morning we buried my father, I faxed the following, per their request:

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing this addendum to Natalie Marshal's credentials to clarify what may be interpreted as a negative perception. On one of the ranking areas on a form used by Natalie's cooperating teacher, it would appear that Natalie did not take her attendance seriously. This is absolutely not the case. Natalie was excused by me, her University supervisor, in accordance with Cumberland University official policy, to attend two job fairs on three separate days. Mrs. Murphy had expressed to me that, because of various testing regimens and other school activities, she felt Natalie could not afford to miss any days. At this point, Natalie had demonstrated to me that she was an exceptionally strong teacher candidate who was more than ready to seek employment. I made the judgment call, overriding her cooperating teacher. I regret that my decision may have tainted Mrs. Murphy's perception of Natalie. It was not my intent. I feel that someone with Natalie's outstanding qualities should be actively pursuing job opportunities and the three days missed did not impact on Natalie's effectiveness as a student teacher.

Please contact me if you need any further information.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Janet Rodgers

(Fax, 05.15.02)

Sarah Murphy had ultimately exercised her social power over the job fair situation with the strict enactment of her role as evaluator. Natalie Marshal and her mother assumed that I could trump this with my influence and control, which I attempted to do. They also assumed that Natalie didn't have the power to influence her future employer alone. As I pushed the button on the fax machine and rushed off to one of the most significant events of my personal life I was saddened by how it all seemed like such petty gamesmanship.

I believe that my perception of the whole situation with Natalie Marshal and Sarah Murphy changed as a result of my latest interactions with Sarah and subsequent analysis and reflection. My heart had been very much with Natalie. I know that I *strongly* identified with Natalie because she reminded me of myself as a student teacher, facing unexpected challenges and coping as best I/she could. I also saw Natalie Marshal as the embodiment of the Cumberland University teacher candidate. She represented the institution as one of its most promising products. I felt a strong loyalty to her and appreciated her meticulous, almost obsessive attention

to following what the university expected of her. She consistently treated me with much respect and deference. I also sympathized with Natalie as she was forced into a situation that could make her fail and she panicked. Sarah Murphy also represented, for me, many rigid and distant teachers from my past who had taught me and who I had worked with. I was definitely not sympathetic to this style of teaching and did not consider such people to be *good* teachers. I was certainly not predisposed to initially rally round Sarah Murphy.

In retrospect, it appeared that all members of the student teaching triad had consistently misread social cues about each other and had clung to entrenched and perhaps dysfunctional expectations and assumptions. I believe Natalie Marshal and Sarah Murphy had been the key players in this drama, but I had a significant role to play as well. We each presented a face and voice that belied a more accurate representation of the social reality we were all experiencing. Natalie Marshal, the girlchild/student teacher needing to be carefully mentored and nurtured, who hid behind the over confident student teacher bragging about her job prospects... Sarah Murphy, the basically well-meaning and empathetic cooperating teacher, who hid behind the demeanor of an abrupt and distant mentor... and Janet Rodgers, the tentative, doubting, overly emotionally invested university supervisor, who hid behind the apparently measured, supportive and confident representative of Cumberland University... social actors enacting what we perceived to be our *proper* unexamined social roles within the student teaching triad. Our story is a rich one indeed and perhaps deserving of much deeper analysis, especially in relation to how we all have ultimately processed the student teaching experiences we shared.

Sarah Murphy had seriously rocked Natalie Marshal's stable conceptualization of a good teacher. This was reflected in a comment made by Betsy Jones, Natalie's first cooperating teacher, concerning Natalie:

I got a lot of feedback from Natalie after she left here... and I got a nice note that said, 'If I hadn't had you I don't think I would be a teacher'. (Interview Tape, 125)

Natalie echoed this sentiment and offered tantalizing foreshadowing of how she would exercise her social power as a teacher with her own students:

What a job! Although teaching is a lot of work I know that it is what I want to do. It has been kind of difficult considering I am working underneath [sic] a teacher who owns the class. I am still not free enough to do things the way that I would like to however, that is expected. (Student Teaching Notebook Reflective Journal, 04.22.02)

Natalie Marshal now teaches an elementary class in the state of Florida and appears to be as enthusiastic about her work as she has always been.

Natalie's story has become for me, like the other tales of power from my past, a strong call for more reflection and dialogue. Here I find much to consider as I examine the constant interplay between reenactments of scripted power relations and social actors' strategic relational permutations based on evolving social situations.

¹ Paula had indicated that I was a supervisor who "could bring them along" when needed. I was very appreciative of the accolade. I felt very comfortable with Paula's leadership style as far as my assignment was concerned. I truly felt she would do whatever she could to help me as I enacted my role as university supervisor.

² Beth Nolan used a discipline system that was rather widespread among the schools. It consisted of each student having access to three colored cards. One card was green, one was yellow and one was red. Usually a large board with the names of all of the students in the class was used. Beneath each name was a paper pouch that contained the cards. Sometimes the cards were attached in a way that they could be flipped over top of each other. In either event, the cards were used to mark various levels of discipline breeches. A minor offense would warrant the taking out or covering up of the green card. The next offense would require the yellow and the final straw would be the red card. This would signal serious punishment in the form of a trip to see the principal and/or a note home to parents.

³ Molly's first placement in Beth Nolan's classroom was in a relatively affluent school that had been generous in space, materials and equipment. In contrast, Ruth Bailey's classroom was cramped and filled with well-worn materials and was in a school attended by children from much less affluent families than was the case for the children at Molly's first school. Molly appears to be referring to home situations that may reflect this.

⁴ In her first placement, Heidi had occasionally noticed the exceptional case: *I also learned some information about one of my learning support students who I have in Science. I found out that this boy reads and writes as a low level first grader, and he behaves like a five year old. Many times he just wants to act really silly during class. Mrs. Bishop told me that all of this is because his mother was on drugs and alcohol when she was pregnant with him. He now lives his with foster parents. That is such a shame. I felt sorry for this boy when I learned all of this. He is the one who has to suffer because of his mother's actions.* (Reflection prompt Form, 01.28.02)

The homogenous nature of the school population may have been responsible for the dearth of reflective entries highlighting cultural difference. Perhaps there were little or no individual or social class/ethnic differences among the white students in the rural/suburban school, or perhaps Heidi hadn't picked up on them.

⁵ It's not apparent whether this information is factual or a prejudiced view.

⁶ Here again, Heidi looks to the individual rationale versus any sort of social/structural explanation.

⁷ The influence and control exerted by the school's attempt to meet certain standards finds its form in the adoption of the Saxon Math program for Susan's students. This curricular choice enforced from the outside, appears to be the most pernicious constraint for Susan in its implementation, however it appears that even in the strict teaching of the lessons, Susan and Heidi still could exercise a modicum of discretion.

⁸ Here Heidi is expressing that she found value in knowing strengths that were revealed to her during her student teaching. She also sought to know her weaknesses and had looked to everyone involved in the experience. Did 'everyone' mean especially, her cooperating teacher, university supervisor, students, parents? Had she arrived at knowledge of the good of her performances through reflection and/or insight or had she relied predominantly on the opinions of everyone?

⁹ Tammy expected student teachers to connect right away with the children.

You can't be standoffish. It's more than a mothering type of relationship with early childhood... also fathering... they must feel safe and comfortable. If they are leery at all its gonna show on the teaching. (Interview Tape, 264) Tammy said that Troy was not afraid to immediately go "right to the child" due in large part to his previous work experience with groups of small children. *I want to see them wanting to tell him stories... interacting with him. It's a red flag if they don't in early childhood.* (Interview Tape, 440)

¹⁰ Tammy's classes often included these types of students. She works with these students before they are 'placed'. This process begins when Tammy recognizes that a child is struggling with issues beyond the range of a typical kindergarten student. The next stage is official recognition, through observation and testing, of problems that warrant placement with appropriate people and resources. Tammy usually has these students a long time before the process is complete. While some students are placed, some children just need to spend more time in kindergarten. This too involves a process and Troy had the opportunity to sit in on a meeting with all interested parties: *Today I observed an IST meeting. It was a meeting to help make the parents aware of difficulty*

the child may be having. In this case, the child was struggling with her letter identification and letter formation. This child is believed to need another year of kindergarten or Pre-1st grade. This child's difficulties are developmental and therefore she needs time. It was interesting to see the different people speak and make up a collective goal for this child. The people attending were the reading specialist, the guidance counselor, the classroom teacher and the parents. It was a very good learning experience to prepare me for a teaching position. (Student Teaching Notebook Reflective Journal, 03.06.02)

¹¹ Troy's reference to "fresh out of college" may refer either to the fact that the student teachers were closer in age to the students or that the student teachers should have command of the latest teaching trends and techniques since they had recently completed undergraduate methods classes.

¹² The semester before Natalie had student taught, she had her Professional Seminar or ProSem during which she had spent a considerable amount of time in Betsy Jones' classroom. She had spent a minimal amount of time with Sarah Murphy before her assignment there. Consequently Sarah assumed that Natalie would require extra effort to become acclimated to her new surroundings.

6. CHAPTER 6: FINAL THOUGHTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

6.1. Addressing the Research Questions

The student teaching triad remains a curious configuration. Triadic structures usually suggest equal measures of influence and control for each member. As I embodied and enacted each student teaching triad role; student teacher, cooperating teacher and university supervisor, my experiences suggested otherwise. The social construction of power had figured prominently in my reading, thinking and writing, especially during the latter phase of my public school teaching career. I consistently struggled with understanding and accommodating/resisting the various stations I maintained within many educational contexts. These perceptions and desires, along with the necessary rigorous demands of a well-crafted research initiative enabled this study. Fortunately I was privy, as a university supervisor, to a rich slice of student teaching experience that could be qualitatively represented and analyzed. My conceptualizations of the intended research process began with my contention that socially constructed power resided within social roles, articulated and enacted/reenacted by social actors. I then proceeded to carefully present the roles of student teacher, cooperating teacher and university supervisor as found within teacher socialization literature that informs the student teaching experience. I also examined these social roles as they were played out in actual student teaching experiences. I looked in-depth at each of eight student teaching triads, paying close attention to the social power dynamics, especially the relational aspects, as I portrayed and considered each one. To create a sense of how research participants perceived and performed their roles as student teaching triad members, my research questions prompted them to consider their influence and control within aspects of their experience in relation to the *what*, *how* and *evaluative* elements of their positions as student

teaching triad members. Prior to conducting this study, I established three research questions that would guide my inquiry:

1. From an inter-subjective perspective, how do student teachers, cooperating teachers and university supervisors located within designated student teaching triads perceive their own and other triad member's influence and control concerning issues related to:

Curriculum (i.e. what to teach)?

Classroom management and instructional strategies (i.e. how to teach)?

The informal and formal evaluation of the student teacher (i.e. how successful the student teacher was seen to be with respect to what and how s/he taught)

2. *How do extra-triad actors, policy, curriculum, standards, and ideology constrain and enable decisions or actions by student teachers or other members of the triad?*

3. *How, if at all, do triad members conceptualize and articulate the need and possibility for the strategic redefinition and reenactment of their scripted roles?*

The table presented in Appendix D summarizes the study results that follow.

From an analysis of artifacts, interview responses and personal ruminations, it would appear that in decision-making concerning curriculum/unit plans/lesson plans (i.e. *what to teach?*) all triad members in this study agreed that the *cooperating teachers* had the most influence and control over these types of decisions. However, cooperating teachers were driven for the most part by the existing curricular structure of the classroom, school, district and state. As long as student teachers proposed lessons and units that were perceived by the cooperating teachers to fall within the framework of the existing curriculum, they were acceptable.

Curricular negotiations between student teachers and cooperating teachers often occurred during the formal weekly meetings required by the university. This dynamic was put into place by cooperating teachers at the beginning of the student teaching assignment during the initial meetings student teachers had with cooperating teachers. I never sat in on initial meetings between student teachers and cooperating teachers, but from interview responses I learned that cooperating teachers in the study used various approaches. Tammy Sullivan showed the

kindergarten report card to Troy Peters and they discussed the possible ways to meet what was to be achieved/emphasized/graded in the kindergarten context. Ruth Bailey, Sarah Murphy, Linda Bishop and Susan Miller presented their student teachers with specific topics and told them to figure out how to teach the material. Ruth, Sarah and Linda chose this approach since it reflected their very strict definition of how student teachers should be initiated into their socialization experience. Susan also followed this strict approach since her school had been designated as a distressed one and what was taught was tightly controlled by the school district and state. Beth Nolan, Betsy Jones and Penny Taylor did give their student teachers some options to choose from, but as Penny indicated, she selected material that she thought the student teacher could “successfully teach.” No cooperating teacher ever indicated that they had thrown it totally open and permitted the student teacher to teach whatever lessons they wanted. As university supervisor, I was never consulted by either the student teacher or cooperating teacher about the basic framework of *what* was to be taught. Nor did I ever suggest that student teachers develop/teach lessons that were in line with, let alone went outside, the given curriculum – as designed by the cooperating teacher.

The design and implementation of specific unit plans was the one area where the student teacher and to some extent the university supervisor held marginal influence and control over aspects of *what* was to be taught. Unit plans were often thematic sets of lessons positioned to enhance and enrich existing curriculum. Unit plans were a university requirement designed and implemented during each student teaching placement. Student teachers proposed curricular unit ideas. Units prepared and presented by my student teachers included topics such as *Nutrition, Families, and Early Explorers*. Unit plan proposals were presented to the cooperating teacher who would then determine if the unit idea would fit into the existing curriculum. Student

teachers often brought with them unit ideas they had developed in their university methods classes, and it appeared that for the most part their unit ideas were well received, in part because the student teachers and/or their university instructors shaped the unit plans in directions that “fit” the existing curriculum as they perceived it. I was made aware of the unit choice but except for the form of the unit plan, had no direct input in the decision as to *what* should be taught as part of the unit plan.¹ I believed that since the unit augmented established curriculum taught, the cooperating teacher along with the student teacher should rightfully determine the subject studied and its intended implementation. Cooperating teachers did not formally evaluate whole unit plans. They stated that they encouraged their student teachers to carefully follow the unit plan specifications from my syllabus. Here I carefully laid out the form of the unit required for submission to be evaluated. Ultimately, I provided the final grade for the unit plan and this was part of the final grade evaluation I made for each student teacher.

Another area that overtly stressed form over content was the writing of lesson plans. Student teachers basically followed university guidelines for daily lesson plan design as set forth in the *Student Teaching Handbook*. Cooperating teachers also had specific expectations for lesson planning in keeping with what their school districts required. Only Tammy Sullivan, Troy Peter’s cooperating teacher, expressed frustration with what she perceived to be student teacher’s inability to write “measurable objectives” into their plans. She faulted the university’s lack of attention to this and noted that she spent considerable time with her student teachers developing this capacity in them.

Student teachers were expected to submit lesson plans to the cooperating teacher in a timely fashion. Cooperating teachers surveyed the content and pedagogy, deemed them to be workable within the context of the classroom (which reflected school, school district, state and

national requirements) and subsequently approved each revised plan before the student teacher taught the lesson. Many cooperating teachers filled the margins of daily lesson plans with helpful suggestions. For the most part cooperating teachers viewed lesson design as a way to promote teaching practice dialogue and growth for student teachers. Often lesson design was the focal point for weekly meetings between cooperating teachers and student teachers. Cooperating teachers utilized their ability/power to define and control the process and the content of lesson design. Some would immediately veto certain lesson elements proposed by their student teachers, especially if the cooperating teacher had tried similar techniques and had been disappointed with the results. Other cooperating teachers appeared more willing to withhold their reservations and permit student teachers to “try new things” and perhaps fail. This element of instructional decision-making by cooperating teachers fell more within the *how* things were taught versus the *what* was appropriate to teach.

During formal observations, I would look over lesson plans, especially the one that I was observing, to make sure that the lesson had been designed according to the standard form provided by the university. I also noted how the lesson conformed to the standards set by the cooperating teacher.

Lesson plan design, at the outset, was a tedious task as outlined in the *Student Teaching Handbook*, and placed an extreme burden on the student teacher and to some extent the cooperating teacher who had to review them. Many of the student teachers expressed frustration with the detail and length of these initial lesson plans. As the student teaching experience progressed, student teachers were sometimes permitted to move to a more relaxed lesson design known as block planning. This is the basic style most cooperating teachers said they used. I did not automatically encourage or allow for this. I left the decision to move the student teacher to

this type of lesson design with the cooperating teacher since they were in the best position to determine whether the student teacher had demonstrated the ability to effectively plan instruction. There was no written university policy concerning this move and, for the most part, this had to be negotiated by the student teachers themselves. Often they initiated the process after dialogue with their student teaching peers during which they realized the option was available. Cooperating teachers usually were willing to negotiate and grant this special privilege to their student teachers. Cooperating teachers also knew that they could require the student teacher to return to the previous detailed lesson plan structure if lesson implementation was suffering because of perceived inadequate planning.

Although, I never actively advocated for student teachers to move to block planning, often, near the end of their placements, I would ask if the student teacher had switched to the less formal lesson plan structure. This indicated to me that the cooperating teacher felt the student teacher had a good grasp of lesson design and was moving into a more real world stance in relation to the planning and teaching of curriculum. This in my mind marked growth and I viewed this move in a very favorable light. Very seldom did cooperating teachers require student teachers to return to the more time-consuming method. In retrospect, I believe that the unclear specifications about the move to block planning may have confused triad members. In Molly Harcourt's case, I believe Beth Nolan thought the decision had to ultimately be mine and I assumed that she would move Molly to block planning when appropriate. Molly had later expressed her frustration with the burdensome amount of lesson planning she had experienced, but at the time she had not verbalized her discontent to Beth or me.

In terms of classroom management and instructional strategies, student teaching triad members indicated that decisions made concerning *how* to teach lessons, were also influenced

and controlled for the most part by the *cooperating teacher*. However, the cooperating teacher's classroom discipline system was designed and implemented according to guidelines determined at the local school and district level.

The cooperating teachers were very attached and protective of their disciplinary practices. They seldom permitted student teachers to vary from their established methods of classroom management. Two student teachers, Molly Harcourt and Natalie Marshal, had mentioned that at their suggestions, student desks had been re-arranged for better control. Two student teachers, Molly Harcourt and Heidi Mason, had expressed frustration with their less than successful attempts to closely model the existing student discipline structures of one of their cooperating teachers. Only Molly Harcourt had *seriously* questioned the effectiveness of the established discipline practices of her cooperating teacher, but this had been before she had successfully modeled them. She later stated that in her current teaching she now uses some specific student control techniques learned from her cooperating teacher during her student teaching experience. Molly's reflective journal entries indicated that she had been significantly influenced by a classroom management methods course she had taken. She had been primed to implement more expansive notions of classroom management developed during this course, but found it was almost impossible as a guest in both Beth Nolan's and Ruth Bailey's classrooms. Molly Harcourt indicated that she intended to eventually use her own classroom management ideas and techniques in her classroom when she began her teaching career.

Both cooperating teachers and student teachers indicated that, as they perceived it, university supervisors had little or no influence and control over *how* lessons were taught. I immediately recognized the proud ownership of established classroom management techniques exhibited by cooperating teachers and, consequently, did not venture comments or suggestions in

this area. I believed that cooperating teachers held a legitimate claim here. I would attend to classroom management as part of my formal lesson observations and note when student teachers demonstrated either deficiencies or successful handling of challenging situations. During my post-observation meetings with student teachers they would often share classroom management tips and techniques that they were using, mostly at the suggestion of their cooperating teachers. Occasionally I offered a classroom management technique that I had personally used or had observed in another classroom. Rarely did our discussions ever move to deeper levels to address developmental and motivational issues in relation to student behaviors. I believe that the student teaching experience, as presently constituted, places serious time constraints on triad member interactions. Spaces and places for in-depth, substantive discussions simply do not exist.

As university supervisor, the area where I had the *most* influence and control, as perceived by student teachers and cooperating teachers, was the *evaluation* of how successfully lessons were designed and taught, perhaps indicating some control over curriculum and instruction. Student teaching triad members, myself included, agreed that the *university supervisor* exerted the most influence and control over decisions made concerning the process and outcome of evaluating the student teacher's performance. This ultimate assessment, however, was contained within university guidelines, informal norms communicated by other supervisors and the influence and control of the director of student teaching. In consultation with the cooperating teacher, I determined the final letter grade that marked a student teacher's relative degree of success or failure. At the end of the second placement I arrived at a grade determination. I based my assessment on classroom observations and formal evaluations. I also factored in how well students had attended to my syllabus requirements. This included the comprehensive *Student Notebook* and *Unit Plan*. This final grade was made part of the

permanent record that student teachers took with them when they graduated. Cooperating teachers perceived themselves to have some influence over the final grade, but they said they usually deferred to the university supervisor.² Student teachers perceived themselves to have little or no influence and control over their final grade, although it appeared that they sometimes had the ability to “hide” information that could influence the final evaluation decision of the university supervisor. All student teachers placed a high premium, however, on receiving an A.

I would often signal to the student teacher, near the end of their second placement, what I expected to give them as a final grade. Usually by that time I had determined the final designation. I felt this move enabled them to relax a bit. I also enjoyed sharing the good news with them since they usually received an A or even an A+. This satisfied my need to bond and celebrate and perhaps close some of the distance required by my role position, as I perceived it. I also made sure to discuss possible A- grades with student teachers well before the end of their second placement. Again, this move attempted to somehow soften what I perceived as the difficult yet necessary judgmental aspect of my role as university supervisor. Student teachers were heavily invested in the final grade. This was where I, as university supervisor, exerted my ability/power to influence the final grade in a definite *power over* position in relation to student teachers and to some extent cooperating teachers. I had not completely *internally adjusted* to my role as evaluator, however, since my reservations about the grading scheme had compelled me to negotiate a more comfortable position for myself in what I perceived to be the utilization of the university defacto pass/fail system.³

At the time of this study, Cumberland University had adopted and implemented the evaluative language and process found within the INTASC standards and rubric. Formal INTASC evaluation forms (Appendix C) were filled out by cooperating teachers and university

supervisors at the mid-term and end of each placement. These forms were filed with the Office of Field Services. Copies of these cooperating teacher formal evaluations were sent to university supervisors to read and initial. Although not required by the university, I had provided cooperating teachers with copies of both my formal observations and evaluations in order to share the content and style of these forms with them.

Student teachers had virtually no influence and/or control over the *formal* aspects of evaluation. Cooperating teachers stated that although they would entertain discussions concerning a particular rating, very seldom, if ever, did such an exchange prompt any altering of the original assessments of their student teachers. *Informal* evaluation was an area that depended heavily on the relational aspects of the power dynamics found within the student teaching triad. Much occurred as student teachers presented lesson plans and cooperating teachers responded to them verbally or by writing suggestions in the margins. This practice-based teacher talk appeared to be especially evident when the student teacher and cooperating teacher had established strong relational bonds and attempts were made by the cooperating teacher to establish a more *power with* stance in relation to the student teacher. As reported in the *Conference Narrative Forms* submitted by student teachers, much informal evaluation was done during weekly meetings between student teachers and cooperating teachers. Robust, productive communication was evident between student teachers and cooperating teachers who enjoyed good working relationships.

As university supervisor, I too rarely altered my *formal* evaluation decisions. When discussing aspects of my formal observations/evaluations with student teachers, Paula Hanson, the Director of Field Services, had suggested that I make no more than two suggestions at a time to enable student teachers to more successfully achieve what I perceived and articulated as

necessary benchmarks in their performance. This micro-managed tendency to carefully oversee and control *all* aspects of the student teacher experience to minimize the possibility of failure is part and parcel, I believe, of the ideology of reputation and dependability that operates within the student teaching program at Cumberland University.

In conjunction with formal evaluations, I also conducted various forms of *informal* evaluation in meetings with student teachers when I visited their schools and communicated with them via email and telephone conversations. During these discussions my comments and suggestions were most often in response to questions posed by student teachers. Candid, robust communication was also predicated by my relationship with each student teacher. This type of candor most often occurred during the latter part of the semester, after we had established a good rapport.

In retrospect, I realize that I may have underutilized this forum. As a result of this study, I have found that during the student teaching experience there is the possibility that cooperating teachers and/or student teachers may hide important information from me. This withheld knowledge has direct bearing on my ability/power to fairly judge and evaluate a student teacher's performance. In the future I will not assume that other triad members are being completely forthright and honest with me. In the future when I meet with student teachers and cooperating teachers alone or as part of official triad meetings, I intend to actively seek out specific information and be sensitive to more subtle clues that indicate an attempt to hide information.

Students for the most part appeared to be satisfied with how they were formally evaluated. Molly Harcourt and Heidi Mason were quite interested in receiving critiques and suggestions. They saw this as a way to grow and become better teachers. Both Molly and Heidi had overtly expressed a desire for many more formal evaluations. I believe that they perceived

the formal evaluation process primarily as an opportunity to discuss their performances as student teachers and they welcomed the chance to discuss their continuing development. This desire on their part also indicated that past formal observations had positively played out for them without onus or censure.

At the end of each placement I would meet with cooperating teachers to discuss the student teacher's final grade. At this meeting I would propose the grade I felt was appropriate to give to the student teacher. The set of cooperating teachers from this study all agreed with my final grade proposals and ultimate decisions. Of the fifty cooperating teachers I had worked with, only two had seriously challenged the final grade assessment their student teacher received from me. In one instance I was urged to lower a grade and in the other it was strongly suggested that I consider an A+ instead of an A. Both cooperating teachers had been responsible for the student teacher's second placement and both suggested that I ignore the input of the cooperating teacher from the first placement. I did not change either grade. I felt my assessments to be authentic and solid. I also believed that Paula Hanson, director of student teaching, had faith in my evaluation decisions and would support my final determinations.

The student teachers who participated in this study received the following grades: Natalie Marshal and Troy Peters received an A+, Molly Harcourt and Heidi Mason received an A. At that time, I considered Natalie's performance to be outstanding based primarily on her exceptional lesson design and delivery. Troy's dynamic, self-reflective approach stood him apart, for me, from most other student teachers I had supervised. Molly and Heidi had been excellent student teachers but had not demonstrated to my satisfaction, as university supervisor and as evaluator, behaviors and attitudes that elevated their performances to the highest level of A+. Neither the student teachers or the cooperating teachers challenged my final grade assignments.

The second research question informing this study was, *'How do extra-triad actors, policy, curriculum, standards, and ideology constrain and enable decisions or actions by student teachers or other members of the triad?'* Participants very seldom referred to extra-triad educational actors in either journal entries or interview question responses. Students, other building teachers, parents and principals were mentioned when this occurred.

Students were usually discussed in the context of how effective classroom management and/or instructional techniques had been. Student teachers and cooperating teachers who were very child-centered, beyond what is typically expected of an elementary classroom teacher, often framed responses around individual students or students as a group. Cooperating teachers often based evaluations of student teachers on how students had behaved during a particular lesson taught by the student teacher or how students responded to the student teacher in general. Most student teachers strongly expressed a desire to design lessons that would peak student interest, motivate them to participate, and discourage them from misbehavior. It appeared that curriculum content had more to do with classroom control than with what they thought students should learn, know and be able to do.

Other building teachers were mentioned in reference to lesson planning and classroom management. Most times these colleagues taught at the same grade level as the cooperating teacher. Student teachers were included in their ongoing dialogues about goals, strategies, successes and failures. Another opportunity student teachers had to interact with building teachers was in the faculty room. Most cooperating teachers regarded the faculty room as a potentially dangerous place for a student teacher and would often carefully school them about how to act and what topics were or were not appropriate for discussion. This was one area where it appeared that the cooperating teacher was attending to and sharing information about outside

“political” influences. Cooperating teachers in this study did serve on various building and school district committees in relation to curriculum planning and discipline. Student teachers were informed about the make-up and workings of these committees and at times were able to sit in on actual meetings. This was not a regular occurrence, however, for the student teachers in this study.

Parents were seldom referred to in the context of decision-making about the *what* or *how* of teaching. Beth Nolan, Molly Harcourt’s cooperating teacher had mentioned that parents appreciated her good classroom control and Natalie Marshal had mentioned a field trip that included parent participants. Troy Peters and Heidi Mason had discussed sitting in on meetings with parents concerning individual students. In addition, Tammy Sullivan had warned Troy Peters to make sure he did not teach material that under-challenged his kindergarten students. She had indicated that this practice would cause some parents to perceive that their children’s academic needs were not being addressed and they may register their discontent with him and/or the building principal.

Principals were mentioned in the context of evaluation since most student teachers requested and received a formal visit/observation from the building principal. Often the principal would discuss the visit with the student teacher noting strengths and weaknesses of the lesson observed. For the individual student teacher much value was found in the principal’s perspectives. Their comments provided windows into expectations and assumptions of future interviewers and building principals. Only Natalie Marshal had mentioned the visit of the principal to the classroom for something other than a student teacher or teacher observation: to prepare the students for an up-coming test. Tammy Sullivan noted that principals would sometimes observe student teachers and report back to the cooperating teacher especially if the

student teacher had been out of line in some sort of extra-classroom supervision of students. When interviewed, both Tammy Sullivan and Penny Taylor said that they paid close attention to what other teachers, as well as the principal, thought and said about their student teachers.

Every triad member mentioned *curriculum/standards/testing* as the most significant outside influence on *what* is taught, especially in today's classrooms. During the time when these student teaching experiences occurred, following on the heels of outcome-based education, the move to standards/testing was just beginning. Cooperating teachers had begun to adjust classroom instruction to accommodate the new accountability focus. In two cases, Troy Peters/Tammy Sullivan and Heidi Mason/Susan Miller, triad members interpreted *curriculum/standards/testing* as having significant influence over what they chose to teach and in Heidi Mason/Susan Miller's case, *exactly how* to teach.

Triad members stated that the discipline policy enforced at the building or district (within state/federal guidelines) level had the most influence on *how* things were taught. This mandated policy was the foundation for discipline systems in place. All teachers were expected to develop their individual classroom management in accordance with approved discipline policy. Molly Harcourt and Heidi Mason had overtly discussed the discipline systems operating in their classrooms in their reflective writing, but this was only in relation to their individual concerns about modeling them.

In the area of evaluation, the newly adopted INTASC system of observation and evaluation was deemed to exert the most influence and control over the formal evaluation process. At the time of this study, university supervisors were just beginning to use the INTASC rubric. At the beginning of the semester, university supervisors were instructed to introduce cooperating teachers to this new evaluation method/form. For the most part, cooperating teachers

in this study found the new evaluation form better than the old one, especially with the forms decreased reliance on descriptive narrative text. All of the cooperating teachers, in this study, thoughtfully utilized the new INTASC form. They indicated that INTASC'S four broad domains [see Appendix C] provided them with a framework to discuss student teacher performance. Many cooperating teachers noted that they felt the 4) *Distinguished* designation was a bit inappropriate for evaluating student teachers, but most used it anyway. I, as researcher, in hindsight and on a closer inspection of all of the INTASC evaluation forms submitted to me for this study, had found that the most thoughtful and complete INTASC evaluations had been done by Sarah Murphy, Natalie Marshal's cooperating teacher. I believe the rubric's less demanding form, with its de-emphasis on written narrative, influenced the evaluative process for most cooperating teachers as they evaluated their student teachers.

The student teachers in this study also appeared to be satisfied with INTASC evaluations. They too expressed appreciation for the common language framework that the INTASC form apparently engendered. The student teachers indicated that conferences with their cooperating teachers had often included dialogue that touched on and/or emphasized the language found in the INTASC format.

Although participants did not directly articulate one, I believe conservatism to be an *enabling or constraining ideology* within the context of this study. Often cooperating teachers would refer to an established idea or practice as "one that always works, so we don't change it." I also perceived that the Cumberland University student teaching experience operated within what I believe to be an ideology of reputation and dependability. Triad members, especially cooperating teachers, appeared to be extremely comfortable with their designated roles. Due to cooperating teachers' dominating influence and control over the whole process, except for

evaluation, this is not surprising. For the most part it was assumed and expected *by all triad members* that Cumberland University student teachers would arrive at their placements, well-prepared and suited to successfully assume their duties. The evaluation process was not entirely perceived to be a sort and select regimen but often an opportunity for dialogue that fostered student teacher growth.

While I do believe that the evidence from this study indicated the influence of an ideology of reputation and dependability, and an overall conservative tone, I do not wish to imply that the teacher preparation program at Cumberland University did not proactively attempt to reform and improve its existing policies and practices.

The third and final research question in this study was: *'How, if at all, do triad members conceptualize and articulate the need and possibility for the strategic redefinition and reenactment of their scripted roles?'*

Participant responses found in Appendix E confirm that both cooperating teachers and student teachers had very clear notions of what their roles encompassed. As a university supervisor, I too, felt that I had a strong sense of how I was to enact my role. Most student teaching triad member responses about member roles, especially their own, appear to be for the most part congruent with their actual performances, during the student teaching experiences studied. An examination of participant responses to the study interview questions also addressed this final research question and revealed a few instances where triad members entertained the possibility of changing aspects of their assigned roles.

Linda Bishop did not wish to participate in this study and did not provide a description of her perception of student teaching triad member roles. However, she may have provided a sense of what she expected and assumed about member roles in the enactment of her cooperating

teacher role. More than any other cooperating teacher, Linda Bishop had overtly realigned her role as she advocated the inclusion of Mary Grant as the shadow cooperating teacher for Heidi Mason. Other cooperating teachers who actively expressed an interest in perhaps redefining their roles included both Tammy Sullivan and Penny Taylor. They had indicated that they wished to redefine their roles in relation to mine as they advocated a more proactive posture for me within the student teaching triad.

Although not specifically articulated by triad members to me, I witnessed various shifts in role enactments. Strategic maneuvers by other triad members, in relation to their scripted roles, as interpreted by me, included Molly Harcourt's shift to a more passive posture with Ruth Bailey in her second placement. Natalie Marshal also assumed a more passive role with Sarah Murphy, but resisted with various hiding maneuvers as she stepped up her neediness to elicit my active support. I often wondered if Sarah had perhaps sent mixed messages to both Natalie and myself to maintain control over her well-developed role of cooperating teacher. Natalie had certainly acted in a way that deviated from or challenged Sarah's conception of proper student teacher behavior. Just as I sought to please those who directed and supervised me, as well as the cooperating teachers who I worked with and the student teachers I supervised, it appeared that Sarah Murphy too wished to preserve her good standing with the university, but not necessarily with me. Sarah's mixed messages fostered a dialogue between us that had a strange, almost dysfunctional quality about it. Our interchanges operated on two tracks; the high practical, rhetorical plane and the submerged emotional sub-text of tentative conformity. I wanted to appear the seasoned university supervisor. Sarah wished to maintain her aloof, strict role enactment. We both worked hard to conceal our reservations.

As for my social maneuvering, I found myself struggling primarily with my novice status in relation to my role, especially when I began to assume my supervisory duties. I carefully enacted what I perceived to be my responsibilities as set forth by the university. I had begun to mindfully adjust my role enactments during my third supervisory shift. This time frame was the one under study. My own strategic positioning, in relation to the scripted role of university supervisor, included negotiating my gatekeeper role with Paula Hanson, the university's Director of Field Services, to permit me to grant A+ and A- grades. As a dutiful university supervisor, I should have perhaps also consulted directly with Paula about Linda Bishop's dual mentoring situation, but I decided not to do so.

Over time, I also became more fully aware of the demanding nature of the student teaching experience, especially for the student teachers. At that point, I began to notice subtle shifts in my enactments of certain aspects of my role. Realizing the pressure-filled atmosphere that my visits usually precipitated, I determined that I would never arrive unannounced for a formal observation and/or evaluation of a student teacher. I communicated this to my student teachers to lessen their stress. I was also mindful of my strategic move to a more overt role of sympathetic advocate in relation to my student teachers. In the case of Natalie Marshal, this included a definite shift to forms of listening and advising that placed me in a posture of surrogate parent and counselor. For Molly Harcourt, I had not seriously penalized her for her inattention to my *Student Teacher Notebook* requirements.

My relations with cooperating teachers did not alter much. I generously granted them their due as, for the most part, experienced and seasoned mentors. I seldom considered any major strategic realignments of my role that would question or challenge their role enactments although

I had begun to entertain some doubts as to the efficacy of some of the attitudes and practices I was witnessing, both in regard to the teaching of students and mentoring of student teachers.

The responses research participants provided for the third research question reinforced what I believe to be the overall unexamined acceptance and/or strategic compliance by student teaching triad members of the student teaching experience. I had already sensed the apparent and not so apparent unequal power differentials within the student teaching triad. With this final research question I had hoped to perhaps find more discomfit among other student teaching triad members with entrenched student teaching triad roles. I had also hoped that, as a result of perceived dissatisfaction with one's place within the social matrix under study, research participants might sense and articulate a need to re-examine and perhaps realign the power dynamics of the student teaching triad. I had wanted to hear critical dialogue and witness overt resistance... what I found was mute acceptance and very mild instances of questioning the status quo.

The results of this study indicated that that none of the student teachers questioned their roles within the student teaching triad. Even though Natalie Marshal had struggled with her student teacher role, she never seriously questioned or actively sought to alter its passive nature. In retrospect, Natalie constructed and utilized a good measure of social power for herself as client-to-be-served. She actively sought very strict role enactments, not necessarily in accordance with my scripted role, from me, as advocate and savior, *after* she had initially resisted what she perceived to be Sarah Murphy's inadequate performance as a cooperating teacher.

Of the cooperating teachers, Tammy Sullivan, Penny Taylor and Linda Bishop were the only ones who wanted to change and, in Linda's case, actually redefine the roles of student

teaching triad members. Tammy and Penny had requested more university supervisor input, and Linda had overtly redefined her mentoring role to include her colleague, Mary Grant.

6.2. Picking Up the Theoretical Threads

In Chapter 2, a survey of relevant teacher socialization literature was helpful in the delineation of social roles for student teaching triad members. Standard expectations and assumptions were apparent. These traditional roles were echoed in various Cumberland University directives as set forth in the *Student Teaching Handbook*.

Student teachers held the least position in terms of overall influence and control and struggled with the contradiction of playing the passive/active social actor. This study recorded how student teachers do indeed struggle with this passive/active tension, often by necessity hiding their true feelings and desires, as Molly Harcourt did, or resisting in what was perceived as inappropriate ways, as evidenced by Natalie Marshal's rocky relationship with Sarah Murphy.

This sample of teacher socialization literature also provided extensive lists of expected behaviors and attitudes that cooperating teachers could and should display as they acted and reenacted their roles. I witnessed the cooperating teachers in this study enact and embody the full recommended complement. It was also assumed in the literature that cooperating teachers remained the primary socializing agent for the student teacher. Here too, I believe this study indicated that all triad members looked to the cooperating teacher as the mentor who was unquestionably the model to pattern. In this regard, cooperating teachers could lay claim to a great deal of socially constructed power within the student teaching triad, especially since the university supervisor, for the most part, remained a marginal and distant social actor. The literature usually addressed structural/macro reasons for the muted roles that university

supervisors assume. I believe that my research also pointed to the personal/micro ways that university supervisors may enhance or inhibit their own performances.

Although this research study was grounded in an assortment of theoretical contentions as outlined in Chapter 2, the following appear to have been particularly reinforced by the results of this study:

- The conceptualization of power in relation to social roles, *socially constructed power*, is useful in the examination of educational contexts.
- Strategic power relations may be possible as *transformative possibilities* when located within reenactments of scripted power relations or social roles.
- *Interpersonal relationships* have a direct bearing on how power is expressed in a social context and flows most freely in a *robust communicative environment*.

Crafting this research study enabled me to touch on my desire to examine how power was socially constructed within student teaching triads. My emphasis on role enactments reflected my basic contention that one may mindfully construct various forms of social power as one performs as a social actor. The *Second Cycle* interview questions located in Appendix B directly questioned research participants about social roles and social power. I encouraged triad members to discuss the role of the student teacher, the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor. I also asked them to discuss power in educational contexts and what they perceived the power dynamics of the student teaching triad to be. During the time frame studied, no one had overtly expressed a problem with the inherent power dynamics located there, except perhaps for Tammy Sullivan and Penny Taylor who expressed a desire for a more active role for me as the university supervisor not just as a distant evaluator but also apparently as an active participant in the *what* and *how* of instruction. Molly Harcourt had expressed her discontent with her mild resistance to my own and university requirements. Although it would appear that Natalie Marshal seriously questioned the power dynamics found in her second triad, I don't believe that she envisioned *different* roles for triad members. She wanted triad members to perform according to *her own*

perceptions of what *good* performances were. Detailed responses to the *Second Cycle* questions can be found in Appendix E.

The results of this study, I believe, point to the fact that all triad members were operating within very strict power parameters even though they may not have *overtly* perceived themselves to be power players and articulate themselves as such. Their frames of references appeared, in most cases, to preclude direct recognition as well as engagement with critical *power* talk. What I found most intriguing was that *power* appeared to be silently and forcefully working in the background as research participants for the most part unawares, enacted and reenacted their social roles and constructed various forms of social power. Perceiving, interpreting and thus *knowing* one's place within the student teaching triad colored all social transactions. I too, often found myself influenced by this same dynamic. Structural encouragements or constraints appeared to minimally influence or control events, as perceived by research participants, although again such forces provided strong directions, especially concerning *what* was and was not taught.

The importance of personal relationships was a strong theme that ran through the triads studied. Most participants discussed personal connections between triad members in great detail. It became apparent to me, as university supervisor, that when there was strong bonding or good chemistry between cooperating teachers and student teachers at the onset of the student teaching experience, more often than not things proceeded smoothly. My personal bonds with other student teaching triad members did not seem to figure as prominently, although I believe that what I expected and how I interacted with triad members did depend on the nature of my relationships with them.

In the table found in Appendix D, the personal connection category represents relations between member dyads within each student teaching triad. This table indicates that the triads of Molly Harcourt and Heidi Mason had predominantly neutral bonds between triad members, myself included. Natalie Marshal's triads exhibited both strong and weak personal connections. Troy Peter's triads were for the most part strong. In Natalie's case I believe my strong identification with Natalie and consequent positive bonding as friend and advocate offset the weak and/or moderately negative bond she shared with Sarah Murphy. The strength of the personal connections found in Troy's triads appeared to result in part from the strong relational bonds he had formed with *both* cooperating teachers. Troy benefited from placement with two cooperating teachers that shared similar teaching styles. These styles included a balanced perception of the student teacher as a passive/active actor. The congruity of these matching styles appeared to facilitate a smooth, unremarkable transition between placements. This was not the case with Natalie Marshal who had gone from a very close, personal, almost parent/child-like connection with her first cooperating teacher, Betsy Nolan, to a more adversarial arrangement with Sarah Murphy, her second cooperating teacher. Natalie had set Sarah up as a formidable opponent. It would have been interesting to see Troy Peters cope with markedly dissimilar mentoring styles. Molly Harcourt was the only other student teacher that had experienced a noticeable difference between the teaching styles of her cooperating teachers. Molly's eventual coming to terms with those differences appeared to involve a much more reserved approach than the strategic social/power maneuvering employed by Natalie Marshal during the rocky second half of her student teaching experience.

At the personal level, the optimal utilization of productive social power was evident when there was a high level and quality of communication among student teaching triad members. The

nature of the personal relationships between triad members appeared to directly contribute to this. Triad members, for the most part, comfortably related to each other according to their scripted roles, but were there connections between notions of power, the quality of relating and the enhancement of good communication?

I believe that Troy Peters' personal conception of his own potential to construct his social reality, as stated in his articulation of social power (found in Appendix E), contributed to his overall success as a student teacher. Troy's response expressed his belief in the value of using knowledge and experience to marshal resources and become a good problem solver. Troy stated that this mindful process enhances the social power of an educational actor. Of all the research participant conceptualizations of social power, I found Troy Peters' to be the most like my own.

Communication between Troy Peters and both of his cooperating teachers was especially robust and productive. My level of engagement with Troy improved significantly towards the end of his student teaching experience. For the most part, high levels of trust and comfort could be found among all of Troy's student teaching triad members. Relationships functioned at optimal levels. How much of this positive energy was related to Troy Peters' conception of power, and how he viewed himself in relation to it, is hard to discern. What was obvious though was that Troy appeared to *embody* his notions of social power as he confidently moved through his student teaching experience. He actively sought to become a good problem solver as he communicated well and established very good working relationships with his cooperating teachers as well as with me, his university supervisor.

Natalie Marshal's conception of power (Appendix E) also appeared to represent what she ultimately enacted as a student teacher. Natalie's conception of social power, as articulated in her response to the power question, resided in the value of good communication, supporting

marginal students as well as challenging bright ones, “your ability to do your job well” (pleasing adults?) and placing adults, in relation to students, “in the periphery.” Like Todd Peters, Natalie’s student teacher role enactment, except for perhaps communicating effectively, reflected her basic notion of social power. Although she advocated the value of good communication among educational actors in relation to social power, that attribute appeared to be sadly compromised during the second phase of her student teaching. Communication had broken down when Natalie had strayed, as Sarah Murphy interpreted it, from the student teacher role that her cooperating teacher expected. Poor ineffective, communication ultimately affected the quality of relationships among all triad members in Natalie’s second triad. This in turn appeared to almost extinguish the positive energy possible when good communication exists among student teaching triad members.

Molly Harcourt had responded with a series of “?????”, question marks, when asked to respond to the question about social power. Perhaps she was especially sensitive to self-referencing her position in relation to social power. This was a concept one could assume she had mindfully considered since she consistently championed under-served students. Maybe Molly did not want to see herself as a power broker if her perception of such a label included negative connotations. Perhaps she had not seriously considered the productive and positive aspects of social power. The question clearly threw her.

Heidi Mason indicated that in her conception of social power, knowledge was power and the “more you know the better you can teach.” She also stated that as long as one was “willing to learn” the power potential was limitless. This sentiment echoed her performance as an *extremely* dutiful student teacher.

As for the cooperating teachers, Beth Nolan and Sarah Murphy did not respond to the question about social power, Ruth Bailey saw power in the ability to mold a student teacher, Betsy Jones saw power as the “control over grades”, Tammy Sullivan viewed teacher accountability to students as power, Penny Taylor was unable to articulate a conceptualization of social power and provided a rather humorous observation that her age precluded her from understanding and expressing her ideas about power. Susan Miller focused on the gate-keeping role of mentors. Both Susan Miller and Ruth Bailey had directly responded that they didn’t like the use of the word “power” in relation to an educational context.

Overall, I believe that the student teaching experiences studied, especially the social power aspects, truly reinforce Seth Kreisberg’s contention that *“Our particular conceptions of power also create and limit our experiences of relationship.”* I also believe that socially constructed power is impacted both by structural, systemic considerations *as well as* personal dispositions and style. The inflexible, ritualistic nature of the student teaching experience appeared to limit the quantity and forms of social power that triad members could construct for themselves, although Natalie Marshal’s case appeared to contradict this since she was perhaps able to squeeze quite a bit of social power juice from her traditional place within her student teaching triads.

The underlying discourses of reputation and dependability, which imply the maintenance of the status quo, was at play in the university preparation of student teachers in the study. This mindset may have constrained the active construction of social power for student teaching triad members. The contradiction here is that the teacher education program flourishes. The number of teacher candidates continues to grow and local school districts continue to enthusiastically welcome Cumberland University student teachers.

This communicative aspect and its reliance on good personal relations underscores what I believe ideally should and *possibly* could occur within student teaching triads. As Seth Kreisberg (1992) also noted:

[V]irtually all the transformative processes described in the preceding pages were made possible by the exceptional quality of the personal interaction within the organization... Community was the social matrix from which empowerment was nurtured and provided a base out of which each person acted in the world. (p. 122)

6.3. Implications for Policy and Practice

I believe this study reinforced much conventional wisdom about the student teaching experience, especially its enduring nature. Those in charge are disinclined to dramatically change it because of their perceptions of its proven success over the years. What might be possible, however, is the search for spaces and places where the student teaching experience could be optimized to provide greater value for this traditional phase of a teacher's socialization.

I wish to call upon the findings of this particular research study and begin the search with an observation concerning the *cultural* context(s) of the student teaching experience; basic education/public schooling and higher education/the world of academia. The student teaching experience straddles these two distinct cultures. Successfully bridging these two disparate worlds remains a significant challenge. Discouragement and doubt, broken trusts and promises, litter both sides of the divide.

Those who have experienced both cultures appear to lose heart once they cross borders even though they believe that educational reform policies wither on the vine when not firmly planted in the soil of the everyday classroom. This observation is taken partly from comments made by a good friend who is a full time faculty member in another teacher education department. A former teacher and principal, he had been very anxious at first to reach out to cooperating teachers who toiled in the public schools. He lost this initial zeal for the classroom

teacher as he comfortably settled into his role of university professor. Sensing opposition to the more “enlightened” perspectives he attempted to provide, he soon lost patience with the elementary classroom teachers he had hoped to influence. Classroom teachers, contextualized by years of isolated conservative thinking and practice *appear* and in many instances *are* a tough audience. As I have stated earlier, study results indicate that cooperating teachers/classroom teachers are very comfortable within the enactments of various aspects of their socially scripted roles. Expectations and assumptions remain clear and attainable. The student teaching experience, *as presently constituted*, was not the place/space for any real questioning or re-alignment of basic social power dynamics found within educational contexts.

In spite of this, I challenge teacher educators and those who represent and direct student teaching to seek out ways to improve the experience. But again, unless a commitment can be made and resources directed to encourage deliberate dialogue among student teaching triad members, the triad dynamic will remain at its under-utilized, superficial level. What sort of value could accrue from efforts to revamp the student teaching experience as it now exists? How could the mindful encouragement of *all* student teaching triad members to assume more proactive, critical roles impact student teaching? Would such moves be detrimental to the student teaching experience and seriously undermine this teacher socialization component?

The first area that must be addressed, I believe, is the assumption that *only* the student teacher gains significantly from student teaching. The experience is primarily tailored to provide the teacher candidate with opportunities to fill the shoes of the practicing teacher. This is the first introduction for student teachers to the attitudes, dispositions, knowledge and skills necessary to do the job of teaching. Although this valuable aspect of the student teaching experience should not be minimized, something may be lost when the power dynamics flow primarily *from* the

cooperating teacher *to* the student teacher. I found the comments made by a cooperating teacher (not a research participant) to sum this up quite nicely. She had stated that although she was thankful for the material and technical resources student teachers brought with them, she really appreciated the *new eyes* they represented. This teacher shared that once she had been exasperated with her student teacher's insistence on attending almost obsessively to every student comment and response. This approach had significantly slowed down the pace of the lesson and threatened to take away from the necessary amount of material that had to be covered. Suddenly, this cooperating teacher had an epiphany of sorts and re-connected to her students in the way she had originally done as a student teacher and novice teacher at the beginning of her career. Her student teacher had shown her how far she had moved from her original, more student-centered stance. Years of practice had muted the initial passion and joy that had colored her career when she began to become teacher.

The traditional flow of goodness in the student teaching experience appears to stream purposefully and plentifully from the cooperating teacher to the student teacher, but could the opposite flow be increased and perhaps include the university supervisor? Cumberland University prepared well-intentioned, bright and energetic student teachers. Could they have uniquely contributed to the student teaching experience in different ways from the expected and assumed? So much good appeared to be pinched off from the positioning of student teachers as basically mute, passive power players working hard to please. Student teachers are rarely in positions to negotiate and express their stations proactively and in good faith. This perhaps sets in motion a submissive pattern that is carried throughout a teaching career. Many may argue that this is a potentially naïve and disruptive suggestion since perhaps the submissive component is deemed necessary in the successful socialization of a teacher. I would counter that an awareness

of the *productive* aspects of social power and the positioning of social actors to take advantage of it, is a noble goal to seek in any educational context.

Once committed to enhancing the potential of the traditional student teaching triad configuration, those persons who influence and control the policies and direction of student teaching programs face a host of operational questions: How should triad members be trained and oriented to various conceptions of social power? How should student teachers be given more to say in the process and outcomes of their evaluations? How could university supervisors encourage more problematizing or challenging of curricular and pedagogical “givens” by student teachers and/or cooperating teachers? How should university supervisors be hired and cooperating teachers selected? Using what mechanisms? From what pool of people? How should they be “trained” or oriented? How many student teachers should they be required/allowed to supervise and how much should they be compensated for the (extended?) amount of time they devote to such work? Coming to terms with these issues would require utilizing many public school/higher education networks and resources. Much of it would be, of necessity, idiosyncratic. This process would take much thought, good faith and effort to implement.

Even before addressing operational concerns, however, I believe it best to solicit information from existing student teaching triad members. I would advocate that student teaching triad members definitely be aware of and comfortable with the language of social power. I believe the area that most lends itself to *creating an awareness* of one’s power as a social actor, within the student teaching experience, would be in the area of communication. Good communication creates a sense of community and oneness that the notion of a dynamic working social triad should embody. Actively creating structural spaces for robust communication between student teaching triad members *prior to* and *during* the student teaching

experience would greatly improve the operational dynamics of the triad. Such spaces could also more fully open up university/public school connections. All sorts of positive outcomes could accrue from a serious investment in producing such productive dialogue. Although a social or getting to know you quality is necessary in initial encounters, it would be beneficial to somewhat guide the form and direction of the eventual conversations. I would encourage a critical orientation to these dialogues. If triad members have also embraced a reflective stance I believe the potential for transformative possibility dramatically increases.

These critical/reflective dialogues between student teaching triad members could encompass discussions surrounding among other topics:

Examining various tensions/contradictions embedded in the student teaching experience, such as: the consequences of hiding valuable information from other triad members and possibly oneself, the inherent pull student teachers experience between being a passive container and an actively engaged social player, as well as the dominating necessity to control students as well as meet their needs.

Looking at ways triad members could optimize the student teaching experience from their own perspectives. They could be encouraged to re-articulate and/or re-define their own triad role relying on both intellectual and social knowledge as well as personal experience. All triad members would be challenged, by other members of the triad, to articulate their perceptions of their place within the triad as presently constituted. With this at play, student teachers would have the opportunity to operate collegially and perhaps be able to negotiate in some way, power relations within a recognized power infused environment.

Helping triad members tease apart the personal from the persona in relation to scripted triad member roles. This may include discussions that incorporate much working knowledge and experience. Role-playing, or the assumption of other member roles could possibly be utilized. Vigorous analysis of expectations and assumptions found in scripted power relations may also lead to more strategic considerations of acceptable performances in relation to more realistic expectations and assumptions found within the lived social contexts of triad members. Realistic structural-macro perspectives should not be minimized here.

Deconstructing of the student teaching experiences of cooperating teachers and university supervisors may include the acknowledgement of the ritual status of the student teaching experience. This move would perhaps prune away unnecessary and possible dysfunctional perceptions and conceptions of what appropriate student teaching performance embodies. These residual notions may unwittingly influence the supervisory styles of both the cooperating teacher

and the university supervisor. Student teachers would be most valuable here as they share their contemporary insights from their unique cultural and generational perspectives.

Examining existing institutional ideologies in relation to the student teaching experience. Efforts to broaden cultural knowledge this way acts as a counter weight to the oft-perceived deficit knowledge base in relation to what student teachers and teachers know.

*Purposefully discuss areas of influence and control both within and **especially** without the student teaching triad. This would hopefully foster the creation of a critical language that teachers could use for the interrogation of existing power relations found in schools today. This language could also begin to introduce teachers to productive aspects of the social construction of power.*

The creation of critical dialogue often becomes problematic since:

Empowerment entails addressing pain, confusion, power imbalances, strong emotions, deep differences, and ambivalence. Our challenge is to move the domain of teaching and learning beyond its current private and personal safe haven into a more disquieting, but also more proper, social, political, and structural context. (Le Compte and deMarrais, 1992, pp. 26-27)

Once constituted, the revitalized student teaching triad would require a series of ongoing efforts. One simple yet effective strategy offered by Penny Taylor, Troy Peter's cooperating teacher, was a full day's visit to the classroom by the university supervisor. This, and many more suggestions to enhance the functioning of the student teaching triad, could be solicited at gatherings of many different triad members. The establishment of an electronic database that could record efforts made by triad members that positively contribute to the student teaching experience would be valuable here, but only if used in conjunction with a good bit of direct human interaction.

The call for the establishment and maintenance of critical dialogue within educational contexts is probably the most ambitious recommendation proposed. The acknowledgment of social power, especially its productive qualities, appears to be especially difficult for many teachers. I do believe though, that since teachers are comfortable with the language of roles and consequently are very tuned into what is *expected* of them, this might be a good place to begin a

critical dialogue that embraces the productive uses of social power. Unfortunately, just naming this elusive stranger can disqualify one as a credible educational actor in the educational context *especially* if one attempts to claim power outside strictly defined and scripted social roles. Perhaps the *subversive* or clandestine nature of this last turn may indeed be a power all its own; one that oppressed/oppressor legions of teachers could someday embrace and use.

As a person, as a teacher, as a supervisor... my story has resonated with the strains of socially constructed power. Unrealistic expectations and assumptions so often put me at odds with what I saw and experienced as I moved through my world. While much of my misrecognition may have come from my unique and personal being-in-the world, I also believe a goodly portion flowed from the way I was “schooled” as a student *and* a teacher. I believe many other stories are similar to mine. I believe that those who care about and wish to improve educational experiences should listen very closely to us. We represent knowledge, attitudes and dispositions that are *there* and should not be overlooked.

I have found the completion of this research study to be very satisfying and a beginning step in what I hope to be a much longer journey as I set my research agenda. In the future, I wish to further position myself so that I may view, record and interpret how social actors come to “be” in other educational contexts. How do they attempt to influence and control events and persons? What becomes of them as persons as they play out their social roles within social/educational systems? How do systems benefit from the mindful/heartful production of personal social power? This inquiring mind wants to *know*!

¹ The required form of the unit plan was included in my syllabus. I used a grading rubric to indicate what elements I expected to see in the final product. The basis of my rubric was taken from a form used by a colleague from another university who had done extensive field supervision. I encouraged student teachers to attempt to create original, creative unit plans. I expected each unit plan to include a rationale, a set of goals, a list of materials, individual lesson

plans, a culminating activity, assessments, adaptations for students with special needs, a bibliography and a list of visuals and any other teacher made materials used. Each area was assigned a point value for grading.

² Beth and Penny had expressed reservations about a proposed higher final grade (not for this set of student teachers), to university supervisors, but they were overruled. Both stated that they then had written lengthy letters of recommendation for these teacher candidates in order to cover themselves when a future employer reviewed the student teacher's credentials.

³ As mentioned previously, I advocated for and was granted permission by Paula Hanson, the director of student teaching, to use plus and minus grade designations. This represented for me a move to a pass-fail grading system.

Appendix A
Student Teacher Weekly Reporting Packet
Reflection Prompt Form

STUDENT TEACHING WEEKLY REPORT FORM
Reflection and Self-Assessment Prompts

NAME:

WEEK OF:

Discuss your most successful teaching experience this week and why you feel you experienced such positive results:

Describe your least successful teaching experience. Again, reflect on the causes behind the problem:

What future goals will you set based upon this experience? Be specific.

What risks did you take in trying new instructional strategies, developing innovative forms of assessment, or in integrating technology into your teaching?

What did you learn about your students this week?

L. Hoover 2001

Appendix A

**Student Teacher Weekly Reporting Packet
Conference Narrative Form**

CONFERENCE NARRATIVE FORM

STUDENT TEACHER:

COOPERATING TEACHER:

DATE:

Please record a summary of your meeting.

Appendix B
Interview Questions
First Cycle

Questions for Student Teachers:

- A. When making decisions about *what* to teach (curriculum/lesson plans/unit plan) to what extent and how were you influenced by...
- your cooperating teacher?
 - the principal or other teachers at the school?
 - your university supervisor?
 - your arts/sciences courses, education courses, pro-seminar and other (pre-college and college) experiences?
 - parents or other members of the school community?
 - school district policy, standards, curriculum framework, testing?
 - state policy, standards, testing?
 - national government policy, standards, testing?
 - subject area professional association standards?
 - textbook and teacher's edition ideas?
1. How was consensus about *what* to teach arrived at?
When consensus could not be found, how was this resolved?
Did any tensions or conflicts surface when this occurred?
Could you describe specific details of a particular incident?
What were some final outcomes?
Did the situation resolve itself to your satisfaction?
Did you feel empowered/constrained by your role/position within the student teaching triad during this process?
2. Were there occasions when your own views about *what* to teach were agreed to or even applauded by the other members of the triad? Please describe one such situation.
- B. When making decisions about *how* to teach (i.e. classroom management and instructional strategies) to what extent and how were you influenced by...
- your cooperating teacher?
 - the principal or other teachers at the school?
 - your university supervisor?
 - your arts/sciences courses, education courses, pro-seminar and other (pre-college and college) experiences?
 - parents or other members of the school community?
 - school district policy, standards, curriculum framework, testing?
 - state policy, standards, testing?

national government policy, standards, testing?
subject area professional association standards?
textbook and teacher's edition ideas?

1. How was consensus about *how* to teach arrived at?
When consensus could not be found, how was this resolved?
Did any tensions or conflicts surface when this occurred?
Could you describe specific details of a particular incident?
What were some final outcomes?
Did the situation resolve itself to your satisfaction?
Did you feel empowered/constrained by your role/position within the student teaching triad during this process?
2. Were there occasions when your own views about *how* to teach were agreed to or even applauded by the other members of the triad? Please describe one such situation.

- C. Were your student teaching strengths and weaknesses adequately reflected in the informal and formal evaluations you received during your student teaching? To what extent and in what ways were the following people influential in defining how you were evaluated during student teaching...

your cooperating teacher?
your university supervisor?
the principal or other teachers at the school?
your students?
yourself?
parents or other members of the school community?
school district policy?
state policy?
national government policy?
subject area professional association standards?
teacher union/association guidelines?
university policy or guidelines?

1. Did any tensions or conflicts surface around issues of *how* you were evaluated as a student teacher?
Could you describe specific details of a particular incident?
What were some final outcomes?
Did the situation resolve itself to your satisfaction?
Did you feel empowered/constrained by your role/position within the student teaching triad during this process?

2. Were there occasions when your own views about how successful you were as a student teacher were agreed to or even applauded by the other members of the triad? Please describe one such situation.

Questions for Cooperating Teachers:

- A. As you interacted with your student teacher in relation to making decisions about *what* to teach (curriculum/lesson plans/unit plan) to what extent and how were you influenced by...
 - your student teacher?
 - the university supervisor?
 - your own teaching experiences?
 - the principal or other teachers at the school?
 - parents or other members of the school community?
 - school district policy, standards, curriculum framework, testing?
 - state policy, standards, testing?
 - national government policy, standards, testing?
 - subject area professional association standards?
 - textbook and teacher's edition ideas?
 1. How was consensus about *what* to teach arrived at?
When consensus could not be found, how was this resolved?
Did any tensions or conflicts surface when this occurred?
Could you describe specific details of a particular incident?
What were some final outcomes?
Did the situation resolve itself to your satisfaction?
Did you feel empowered/constrained by your role/position within the student teaching triad during this process?
 2. Were there occasions when your own views about to teach were agreed to or even applauded by the other members of the triad? Please describe one such situation.
- B. As you interacted with your student teacher in relation to making decisions about *how* to teach (i.e. classroom management and instructional strategies) to what extent and how were you influenced by...
 - your student teacher?
 - the university supervisor?
 - your own teaching experiences?
 - the principal or other teachers at the school?
 - parents or other members of the school community?
 - school district policy, standards, curriculum framework, testing?
 - state policy, standards, testing?
 - national government policy, standards, testing?
 - subject area professional association standards?
 - textbook and teacher's edition ideas?

1. How was consensus about *how* to teach arrived at?
 When consensus could not be found, how was this resolved?
 Did any tensions or conflicts surface when this occurred?
 Could you describe specific details of a particular incident?
 What were some final outcomes?
 Did the situation resolve itself to your satisfaction?
 Did you feel empowered/constrained by your role/position within the student teaching triad during this process?
 2. Were there occasions when your own views about *how* to teach were agreed to or even applauded by the other members of the triad? Please describe one such situation.
- C. When making decisions concerning the informal and formal evaluation of your student teacher, to what extent and how were those decisions influenced by...
- your student teacher?
 - the university supervisor?
 - your own teaching and supervision experiences?
 - the principal or other teachers at the school?
 - students in your classroom?
 - parents or other members of the school community?
 - school district policy?
 - state policy?
 - national government policy?
 - subject area professional association standards?
 - teacher union/association guidelines?
 - university policy or guidelines?
1. Did any tensions or conflicts surface around evaluations of this student teacher?
 Could you describe specific details of a particular incident?
 What were some final outcomes?
 Did the situation resolve itself to your satisfaction?
 Did you feel empowered/constrained by your role/position within the student teaching triad during this process?
 2. Were there occasions when your own judgments about the effectiveness of your student teacher were agreed to or even applauded by the other members of the triad? Please describe one such situation.

Appendix B
Interview Questions
Second Cycle

----- Original Message -----

From: [Janet Rodgers](#)

To: Student Teachers and Cooperating Teachers

Sent: Wednesday, February 04, 2004 3:43 PM

Subject: Follow-up Questions

Dear Research Participants,

Here are some follow-up questions for you to respond to. Don't feel you have to rush through them. It would be best if you answered them one at a time from the beginning instead of skimming through all of them before you start. They definitely build on each other. Take your time and thanks again.

Janet

- 1. How do you conceptualize the 'role' of the student teacher?**
- 2. How do you conceptualize the 'role' of the cooperating teacher?**
- 3. How do you conceptualize the 'role' of the university supervisor?**
- 4. *For Cooperating Teachers...***
In the evaluative aspect of your role as a cooperating teacher, would there ever be a rationale provided by a student teacher that would prompt you to alter an observation or suggestion? What would this rationale be?
- 4. *For Student Teachers...***
When discussing formal and informal evaluations with your supervisors did you ever provide a rationale to them that resulted in the altering of your initial evaluation? If so, what was it?
- 5. What is your conception of 'power' in an educational context?**

6. In general, do you feel the power dynamics inherent in the roles of student teacher, cooperating teacher and university supervisor contribute to the success of the student teaching experience? How so?

Appendix C
INTASC Observation Form

***CUMBERLAND UNIVERSITY,
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES
STUDENT TEACHER OBSERVATION FORM***

Name:
School:
Cooperating Teacher:
Class Observed/Grade Level:
Date/Time:
Subject of Lesson:

OBSERVED ACTIVITIES / TIMELINE:

INTASC PRINCIPLES CHECKLIST (1=Basic; 2=Developing; 3=Proficient; 4=Distinguished; Leave blank if not observed)									
	1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4
1. Understands the disciplines taught, creates learning experiences to make it meaningful to students.					6. Uses knowledge of communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction.				
2. Provides learning opportunities with an understanding of student intellectual, social, and personal development.					7. Plans instruction based on knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals [including state standards].				
3. Adapts instruction to diverse learners.					8. Understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to enhance student learning.				
4. Uses a variety of strategies for students' critical thinking and problem-solving skills.					9. Reflects on teaching, professional practice, decisions, choices; looks for opportunities to grow.				
5. Maintains effective classroom management for student positive behavior, social interaction, and active engagement in learning.					10. Fosters relationships with others involved in the education of students.				
AREAS OF MASTERY					AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT				

COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS	

Signature of Observer:

Date:

Appendix C INTASC Evaluation Form

Name:

School:

Cooperating Teacher:

Grade Level/Subject:

Dates of Reported Student Teaching:

Cooperating Teacher Phone Number/E-mail:

Please rate the student teacher's performance as it applies to the following domains, and then make a general comment on each domain.

1=Unsatisfactory; 2=Basic; 3=Proficient; 4=Distinguished

DOMAIN I: PLANNING AND PREPARATION	1	2	3	4
A. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy (knowledge of content, of relevant connections, of content-related pedagogy)				
B. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students (characteristics of age group, students' varied approaches to learning, skills and knowledge, interest and cultural heritage)				
C. Selecting Instructional Goals (value, clarity, suitability for diverse students, balance among different types of learning)				
D. Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources (use of resources from various sources-school, district, community)				
E. Designing Coherent Instruction (learning activities, instructional materials and resources, grouping, lesson and unit structure)				
F. Assessing Student Learning (consistence with instructional goals, criteria and standards, variety of methods, use for planning)				

Comments about Domain I: Planning and Preparation				
DOMAIN II: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT	1	2	3	4
A. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (interaction with students, promoting student interaction)				
B. Establishing a Culture for Learning (importance of the content, student pride in work, high expectations for learning and achievement; active student participation)				
C. Managing Classroom Procedures (instructional groups, transitions, routines, materials and supplies, noninstructional duties)				
D. Managing Student Behavior (communicating expectations, monitoring of student behavior, responding appropriately to student misbehavior with a hierarchy of approaches)				
E. Organizing Physical Space (safety and arrangement of furniture, accessibility to learning and use of resources)				
Comments about Domain II: The Classroom Environment				

1=Unsatisfactory; 2=Basic; 3=Proficient; 4=Distinguished

DOMAIN III: INSTRUCTION	1	2	3	4
A. Communicating Clearly and Accurately (directions and procedures, oral and written language; use of voice)				
B. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (quality of questions, discussion techniques, student participation)				
C. Engaging Students in Learning (representations of content, variety of activities and assignments, grouping of students, instructional materials and resources, structure and pacing, effective use of instructional time)				
D. Providing Feedback to Students (quality; accurate, constructive, and specific; timeliness)				
E. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness (lesson adjustment, response to students; persistence in seeking effective approaches)				
Comments about Domain III: Instruction				
DOMAIN IV: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES	1	2	3	4
A. Reflecting on Teaching (thoughtfulness and accuracy, use in future teaching)				
B. Maintaining Accurate Records (student completion of assignments, student progress in learning, instructional and noninstructional record-keeping)				
C. Communicating with Families (information about the instructional program, information about individual students, engagement of families in the instructional program)				
D. Contributing to the School Community (relationships with colleagues, participation in appropriate school events)				
E. Growing and Developing Professionally (commitment to opportunities for professional development)				

F. Showing Professionalism (service to students, attire and attitude, decision making, fulfillment of responsibilities)				
Comments about Domain IV: Professional Responsibilities				
OVERALL EVALUATION				

1=Unsatisfactory; 2=Basic; 3=Proficient; 4=Distinguished

General Comment about Student Teacher's Progress and Potential:

Signature:

Date:

Relationship to Student Teacher:

Appendix D

Table of Research Results

<u>TRIAD</u>	<u>ST</u>	<u>CT</u>	<u>US</u>	<u>ST</u>	<u>WHAT</u>	<u>EXT</u>	<u>HOW</u>	<u>EXT</u>	<u>EVAL</u>	<u>EXT</u>
1.	M(+)	B(-)	Me(-)	M ¹	B m+ me ²	(-) ³	B m+	(+) ⁴	Me b	(+/-) ⁵
2.	M(-)	R(-)	Me(-)	M	R m me	(-)	R m	(-)	Me r	(+/-)
3.	H(-)	L(-)	Me(-)	H	L h me	(-)	L h	(+)	Me l	(-)
4.	H(-)	S(-)	Me(-)	H	S h me	(+)	S h	(-)	Me s	(-)
5.	T(+)	T(-)	Me(-)	T	T t me	(+)	T t+	(-)	Me t	(+/-)
6.	T(+)	P(+)	Me(-)	T	P t+ me	(-)	P t+	(-)	Me p	(+/-)
7.	N(+)	B(-)	Me(+)	N	B n+ me	(-)	B n+	(-)	Me b	(-)
8.	N(0)	S(0)	Me(+)	N	S n me	(-)	S n	(-)	Me s+	(-)

ST = Student Teacher = (M)olly, (H)eidi, (T)roy, (N)atalie

CT = Cooperating Teacher = (B)eth, (R)uth, (L)inda, (S)usan, (T)ammy, (P)enny, (B)etsy, (S)arah

US = University Supervisor = (M)e ... Janet Rodgers

¹ Personal connection + (Strong) 0 (Weak) - (Neutral)

² Influence/control within triad: Upper Case(Most) Lower case (Some)
Lower case+ (More than usual) Absent (None)

³ External influence/control (Curriculum/Testing/Standards) + (Problematic) - (Not problematic)

⁴ External influence/control (Discipline Policy) + (Problematic) - (Not problematic)

⁵ External influence/control (INTASC) +/- (Initially problematic) - (Not problematic)

Power Dynamics (Influence/Control) assumed in scripted Cumberland University Triad Member Roles from the *Student Teaching Handbook*: *

<u>WHAT</u>	<u>HOW</u>	<u>EVALUATION</u>
CT st+ us+	CT st+ us+	CT US

Power Dynamics (Influence/Control) found in Student Teaching Triads From Study: *

<u>WHAT</u>	<u>HOW</u>	<u>EVALUATION</u>
CT st us	CT st	US ct

* Upper Case (Most) Lower case (Some)
Lower case+ (More than usual) Absent (None)

Appendix E

Conceptualizations of 'Role' and 'Power' from Student Teaching Triad Members

MOLLY HARCOURT

Role of Student Teacher

The student teacher role should be that of combining their own ideas within the general structure of the overall classroom. Student teachers should make students feel comfortable with them. This is also a great time for them to try new ideas, to see what works and what doesn't.

Role of Cooperating Teacher

The cooperating teacher's role is to have an organized classroom so that when the student teacher begins teaching the students are already in a routine. This makes the transition from student to student teacher an easier one. The co-op. should also provide feedback- what they liked about the lesson, what could be improved on, additional ideas, etc.

Role of University Supervisor

The university supervisor's role should be one of offering ideas and suggestions, but I think primarily the co-op and student teacher should set the tone for what will happen during the student teaching experience.

Conceptualization of Power in an Educational Context

????????[Molly's Response]

BETH NOLAN (DID NOT RESPOND).

RUTH BAILEY

Role of Student Teacher

The student teacher is the learner. The one who is putting herself/himself into the role as teacher, taking the initiative to try new ideas, developing a system of management, experiencing how to deal with different personalities and learning styles of students.

Role of Cooperating Teacher

The cooperating teacher is modeling constantly, giving feedback either praise or constructive, nurturing the student teacher until he/she is ready to teach without the presence of the cooperating teacher.

Role of the University Supervisor

The university supervisor monitors the lesson plans, daily reflections of the student teacher, and observes periodically giving suggestions as needed. Also, she attends to the student teacher's rapport with the children, the cooperating teacher, and the peer colleagues.

Conceptualization of Power in an Educational Context

I don't like the word power. The cooperating teacher and supervisor are to help the student teacher in order to help him/her to become the best teacher possible.

NATALIE MARSHAL

Role of Student Teacher

Before I was a student teacher, my impression of becoming a student teacher was that you had to do thing in order to please your uppers and just get through the experience. During my experience of being a student teacher I saw it differently. I realized that it was a learning experience in which you need to figure out what works for you and you need to make sure your co-op is happy. After my experience as a student teacher I realized how valuable the experience was. Especially the times in which your co-op leaves you alone with the children and you are the only "teacher" in the room. I feel that that time of student teaching was the most independent time of all.

Role of Cooperating Teacher

I conceptualize the role of the cooperating teacher as a facilitator and an observer. Depending on which experience, I viewed one of them as a great mentor and a resource for information.

Role of University Supervisor

I saw the role of the university supervisor as an advocate for the student teacher. They were there to look at the whole picture. They were also there to discuss strengths and needs from their view. Through journal reflections, I feel as though the university supervisor was able to take a more personal view when assessing the student teacher. Therefore, they could use the whole picture.

Conceptualization of Power in an Educational Context

If you are asking me now what my concept of 'power' is, it is communicating effectively. Power, is the ability to communicate effectively with coworkers, students and parents. Most of all, power is the ability to instill confidence in a child who has very little. Power is also the ability to challenge the students who are more advanced to reach yet a higher standard. (I do not view power as a hierarchy of adults, I view it as your ability to do your job well. The adults around are in the periphery).

BETSY JONES

Role of Student Teacher

At the beginning of the assignment, the student is an observer who watches the classroom teacher to learn different teaching strategies. Later, as a coordinator who combines the college methods courses with what she has observed from the classroom teacher.

Role of Cooperating Teacher

The classroom teacher is a model and mentor for the student teacher. We are to provide the student teacher with examples of a variety of teaching strategies to use in order to be a successful teacher. We should also encourage the student teacher and help her reflect on lessons to discover ways to improve.

Role of University Supervisor

The university supervisor is the final judge of the student teacher who determines if the student teacher has made the transition from being an observer to becoming an effective classroom teacher.

Conceptualization of Power in an Educational Context

To me I see power in the educational context as having control over grades or future success.

SARAH MURPHY

Role of Student Teacher

The role of the student teacher is to put into practice the theory that she has learned in the college classroom. It's like learning to drive a car - you learn all the rules, what makes a car run and all it's button and pedals and student teaching is when you really turn on the engine and put your foot on the gas. The co-op is mom or dad sitting beside you in the front seat.

The Role of Cooperating Teacher

The role of the co-op is to guide the student teacher in how theory is put into practice. There should be that point, just like in the driving experience, where the co-op feels free to step out and let the student teacher take off, as long as the student teacher knows the right road to follow.

Role of University Supervisor

The supervisor is responsible for making sure the placement fits both parties; to be sure both know what is a necessary requirement for the experience. Provides a second source of evaluation - someone removed from the class dynamics and can provide a true outsider's view of the lesson.

Conceptualization of Power in an Educational Context

(Did Not Respond.)

TROY PETERS

Role of Student Teacher

I conceptualize the role of student teacher as an internship into the educational field of teaching. I see the role of the student teacher as someone who has been given all the book knowledge associated with teaching and is now using that knowledge in the actual school setting to gain experience and insight. The role of the student teacher is to gain additional knowledge from the cooperating teacher.

Role of Cooperating Teacher

I conceptualize the role of cooperating teacher as a mentor into the educational field of teaching. I see the role of the cooperating teacher as an expert who has mastered their teaching abilities and is giving the advice on how to deal with the actual job of teaching. Their job is to help the student teacher better understand how to teach the knowledge that the student teacher has learned through educational courses. They are there to make the smooth transition from the student aspect to the teaching aspect.

Role of University Supervisor

I conceptualize the role of university supervisor as a mediator for the student teacher and the cooperating teacher. I see the role of the university supervisor as an assistant and professor of what is expected during our student teaching experience from the university. Their job is to make sure that everything is working out during our experience. They are our evaluators to how well we are succeeding as a teacher in the school setting and our preparation to succeed.

Conceptualization of Power in an Educational Context

My conception of power in an educational context is that of knowledge, experience, and the ability to use my various resources. Having the knowledge of how to teach and what to teach gives me the power to be a better educator. The more experience in the actual school setting makes me a more powerful problem solver when dealing with different situations that arise. When given the chance to use various resources such as other educators and other teaching techniques, you are given unlimited power.

TAMMY SULLIVAN

Role of Student Teacher

To learn from observing his/her classroom and school environment.

To ask questions of the cooperating teacher and others in the educational field in the school.

To develop lesson plans in cooperation with coop teacher.

*To gradually take over teaching under observation and guidance of teacher...
independently teach the classroom.*

To continually critique and adjust his/her plans to meet the needs of the students with continued support from teacher.

To share new ideas and information with cooperating teacher.

To be punctual, well-prepared and enthusiastic about working with children.

Role of Cooperating Teacher

To be an effective role model for the student teacher.

To share personal successes and failures in the classroom.

To provide classroom guidelines and expectations along with reviewing those from the university.

To discuss daily what worked and didn't work and to help guide the student teacher into a better, more effective plan of instruction and discipline.

To encourage and evaluate so to provide positive feedback on a daily basis.

To encourage questioning from the student teacher of me and others in the school environment.

To share materials.

Role of University Supervisor

To meet with student teacher before their experience begins to share university's guidelines and expectations.

To share with the coop teacher on a 1-to-1 basis to discuss progress/difficulties the student teacher might be experiencing (on a regular basis).

To observe and share with the student teacher after each evaluation - take the student teacher to another room and discuss the observation. If able to work out, a 3-way conference with coop teacher, student teacher and university supervisor would be nice at least once each semester.

Availability for consult anytime if the coop teacher has concerns about the student teacher's ability.

Conceptualization of Power in an Educational Context

I'm not sure I would say 'power' but I do feel the teacher is ultimately in control of what happens in that classroom on a daily basis. The teacher is accountable for the learning and care of her/his students.

PENNY TAYLOR

Role of Student Teacher

Observe, observe, observe... Then try, try, try... While some schools have students who observe and teach in previous placements, I find it extremely important for the student teacher to spend a few days observing roles, rituals, habits, behavior management strategies for some of the more difficult students, of the room, teacher, and students. The student teacher needs to initiate ideas, comments, plans, lesson plans to the cooperating teacher for review and discussion.... With BOTH having an open mind to differentiated views... The student teacher needs to try an idea and then use the outcome from the lesson to plan and adjust the next lesson.

Role of Cooperating Teacher

Support, support, support and then let, go let go, let go... While there are areas in which the student teacher needs to have a hand-holding experience (such as PSSA testing, deciding what units needs to be taught, etc.) this is their last stop before a teaching position. I feel strongly that the CT needs to let the ST find 'their way' in a way that does not disrupt the routines that have already been established. Everyone has different teaching styles, but a veteran teacher needs to be able to model good classroom management and teaching techniques and encourage the positives sides of teaching and open opportunities for growth in the ST. The CT needs to have an open door policy for ideas, suggestions, as the ST gains confidence in the classroom. The CT must be prepared to evaluate the work of the ST in most of the ways they evaluate their own students in the classroom---from classroom management, time management, cooperation skills, and assessment strategies. Along with the assessment should come suggestions/commendations. The most complicated role of the CT is making the informed decision of whether the ST is capable of handling his/her own classroom and giving a recommendation that reflects the ST's 8 week experience.

Role of University Supervisor

The ideal supervisor would have time to spend in the classroom viewing overall teaching throughout a day rather than looking at specific lesson plans or one specific lesson. Feedback from the supervisor about strategies to use in the classroom or suggestions for areas that show need for improvement should be given either through conferencing at school or through email. Some students just need encouragement, a new perspective, or feedback, while others need more specific recommendations. These are also responsibilities of the CT, but the supervisor has the advantage of being about to compare/contrast with other STs.

Conceptualization of Power in an Educational Context

I don't know what this is asking----- asked a few in my hallway---- no ones seems to know----- remember this is menopause hall!!!!!--- either we forgot, we're too old, or we never did know!!!!

HEIDI MASON

Role of Student Teacher

I think that the role of the student teacher is to learn how to become a teacher. By working hard and using everything that was taught to them and the help from all of the people involved within the school, a student teacher can learn and grow and become a great teacher. A student teacher cannot be afraid of making mistakes. Instead, he or she must learn from those mistakes. A student teacher cannot be afraid to take and use ideas and strategies that they have seen other teachers use. And, last but not least, a student teacher should never be afraid to use their own ideas or even try something new. A student teacher should know that things are not always going

to go as planned. That is alright because as a student teacher you will learn to become flexible. Student teaching is a great experience if you do your best, and in the end you can become a great teacher.

Role of Cooperating Teacher

The role of the cooperating teacher is to be the best teacher to a student teacher that he or she can be. A great cooperating teacher shares ideas and strategies, communicates well, praises, and guides a student teacher. A cooperating teacher provides continuous help and believes in the student teacher. Cooperating teachers are like mentors whom student teachers look up to and work hard to be as good as.

Role of University Supervisor

The role of the university supervisor is to provide the student teacher and the cooperating teacher with a layout of guidelines for everything that needs to be done during the student teaching experience. The university supervisor is responsible for observing the student teacher and helping to make sure that the student teacher is learning and growing throughout the whole experience. In the end, the university supervisor needs to decide how well the student teacher performed and give a final grade.

Conceptualization of Power in an Educational Context

I think that in an educational context knowledge is power because the more you know, the better you can teach. And, if you are always willing to learn, the more knowledge you will gain and the more 'power' you will have.

LINDA BISHOP (DID NOT RESPOND).

SUSAN MILLER

Role of Student Teacher

The student teacher's role is to continue to develop his/her skills during practical experience. Hopefully student teaching is the final experience in a long line of practicums and the student teacher already has some internal instinct as to what he/she is good at and where he/she may need some work. Student teachers are to observe and learn from their cooperating teachers and other teachers in the school and incorporate techniques that 'work' into their teaching. I believe they need to teach the curriculum that is required, but should be allowed some leeway as to how the material is taught.

Role of Cooperating Teacher

The role of the cooperating teacher is to be a guide and a model and to assist the student teacher where needed. If the student teacher wants or needs suggestions on discipline or on how to teach the curriculum, the cooperating teacher's job is to provide that guidance and answer questions. Observation (both of lesson plans and the teaching of the lessons) and evaluation are keys in assisting the student teacher. In my experience, there are student teachers who need a lot of guidance and those who need relatively little.

Role of University Supervisor

The university supervisor's role is to observe the student teacher and work closely with the cooperating teacher to determine where the student teacher's strengths are and where the his/her

weaker areas may be. At that point, the supervisor is to praise the strengths and give suggestions for the weaknesses. Ultimately, it is the supervisor's decision as to what the final university recommendation will say, but hopefully she considers the cooperating teacher's viewpoint. In my experience, the opinions of the supervising teacher and the supervisor have been similar and therefore there have been no problems.

Conceptualization of Power in an Educational Context

I don't really like that word in relation to the student teaching experience. The role of the cooperating teacher and the supervisor should not be one of 'power' but rather one with compassion and the student teacher's best interest at heart. I applaud schools that let college students learn early on if they may not be meant to be teaching. I started classroom experiences my freshman year and would've certainly hoped at that point that if teachers and/ or supervisors truly felt that I wasn't 'cut out' for teaching, that they would've told me then. Hopefully, by the time the student teacher has reached their senior year, we know that they are somewhat qualified to be a caring, effective teacher.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, N. G., Shea, C. M., Liston, D. D., & Deever, B. (1998). *Learning to Teach: A Critical Approach to Field Experiences*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Allen, M. B. (2003). *Eight Questions on Teacher Preparation: What Does the Research Say?* (Department of Education's Fund for the Improvement of Education, award number R215000010). Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States (ECS).
- Anderson, R., & Saimond, P. A. (1964). Student Teaching - Gateway to the Profession. *New York State Education*, 51, 8-9.
- Anyon, J. (1983). Intersection of gender and class: Accommodation and resistance by working-class and affluent females to contradictory sex-role ideologies. In S. Walker & L. Barton (Eds.), *Gender, Class and Education* (pp. 19-38). London: Falmer Press.
- Appel, S. (1996). *Positioning Subjects: Psychoanalysis and Critical Educational Studies*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H. (1993). *Education Still Under Siege*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Balch, P. M., & Balch, P. E. (1987). *The Cooperating Teacher: A Practical Approach for the Supervision of Student Teachers*. Lanham, MD: New York, London: University Press of America.

- Baldrige, J. V., Deal, T., & Ingols, C. (Eds.). (1985). *The Dynamics of Organizational Change in Education*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Barrows, L. K. (1979, Spring). *Power Relationships in the Student Teaching Triad*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1996). *Women's Ways of Knowing: Tenth Anniversary Edition*. New York: BasicBooks, Inc.
- Berghoff, B. (1997, Spring). *Stance and Teacher Education: Understanding the Relational Nature of Teaching*. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Scottsdale, AZ.
- Blank, M. A., & Heathington, B. S. (1987). The Supervisory Process: A Consistent Approach to Help Student Teachers Improve. *The Teacher Educator*, 22(4), 2-14.
- Boler, M. (1999). *Feeling Power*. New York: Routledge.
- Britzman, D. P. (1991). *Practice Makes Practice*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Britzman, D. P. (1998). *Lost Subjects, Contested Objects: Toward a Psychoanalytic Inquiry of Learning*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Buendia, E. (2000). Power and possibility: the construction of a pedagogical practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 147-163.
- Bunting, C. (1988). Cooperating Teachers and the Changing Views of Teacher Candidates. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(2), 42-46.
- Butler, J. (1997). *The Psychic Life of Power*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Calderhead, J., & Gates, P. (Eds.). (1993). *Conceptualizing reflection in teacher development*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Carspecken, P. F. (1996). *Critical Ethnography in Educational Research*. New York: Routledge.
- Clark, M. (1962). Supervision in Student Teaching. *The Teacher's College Journal*, 34:80-81, 104-105.
- Cogan, M. L. (1973). *Clinical Supervision*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Cotton, E. G., & Fischer, C. R. (1992, February). *School and University Partners in Education: The Selection and Preparation of Effective Cooperating Teachers*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Orlando, FLA.
- Del Popolo, J. A. (1960). Experiences a Student Teacher Should Have. *The Journal of Teacher Education*, 11, 75-78.
- Dewey, J. (1977). *John Dewey: The Middle Works, 1899 - 1924*. Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dixon, W. R. (1962). Some Observations on the Role of Classroom Supervising Teachers in Teacher Education Programs. *The University of Michigan School of Education Bulletin*, 34, 39-41.
- Dreyfus, H. L., & Rabinow, P. (1982). *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Duncan, D. M. (2000). The Socialization of Mature Women Students: the importance of ethnographic accounts to educational research. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 5(4), 459-474.
- Eisner, E. W. (1993). Forms of Understanding and the Future of Educational Research. *Educational Researcher*, 22(7), 5-11.
- Feinberg, W., & Soltis, J. F. (1992). *School and Society*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *Archeology of knowledge*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality: An introduction* (Vol. 1). New York: Vintage Books.
- Freibus, R. J. (1977). Agents of Socialization Involved in Student Teaching. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 70(5), 263-268.
- Freire, P. (1997). *Pedagogy of Hope: Reliving Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: The Continuum Publishing Company.
- Freire, P. (1999). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed: New Revised 20th Anniversary Edition*. New York: The Continuum Publishing Company.
- Garman, N. B. (1982). The Clinical Approach to Supervision. In T. J. Sergiovanni (Ed.), *Supervision of Teaching* (pp. 35-52). New York: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).
- Garman, N. B. (1986). Clinical Supervision: Quackery or Remedy for Professional Development. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 1(2), 146-157.

- Garman, N. B. (1986). Reflection, the Heart of Clinical Supervision: A Modern Rationale for Professional Practice. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 2(1), 1-24.
- Genovese, E. (1972). *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made*. New York: Vintage.
- Giddens, A. (1977). *Studies in Social and Political Theory*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Ginsburg, M. B. (1988). *Contradictions in Teacher Education and Society: A Critical Analysis*. Philadelphia: The Falmer Press, Taylor & Francis Inc.
- Ginsburg, M. B., & Lindsay, B. (1995). Conceptualizing the Political Dimension in Teacher Education. In M. B. Ginsburg & B. Lindsay (Eds.), *The Political Dimension in Teacher Education: Comparative Perspectives on Policy Formation, Socialization and Society* (pp. 3-19). Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press, Taylor & Francis Inc.
- Giroux, H. A. (1981). *Ideology, Culture and the Process of Schooling*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Giroux, H. A. (1983). *Theory and Resistance in Education: A Pedagogy for the Opposition*. New York: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.
- Giroux, H. A. (1988). *Teachers as Intellectuals: Toward a Critical Pedagogy of Learning*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Goodman, J. (1988). Constructing a Practical Philosophy of Teaching: A Study of Preservice Teachers' Professional Perspectives. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 4(2), 121-137.

- Gore, J., & Zeichner, K. (1991). Action research and reflective teaching in preservice teacher education: A case study from the United States. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 7(2), 119-136.
- Greene, M. (1978). *Lanscapes of Learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Groff, P. (1986). No More Free Supervision of Student Teaching. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 1, 82-87.
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 1: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Haines, A. C. (1957). Role Dilemmas in Student Teaching. *The Journal of Teacher Education*, 8, 365-368.
- Hodges, C. (1982). Implementing Methods: If You Can't Blame the Cooperating Teacher Who Can You Blame? *Journal of Teacher Education*, XXXIII(6), 25-29.
- The Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A. E. (1990). Socialization of Student Teachers. *American Educational Reserach Journal*, 27(2), 279-300.
- Inlow, G. M. (1956). The Complex Role of the College Supervisor. *Educational Research Bulletin*, 35, 10-17.

- Jalongo, M. R., Isenberg, J. P., & Gerbracht, G. (1995). *Teachers' Stories*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Johnson, J. A. (1968). *A Brief History of Student Teaching*. DeKalb, IL: Creative Educational Materials.
- Johnston, S. (1994). Experience is the Best Teacher or is it? An Analysis of the Role of Experience in Learning to Teach. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 45(3), 199-208.
- Kanpol, B. (1998). Confession as Strength: A Necessary Condition for Critical Pedagogy. *Educational Foundations*, 1, 63-75.
- Karmos, A. H., & Jacko, C. M. (1977). The Role of Significant Others During the Student Teaching Experience. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 28(5), 51-55.
- Kelleher, R. R., Collins, A. M., & Williams, L. A. (1995). Understanding Role and Goal Problems in Early Field Experience Programs. *The Teacher Educator*, 30(4), 37-46.
- Kincheloe, J. L. (1993). *Toward a Critical Politics of Teacher Thinking*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Koehler, V. R. (1986, April). *The Instructional Supervision of Student Teachers*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Koehler, V. R. (1988). Barriers to the Effective Supervision of Student Teaching: A Field Study. *Journal of Teacher Education*, March-April, 28-34.

- Kresiberg, S. (1992). *Transforming Power: Domination, Empowerment, and Education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Lacey, C. (1977). *The Socialization of Teachers*. Albany, NY: Methuen, Inc.
- Lange, J. D., & Burroughs-Lange, S. G. (1994, Spring). *Intensifying the Professional Learning of Student Teachers: A Collaborative Process*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Australian Teacher Education Association, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia.
- Lasley, T. J., & Applegate, J. H. (1985). Problems of Early Field Experience Students of Teaching. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 1(3), 221-227.
- Lather, P. (1991). *Getting Smart: Feminist Research and Pedagogy With/in the Postmodern* (Vol. 19). New York: Routledge.
- LeCompte, M. D., & deMarrais, K. B. (1992). The Disempowering of Empowerment: Out of the Revolution and into the Classroom. *Educational Foundations*, 6(3), 5-31.
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Marzano, R. J., & Marzano, J. S. (2003). Building Classroom Relationships: The Key to Classroom Management. *Educational Leadership - Journal of the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development*, 61(1), 6-13.
- Maxwell, N. (1992). What Kind of Inquiry Can Best Help Us Create a Good World? *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 17(2), 205-227.

- McBride, M., & Skau, K. G. (1995). Trust, Empowerment, and Reflection: Essentials of Supervision. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 10(3), 262-277.
- McIntyre, D. J., & Byrd, D. M. (Eds.). (1996). *Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers: The Field Experience, Teacher Education Yearbook IV* (Vol. 4). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.
- McIntyre, J. D. (1983). *Field Experiences in Teacher Education: From Student to Teacher* (Informational Analysis ISBN-0-89333-029-9). Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.
- McLaren, P. (1994). *Life in Schools*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- McNally, J., Cope, P., Inglis, B., & Stronach, I. (1997). The Student Teacher in School: Conditions for Development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(5), 485-498.
- Mehan, H. (1992). Understanding Inequality in Schools: The Contribution of Interpretive Studies. *Sociology of Education*, 65(1), 1-20.
- Mercer, W. A. (1963). The Supervising Teacher's Role. *The Clearing House*, 37, 342-343.
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case Study Research in Education: A Qualitative Approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Metzger, M., & Ringwall, C. F. (1988). Friendly Persuasion: How do you convince a doubting beginner to remain in the classroom? *Teacher*, 2(7), 33-37.
- Mishler, E. G. (1986). *Research Interviewing: Context and Narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Morrow, R. A., & Torres, C. A. (2002). *Reading Freire and Habermas*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Nettle, T. (1988). A Teaching and Learning Approach to Supervision within a Teacher Education Program. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 14(2), 125-133.
- Noblit, G. W. (1993). Power and Caring. *American Educational Research Journal*, 30(1), 23-38.
- Noddings, N. (1992). *The Challenge to Care in Schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Pellett, T. L., Strayve, K., & Pellett, H. A. (1999). Planning for Student-Teaching Success: A Guide for Cooperating Teachers. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 70(5), 50-54.
- Peshkin, A. (1993). The Goodness of Qualitative Research. *Educational Researcher*, 22(2), 23-29.
- Piantanida, M., & Garman, N. B. (1998). *The Qualitative Dissertation: A Guide for Students and Faculty* (In-House Document). Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh.
- Pitton, D. E. (1998). *Stories of Student Teaching: A Case Approach to the Student Teaching Experience*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc Simon & Schuster/A Viacom Company.
- Popkewitz, T. S. (1998). *Struggling for the Soul: The Politics of Schooling and the Construction of the Teacher*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Popkewitz, T. S., & Fendler, L. (Eds.). (1999). *Critical Theories in Education: Changing Terrains of Knowledge and Politics*. New York: Routledge.

- Potthoff, D., & Alley, R. (1995). Selecting Placement Sites for Student Teachers. *Education Canada*, 55-59.
- Radford, K., Cashion, M., & Latchford, S. (1993). Locus of Control and Teachers: A Preliminary Report of an Investigation of Locus of Control in Pre-Service Teachers. *The Teacher Educator*, 29(1), 43-52.
- Ramanathan, H., & Wilkins-Canter, E. A. (2000). Preparation of Cooperating Teachers as Evaluators in Early Field Experiences. *Action in Teacher Education*, 22(2), 101-111.
- Rand, M. K., & Shelton-Colangelo, S. (1999). *Voices of Student Teachers: Cases from the Field*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc. Simon & Schuster/A Viacom Company.
- Reinharz, S. (1979). *On Becoming a Social Scientist*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Reitzug, U. C. (1994). A Case of Empowering Principal Behavior. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31(2), 283-307.
- Richardson-Koehler, V. (1988). Barriers to the Effective Supervision of Student Teaching: A Field Study. *Journal of Teacher Education*, March-April, 28-34.
- Rikard, G. L. (1990). Student Teaching Supervision - A Dyadic Approach. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 85-87.
- Rose, T. E. (1963). The Role of the Cooperating Teacher. *Wisconsin Journal of Education*, 95, 13-14.
- Schooler, V. E. (1957). You and Your Student Teacher. *The Indiana Teacher*, 102, 8-9.

- Schooling, H. W. (1962). Partnership in Teacher Preparation. *National Education Association Journal*, 51, 61-62.
- Schoonmaker, F. (1998). Promise and Possibility: Learning to Teach. *Teacher's College Record*, 99(3), 559-591.
- Sears, J. T., Marshall, J. D., & Otis-Wilborn, A. (1994). *When Best Doesn't Equal Good*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Seidman, I. E. (1991). *Interviewing as Qualitative Research*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Shaver, J. C., & Wise, B. S. (1989, February). *Education into the 21st Century: Looking at Cooperating Teacher Educators*. Paper presented at the Association of Teacher Educators Conference, St. Louis, MO.
- Shor, I. (1992). *Empowering Education*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Shoultz, A. K. E. (2002). Learning to Think Like a Teacher: The Role of Reflection in Student Teaching. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Iowa, Iowa City.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the New Reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-22.
- Spatig, L. (1995). Student Teaching as Social Reproduction: An Ethnography in Appalachia in the United States. In M. B. Ginsburg & B. Lindsay (Eds.), *The Political Dimension in Teacher Education: Comparative Perspectives on Policy Formation, Socialization and Society* (p. 282). London-Washington, DC: The Falmer Press - A Member of the Taylor & Francis Group.

- Tannehill, D. (1989). Student Teaching: A View From The Other Side. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 8, 243-253.
- Tannehill, D., & Goc-Karp, G. (1992). The Student Teaching Practicum: Placement Trends and Issues. *The Physical Educator*, 49(1), 39-48.
- Tanruther, E. M. (1964). What Does it Mean to be a Supervising Teacher? *The Teacher's College Journal*, 35, 167-171.
- Thayer-Bacon, B. J. (1997, October). *The Power of Caring*. Presidential address presented at the Annual Conference of the Ohio Valley Philosophy of Education Society, Cincinnati, OH.
- Torres, C. A. (1998). *Education, Power, and Personal Biography*. New York: Routledge.
- Usher, R., & Edwards, R. (1994). *Postmodernism and Education*. New York: Routledge.
- White, J. J. (1989). Student Teaching as a Rite of Passage. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 20, 177-195.
- Wilson, E. K., & Saleh, A. (2000). The Effects of an Alternate Model of Student Teaching Supervision on Clinical Master Teachers. *Action in Teacher Education*, 22(2), 84-90.
- Wooley, S. L. (1997). *What Student Teachers Tell Us*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Washington, DC.
- Yee, A. H. (1967). *The Student Teaching Triad: The Relationship of Attitudes Among Student Teachers, College Supervisors, and Cooperating Teachers* (Research Report to the U.S. Office of Education OE-6-10-309). Austin: The University of Texas.

Zeichner, K. M. (1983). Alternative paradigms of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(3), 3-9.

Zeichner, K. M. (1983). Individual and institutional factors related to the socialization of beginning teachers. In G. Griffin & H. Hukill (Eds.), *First years of teaching: What are the pertinent issues* (pp. 1-59). Austin: The University of Texas at Austin.

Zeichner, K. M., & Gore, J. M. (1990). Teacher Socialization. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp. 329-348). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. (1985). Varieties of Discourse in Supervisory Conferences. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 1(2), 155-174.

Zeichner, K. M., & Tabachnick, R. (1985). The development of teacher perspectives: social strategies and institutional control in the socialization of beginning teachers. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 11(1), 1-25.
