

Copyright

by

Debra E. Bay-Borelli

2011

The Dissertation Committee for Debra E. Bay-Borelli Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

**Integrating Management with Instruction:
How District Aligned Curricula has Altered Teacher Thinking**

Committee:

Christopher Brown, Supervisor

Marilla Svinicki

Nancy Roser

Linda Lucksinger

Scott Ritchie

**Integrating Management with Instruction:
How District Aligned Curricula has Altered Teacher Thinking**

by

Debra E. Bay-Borelli, B.S., M. S. Ed.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2011

Dedication

To Anthony, Alicia, Diane, Laurie and Marisa¹—the wonderful teachers who graciously invited me into their classrooms, giving of their precious time to share their insights into what learning to teach looked like for them. I will forever be grateful.

¹ The names of the teachers presented in this dissertation are pseudonyms to protect the confidentiality of participants.

Acknowledgements

If anyone had enlightened me about the amount of time, energy and brainpower this endeavor would extract from me...I'm not sure I would have dared to do it. However, the knowledge I have gained throughout this process amazes me every time I talk about this topic.

Where do I begin to acknowledge the enormous number of people involved, in one way or another, in this endeavor?

To begin with...I was fortunate to have worked with such an incredible dissertation committee. Thank you - Dr. Marilla Svinicki, Dr. Nancy Roser, Dr. Linda Lucksinger and Dr. Scott Ritchie for giving of your time to guide me. Each one has taught me so much about teaching, surviving and mentorship.

A heart felt thank you...Dr. Christopher Brown, the chair of my committee. At a time when I couldn't envision this endeavor being completed, he guided me to its fruition. For his patience, support, wisdom and friendship I'm deeply grateful.

Thank you, Friendly Frogs...We read, critiqued and supported each other's work. This was Chris Browns' gift to each of us as we worked through our dissertations. He brought us together to provide an arena for support and strengthened the group by being a contributing member. Chris created this group because he believed it was important for our development as scholars...the hallmark of a true teacher. We all feel indebted to him for this opportunity.

Thank you to my colleagues at Tarleton State University who have been a constant source of support over the past couple years. When I thought I couldn't do it, they cheered me on and provided the space for me to work on my writing.

Thank you to my family and friends who have waited for a long time for me to return from the realm of dissertation land. I give thanks to each of you for enduring my absence at gatherings, my inattentiveness and my inability to see anything but this dissertation. I know you are all sick of hearing me say, "No, I can't. I have to write."

Thank you to Rich and Shirley, our dear friends, for coming to live on the ranch with us and taking care of my horses and the ranch while we were in Stephenville.

Thank you to my sister and best friend, Diane...her steadfast love and support is always unconditional and constant. Only other sisters understand the eternal, unbreakable bond we share.

Thank you to Michael, my husband and my partner in life's adventures. He has been steadfast while enduring my kaleidoscope of moods and loved me with all his heart anyways...thank you for standing by me and being my true north.

And last, but not least...my four legged family. My ever-faithful German Shorthair Pointers: Zig, Fritz, Gunner and Max...thank you for your constant presence and love. I was never alone...as anyone who shares their lives with this breed understands. We can take regular walks in the park again. And my horses: Buzzy and Chance ...we can start riding on a regular basis again...Hurrah!!!!

And thank God...it's done!!!!!!!

**Integrating Management with Instruction:
How District Aligned Curricula has Altered Teacher Thinking**

Publication No. _____

Debra E. Bay-Borelli, Ph. D.
The University of Texas at Austin, 2011

Supervisor: Christopher P. Brown

In light of the continual debate among researchers regarding new teachers' concerns about classroom management and the need to insure that instruction results in positive student learning the focus of this qualitative case study has been to examine how five second and third year teachers planned for and thought about the management of student engagement during instruction. The main purpose of this study was to examine the professional thinking of five second and third year teachers while planning for a lesson in comparison to their actions during the lesson and later how they reflected on that plan. In addition, the teachers' beliefs about how they learned to integrate management with instruction during planning were examined. The results of this study indicate these five teachers did intentionally think about and plan for the integration of management with instruction during their lessons. District aligned curricula were used in each of these teachers' districts which caused them to alter the traditional planning model

so they could plan for the integration of management with instruction in their lessons. In addition these teachers believed they learned to address management with instruction as a result of their first year(s) of teaching.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
The Context.....	2
This Study	3
This Dissertation	3
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	6
Conceptual Framework.....	8
The Integration of Management with Instruction	9
Reconceptualization of Management and Instruction.....	12
Professional Thinking During Teacher Planning.....	15
Summary	17
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	19
Research Questions	20
Conceptual Framework.....	21
The Constructs Present When Integrating Management with Instruction	23
Participant Selection	25
The Participants	27
The School Districts.....	30
The Elementary Schools	31
Data Sources	32
Initial Interviews	33
Planning Interviews	33
Field Observations	34
Post Observation Interviews	35
Data Analysis	37
Trustworthiness and Credibility.....	44
Ethical Considerations	45
CHAPTER 4: STUDY FINDINGS.....	47
Teacher Planning	48
The First Phase or Transmission Phase of Preactive Planning: Transmitting District Aligned Curriculum Plans to the Teachers' Weekly Lesson Plans	48
The Second Phase of Preactive Planning: Tailoring the DAC to Match the Context of their Classrooms	54
How Teachers Think About Integrating Management with Instruction	63

The External Constructs Codes.....	65
Expectations/Modeling – Alicia	65
Monitoring/Pacing – Marisa	74
Routines/Procedures – Laurie	80
Cooperation/Self-Regulation – Diane.....	86
Expectations – Anthony	94
Adjusting Management and/or Instruction During the Tailoring Phase of Proactive Planning.....	99
Traditional Teacher Planning Meets DAC	108
Adjusting Management and/or Instruction During Interactive Teaching.....	109
Developing Knowledge about Integrating Management with Instruction	111
Theme #1: Survival Learning	111
Survival Learning for the Second Year Teachers – Marisa and Alicia.....	114
Survival Learning for the Third Year Teachers – Anthony, Diane and Laurie.....	121
Theme #2: University Learning	131
Findings Conclusion	135

CHAPTER 5: MAKING SENSE OF THE FINDINGS IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH.....	138
Transforming the Meaning of Management	139
An Unexpected Realization	141
The Contributions of This Study.....	142
Planning and Thinking about Integrating Management with Instruction	145
Adjusting Lesson Plans to Include Management in the Context of Classrooms.....	150
New Teachers Dialogue about Learning to Integrate Management with Instruction	154
Implications.....	160
Limitations and Future Research	167
A Final Word	169

APPENDICES	171
Appendix A – IRB Letter of Consent	172
Appendix B – Initial Interview Protocols	174
Appendix C – Planning Interview Protocols	177
Appendix D – Post Observation Interview Protocols	178
Appendix E – Constructs Table	179
Appendix F – Engagement Constructs Worksheets.....	181

Appendix G – Methodology – District & School Information Table.....183
Appendix H – Research of Carolyn Evertson and Her Colleagues184
REFERENCES.....187

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1: Five Teachers' Lesson Information Chart	29
Table 2: Explanation of Coding.....	39
Table 3: Teacher Data Chart.....	50

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Memories of my first years in an elementary classroom were dominated, as it is for most new teachers, with uncertainty about the best strategies for managing my students and their instruction. Having taught for several decades, I have had the opportunity to work with numerous new teachers and preservice teachers and watch them struggle, as I did, with classroom management and instruction. The impetus for my late entry into a doctoral program were these experiences and a desire to look more closely at the struggles new teachers have in an effort to search for reasons and perhaps solutions to help the newest members of our profession.

During my time in the classroom I have learned how important it is to provide my students with instructional tasks that grab them and engage them in learning. With experience in a classroom I also came to the understanding that the management of a lesson is critical to the delivery of the lesson. Thus my desire to invest so much time into researching how new teachers integrate management and instruction during the planning process.

As a graduate student, a teaching assistant and a student teaching supervisor I have had an amazing opportunity to witness first hand how preservice teachers develop their practices in the area of management and instruction. During my previous research as a doctoral student I had the opportunity to interview and work with many preservice and first year teachers and talk to many experienced mentor teachers. Through these experiences I began to build my understanding about the dynamics of the relationship

between management and instruction through their eyes. It is much different experiencing it myself, as a preservice teacher and new teacher, than it is to experience it through another young teacher's words and actions. I believe these experiences have enhanced my ability to research this phenomenon for my dissertation.

The Context

The most popular meaning for classroom management within the school building still remains student discipline or the correction of misbehavior (Evertson & Randolph, 1999; Henley, 2006; Weinstein & Mignano, 1997; Wiseman & Hunt, 2001), which adds to that confusion for new teachers as they struggle to develop their own instructional practices. Therefore it is important for this study to clarify that the meaning of classroom management is not simply student discipline. In this research the view of classroom management includes all the things teachers must do to encourage learning (Brophy, 2006; Evertson & Randolph, 1999; Evertson & Weinstein, 2006), mainly focusing on the orchestration of instruction in ways that promote, encourage and maintain student participation and engagement (Brophy, 1985; Bullough, 1987, 1989; Erickson, 1986; Evertson & Neal, 2006; Griffin, 1986; Kagan, 1992; Watzke, 2003, 2007; Weade, 1987; Weade & Evertson, 1988; Zumwalt, 1986). This includes focusing on the intersection of managing engagement during instruction from a socio-cognitive perspective (Evertson, 1982; Evertson & Harris, 1992; Evertson & Neal, 2006; Gump, 1982; Kounin, 1970; Randolph & Evertson, 1994; Weade & Evertson, 1988).

This Study

In light of this continual debate among researchers about new teachers' concerns with classroom management and the need to insure that instruction results in positive student learning (Marzano & Marzano, 2003), the focus of this study has been to examine how new teachers with two or three years of experience plan for and think about the management of student engagement and instruction. During this study I discussed with five second and third year teachers their lesson planning strategies for a lesson of their choosing. I talked with them during their preactive planning (Yinger, 1978) about the lesson development and observed them implementing the lesson. Following the lessons I engaged them in a reflective discussion where we discussed what happened during the lesson and why changes in their initial plan might have taken place during the lesson. While conducting the interviews and observations I was always mindful of keeping in the forefront of this investigation the relationship between the management of student engagement and the instruction of content. It was my intention to examine how they merged these two components of teaching together during planning and then how they implemented and adjusted their lessons to keep student engagement and the academic tasks appropriately aligned.

This Dissertation

The second chapter of this dissertation will review the literature, which helps to introduce and explain the conceptual understanding of the relationship between student engagement and instruction and how it should manifest itself during teachers' preactive lesson planning, interactive teaching practices and post lesson reflection (Van Manen,

1995; Yinger 1977, 1979, 1986). In outlining the conceptual framework I will provide a review of the literature, which highlights the ideas related to how teachers manage instruction in learning-centered classrooms (Evertson & Neal, 2006; Evertson & Randolph, 1999) with a socio-cultural understanding of engaged student participation (Hickey, 2003; Hickey & Schafer, 2006) in order to explain how this framework was developed. I will also discuss how teachers plan for and orchestrate engaged participation in learning-centered classrooms, how they reflect on the different phases of planning and the importance of professional thinking during this process.

In the third chapter, I will describe the methodology that directed the investigation of the questions that guided this study. These questions are:

1. How do second and third year teachers plan for integrating the management of engagement with instruction in their lessons? And how do they reflect on this planning after the lesson is completed?
2. When implementing this plan, how do they adjust their goals for management and/or instruction if their plan doesn't adequately address their preplanned goals? And how do they reflect on those adjustments after the lesson is completed?
3. Finally, how did the teachers talk about learning to integrate management with instruction during their lessons?

This chapter will also introduce the five teachers who participated in this study and provide details about the school districts and elementary schools where each teacher works.

The fourth chapter will present findings that emerged from my analysis of the data collected during the teacher interviews and observations of the lessons. The fifth and final chapter will present a discussion about the findings, the implications of those findings and the significance of this study for teacher educators who work with preservice and inservice teachers.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

For decades teachers have indicated that different aspects of classroom management have been a major concern specifically as it relates to student control and motivation during instruction. Research has repeatedly found that new teachers list student control and the motivation of students among their major concerns (Fuller & Brown, 1975; Veenman, 1984). In more recent years classroom management, again in the areas of student control and motivation, has continued to be a major concern voiced by experienced and new teachers (Borich & Tonibari, 1997; Garrahy, Cothran, & Kulinna, 2005; Goyette, Dore, & Dion, 2000; Meister & Jenks, 2000; Meister & Melnick, 2003; McCann & Johannessen, 2004; Romano & Gibson, 2006; Turley, Powers & Nakai, 2006). As society and education have changed over the past several decades teachers still continue to voice their concerns in the areas of classroom management and motivation instruction.

The first five years of teaching² are filled with learning a multitude of new skills in new environments with very little time to think and reflect (Liston, Whitcomb, & Borko, 2006; Martin & Chiodo, 2001; Mok, 2005) making it difficult for new teachers to understand why they are having management problems. Lidstone and Hollingsworth (1992) explain the ultimate goal of new teacher learning is to recognize how to promote student learning. But the sequence for gaining this understanding begins with new

² For this study, “new teachers” will mean teachers with less than five years of teaching experience.

teachers recognizing and learning how to integrate management and instruction during lessons.

This integration usually develops after the beginning teacher has routinized management and subject/pedagogy knowledge separately...Skilled teachers know that management problems do not usually occur in isolation from the lesson being taught. If the subject matter or pedagogy is too easy or too difficult and/or if the task does not require at least some active construction of knowledge on the part of the learner, behavioral problems will most likely develop. (Lidstone & Hollingsworth, 1992, p. 43)

The understanding that most management issues are directly related to instruction becomes internalized as new teachers gain experience through designing and implementing lessons and reflecting on the outcomes.

Researchers have found that without this early knowledge new teachers can take up to five years to gain this competency (Berliner, 2001; Liston, Whitcomb, & Borko, 2006; Martin & Chiodo, 2001; Mok, 2005). This lengthy learning period makes it very difficult for teachers with less than five years of teaching experience to cognitively understand what is actually happening and why (Berliner, 2001). The initial years of teaching are filled with so many new learning experiences that new teachers cannot seem to “think aloud because they [are] cognitively overloaded” (Carter, Cushing, Sabers, Stein, & Berliner, 1988, p. 475). New teachers become so overwhelmed that it is difficult for them to put into words what they are thinking and feeling (Carter, Cushing, Sabers, Stein, & Berliner, 1988; Martin & Childo; 2001). This inability to talk about what is

happening in their classrooms makes it difficult for new teachers, first year teachers in particular, to figure out the connection between management and instruction. New teachers realize they are having problems and when asked may say the problem is student discipline, but the real issue is most often “problem construction” (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). Feiman-Nemser believes the problem with student discipline may in fact be the effect of less than engaging instructional tasks.

Conceptual Framework

This study investigates how second and third year teachers think about the integration of management with instruction during teacher planning. This framework reflects a merger of research about how teachers manage learning in learning-centered classrooms (Evertson & Neal, 2006; Evertson & Randolph, 1999) with a socio-cultural understanding of engaged student participation (Hickey, 2003; Hickey & Schafer, 2006). Hickey & Schafer’s (2006) engagement domain, one of their five core aspects of classroom management, characterizes classroom management in terms of the actions teachers take to facilitate learning. The authors defined engagement as maximizing student participation in the content of the lesson. They believe that one way teachers maximize student participation is by “ritualizing the routines that define the communities of expertise for which we want students to engage” (p. 281). Hickey & Schafer also believe engaged participation can improve student behavior and cognition, which are “widely considered indicative of effective classroom management” (p. 282) and encompasses more than instructional routines. I will now turn to the research literature to inform the reader as to how I came to this framework and what it entails. Upon

completing my review, I will revisit and restate the conceptual framework that I used to guide this study.

The Integration of Management with Instruction

Throughout the 60's, 70's and early 80's, classroom management and instruction were addressed as separate domains both in research and teacher training. Classroom management was seen as the precursor to instruction necessary for effective teaching and successful student learning (Evertson & Neal, 2006; Evertson & Randolph, 1999; Weade & Evertson, 1988). During the late 80's, researchers started to question this pre-established relationship between classroom management and instruction. New research concluded that classroom management and instruction actually functioned interdependently during classroom instruction (Brophy, 1985; Bullough, 1987, 1989; Erickson, 1986; Evertson & Neal, 2006; Griffin, 1986; Kagan, 1992; Watzke, 2003, 2007; Weade, 1987; Weade & Evertson, 1988; Zumwalt, 1986). As a result of Erickson's (1986) data collection in the classroom of a 1st grade teacher where he was examining a social-constructivist view of work and tasks he realized in the real time and space of this 1st grade classroom the distinction between classroom management and instruction was difficult to clearly define. Two years later, in Weade & Evertson's (1988) study of "effective and less effective teachers in the distribution and sequencing of social and academic tasks during classroom lessons" (p. 191), the authors concluded that separating classroom management and instruction created a "false dichotomy" (Erickson, 1986, p. 144; Weade & Evertson, 1988, p. 189). In this same study, Weade & Evertson (1988) described the relationship between management and instruction in these words:

“...classroom lessons are structured in terms of highly differentiated parts through which the teacher more or less consistently and continually shifts the demands for students participation and demonstration of procedural and academic competence” (pp. 198-9). A few years after that study Randolph and Evertson (1994) tried to capture images of compatibility between management and learning-centered instruction based on that previous research. In doing so they enhanced this idea by explaining “a redefinition of management must address the interrelationship of management and instruction...” (p.56). Twelve years later Evertson & Neal (2006) conducted additional research in an attempt to better “understand the key management issues in learning-centered classrooms” (p. 2). This research was conducted in the classrooms of two experienced teachers, Bill (a 6th grade teacher of 26 years) and Patricia (a 4th grade teacher of 15 years). The authors found that Bill and Patricia were working to better their understandings and practices to make “research-based concepts about knowledge, learning, teaching and classroom management a reality in their classrooms” (p. 3). In these two teachers’ classrooms the findings of this study indicated when management was placed in the context of a learning-centered view of learning the previously understood definitions of management and the previously held beliefs about the relationship between management and instruction were not practical any more. This succession of research examining the relationship between management and instruction in learning-centered classrooms has produced a clearer picture of the need to change our definitions of management as well as the way teachers think about management while planning instruction.

In order to complement this more complex view of learning Rink's (2006) text discussion about developing and maintaining the learning environment of the physical education classroom stresses that classroom management is the "arranging of the environment for learning and maintaining and developing student-appropriate behavior and engagement in the content" (p. 138). In order to create this kind of management and parallel the simultaneous orchestration of academic learning the teacher needs to develop a deep understanding of the content for that learning "that goes beyond the content knowledge of the discipline" (Shulman, 1987) including a working knowledge of how the students will best be able to access and learn the content. This knowledge is developed through teachers experiencing the planning, preparing and teaching of lessons, which is "that special amalgam of content and pedagogy that is uniquely the province of teachers, their own special form of professional understanding" (Shulman, 1987, p. 8). It is the academic component of the lesson that creates an environment that grabs the students' attention, engages them and creates the desire to participate in the lesson (Hickey, 2003). The management of these types of experiences is highly social and interconnected with the way in which teachers create learning experiences for their students. For new teachers this is an enormous undertaking.

Typically these are not skills new teachers completely develop before beginning their career (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). It is a set of skills that will evolve throughout a teacher's entire career. As Eisner (2002) points out "learning to teach well is a lifetime endeavor" (p. 577). The set of skills required for teachers to orchestrate this integration of management with instruction could be more easily understood if

management and instruction were more accurately conceptualized to reflect this integration. It is important for new teachers to understand this reconceptualization of management and instruction prior to entering their own classrooms in order to lessen the impact of the enormous undertaking of those first few years that are filled with learning a multitude of new skills in new environments.

Reconceptualization of Management and Instruction

For new teachers to better understand how the integration of management and instruction works it is important that they understand that how they define the complexities of management in relationship to this learning-centered image of instruction will affect their development of management strategies that complement their instructional strategies. The result is an updated image for both management and instruction. With the “cognitive revolution” of the 1970’s (Bruer, 1993; DeCorte, Greer, & Verschaffel, 1996) and a better understanding of how the mind actually works in relationship to learning development teacher learning needed to incorporate this new integrated image. Learning extended beyond the basic skills previously thought to be the foundation for learning higher order thinking skills, understanding concepts and making sense of learning. “Cognitively engaged students use thinking, metacognitive and self-regulatory strategies to approach learning thoughtfully” (Blumenfeld, Puro, & Mergendoller, 1992), which meant a necessary component of instruction became the cognitive engagement of the students in their own learning. Learners bring prior knowledge with them to every new experience and the teacher’s role is to facilitate building a bridge between what learners know and the attainment of more advanced,

extensive knowledge (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000; Darling-Hammond, 1996). This cognitive perspective sees learners as actively constructing their own knowledge.

In adopting this more accurate description of the learning process there also needs to be a reconceptualization of what management means in relationship to the inherent resulting changes in the social structures of lessons. The conceptions of learning and management and the subsequent roles of teachers and students have been gradually transforming over the last two decades (Cohen, McLaughlin, & Talbert, 1993; Evertson & Neal, 2006; Marshall, 1992; Wenger, 1999). In learning-centered classrooms teachers and students have been working together in communities of learners where they assist and learn from each other. Teachers must facilitate the activities in these learning-centered classrooms in coordination with learning-oriented management (Evertson & Neal, 2006; Evertson & Randolph, 1999; Randolph & Evertson, 1994). In learning-centered classrooms management “may look seamless, yet they are carefully orchestrated at a complex level so that meaningful learning can occur” (Evertson & Neal, 2006, p. 8). The complexity of the learning activities created by teachers in learner-centered classrooms require students to self-regulate their learning as well as the management of the social implications of that learning. In Evertson and Neal’s (2006) research which examined this reconceptualization of management and instruction in the learning-centered classrooms the authors found that their research participants, Bill and Patricia, demonstrated an “evolving understanding of the interrelationship of management and instruction was one key to the productivity of the learning environments that they established” (p. 8).

Evertson and Neal found as Bill and Patricia ‘integrated their teaching and management approaches, they changed their conceptions of authority and their relationships with their students in ways that influenced not only the students’ academic learning but also their moral and social development. Instead of learning only to comply with directions, the students began to develop autonomy, including the capacity for self-regulation as well as a sense of responsibility for themselves and others. Instead of learning to work alone and perhaps to compete with others, the students learned how to participate in a community where the members collaborate in getting tasks done and care about the common good’ (p. 12).

New teachers’ understanding of the interrelationship between management and instruction and their ability to demonstrate those understandings in their instructional practices will affect the learning environment they establish in their classrooms as well. This understanding is enhanced through a teacher’s active engagement in decision making and reflection throughout the three phases of planning (Van Manen, 1995; Yinger 1977, 1979, 1986). As a teacher begins planning for a lesson, implements the lesson and afterwards thinks about or reflects on that lesson year after year the understanding about how to strengthen that lesson and improve on student learning increases exponentially.

I now turn to the literature that examines how professional thinking is related to the reflective thinking and reflective action required for teachers to make all the decisions necessary to orchestrate the effective integration of management with instruction for their lessons.

Professional Thinking During Teacher Planning

Professional thinking during the three phases of teacher planning incorporates teachers thinking about what needs to be taught as they plan for a lesson, thinking in the active moment of the lesson and then thinking and reflecting about the lesson afterwards. Teachers' professional thinking during instructional planning is often portrayed as problem solving and decision making (Clark and Peterson, 1986; Conway, 2001; Genishi, Ryan, Ochsner, & Carnell, 2001; Hatton & Smith, 1995; Yinger, 1977, 1980, 1986) when teachers are depending on their abilities to think and act reflectively so they can carefully order their ideas and take action (Adler, 1991; Conway, 2001; Dewey, 1933; Gore & Fechner, 1991; Hatton & Smith, 1995; Schon, 1983, 1987; Van Manen, 1995).

Planning for instruction is very much a cognitive activity requiring a great deal of reflection on the part of the teacher. Teachers are constantly having internal, reflective conversations with themselves about what they need to do, which is metacognitive in nature (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000). During this planning teachers are working on future-oriented actions therefore this planning is framed in uncertainty and unpredictability (Clark & Peterson, 1986; Conway, 2001; Hatton & Smith, 1995; Van Manen, 1995; Yinger, 1977, 1986). Planning during instruction adds the unpredictability of a classroom full of children, which occurs in a world of immediacy, responsive action and of social exchange (Clark & Peterson, 1986; Van Manen, 1995; Yinger, 1977, 1986).

Usually, the teacher does not have time to distance himself or herself from the particular moment in order to deliberate (rationally, morally, or critically) what he or she should do or say next. This temporal dimension of direct or immediate

action parallels the close quality of relationality that the interactive dimension of teaching seems to require... Practicing teachers know this all too well (Van Manen, 1995, p. 42).

During this interactive teaching phase of planning (Van Manen, 1995; Yinger, 1977, 1986) teachers are making multiple decisions on the spot in response to student needs that cannot wait for the teacher to go to a quiet place to think about what an appropriate response might be. This “temporal dimension” Van Manen talked about happens in direct response to student actions.

Because of this need for immediate action nothing can ensure that the lesson will proceed as planned. Due to this uncertainty and unpredictability the planning document created for instruction can only provide an entry framework for actual instruction (Weade & Evertson, 1988; Yinger, 1986). The reflective conversations teachers have with themselves are present throughout the three phases of planning as they consider what needs to happen and how it will actually happen during instruction. Dewey (1933) defined this type of reflective thought as “active, persistent and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it and further conclusions to which it tends” (p. 9). Even for the experienced teacher being a reflective practitioner during the immediacy of the moment during instruction can be difficult. This ability to reflect on one’s practice enables teachers to make decisions by looking into the future while creating their lessons. They can also examine their practices in the immediacy of the ongoing lesson to decide if their planning is working. After the lesson they can look back and evaluate the decisions made prior to the lesson and how

those decisions worked during the lesson. As a result of this reflection they can look forward to future lessons and based on experience develop better practices from the knowledge they gain.

Summary

The framework for this study incorporates the integration of management and instruction in a learning-centered context (Evertson & Neal, 2006) through an engaged participation lens (Hickey, 2003; Hickey & Schafer, 2006), while listening to second and third year teachers' professional thinking during teacher planning. Instruction has changed over the past two decades into an active, hands-on forum for learning that requires management be redefined in order to foster and compliment this change (Evertson & Neal, 2006). Management needs to be thought of as the "arranging of the environment for learning and maintaining and developing student-appropriate behavior and engagement in the content" (Rink, 2002, p. 136). As teachers plan for and implement their lessons they take into consideration: instruction - what students will need to learn and how they will learn it best and management - the way they structure that learning to involve and affect student participation and engagement (Hickey & Schafer, 2006). That connection between management and instruction is what teachers interface to create effective instruction (Manzano & Manzano, 2003).

The problems teachers have with classroom management are well documented (Borich & Tonibari, 1997; Garrahy, Cothran, & Kulinna, 2005; Goyette, Dore, & Dion, 2000; Meister & Jenks, 2000; Meister & Melnick, 2003; McCann & Johannessen, 2004; Romano & Gibson, 2006; Turley, Powers & Nakai, 2006). Yet very little is known about

the individual experiences of new teachers' struggles and successes dealing with the management of student engagement during the planning and implementation of instruction or the affect this management has on the success of their lessons. Examining second and third year teachers as they deal with the management of student engagement and instruction through a framework that reflects an integration of the research on how teachers manage learning in learning-centered classrooms (Evertson & Neal, 2006; Evertson & Randolph, 1999) with a socio-cultural understanding of engaged student participation (Hickey, 2003; Hickey & Schafer, 2006) would begin to fill in this gap in the literature.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

As previously outlined there has been a wealth of valuable knowledge gained from the previous research about the challenges new teachers face related to classroom management (e.g. Fuller & Brown, 1975; Veenman, 1984). This research has historically been driven by quantitative methodologies that tend to offer quantifiable data about what management concerns are for a large number of novice teachers (e.g. Veenman, 1984, Turley, Powers & Nakai, 2005). This study examined that knowledge and looked deeper into the thinking and practices of five second and third year teachers while they plan their lesson allowing them to inform us as to how and why management is a concern for them. Examining how individual second and third year teachers grapple with the complexities of integrating preventative management with active, hands-on, learner-centered instruction offers researchers a glimpse at how new teachers fit their concepts of management within our current concepts of learners actively participating in the co-construction of their own knowledge (Meece, 2003). This study begins to address this issue of how new teachers with two or three years of experience integrate the management of engagement with instruction.

Specifically this study utilized a qualitative case study methodology (Yin, 2003) to investigate how second and third year teachers integrated the management of engagement and instruction as they planned for and created their lesson plan, as they taught that lesson using their plan and how they reflected on the adjustments they made to their lesson plan after they completed the lesson. Framing this research as a qualitative

case study allows for the retention of “holistic and meaningful characteristics of the real-life events” (Yin, 2003, p.2) present in real-life classrooms filled with real-life experiences for second and third year teachers. Yin (2003) explains this approach to research provides the researcher with the opportunity to gather a great deal of detail about the context of each individual case while at the same time allowing for comparisons across multiple cases. Examining each teacher’s planning practices and their own reflections on those practices allowed me to position the teacher’s experiences, perceptions and decisions in relationship to the observable outcomes of their management and instructional strategies. It also offered me the chance to conduct an in-depth investigation into second and third year teachers’ decision-making thinking, which led to the generation of thick descriptions about how new teachers make decisions during planning. The questions that guided this qualitative case study are:

1. How do teachers with two and three years of classroom teaching experience plan for integrating the management of engagement with instruction in their lessons?
2. When implementing this plan, how do they adjust their goals for engagement and/or instruction if their plan does not adequately address their preplanned goals? And how do they reflect on those adjustments after the lesson is completed?
3. Finally, how did the teachers talk about learning to integrate management with instruction during their lessons?

Conceptual Framework

In order to address these three research questions I employed a conceptual framework designed to examine the professional thinking of five second and third year teachers in relationship to their integration of management with instruction during the planning and implementation of a lesson. This framework reflects a merger of research about how teachers manage learning in learning-centered classrooms (Evertson & Neal, 2006; Evertson & Randolph, 1999) with a socio-cultural understanding of engaged student participation (Hickey, 2003; Hickey & Schafer, 2006). Hickey & Schafer's (2006) engagement domain, one of their five core aspects of classroom management, characterizes classroom management in terms of the actions teachers take to facilitate learning. Doing so assisted me in developing the external codes, which reflect this framework of theoretical and conceptual understanding and guided this study.

I used the four sets of external constructs (expectations, monitoring, routines/procedures and cooperation/self-regulation) developed from this conceptual framework during the initial collection and analyze of the data (see Appendix E, Constructs Table). These constructs assisted me in identifying how these five teachers integrated management with instruction during their lessons as they were developing the foundation for learning-centered instruction in their classrooms (e.g. Evertson & Neal, 2006; Meece, 2003). This study framed the development of the five teachers' understanding about the integration of management with instruction within the ultimate focus of this development—student learning. Evertson & Neal (2006) defined learning-centered classrooms as “classrooms where teachers focus on student learning and are

continuously working to understand new theories about learning and what these mean for their own teaching” (p. 1). The teachers in this study were working towards developing classrooms that focused on student learning as they matured in their individual understandings about integrating management with instruction while planning for, implementing and reflecting on their lessons.

In learning-centered classrooms the intermediate goal is to provide students with opportunities to make choices, reflect on those choices and to make those choices and their outcomes personally meaningful. The overarching goal of providing this type of instruction on a daily basis is to develop lifelong learners who understand how to make decisions and to feel ownership for their learning (Evertson & Neal, 2006). The phenomenological perspective of integrating engagement and instruction “is about teachers finding the time for knowledge of, reflection on and support for learners coming to understand the responsibility of choice” (McCaslin et al., 2006, p. 229). Teachers are continually learning in this highly cognitive profession. They need to be provided the time to think, reflect, build, analyze, work collaboratively, experiment and do research with and about the learning activities they want to use during instruction (Smith, 1996; Evertson & Neal, 2006). The need to be allowed time to think for second and third year teachers who are in the midst of learning about and developing their own teaching practice is paramount for the development of their expertise as teachers.

Today with a cognitive and socio-cultural view learning focuses on active, engaged learners who are encouraged to develop self-regulation and to help build and participate in classroom communities. In light of this change control leaves the hands of

the teacher and becomes the responsibility of the student. Thus the purpose of a lesson becomes the students learning multiple concepts, facts and skills rooted in engaging activities, projects or problem sets. The social purpose of the lesson takes a much larger role in the success of a lesson as a result of the increased involvement and responsibilities the students undertake during a lesson.

The Constructs Present When Integrating Management with Instruction

The constructs of management present during learning-centered instruction look very different from those present in the teacher-centered instruction of the pre-1990's. Applying socio-cultural theory to classroom management Hickey & Schafer (2006) characterize management as five domains of actions teachers take to facilitate learning:

- Engagement – maximizing student participation in the content;
- Curriculum – defining scope and sequence of instruction;
- Relationships – interacting with and among students;
- Development – changing behavior and cognition over time;
- Discipline – preventing and addressing behavior problems. (p. 285).

In outlining these five characteristics of management Hickey & Schafer (2006) explain that teachers utilize all five of these domains in concert as they integrate management with instruction and each domain relying on the other four domains for success. Each of these areas has numerous visible and invisible constructs associated with them.

Finally I narrowed the observable constructs for this study by focusing my data collection on Hickey & Shafer's (2006) engagement domain—maximizing student participation in the content. I examined how teachers maximize their student's social

participation during instruction and how the design and content of instruction creates engaged participation.³ There are many ways effective managers engage learners during instruction. For this study I examined the following four constructs that teachers consistently use during the presentation of their lessons to encourage student engagement. These are four of the constructs cited in the literature as being necessary teacher actions for promoting student engagement (Dolezal et al, 2003; Emmer & Gerwels, 2002; Evertson & Neal, 2006; Hickey, 2003; Hickey & Schafer, 2006; Krasch & Carter, 2009; Lidstone & Ammon, 2002; Raphael, Pressley & Mohen, 2008; see additional cited research in Appendix E, Constructs Table). I chose to limit the focus for this study to one of Hickey & Shafer's (2006) domains,—engagement—because engaged participation demonstrates how management is so intricately intertwined with instruction. Teachers must create and present lesson content that will engage students thus motivating them to participate in their own learning. That is the main point of this research. This is the essence of integrating management with instruction. The four construct sets outlined below are strategies teachers use to assist with and strengthen student engagement during instruction. Therefore this study's constructs became:

1. Expectations – strategies employed by the teacher to ensure the students always know what is expected of them both socially and academically.
2. Monitoring – strategies employed by the teacher to actively keep track of what the students are doing both socially and academically.

³ “Engagement as Participation. From a sociocultural perspective, engagement is fundamentally about the meaningful participation in the knowledge practices that define domains of expertise (Hickey & Shafer, 2006, p. 286)

3. Routines/Procedures – strategies employed by the teacher to develop consistent ways for students to do what they need to do on a daily basis without assistance and with total understanding of the process.
4. Cooperation/Self-regulation – strategies employed by the teacher to encourage students to work well together and to learn how to be in control of and responsible for their own social and academic behaviors.

Appendix E - Constructs Table lists these four engagement constructs. In the corresponding column of each construct there is a list of teacher actions that characterize the constructs. These constructs framed the initial interview questions, planning interview questions, observational data collection and the post observation interviews.

Participant Selection

For this study I worked with five second and third year teachers who have been recognized as demonstrating strong skills in the areas of management and instruction (two second year teachers; one each in kindergarten and 2nd grade and three third year teachers; one each in kindergarten and 1st and 2nd grades). I have chosen to study participants who are second and third year teachers for several reasons. First, as previously noted, first year teachers are “cognitively overloaded” and as a result they are unable to accurately talk about what they are thinking and feeling (Carter, Cushing, Sabers, Stein, & Berliner, 1988, p. 475). Secondly, even though more recent stage theorists have questioned the chronological nature of Fuller & Brown’s (1975) original theory (Conway & Clark, 2003; Chiodo & Chang, 1999; Liston, Whitcomb & Borko, 2006; Martin & Chiodo, 2001; Mok, 2005; Turley, 2002; Turley, Powers, & Nakai, 2006;

Watzke, 2003, 2007) they still agree that during the first year a new teacher is faced with more classroom related problems than they will face in the following years. These two issues in relationship to first year teachers' developmental growth would make it difficult to have the conversations needed to address this study's research questions. The second and third years of experience are still within the five years that research has suggested it takes for new teachers to gain this competency (Berliner, 2001; Liston, Whitcomb, & Borko, 2006; Martin & Chiodo, 2001; Mok, 2005). Investigating the practices of second and third year teachers means they should be beyond the overwhelming effects of the first year but can still discuss their early learning in relationship to how they plan for and implement their instructional and management strategies.

To find five participants who demonstrate strong skills in the areas of management and instruction I tapped into the past several years of connections I have made while working in a local university's teacher education program as a university facilitator and teaching assistant. My roles as university student teaching supervisor and teaching assistant provided me with the opportunity to seek out teachers who were trained in a traditional teacher education program and access to experts who have in-depth knowledge of teachers in action. Using these experts, as well as the principals and classroom teachers I have come to know over the past few years, I was able to generate a list of potential participants who demonstrate strong skills in the areas of management and instruction. I then selected a second and third year teacher at the kindergarten level, a third year teacher at the 1st grade level and a second and third year teacher at the 2nd grade

level, five in total, who were recommended by at least two people from this pool of experts and asked those novice teachers if they would like to participate in this study.

The Participants

Marisa Trujillo was finishing her second year as a kindergarten teacher at Martinez Elementary. A single, Hispanic woman in her 20's Marisa is a second generation Mexican American who attended elementary school at a school near Martinez. She received her bachelor's degree (EC-4) and teaching certification at a large university in this same city. She received her ESL certification shortly after graduation. Marisa did her student teaching in a 1st grade classroom at Martinez. I observed Marisa during her first year at Martinez for the purpose of collecting data for another research study.

Laurie Andrews was in her third year as a 1st grade teacher at Harrison Elementary. Laurie is a single, Caucasian woman in her 20's. She graduated from the same university as Marisa although one year prior. She graduated with her bachelor's degree (EC-4) and teaching certification. Laurie did her student teaching in 1st grade at Harrison in the very same room she has taught in for the past three years. When her mentor teacher changed grade levels Laurie was hired to fill that vacancy and she settled into the classroom in which she was a student teacher.

Anthony Booker was in his third year as a 2nd grade teacher at Selleck Elementary. Anthony is a single, Caucasian man in his 20's. Anthony graduated from the same university as Marisa and Laurie. He did not do his student teaching at Selleck but believes he was hired because the principal made an effort to hire male teachers.

Alicia Smith was in her second year of teaching 2nd grade at Starlight Elementary. She is a single, Caucasian woman in her 20's. Alicia is a native of Illinois and graduated from an Illinois public university. After receiving her bachelor's degree Alicia worked for a few years in another field. She realized she wanted to be a teacher so she decided to go back to college and earned her teaching certificate in a master's program at the same university.

Diane Morgan is in her third year of teaching kindergarten at Starlight Elementary. Diane graduated from a small university in East Texas. She graduated from college with a bachelor's degree, married, had a child and then decided to go back to college to become a certified teacher. She did so through a traditional university program.

Table 1: Five Teachers' Lesson Information Chart

<i>Teacher</i>	<i>Grade</i>	<i>Number of Years Teaching</i>	<i>Subject taught for lesson</i>	<i>Team or Individually Planned Lessons</i>	<i>District</i>	<i>School</i>
Marisa	K	2	Literacy/ Categorization Skills	Individual (Team outlines DAC topics)/ Planned, not shared or handed in.	Norton	Martinez
Diane	K	3	Math/Science/ Measurement	Team/ Required to hand in plans to Principal weekly.	Englewood	Starlight
Laurie	1 st	3	LA/Writing/ Editing Skills	Individual (Team outlines DAC topics)/Some sharing with team members.	Knoll	Harrison
Alicia	2 nd	2	Science/Animals/ Adaptations	Team/ Required to hand in plans to Principal weekly.	Englewood	Starlight
Anthony	2 nd	3	Science/Sound Vibrations	Team/ Share plans weekly with Team.	Brighten	Selleck

The School Districts

This study was conducted in four Central Texas public school districts. The five participants taught in four schools within these districts during the spring semester of the 2008-2009 school year. The largest of the four districts is Norton Independent School District, an urban district in a medium-sized city with one large university and several smaller universities. Norton has a student body of approximately 82,000 housed on 120 campuses throughout the city. The Hispanic population for the 2008-2009 school year was at 58.8% and grows each year. The other ethnic populations represented are: 25.8% White, 12.1% African American and 3.4% Asian. The percentage of economically disadvantaged students is 60.85%. That percentage is also rising each year.⁴ Of that student population 65% met the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) standards. Norton employs 5,835 teachers, 39.1% of whom have five or fewer years of experience.

The other three districts can be characterized as suburban. One of those districts is Brighton Independent School District. There are approximately 22,000 students who attend the 25 campuses in this school district. Student body demographics are: 36% Hispanic, 32% White and 23% African American. There are 42.46% economically disadvantaged students attending this district. Brighton had 70% of its student population meet the TAKS standards. There are 1,382 teachers employed in this district, 31% are beginning through fifth year teachers.

⁴ All district and elementary school statistics came from the 2007-2008 Academic Excellence Indicator Report (Texas Education Association – TEA) or the individual building report cards (TEA).

The second suburban school district is Englewood Independent School District, which has a student body population of approximately 41,700 on 46 campuses. The predominant ethnic populations found on these campuses are: 52% White, 25.8% Hispanic, 11.4% Asian and 10.5% African American. The economically disadvantaged population represents 24.7% of the district's student body. Of Englewood's student population 81% met the TAKS standards. Of the teacher population of 2,875, 40% have five or fewer years of experience.

The third school district is Knoll Independent School District. Knoll's student body consists of approximately 28,000 students being educated on 34 campuses. The students are represented ethnically as: 69.9% White, 19.7% Hispanic, 5.3% African American and 4.5% Asian. Of this population 82% of the students met the TAKS standards. There are 1,876 teachers in this district, 40% of whom are beginning to fifth year teachers.

The Elementary Schools

The first elementary school in which data was collect is part of the Norton Independent School District. Martinez Elementary School has a student body population of approximately 400. Martinez serves a predominately Hispanic population (89% of students) and has an economically disadvantaged indicator of 95%.

The next elementary school is Selleck Elementary School, which is in the Brighten Independent School District. The school population is approximately 900 students with an ethnic makeup of 42% Hispanic, 27% African American and 25% White students. Selleck is classified as being 49% economically disadvantaged.

The third, Starlight Elementary School, is in the Englewood Independent School District. Starlight has approximately 600 students, with only 6% designated as economically disadvantaged. The ethnic population is: 65% White, 9% Hispanic and 3% African American.

The fourth school is Harrison Elementary School, which has a population of approximately 450 students. This elementary school is part of the Knoll Independent School District. Harrison has 12% of its population labeled economically disadvantaged with an ethnic makeup of: 73% White, 16% Hispanic and 5% African American.

Data Sources

Data collection began with an initial individual meeting with each of the selected participants to discuss the research study and what their role would be in this study if they chose to participate. After they agreed to participate I obtained their written consent to participate in the study (see Appendix A, IRB Letter of Consent) then asked them the first set of initial interview questions (see Appendix B, Initial Interview Protocols). At the end of that interview we scheduled a time and date for the second initial interview. At the second interview I asked a second set of initial interview questions (see Appendix B, Initial Interview Protocols). At the end of the interview we scheduled a time and date for the next three parts of the data collection process and scheduled those times. The ideal sequence was to have the planning interview (see Appendix C, Planning Interview Protocol) occur the day before the observation. Then the post observation interview (see Appendix D, Post Observation Interview Protocol) would occur the day following the observation. This allowed for the time needed to transcribe the interview tapes from the

planning interview before the observation of the lesson to help structure the data collection process and then to go over the field notes from the observation before discussing the observation with the participants. I asked the participants to select a lesson they like to teach and one they felt comfortable teaching for the study.

Initial Interviews

The semi-structured initial two interviews were designed to allow the researcher and the participants to (a) obtain permission to audiotape interviews and observe the lesson being taught, (b) obtain signed consent forms, (c) get to know each other better and become more comfortable with each other and (d) find out why they decided to teach and how they feel about being a teacher (see Appendix B, Initial Interview Protocols). These initial interview sessions were audio taped and transcribed.

Planning Interviews

During this semi-structured planning interview the participants walked me through their own process for planning the lessons I would later observe. At this time I also asked them a set of open-ended questions (see Appendix C, Planning Interview #3 Protocol). This preactive lesson planning (Van Manen, 1995; Yinger, 1977, 1978) was critical in assisting me to better understand the participants' vision for how the lesson should unfold. I listened carefully to how they talked about the academic and social aspects of their lessons. It was necessary for me to understand how the teacher was planning to teach the concept and how the teacher planned to use the five constructs to frame engagement during the lesson. The way the teacher talked about teaching the content and developing student engagement through the four sets of constructs would

indicate if and how the teacher was thinking about management and instruction while planning for the lesson and this was the main focus of this study. The participants selected the lessons to be discussed and observed. They were asked to select lessons that would demonstrate the elements of learning-centered instruction incorporating active, hands-on learning (excluding routine lessons such as morning opening). The planning interview sessions were audio taped and transcribed.

Field Observations

The next step was the observation of the lesson being taught. These observations occurred during the interactive teaching (Van Manen, 1995; Yinger 1977, 1986) of the lesson discussed in the planning interview. During this time I observed the participants teaching the lesson and watching how they brought to life the lesson plans they talked about in the planning interviews. In my field notes I began by writing a few sentences about what was happening in the classroom to get a sense of context prior to the actual lesson being observed and a sense of how the teacher transitioned into the lesson. An example would be: “The children are finishing their morning writing. They each have a writing paper with the upper half of the page for drawing and the bottom half with lines to write their stories. As [Diane] moves around the room checking work she has those finished get a book, move to their spot on the rug and read quietly” (Diane, Observation Field Notes, 3/25/09). When the timer Diane uses to delineate time for activities goes off she begins the transition to the lesson.

Timer goes off. Diane tells the students to put their papers in the unfinished work cubbies. Those reading at the rug are instructed to return their books and then wait

for math instruction at the rug. Diane waits a few minutes for all the students to get to the rug. Then she begins counting down. The students listen to Diane and get themselves to the rug. She waits until they are all settled and quiet to begin the lesson. (Diane, Observation Field Notes, 3/25/09)

The field notes detailed everything that happened from the transition through to the closure of the lesson. When I had questions I would write them in the field notes so I could talk to the teacher about them in the post observation interview. For instance in my field notes for Marisa's lesson observation (4/15/09) when it was time for her to use the tape she discussed in her planning interview (4/14/09) my entry looked like this: "Begins reading book (No tape?? Ask Marisa – pacing, not enough time?)..." (4/15/09). During the post observation interview I would go back to those questions and discuss them with the teachers.

In addition these observations allowed me to become more familiar with the setting, context and the general feeling of each classroom and school building gaining a better contextual understanding of how they affected each participant's decision-making process.

Post Observation Interviews

The day after each classroom observation I meet with the participants to give them an opportunity to talk about what happened during the lesson. During these post-active teaching (Van Manen, 1995) interviews the participants had the opportunity to discuss the adjustments, if any, they made related to student engagement and instruction. During this semi-structured interview I also asked questions (see Appendix D, Post

Observation Interview Protocol) about the five engagement constructs (see Appendix E, Constructs Table) and the adjustments participants made to their original plans during the actual lessons. The explanations the teachers provided about their decision making process helped me to better understand why they made those decisions and provide insight into how they made those types of decisions on a regular basis. As my understanding of each participant's lesson planning and teaching practices increased, I began to shape my tentative interpretations. During the post observation interviews I had the opportunity to test those tentative interpretations. In my field notes for Marisa's lesson observation (4/15/09), I made a tentative interpretation during the observation about why Marisa might have omitted the tape we talked about in her planning interview (4/14/09) from the lesson. Marisa talked about pacing being a problem for her so I interpreted the omission of the tape as being "pacing, not enough time?)" (4/15/09). During the post observation interview (4/16/09) Marisa explained,

I listened to it that morning and decided it wasn't great and it wouldn't help the kids a lot. If those tapes don't really make good connection and it needed to in order to keep their attention they can get in trouble. And the kids were really getting into the lesson so I didn't want to interrupt the flow of the lesson. I was also pressed for time so I needed to make sure I used what worked so I skipped it (Post Observation Interview, 4/16/09).

This confirmed my tentative interpretation as noted in my field notes (4/15/09) but it also enabled me to extend that interpretation to include Marisa complete reasons. Besides the pacing aspect of the decision she also did not feel, after listening to the tape, that it

integrated management and instruction in a sufficient manner. These interviews were audio taped and transcribed.

Data Analysis

The data collected via this qualitative case study approach was analyzed effectively through the constant comparative method (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Generalizations naturally emerged from the data as it was collected. The generalizations were actually developing theories that were constantly being compared against new data that was being continually collected in the field (Mertens, 1998). The constant comparative analysis allowed for continuous interaction with the data and consistency in asking questions to support the generation of theory and connection of the concepts. As the initial planning interview ended, I began the analysis process. As each interview and observation unfolded I was carefully analyzing each individual participant's reflections about how they planned for, taught and reflected on their lessons and then cross-analyzed or compared all five participants' reflections for similarities and differences (Mertens, 1998).

Data was coded using external and internal codes (Graue & Walsh, 1998; Hatch, 2002). The four engagement constructs that emerged from the conceptual framework (see Appendix E, Constructs Table) became the external codes categories used during the collection and analysis of the data. These four external constructs were expectations, monitoring, routines/procedures and cooperation/self-regulation. After initially coding the data using these constructs, each of the construct-coded data was again analyzed using the external codes initially developed within each construct category. During

another level of analysis, additional internal codes were developed that expanded on the four sets of external constructs originally developed (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Simons, 2009). With additional analysis, internal codes or subcategories were generated as new ideas emerged from the data (Graue & Walsh, 1998). These internal codes reflect ideas that emerged after the first few levels of analysis were completed using the external codes for each construct. Three additional internal codes were added as a result of the data analysis. In the construct of monitoring an internal code was added for time management, which was not initially included as an external code but emerged through the analysis of the data. For the construct of routines and procedures I added an internal code for transitions. For the construct of cooperation and self-regulation I included an internal code for a community of learners, both having been overlooked during the development of the external codes but emerging during initial data analysis (see Appendix E, Constructs Table). The following is an example of this coding process:

Table 2: Explanation of Coding

Source of Data	Data	Analysis	Coding
Preactive Planning Interview	“Prior to this lesson we will be finishing community circle, so we will be at the rug ready to begin.” (Laurie, 4/27/09)	First level of analysis: examining each case and finding dialogue that could be coded with one of the four external construct codes.	First level of coding: classification under the <i>cooperation/self-regulation</i> external construct code.
Field Notes	“The sentences from Daily Oral Language (DOL) practice were on the board: What will I try harder on today? Will I be respectful? Laurie and the children were	Second level of analysis: separating the dialogue from	Second level of coding within the cooperation/self-regulation code became: <i>creates environment of warmth, care and concern for students.</i> Third level of coding: the

Table 2: Explanation of Coding

	<p>at the rug and involved in Community Circle time. One of the children is holding a stuffed duck and talking about the previous day and what she would do differently today. As she ends she passes the stuffed duck to the next child in line. The students are quiet, eyes on the speaker and displaying good listening skills' (Laurie, 5/6/09).</p>	<p>the transcripts into the four different external construct codes; code within the construct codes for more specificity.</p> <p>Third level of analysis: merging the four external construct coded transcripts for the five cases together.</p> <p>Fourth level of analysis: organizing the merged data sets (preactive interview, field notes, post observation interviews) into emerging themes.</p>	<p>internal code of <i>community circle or meeting</i> emerged.</p> <p>After coding the data it was organized into themes reflecting my interpretation of the data; this interpretation reflected how the data revealed whether the teachers did or did not integrate management with instruction, if and how the teachers made adjustments to their lesson plans and how they discussed learning to integrate management with instruction. For instance, linking teacher dialogue during the interviews (discussions about community circles or meetings) with actions that occurred during the interactive lesson/observation (students taking part in community building activities) for all the teachers led me to see how the teachers actually orchestrated the integration of management with instruction.</p>
<p>Post Observation Interview</p>	<p>'They are learning to have good conversations about topics, discuss with each other what they are learning and ask each other questions. That is one of the ideas behind our community circle time. The routine is that everyone gets to speak their opinion or thought on a topic... That is what we do every morning after DOL to get our day started' (Laurie, 5/7/09).</p>		

In all three sections this data was first coded as part of the cooperation/self-regulation construct. During subsequent rounds of analysis, these sections were refined into the external codes that are subcategories of the cooperation/self-regulation construct. During this process I realized this set of data fit into several of the external code areas and, as a result created an internal code as a subcategory of the cooperation/self-regulation construct called creates community of learners. I finally chose to word this internal code in this fashion because most of the teachers talked about some form of community building but not specifically calling it a “community of learners” as Laurie did.

As you can see the development of the internal codes relied upon the continued development of such ideas as the community of learners from Laurie’s data, which emerged as the analysis progressed through each of the interviews and the observation. Due to the complexity of classroom activity and how contextually bound the meaning was within each lesson I began analyzing the data immediately following the initial interview and continue throughout the data collection process in order to better understand the management and instructional issues within the larger framework of the teachers’ planning.

After listening to others who had traveled this path before me talk about being prepared for the multitude of data collected for a dissertation I decided on several ways of dealing with my own onslaught of data. First, after each interview I listened to the tape from that interview as I drove home, while identifying in my head the constructs the teacher was talking about. Initially I had planned to have the tapes of each interview

transcribed by the professional transcriber I had used during previous studies but I could not do so for this study because of the tight timeframe needed for turnaround. It was important for me to transcribe the tapes the night after the interviews in order to organize how the interview would be structured for the next day and what I would be looking for as I observed the lesson. I did not particularly want to spend all those hours transcribing the tapes but I wanted to hear their voices again and I needed immediate direction. So I purchased *Dragon Dictate* by Nuance for my Mac. *Dragon Dictate* allowed me to listen to the tapes and transcribe orally while the computer typed the transcripts. This was a quicker and more efficient method of transcription.

After the data collection and transcribing was completed I put each of those transcripts into another word document, which was designed with two columns, one for the data (on the left) and a column for my notes and comments (on the right). While the documents were still on my Mac I went through the transcripts and coded them with the four construct areas. Next, I took each of those documents for each teacher and made four new documents, also with two columns, with the set of data for each construct on separate documents. This time I went through the data and coded it using the external codes developed as categories within each of the four constructs.

The next step was to produce hardcopies of this last set of documents. At this point I needed to be able to move the data around within a single case (one teacher) and among the five cases (all five teachers). So I cut up the documents first making piles for each construct per teacher laying out similar context between the interviews and the observations. This is the point where the internal codes began to emerge. I could see how

certain pieces of data, when connected across the interviews and observations, were taking on a different life than those of the external codes I developed prior to data collection, as can be seen in the example of Laurie's data coding above.

After seeing these three internal codes emerge within a single case I decided to merge the five cases data into the constructs and see what else might emerge. What emerged became the themes I will discuss in more detail during chapter four. The first theme, the two phases of planning, emerged while questioning if these teachers really did think about the integration of management and instruction during their planning. The data demonstrates they did but it also reflects a two phase planning process that has not been documented in other research on teacher planning.

The second theme, teacher focused constructs, unfolded as I realized each teacher had one construct pile that was larger than the others. For instance Alicia's expectation construct pile was considerably larger than her other three construct piles. Upon further analysis I realized the data was clearly indicating that each of the teachers acknowledged they were focusing on particular constructs and demonstrated that focus during the lesson observation.

A third theme, adjusting the plan, emerged in relationship to questioning whether the teachers made adjustments to their original lesson plan during interactive teaching (Yinger, 1986). The second research question for this study was developed because the previous research on teacher planning indicated that teachers make adjustments to the original lesson plans while teaching their lessons. As such the planning document created for instruction should only provide an entry framework for actual instruction (Weade &

Evertson, 1988; Yinger, 1986). For the teachers in this study it was actually during the second phase of preactive planning (Yinger, 1977) when they made these adjustments to their original lesson plan. Only one of the teachers actual made an adjustment during the lesson.

The fourth theme, survival learning, emerged while the teachers were comparing what they were doing right in their present lessons to what they did not do the previous year(s). For instance when Marisa was talking about establishing routines she explained that her students “seem to be able to follow established routines that don’t change. I learned from last year that I have to be consistent with what I expect them to do” (Planning Interview, 4/14/09).

The last theme, university learning, emerged as a result of the teachers’ conversations about how the experiences they were having in the classroom helped them to connect those experiences to what they learned at the university. One of Alicia’s comments demonstrates this connection:

In school you hear model, model all the time but I think as new teachers you don’t take it that literally. Actually being in front of kids trying to get them to understand what you want from them is when you start to understand and take it literally (Post Observation Interview, 3/12/09).

Both survival learning and university learning are reflective of how some of these teachers learned to integrate management with instruction during planning. This approach to the analysis of the data was beneficial because it helped shape “the direction of future data collection based on what [I was] actual finding or not finding” (Hatch, 2002, p. 149).

I relied on the use of analytic memos to record any additional reflections and insights, which also were used to refocus the lesson planning interviews, observations and post observation interviews (Hatch, 2002).

The cross-case synthesis (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yin, 2003) analysis technique utilized towards the end of the data analysis process, which help the themes to emerge, was used to support the constant comparative method (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) explained above. Cross-case synthesis applies specifically to the analysis of multiple individual cases (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yin, 2003), in this study the aim of examining lesson planning practices in multiple cases is to increase generalizability of findings across the five individual cases. Throughout the study I was constantly comparing the cases to decide whether they shared similarities, patterns, themes, etc. or if they reflect subgroups or categories demonstrating similarities and differences among the cases. As I listened to these five teachers talk about their lesson planning and watched them teach those lessons it was difficult not to continually think about those similarities and difference. There proved to be more similarities across the cases than differences.

Trustworthiness and Credibility

During data collection, as I transcribed the tapes and began the initial analysis of the data, I discussed those findings with the teachers. At the beginning of each interview I began by reviewing parts of the previous interviews with each of the teachers for clarification and accuracy. It was important to make sure I clearly understood the meaning they intended for the information being shared. Member checking “is the most important criteria in establishing credibility” (Mertens, 1998, p. 139). At the end of each

interview I always asked the teachers if they had any other ideas, concerns, or questions they would like to share (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). But I always kept in mind, “Although member checking can inform a researcher’s judgment, it cannot substitute for it” (Seidman, 1998, p. 56).

During the daily transcription of the interview tapes triangulation of the data was achieved by continually comparing what the teachers were saying throughout each of the four interviews. Then the field notes from the lesson observations were compared to what the teachers said during the interviews for consistency. As I was developing earlier drafts from the data to describe these comparisons I shared my writing with a community of learners, which included practicing teachers, elementary school administrators and teacher educators, most of who were also doctoral students. This sharing of ideas among this group of scholars helped me to strengthen my ideas as a result of their in-depth questioning of my interpretations (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Mertens, 1998).

Ethical Considerations

For the protection of the participants and in accordance with the regulations of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at The University of Texas at Austin each participant received a copy of the informed consent form for this study (see Appendix A, IRB Letter of Consent Form). I spoke with each participant individually to discuss the details of the study and what part they would play in the study. I then asked them each to sign the consent form and provided them with a copy.

“The responsibility for ethical research ultimately lies with the individual researcher” (Anderson, 1998, p. 88). As the primary researcher for this study the

responsibility was mine to ensure that I conducted myself in a moral and professional manner. Participants' names and the names of the districts and schools they teach at have been replaced by pseudonyms to protect the participants' and schools' identities and to maintain confidentiality.

CHAPTER 4: STUDY FINDINGS

Recent literature on teachers' professional thinking during instructional planning has often been portrayed as problem solving and decision making (Clark and Peterson, 1986; Conway, 2001; Genishi, Ryan, Ochsner, & Yarnell, 2001; Hatton & Smith, 1995; Yinger, 1977, 1980, 1986). Instructional planning is a time when teachers are depending on their abilities to think and act reflectively so they can carefully order their ideas and take action (Adler, 1991; Conway, 2001; Dewey, 1933; Gore & Zeichner, 1991; Hatton & Smith, 1995; Schon, 1983, 1987; Van Manen, 1995). When teachers engage in instructional decision making the type of instruction they choose has an effect on the social context of the classroom during the lesson (Evertson & Neal, 2006). Teachers depend on their abilities to think about these ideas during planning to balance both the social and academic contexts of their lessons. Therefore it was critical to examine teacher thinking during the planning process in order to better understand how the new teachers in this study integrated management with instruction during their lessons. This chapter addresses teacher thinking as the basis for teacher planning and what the teachers in this study thought about while they were preparing for and teaching their lessons in relationship to the integration of management and instruction.

The purpose of this study was to examine how second and third year teachers think about the relationship between management and instruction during preactive planning, interactive teaching, and post teaching reflection. Observations of the lessons were included in the methodology to examine how the teachers adjusted the plans they create during preactive planning to match the needs of their students during interactive

teaching. The teachers' discourse recorded throughout this investigation emphasized the teachers' perceptions about how they learned to integrate management with instruction. This chapter will address the three research questions central to this study by first examining how these teachers changed the traditional planning process so they could accommodate the district aligned curricula (DAC) used in their districts and also meet the needs of the students in their classrooms. Next, how they adjusted their DAC plans prior to actually teaching the lesson to insure the needs of their students were met and how this changed traditional planning for them. Finally, how the teachers discussed their learning to integrate management and instruction and how it became part of their teaching practices. Due to the significance of the findings in relationship to these teachers' planning process as it affected their abilities to integrate management and instruction, teacher planning will be discussed first.

Teacher Planning

The First Phase or Transmission Phase of Preactive Planning: Transmitting District Aligned Curriculum Plans to the Teachers' Weekly Lesson Plans

The teachers in this study began the first phase of preactive planning⁵ (Yinger, 1977, 1980, 1986) by transmitting or transferring the information from their District Aligned Curriculum (DAC) to their official weekly written lesson plans. As a result this first phase of preactive planning will be named the transmission phase for this dissertation. Since the 1980's U.S. educational reform has been focused on setting

⁵ "Preactive planning is a term for those times in teaching such as before school, after school, during recess and during other breaks when the teacher is in an empty classroom" (Yinger, 1980, p. 107-108). This planning precedes the actual teaching of the lesson.

measurable academic standards to outline what students should know and be able to do consistently throughout the nation. In response Texas developed the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS), which were first released in 1997. Many districts throughout Texas developed more detailed aligned curricula guides to address the TEKS, which serve as work plans for teachers as they prepare to teach. The depth and scope of these district aligned curricula vary by district. The districts in this study all had detailed DAC providing the plans for teachers to use (including materials) on a daily basis. This fact changed how the teachers in this study planned for their lessons.

In the past decade the realm of teacher planning has become confined within the mandates of state standards and district curriculums. “Contemporary lesson planning in the United States of America (USA) involves goals and objectives constructed intentionally to align each state with the rigorous grade and course level standards of a constantly heightening national curriculum,” (Hughes, 2005, p.106) as set forth by the national associations in each of the content areas (i.e. National Council of Teachers of English – NCTE; National Council of Teachers of Mathematics – NCTM; National Council for the Social Sciences – NCSS; and National Science Teachers Association – NSTA). This model of effective curriculum planning and daily lesson planning stems from the work of Tyler (1949), which was later expanded on by Taba (1962) and Popham and Baker (1970). The model incorporated four steps: stating specific objectives, selecting learning activities, organizing learning activities and specifying assessment strategies. “This model is basically a linear ends-means in which planning progresses logically from one’s goals” (Yinger, 1980, p. 108). This process of instructional

development has been the standard for instructional planning for many years and “has been prescribed for all types of educational planning” (Yinger, 1980, p. 108). It is still the basis for the designing of the DAC.

Table 3: Teacher Data Chart

Teachers	Number of Years Teaching	Grade Level	District	School	Is DAC present?
Marisa	2	K	Norton	Martinez	Yes
Diane	3	K	Englewood	Starlight	Yes
Laurie	3	1 st	Knoll	Harrison	Yes
Alicia	2	2 nd	Englewood	Starlight	Yes
Anthony	3	2 nd	Brighten	Selleck	Yes

This model of curriculum planning and daily lesson planning was evident in the DAC present in each of the four Texas districts the teachers in this study worked in. The curricula were detailed in every aspect of instructional planning including the daily lesson plans, materials and methods for teaching and assessments. During the initial phase of the planning process these teachers’ main concerns were about the instructional objectives of the lesson as defined by the DAC. Marisa explained, “At this point I thought only about the subject. Getting down what’s required to teach” (Planning Interview, 4/14/2009). Diane discussed how they begin the planning process, “Well, you know we plan as a grade level. We begin by focusing on what we are going to teach. So we start with the [district’s curriculum]” (Planning Interview, 3/24/09). Laurie said, “I start the process by dealing with the content.” (Planning Interview, 4/23/09). Anthony stated, “We figure out,

according to the district curriculum manual, what content we are suppose to be on for the week and go from there” (Planning Interview, 5/12/09). Their discussions about planning highlighted only the academic portions of the lesson at this point. Prewritten and approved district lessons, as Hughes (2005) points out, play “a significant institutional role that tells teachers directly what plan should be taught (subjects as well as subject-matter) while setting teachers up with planning created to endure encroaching high-stakes standardized tests” (p. 115). For the teachers in this study, using these district documents to identify what it was they were to teach was the norm among these teachers during this transmission phase⁶ of preactive planning.

Methods examined in the previous decades of research on teacher planning provides evidence that teachers were required to “set goals, formulate alternatives, predict outcomes for each alternative and then evaluate each alternative for its effectiveness in reaching goals and achieving desired outcomes” (Yinger, 1980, p. 108). During planning teachers worked through a logical progression, which originated from their goals. In fact teachers have always been given curriculum guides and manuals providing the details about what lessons would look like. The difference between those previous forms of curriculum guidance and the DAC used by these teachers is the district expectations they will be followed exactly as they are written. In this case study these five teachers used their DAC guides to perform their initial lesson planning; therefore, the traditional type of planning Yinger (1980) talks about is already completed through the DAC and not by the individual teachers. In previous planning research teachers used their

⁶ The author of this dissertation created the term “transmission” used to name the first phase of preactive

curriculum guides and manuals as references for their own decision making and planning. These five teachers' instructional planning was a departure from this previously established method of lesson planning. These teachers created an altered phase one within Yinger's (1980) preactive planning model, which has been named the transmission phase for this dissertation.

Instead of initially determining their own goals for the students their DAC provided them with that planning. Planning for the teachers in this study began by transmitting or copying the lesson plans from their district aligned curricula to their own weekly lesson plans. As Anthony noted, "We look at the [district curriculum guide] for second grade and pick out the lessons we'll use for next week. Basically, we cut and paste. Then make copies and share them with the others [second grade teachers]" (Planning Interview, 5/12/09). As Anthony points out, the thinking process for the initial written phase of planning for these teachers was formulaic. He added, "We just use the goals and lessons the district tells us to use" (Planning Interview, 5/12/09).

Alicia and Diane taught in the same district. Like Anthony's district, teachers in their district also created weekly plans that were shared with the other team members and the team makes them available to the building administration. Diane stated that her team "...looks over the [district curriculum guide] to see what the goals will be for each subject" (Planning Interview, 3/24/09). Then, they work in groups of two teachers to take their district's curriculum and put those plans in a week of lessons for each member of the team to use in their own classrooms. Diane explained that "our [district's curriculum] gives us what we need to teach so everyone in the district's teaching everything in the

same order. I change activities and how I teach it, but I follow the objectives in the [district curriculum guide]” (Planning Interview, 3/24/09). Diane’s statement indicates that she is adjusting the content of the lesson while maintaining the goals and objectives provided for her in her district’s curriculum. Alicia stated, “We really just use the district lessons for our weekly written lesson plans because the district expects us to use them” (Planning Interview, 3/10/09). The scope and sequence these teachers used to format the lessons they taught in their classrooms was created by the district from the state standards and functions as the framework for their thinking during the tailoring phase⁷ or second phase of preactive planning.

There were other curricular requirements in the district aligned curricula the teachers talked about. These were also required through the DAC to incorporate into their lessons “exactly as the [curriculum guide] detailed. Like the [science] journal is a district expectation” (Planning Interview, 5/12/09, Anthony). The goal is to align “expectations to the grade levels so that every grade level builds upon what the kids did the year before” (Planning Interview, 5/12/09, Anthony). They are also required to “have the same format from grade level to grade level” (Planning Interview, 5/12/09, Anthony). Of the science journals, Alicia pointed out, “It’s all spelled out for you in the [district curriculum guides]” (Planning Interview, 3/10/09). These statements were echoed by all the participants and demonstrate the extent to which the DAC provided a detailed outline of the initial lesson planning process, which these teachers consistently used to begin their process of planning for their daily lessons.

⁷ The author of this dissertation created the term “tailoring” used to name the second phase of preactive

Typically teachers with less than four years of experience tend to adhere more closely to the established curriculum or the district aligned curricula, in this case, than do their veteran counterparts (Boudah et al., 1997). This behavior was evidenced within the planning practices of the teachers in this study. As the teachers walked me through their thinking during the transmission phase of their lesson planning (the lesson plans derived from the DAC) they talked about the sequential steps they took while picking out and writing down the lessons provided in their district curriculums. It wasn't until they talked about how they were going to adjust those plan to best suit their own students that the management aspects of their lessons emerged. This new focus in planning was different from their content focus while they talked about the transmission phase of their preactive planning and therefore needed to be documented as such. In this next section this second phase of planning these teachers engaged in, where they began making adjustments to the DAC plans and addressed the social implications of those DAC plans, will be examined.

***The Second Phase of Preactive Planning: Tailoring the DAC to Match the
Context of their Classrooms***

The second phase, which for this dissertation is named the tailoring phase, occurred prior to the interactive teaching⁸ (Yinger, 1986) of the lesson in front of students. At this point they started actively thinking about how they could adjust their written transmissions of the DAC to better meet the needs of their students and the context of their own particular teaching situation. While seeking to answer this study's

⁸ "The world of interactive teaching is a world of immediacy, of responsive action, of social interchange...demanding enormous amounts of the teacher's attention and energy" (Yinger, 1986, p. 263).

first research question, which focused on how second and third year teachers plan for integrating the management of engagement with instruction in their lessons and reflect on this planning after the lesson is completed, this second phase or tailoring phase of preactive planning was where the teachers actually talked about this connection. The act of sifting through the curriculum documents during the transmission phase of preactive planning and writing those official weekly lesson plans stimulated their initial thoughts about what would actually happen in the context of their own classrooms during their lesson. This tailoring phase of planning actually fits into the traditional preactive planning model (Tyler, 1949) in relationship to how teachers traditionally tailor or adjust the plan for their lessons to fit their own students and the context of their classrooms. It is during this tailoring phase where these teachers addressed the second research question for this study: When implementing this plan, how do they adjust their goals for management and/or instruction if their plan doesn't adequately address their preplanned goals? And how do they reflect on those adjustments after the lesson is completed? To more carefully detail the findings, which support the presence of this second phase of preactive planning, the next part of this section will examine three of the teachers' individually to clearly outline how they actually tailored the DAC plans to address the social and academic needs of their students.

Alicia -

Alicia, a 2nd grade teacher, addressed what happened during the tailoring phase of preactive planning for her when she said, "I think about how I'm going to teach the lesson from the time we finish those written plans. I try to visualize how it will look in

my classroom and what I'm going to need. I think about the room arrangement and the best way to group my students" (Post Observation Interview, 3/12/09). Alicia's comments support this two-phase preactive planning process (the transmission phase followed by the tailoring phase) reflected across the data. She delineates how she plans during the first phase when she talks about aligning her written plans to cover what she is expected to teach in the DAC. Then, when Alicia has finished those written plans, she enters the tailoring phase of her planning. This is the point in their preactive lesson planning when these teachers participate in the traditional form of planning previously outlined in prior research on teacher planning (Popham & Baker, 1970; Taba, 1962; Tyler, 1949; Yinger, 1977). This tailoring phase is where Alicia begins to create the vision she wants for this lesson in her classroom. She explains her vision is to make sure the plans work in her classroom for her students. Tyler (1949) concurred with Alicia's professional judgment while stating that when teachers are making choices about learning experiences "the reactions desired in the experience [must be] within the range of possibility for the students involved" (p. 67). In order to make the experience work for her students Alicia had to take her district DAC focus for the entire district and tailor it for the needs of her specific classroom context.

For instance, Alicia's science lesson about animal body adaptations took place during the last week of a six-week science unit about animal adaptations. The goal of this unit was to foster the children's understanding of what animal adaptations are and how and why they adapt to their habitats. The unit culminated with the students giving their animal adaptation presentations and showing the assignment artifacts they had each

created during this unit. While talking me through her plans for this lesson Alicia explained,

Each student researched their own animal and all about its adaptations, habitat and diet, what continent it is on and produced a power point about all they have learned. This specific lesson is a review and a way to assess what they have learned about the adaptations. They will be putting together three real animals they have researched into one made up animal of their own. They will be explaining what adaptations their new animal will have based on their body parts” (Planning Interview, 3/10/09).

While Alicia and her teammate were planning this science unit they decided to add this lesson because:

We wanted an authentic way to assess what they had learned about the animal they researched and the animals their classmates had researched. They love this unit anyways, but adding this type of higher-level thinking really enhances the joy they get out of learning. They get into lessons like this. The more lessons they can have that actively involves their minds and hands are a management dream. The better and more hands-on my lesson is the less I have to worry about behavior. I’m all for that (Planning Interview, 3/10/09).

Alicia and her grade level teammates used their district’s curriculum to plan out this unit, but they also extended it so the students could reach to higher levels of thinking. This would model Tyler’s (1949) original descriptions of how teachers initiate instructional planning when they select and organize activities that support their learning goals and

objectives. Alicia and her colleagues did this by providing the students with a learning experience that required them to go beyond the DAC and to use what they learned about adaptations to create their own animals. Alicia adjusted the written plans she took from the DAC because “I want them to demonstrate they really know what adaptation is and transfer that knowledge to other situations” (Planning Interview, 3/10/09). Alicia’s professional judgment lead her to engage in this tailoring phase of preactive planning in order to adjust her district aligned curriculum to better match the needs of her students.

Alicia’s statements also demonstrate that she realized this type of good instruction had a positive effect on student behavior demonstrating her understanding about how instruction and management are integrated during her lessons. This idea echoes Evertson and Neal’s (2006) suggestion that “self-regulation involves learning to form goals and plans to guide one’s own behavior rather than behaving only in response to external commands” (p. 5). Alicia’s lesson afforded her students the freedom to make decisions about how they would develop their own ideas and plans for their animals while being engaged in a lesson they enjoy and, as a result, learn to self-regulate their own behavior.

Marisa -

Another example of the tailoring phase of preactive planning was found in Marisa’s literacy lesson. For this lesson she planned to use an activity sheet she had designed for the students to work on independently after she finished reading the story with the children and introducing the concept of living in homes and categorizing types of homes. She noted,

I woke up out of a sound sleep that morning and had to get to work so I could change the activity sheet. It really was a last minute thing. I'm glad I made that decision. That was partly an academic reason and a management reason. I wanted this to be an independent activity. I realized that the activity was academically too advanced for them but also that it would create a set of management issues. These children need to know exactly what they are doing to work independently. They get upset and out of control when the activity is too difficult. The original activity was definitely too hard for the students and I would have had to spent too much time dealing with discipline problems because of how hard it was. But I'm glad I made that decision. It went so much better (Post Observation Interview, 4/16/09).

Marisa's statement demonstrates how she realized her students needed to have an activity that allowed them to work at their independent level if they were going to accomplish that activity successfully and with minimal need for her assistance while allowing the students to practice what was taught in the lesson. Tyler (1949) outlined that "for a given objective to be attained, a student must have experiences that give him an opportunity to practice the kind of behavior implied by the objective" (p. 65), which was the point in Marisa changing this activity. To provide them with this independent work she adjusted the lesson plan she'd previously transmitted from the DAC into her lesson plan book. Marisa created a hands-on activity that was not part of the DAC. Her activity replaced a worksheet provided with the DAC. Marisa's activity required "the students to make a blueprint of their home and place a series of objects in the rooms of the blueprint" (Post Observation Interview, 3/12/09). The activity reinforced what was taught during the

literacy lesson and provided Marisa time to work with students who need additional assistance.

Marisa's comments demonstrate an understanding of the dynamics in how the difficulty of the learning activity would affect student behavior when she stated "I realized that the activity was academically too advanced for them but also that it would create a set of management issue" (Post Observation Interview, 4/16/09). Marisa understood how her students learned and what their limitations were. What Marisa was attempting to accomplish while planning her lesson was to orchestrate the management and instructional components of the lesson to mirror this understanding she had about her students' needs. Evertson and Neal (2006) talk about teachers being "asked to create a bridge between the needs of each learner and the attainment of more complex and meaningful learning goals" (p. 4). In this example Marisa demonstrated how she created this bridge between the objectives for the lesson and what she knew about the needs of her students.

Anthony -

For some the need to adjust the original lesson plans to better reflect the needs of their own classroom occurred right before the lesson. For instance Anthony taught a science lesson about sound vibrations. He set up the room with a series of lab stations for the students before they entered the room. However as he watched his students move around the room right before they were to break off into their lab groups he realized he had to change where he had planned to set up the stations. Lambert (1995) and Evertson and Neal (2006) talked about the need to provide flexible spaces for students during

interactive activities requiring collaboration as a critical part of learning like during the science labs Anthony created. Anthony discussed this adjustment during his post observation interview.

I watched them milling around getting ready for the lab and there it was. They were having trouble getting around the areas where the stations were set up. You can see the flow of the groups would have been a problem. It all of a sudden hit me, there would have been lots of behavior problems. There wasn't enough room for them to move from station to station or enough room to carry out the actual experiments. I don't think of things like that until I am in the moment and ready to teach. But I catch those things more consistently than I did in the past (Post Observation Interview, 5/14/2009).

As Anthony watched his students begin to interact with the science stations he realized the relationship between the way the classroom was set up and the effectiveness of instruction. In Evertson and Neal's (2006) study they found teacher decisions about "their environmental arrangements were not ends in themselves, but means to learning" (p. 6). Anthony realized he had to manage the environment of his classroom differently if his students were going to be successful learning about sound vibrations. Anthony was concerned about the room arrangement supporting the social needs of his students as they transitioned between the lab stations. Evertson and Neal (2006) support Anthony's concern when they said, "The spatial environment is designed to facilitate collaboration" (p.6). The main focus of Anthony's lesson was the collaboration of the students in their lab groups, therefore the spatial environment of his classroom needed to support this

collaboration. This last minute change to the spatial environment around the lab stations made by Anthony allowed the students to transition fluidly from station to station and provided appropriate space for student learning at each station.

In each of the teaching situations discussed above these teachers planning strategies included intentional thought about the integration of management and instruction for their lesson during the tailoring phase of preactive planning. Their work also demonstrates the existence of this additional phase of preactive planning that allows them to tailor their districts' aligned curricula to the specific needs of their own students.

Even at the district level these aligned curriculums have the needs of a larger community of learners with diverse needs wrapped up into one set of curricular goals and objectives. These teachers demonstrated they went beyond simply managing (Apple, 2007) the lessons they transferred from their DAC (Woods & Jeffrey, 1998). They understood the need for an additional step to align or tailor their original written lessons, derived from their DAC, to address the diversity in the smaller community within the context of their own classrooms. The use of DAC in each of these districts forced the teachers to create an additional phase for planning which changed the traditional planning process written about in previous planning research (Hughes, 2005; Popham & Baker, 1970; Taba, 1962; Tyler, 1949; Van Manen, 1995; Yinger, 1977, 1980, 1986). Instead of following the traditional planning process where teachers created their own instruction, the DAC created the instruction for the teachers in this study. This change in control of the instructional design process created a need for additional planning to tailor the provided instruction to fit the diverse needs at the classroom level.

How Teachers Think About Integrating Management with Instruction

The first research question in this study examined how second and third year teachers planned for integrating the management of engagement with instruction in their lessons. As a way of categorizing how the teachers integrated management and instruction the view of classroom management became all the things teachers must do to encourage learning during preactive planning, interactive teaching and reflective planning ((Brophy, 2006; Evertson & Randolph, 1999; Evertson & Weinstein, 2006; Van Manen, 1995; Yinger, 1977, 1978, 1980, 1986). The focus of this study was on how their planning for the integration of management and instruction promoted, encouraged and maintained student participation and engagement (Brophy, 1985; Bullough, 1987, 1989; Erickson, 1986; Evertson & Neal, 2006; Griffin, 1986; Kagan, 1992; Watzke, 2003, 2007; Weade, 1987; Weade & Evertson, 1988; Zumwalt, 1986). The planning process included: the two stages of preactive planning, which occurs prior to the actual teaching; interactive planning while teaching, which requires continuous planning on the part of the teacher in response to student reactions to instruction and reflective planning, which occurs after the lesson is taught and the teacher is reflecting back over both the preactive and interactive planning.

Hickey and Schafer's (2006) engagement domain one of their five core aspects of classroom management, which characterizes classroom management in terms of the actions teachers take to facilitate learning was utilized to provide a lens for data collection and data analysis. For this study, the two-phased preactive planning these teachers engaged in prior to their lessons, the actions they took during their lessons and

then their reflections about the entire process after their lessons were all considered part of the actual actions taken by these teachers to facilitate learning during interactive teaching (Yinger, 1986). Hickey & Schafer (2006) defined engagement as maximizing student participation in the content of the lesson. They also state that one way teachers maximize student participation is by “ritualizing the routines that define the communities of expertise for which we want students to engage” (p. 281). In addition they believe engaged participation can improve student behavior and cognition, which are “widely considered indicative of effective classroom management” (p. 282) and encompasses more than instructional routines. Boekaert (1999) claims that even with ritualized routines, the content of the lesson and the social context vary continuously, which requires teachers and students to maintain productive discourse in order to maintain engaged participation during the lesson. In this sense the discourse that goes on between teachers and students is focused on assisting the students in knowing how they can successfully participate in learning and what the social rules are for successful learning in the classroom. The framework for social discourse during interactive teaching (Yinger, 1986) is planned by the teacher in coordination with the planning of instruction during preactive planning when they are aligning the management of the lesson with the instruction selected for use. Then when the actual social interactions take place during interactive teaching the original plan may need to be adjusted to fit a particular set of circumstances. This sociocultural perspective of knowing and learning provides a social lens for examining how these teachers plan for and then interactively engage their students through the integration of classroom management and instruction (Evertson &

Neal, 2006). Through the use of their lesson plans during instruction the teachers gained knowledge and experience about what part of their plan, derived during the tailoring phase of preactive planning, works for their students. In addition this process helps them to gain perspective about what works in their original plan derived from the DAC and developed during the transmission phase of preactive planning.

The External Constructs Codes

All the teachers in this study demonstrated the use of each of the four engagement codes (expectations, monitoring/pacing, routines/procedures and cooperation/self-regulation) (see Appendix E, Constructs Table) during the instruction of their actual lessons and discussed them during their planning and post observation interviews. However each teacher was particularly concerned about one of these coded areas throughout the planning process. Alicia's main concern was in the area of expectations. Marisa was concerned about how she paced her lesson. Laurie was honing her skills at using instructional routines. Diane's attention was on developing her students' cooperation skills. Lastly, Anthony was developing consistency in defining and communicating expectations. The next set of subsections will explore how each of the teachers talked about their primary concern with student engagement during their planning and post observation interviews and provide data that demonstrates how they handled these concerns during the interactive teaching (Yinger, 1986) of their lessons.

Expectations/Modeling - Alicia

Rink (2006) notes, "A primary characteristic of a good management system is that expectations are made clear ahead of time – not after students have misbehaved" (p.146).

This idea of learning socially acceptable behaviors while in the context of the classroom is one factor of the Social Cognitive Theory. Within this theory operant conditioning originally explained that students learn to control their behavior within the context of the classroom through reinforcement and imitation. Bandura (1977) expanded operant conditioning to include “two additional influences on behavior” one of those was “modeling and thus vicarious (vs. direct) learning of behavior and (b) ‘self-efficacy,’ or one’s personal beliefs about the ability to learn or perform specific behaviors” (McCaslin et al., 2006, p. 235). This means that successful teachers reinforce their instructional expectations and this will lead to successful imitation of those expectations by the students and result in their development of positive self-efficacy.

In Alicia’s case she was concerned about how effectively she was modeling what she expected of her students during the lessons. As a second year, 2nd grade teacher, she wanted to be sure the students were learning appropriate instructional behavior so she wouldn’t have to spend instructional time with discipline issues. Alicia wanted to more effectively scaffold her students’ understanding about what she expected of them during instruction, so she focused on how she was modeling management and instructional expectations for her students.

Modeling is a subcategory of the external engagement code of expectations. While talking about how modeling influenced student behavior in her classroom Alicia explained, “Something I really spend time on is modeling. I am going to be modeling what they will be doing throughout the activity. As we talked about before I realized after last year that everything has to be modeled” (Planning Interview, 3/10/09). Melograno

(1997) created a five-step method to help physical education teachers conceptualize assessment as an integral part of teaching. One of the five steps speaks to what Alicia is talking about above; teachers need to “demonstrate expected behaviors (i.e., model expectations); actually show students what is being sought” (p. 37). Alicia explained how she modeled expectations when she said,

First I explained what I expected them to do when they were creating their animals. Then I walked them through the process. I modeled on the overhead how I created my animal so they would understand what I expected of them (Post Observation Interview, 3/12/09).

Alicia is describing how she demonstrated expected behavior just as Melograno (1997) discussed for physical education teachers. Pressley, et al (2003) also referred to this concept in relationship to the teacher providing clear directions. “The teacher gives the directions in a precise, easy-to-follow way, checking for understanding as each step is completed” (Pressley, et al, 2003, p. 78). Wiseman and Hunt (2001) explain that modeling is “being able to see someone else perform a particular task successfully” and that “influences the observer to do the same” (p. 41). Alicia’s explanation of why she modeled her process for creating an animal echoes what Wiseman & Hunt (2001) believe about modeling.

During the initial activity of the lesson Alicia explained that she would begin by reviewing how they were supposed to select the appropriate adaptations for their animals. The previous lesson ended with the students identifying adaptations and reviewing what they had found out about their original animals’ adaptations. During the first part of the

lesson Alicia has the students do an activity in which she provides each group of students with a picture of a two-animal cross. “This activity is designed to let them practice the adaptations together before they begin their individual animal crosses” (Planning Interview, 3/10/09). Alicia realized the students didn’t all understand what she was asking them to do in relationship to reporting what their animal’s adaptations were.

During the observation field notes Alicia’s handling of the situation is described.

Alicia begins by holding up a picture of a horse/zebra cross to model for the children what she is expecting them to do. ‘Let’s begin by examining this animal. What body parts do you see that you can identify their adaptations?’ The students raise their hands and Alicia calls on them to share their thoughts. Alicia restates what the children say and writes it on the overhead. After several student contributions Alicia realizes the children haven’t figured out what she wants.

‘Okay, you’re not sure what I want.’ So she begins again by deliberately asking specific questions about adaptations while demonstrating what she is asking using the horse/zebra cross to show them what they need to be looking for. ‘Why does this animal have stripes? Remember horses and zebras are related so why did we learn the zebra needed to develop the strips? What were they adapting for?’ She points to the half stripes on the horse/zebra cross. The children talk about what they learn in their last lesson about the zebra’s adaptations. Alicia explains, ‘I would need to include that reason when my group explained that adaptation.’ Alicia demonstrates by writing the reason on her worksheet. ‘What other adaptations do you see in this cross?’ The children begin thinking about the

adaptations and talk more about them. You can see them talking among themselves as they really get involved in the process. Their answers are more appropriate and most of the children are actively participating at this point. Alicia thinks the children are ready to work in their groups. She instructs them to begin talking about the animal crosses they have a picture of. She tells them they have ten minutes and then they will be sharing their discoveries with the rest of the class. This time the discussions are much more productive because of the modeling. Alicia walks around the room helping with disputes and helping the students to probe their memories about what they have already learned about their animal's adaptations. The students' questions are not about the directions, but specifically about the reasons why their animals needed certain body parts to adapt to their environment (Observation Field Notes, 3/11/09).

Pressley, et al (2003) talked about the teacher providing clear directions. Alicia demonstrated Pressley, et al's (2003) notion of clear directions when she explains how conscious she is about getting better at modeling expectations for her students so they understand what she is asking them to do. While discussing this episode after teaching the lesson Alicia noted that, "I've learned a lot from the trials of my first year. I wouldn't have gone back over that last year. They would have had problems and I wouldn't have figured out what to do" (Post Observation Interview, 3/12/09). After Alicia went over what the students needed to do several times, in response to their initial questions, the students went on with the activity without asking for any more clarifications about the directions. The students seem to understand they needed to connect their animal's body

parts to its need in adapting to the animal's environment. Their discussions after this episode were evidence of the success of Alicia's modeling the expectations for this connection.

After the students discussed their findings during the initial part of this lesson Alicia started the main activity of the lesson. During this part of the lesson the students developed their own animal out of three other animals they had already talked about. At this point Alicia uses an animal combination that she developed prior to the lesson, during the tailoring phase of preactive planning, to model the expectations for what the final product will be for this lesson.

Alicia places an example of the design worksheet that each child will be using on the overhead. 'This is the design worksheet each of you will be using to record the information about your animals. I will be using the shark, gorilla and T-Rex to make my combination. My new animal is called a Sharilla Rex.' The next section of the design worksheet outlines each of the animals that make up this new animal, what part the new animal has from those original animals and what that adaptation means to the new animal. Alicia demonstrates drawing the animal. 'I am going to use the body of the T-Rex with the arms of a gorilla instead of those short little arms a real T-Rex would have. I think I will add the shark's tail and fins to finish up the Sharilla Rex.' On the back of the paper Alicia demonstrates writing about the new animal, including all the elements written on the front of the paper... Alicia demonstrates how she refers back to the front of the paper to help her describe her new animal. 'I will need to look back at the body parts and

their adaptations when I write my narrative.’ She asks the children if they remember what the adaptations are for and how she can write about it. ‘I want to make sure I talk about each of these new adaptations. What is the Sharilla Rex adapting to with these fins?’ (Observation Field Notes, 3/11/09).

Alicia followed the exact steps she outlined during the preactive planning interview (Yinger, 1986). She followed through with a detailed modeling of the expectations she had outlined as part of the plans she developed during the tailoring phase of preactive planning. During interactive teaching (Yinger, 1986), as Alicia modeled her expectations, she gauged what she was doing by carefully watching her students reactions and answers to her questions. “The students nod their heads and move forward in their chairs as they get what Alicia is talking about. She is examining each of their reactions, verbally and body language as she carefully watches her students’ reactions” (Observation Field Notes (3/13/09). Alicia’s planned behaviors included the specific directions Pressley, et al (2003) talked about; the modeling of expectations Wiseman and Hunt (2001) discussed and demonstrated expected behavior as Melograno (1997) outlined.

During interactive teaching (Yinger, 1986), only one of the students needed additional assistance at which time she modeled that part of the directions again as demonstrated in this next vignette.

The students are pretty much working on their own while sharing with their neighbors what they are doing. One student says, ‘I’m putting the lion’s legs on my whale then he can come out on land.’ Another student comments, ‘The lion’s claws can help protect him in water and land.’ There are lots of these types of

comments all across the room. Alicia is helping them contain their excitement about the lesson and redirecting their energies into productive discourse. ‘What would these legs help your animal to do?’ One of the boys asks Alicia, ‘How do I fill out this part?’ pointing to the place where he needs to list his animal’s body parts and adaptations. Alicia says, ‘Do you remember when I was making my Sharilla Rex how after I drew the picture I had to write down all the different body parts it had and the adaptations for each part?’ ‘Not really.’ Alicia got her demonstration paper and walked him through the modeling she did for the entire class. The boy seemed to understand better and got back to work. As I walked around the room I could see that all the students were successfully completing the assignment (Observation Field Notes, 3/11/09).

This episode shows Alicia making the decision to go back to the lesson expectations and model them, once again, for a student who didn’t understand after she modeled the lesson expectations the first time. Unlike the other students this student still wasn’t sure how to match the body parts with their adaptations. Without this knowledge Alicia knew he wouldn’t be able to participate successfully in the lesson. As Wiseman and Hunt (2001) noted, Alicia’s successfully modeling what the students were expected to do for this part of the lesson influenced their being able to complete the assignment successfully themselves. In the end all the students, including the student she helped in the last episode, successfully completed this assignment. They were also able to talk about the body part adaptations they incorporated into their animals during the final presentation to their classmates.

Alicia explained again why the modeling of expectations is so important to her. I was even trying to use the pictures they would be using to draw the picture. I showed them the picture and then drew the part I needed. I really wanted them to understand that it was okay to use those references to help them. It is so important to model every detail for them before asking them to do an activity (Post Observation Field Notes, 3/12/09).

When the students see Alicia model or perform a particular task such as the steps it will take them to complete this assignment and influences their chances of doing the same (Wiseman & Hunt, 2001). When students are successful on such tasks they develop higher self-efficacy (Schunk, 1994) and this was evidenced during their discussion at the end of this activity. They were all participating and sharing their findings. The higher levels of self-efficacy demonstrated throughout this activity did positively influence and change how the students behaved during the lesson (Bandura, 1977). This description of the affects of Alicia's modeling demonstrates how student success raises self-efficacy, which changed the unwanted behaviors Alicia experienced the previous year when she didn't model expectations as carefully.

This statement of Alicia's supports this idea, "Last year they never knew what I wanted them to do and I had to run around answering questions, that by simply modeling I have almost eliminated this year. They are working more independently now and feel good about what they do" (Post Observation Interview, 3/12/09). Alicia added that the students "get straight to work, no confusion, which also helps with the behavior problems" (Post Observation Interview, 3/12/09). For Alicia lessening behavior problems

in her instruction led to the students experiencing a successful performance, which Bandura (1977) believes is the principle vehicle for changing student behavior. Alicia's modeling of the lesson expectations enhanced student learning and demonstrates how she consciously and successfully integrated management and instruction during the lesson.

Monitoring/Pacing - Marisa

Student learning is "dependent upon pacing" (Hoadley, 2003, p. 265) or "the rate at which teachers presented new concepts to their students" (Barr & Dreeben, 1983, p. 33). Educational research has found that a lesson moving at a faster pace in comparison to a lesson moving at a slower pace has more benefit for student learning because the pacing of the lesson is linked to maintaining student interest during a lesson (Wiseman & Hunt, 2001).

When students are aware that they are making progress toward their learning goals and are involved in a variety of interesting and meaningful activities, they are much less likely to become involved in misconduct and pose management problems for their teachers (Wiseman & Hunt, 2001, p. 61).

Rink (2006) supports this idea when she explains, "If students begin to work on the task but gradually lose interest in the task, the problem is most likely related to task pacing" (p. 164). Rink calls a teacher's ability to support and recognize students who are on task and those who are off task needing to be refocused "one of the arts of teaching" (p. 223). Task pacing is critical for new teachers to understand as part of the management component of instruction. The pacing of instruction has a direct correlation with student participation during instruction and can negatively affect student learning.

Marisa was concerned about the pacing of her lessons because she realized it was affecting the effectiveness of her instruction of the content she was trying to teach her students. She noted, “The main thing I think about while planning my lessons is pacing. I can’t let the lesson go too long on any one thing or I lose them. Then there’s trouble” (Planning Interview, 4/14/09). Wiseman & Hunt, (2001) believe when instruction is perceived by students as moving too slowly there is greater chance for students to “drift away from the lesson experience” (p. 92). Marisa talks about how her students drift away from the lesson if she isn’t careful about how she paces her lessons.

That’s one thing I’m still working on is keeping them interested by not dragging out my lessons. I still have problems with that, especially if the kids are talking and talking and talking about one thing we’ll stay there for a while and those who are not interested are just having a field day. And so I try to just keep things going and well, just moving it forward. I’ve noticed this year that if the pacing’s not right the students let me know by the way they react. It’s hard to find that balance, when to spend more time on something and when to move on. That is really one thing that I think about a lot (Planning Interview, 4/14/09).

Marisa’s concerns, which reflect her understanding of the connection between task pacing and the students’ reactions, support the ideas of Rink (2006) and Wiseman and Hunt (2001) in explaining how the management of task pacing affects student engagement and ultimately student learning.

Marisa taught “a standard literacy lesson focusing on categorization skills” (Planning Interview, 4/14/09). Her goal for the lesson was to have her students learn how

to categorize types of housing and the contents of those homes. She demonstrates in this set of transcripts from her lesson observation how she struggles with the pacing of her lesson and keeping her students engaged with the lesson.

After Marisa is about five minutes into the lesson the children begin moving around in their squares on the rug, touching and talking to each other. Marisa has to say several times things like: 'You should be sitting listening with your spoons in your bowls... Thank you to those of you who are waiting quietly... I like the way [student A] and [student B] are sitting silently listening to what their friends are saying... I like the bubble [student C] has so he will not talk and can listen to his friends... and... Look at how nicely [student D] is sitting with his hand up waiting for his turn.' Marisa keeps their attention for about five minutes and then they drift off and she has to redirect them and draw them back into the lesson. Each time Marisa nervously glances at her watch or the clock. Marisa prepares to read a poem that is related to their story titled: *A House for Me*. Marisa reviews the title with the children. They redirect their attention to the poem because Marisa tells them 'Listen carefully, I'm going to read a line and then we will all read it together.' They are excited so they get a bit talkative. Marisa continues to use positive reinforcement through compliments and explaining what she expects of their behavior. When Marisa turns to the big book on the easel to her left the children once again redirect their attention back to the lesson. Marisa has the children predict what the story will be about by looking at the picture and they go on a picture walk. The title on the title page intrigues the children. They recognize

each letter is made up of a different animal. 'Ms. Trujillo, look at the letters!'

'Animal letters!' Marisa says, 'Oh, my, you are really looking carefully as I read to have seen that. Good Job.' They all start talking about the animals they see and begin standing up and moving toward the book so they can touch it. Marisa gets them back in their seats. She looks at her watch and says, 'Let's move on and look at each of the pictures and see if we can predict what the story will be about.' The children use three sentence starters to talk about what they see, predict, or wonder: I wonder... I predict that...and I observe...Marisa has them written on sentence strips and attached to another easel beside her. She points to them if children just use one or two words. 'Use your words in sentences beginning with...' and she points to these sentences. Marisa recognizes that their attention is waning. She gets them up so they can move around. 'OK, let's stand up in our squares and do 10 shoulder shrugs. Now let's do 10 shoulder rolls.' 'Great job! Let's sit down' (Observation Field Notes, 4/15/09).

During this lesson, Marisa recognizes when the students are off task and immediately attempts to refocus their attention back to the lesson. The interaction the students have with Marisa's reading of the book is not enough to sustain their attention resulting in frequent off task behavior. The lesson itself was planned to be 45 minutes long and required the students to sit and listen for most of the lesson. Marisa doesn't seem to allow for enough student interactions and activity to keep them on task. The students begin by listening to the story, but it is long and their attention span does not seem to be able to withstand the length of this book. Marisa is worried about time, as evidenced by her

glancing at the clock and her watch, but she sticks to her plan and doesn't adjust the lesson to accommodate the needs of the learners resulting in their off task behavior. As Rink (2006) suggests, Marisa tries to refocus the students' off-task behavior through management techniques but not by adjusting her instructional strategies.

As she discussed during the planning interview Marisa followed the plans outlined in the district's literacy manual, but after the lesson she noted that,

It is a bit lengthy. The pacing that I expected (based on the building's daily schedule) to have is a max of 45 minutes. That includes the read aloud, discussion and an activity, which doesn't work. That puts the pacing off and as you could see the kids get bored or whatever and there's behavior problems (Post Observation Interview, 4/16/09).

This reflection highlights how Marisa felt about what happened during the lesson and supports the analysis of the data from the observation field notes above. It also supports what Wiseman and Hunt (2001) noted when they state a teacher moves forward "at a quicker pace" and with her students "overtly involved in the instruction" she assists them in "learn[ing] at higher levels and enjoy[ing] their learning more" (p. 92). Marisa recognized this need for a quicker pace when reflecting on her lesson. She stated, "I would change the reading of the story next time. It was long and the kids were getting bored. Next time I will figure out what pages the kids can read to keep them involved" (Post Observation Interview, 4/16/09). Marisa did say that she would change the students' participation while reading the story in the future. Even though she decided not to use the tape she still was at a place in her development where she could not make any

more extensive changes to what the DAC was dictating. As Berliner (1988) outlines teachers who are moving between the novice stage and the advanced beginner stage are beginning to demonstrate “strategic knowledge.” Marisa is learning “when to ignore or break rules and when to follow them.” This is “developed as context begins to guide behavior” (Berliner, 1988, p. 3). Marisa’s strategic knowledge was not at a point where she could drop or change other parts of the lesson even though she recognized the amount of work required for the 45-minutes designated for the lesson wouldn’t work.

As a second year, kindergarten teacher, Marisa actions and statements seem to suggest that she was not yet cognizant of the fact that she could change her plan for instruction to help eliminate the students’ off task behavior. “The behavior of the novice is rational, relatively inflexible and tends to conform to whatever rules and procedures they were told to follow” (Berliner, 1988, p. 2). Marisa still conforms to what she is told to teach by the DAC and is just beginning to adjust rather than conform to what she is actually teaching. She is more willing to examine and change her management of instruction at this point in her development but is also showing signs of changing parts of her instruction as well. As Marisa gains more experience Berliner’s model suggests that she will advance her pedagogical thinking to include not only the changes in the management strategies she presently uses, but in the academic components of her lessons as well. When she has the chance to teach this lesson again in her third year of teaching her pedagogical knowledge should increase, as a result of experience, to encompass changes to instruction.

Routines/Procedures - Laurie

Evertson and Neal's (2006) research incorporated the establishment of norms for participation as a form of routines and procedures. The types of participation included such classroom activities as: "How and when to move from group to group; What the appropriate noise and voice levels are for group interactions; How, when and from whom to get help with academic and procedural content; and How, when and where to obtain needed materials" (p. 9; see also, Evertson and Randolph, 1994). Other types of routine instructional activities could include the participation requirements necessary for group discussions, which would need the norms for participation established or routines developed so students know how they can participate successfully in the instructional context. Students must "understand how participation in the classroom manifests itself in academic work" (Evertson & Neal, 2006). Yinger (1979) noted when these routine instructional activities become part of the students' daily practices they will be more comfortable adhering to those established routines when out of the ordinary occurrences happen during instruction.

As a third year, 1st grade teacher, Laurie focused on routines because her "first two years of experiences taught me to rely on using routines to help control for student behavior" (Post Observation Interview, 5/7/09). The connection she made about her uses of routines during instruction having a positive effect on student behavior indicates an understanding of how effective management strategies used during instruction helps minimize disruptions to instruction. It also indicates a developing understanding of the relationship between management and instruction. Laurie also noted that "most of what I

do is highly routinized and I don't have to plan those things for my lessons any more" (Planning Interview, 4/27/09). Laurie's statement matches Yinger's (1979) point that "routines increase flexibility and effectiveness by freeing time and energy from many planning and implementation decisions" (Yinger, 1979, p. 167). Laurie's comments indicate that this year while planning for her lessons she doesn't have to devote as much time to detailing with all those procedures and routines she has internalized through two and a half years of experiential learning. Laurie is still developing her practices, but she feels comfortable with what she has established at this point. She still feels the need to focus on improving her routines and on creating more routines where needed.

The lesson Laurie taught was a writing lesson in which the students were going to be learning about editing skills. Laurie explained:

This nine weeks the writing demands go up on our fourth nine weeks assessment. They have to take a story they've already written and edit it. So the writing skill is editing. So that's what we'll be doing, which is pretty advanced. This is a higher up skill that we will be attempting for editing. We've talked about the writing, composing end of it for so long now we'll be transitioning to how they recognize and mark mistakes...using editing marks, proofreading marks and how to quick edit something instead of erasing the mistakes and fixing them (Planning Interview, 4/27/09).

While teaching this lesson about how to quickly edit someone else's writing Laurie and the students demonstrated numerous routines they had established previously during the school year. One of the routines Laurie worked on during this lesson was practicing with

the children how to work in pairs to edit each other's work. "This is a new routine we are just working on establishing. I found myself telling them too much during this time, so I decided to try to set up a routine for them" (Post Observation Interview, 5/7/09). One of the elements Laurie wants to be part of this routine is that "They always work on one student's piece at a time so they can talk about the corrections" (Post Observation Interview, 5/7/09). The children have been working on establishing this routine for how they accomplish their peer editing for several weeks now. The following transcribed excerpt from the observation field notes demonstrates how the students practice using this new routine and how Laurie uses other established routines to keep the students focused as they practice and learn the new routine.

After the students are in their seats Laurie calls off name of student on each writing paper. The children come up and get their paper. Some of them go back to their tables and begin...to mark their papers. Laurie notices and rings a set of chimes she has hanging over the reading table. The children quiet down turn around and look at her. She makes a V with her first and second finger then uses them to point to her eyes. 'I need your eyeballs up here.' She explains, 'Have you been given any directions about what to do with your paper?' 'No.' 'Then please, put your pencils down until I get the papers passed out and go over the directions.' Laurie finishes and explains, 'I will pair you up. With your partner you will first read and correct one of your papers and then do the same thing with the other paper.' She tells them to 'think about where you might want to work in the room.' As she calls the names of the partners they go off together and sit

throughout the room. Laurie notices some of the children are having trouble agreeing on a spot to work. She says, 'Stop, look and listen.' The children repeat it back to her. She tells them to 'listen to each other's ideas and to compromise.' That works and they get busy. A couple times at the beginning of their group work Laurie says 'Sh, Sh, Sh'. The children repeat it to her. They quiet down with that reminder...Laurie rings the chimes over the reading table again. She waits. They know exactly what she expects. Silence and all eyes are on her. She tells them to 'Get to where you need to be to see me.' Next Laurie gives them clear expectations for time management. She explains, 'We are at the end of our time to edit each others papers. So when the big hand is on the ten you need to be done with the first piece and then when the big hand is on the eleven both should be done.' This means they have five minutes to finish each piece. The kids begin to hurry. Each of their stories is four to five lines long. They are written on the primary writing paper that has the top half of the paper blank to draw a picture. Their stories are written under their pictures (Observation Interview, 5/6/09).

In this lesson Laurie has created many routines that act as supports to her management of the delivery of content to her students. These routines support what Yinger (1979) was speaking to when he wrote, "routines are devoted to teaching students the structure and sequence of activities and acceptable student behavior in each setting" (Yinger, 1979, p. 166). It was clear, as demonstrated in the vignette above, the flow of the lesson was accomplished through such routines as ringing the chimes, which helped Laurie and her students to keep learning on track.

Another well-established routine in Laurie's classroom was the establishment of "Noise Monitors" who were to help her monitor the other students' noise level.

I assign the students on a rotating schedule, a boy and girl everyday to help me. I review the rules with them; give them a list of boys' or girls' names. They give warnings to the other students by tapping them on the shoulder and keep a record of who they warned on the list I give them (Post Observation Interview, 5/7/09). By establishing the noise monitors Laurie has allowed the students to help each other stay on task during their activities and while finishing up assignments.

Laurie explained, "I never ask the monitors to do anything more than tap another student's shoulder. At this point in the year that's usually all it takes" (Post Observation Interview, 5/7/09). Laurie isn't turning the responsibility of discipline over to the monitors. Through this routine she is establishing a process for the students to monitor themselves. An example of the role noise monitors play in the classroom:

A student is being loud during a class discussion. Laurie tells one of the monitors she needs to give him a warning 'because he is not asking questions, he's just being loud.' The monitor gets up and walks over to that boy, taps him on the shoulder and tells him 'This is your first warning.' The problem ends (Observation Field Notes, 5/6/09).

If the problem doesn't end the monitor returns to his or her seat and Laurie handles the next level of discipline. At one point during the post observation interview I asked Laurie what she would do if the behavior didn't stop. She said, "I handle it. That has involved several different strategies depending on the severity of the behavior. I have two students

who have needed my intervention because they have difficulty self-regulating their own behavior. They still aren't there yet, but they have shown improvement" (Post Observation Interview, 5/7/09). Evertson & Neal (2006) explain that "teachers alone do not establish and support classroom norms; students also play a vital role" (p.10). None of these issues were observed during the lesson. This example reiterates how Laurie has used routines to help the students understand what acceptable student behavior is for this setting (Yinger, 1979). The monitors help remind the other students what the established norms for participation (Evertson & Neal, 2006) are in this context.

When discussing the importance of routines within her instruction, Laurie commented that from the first day of school she created and taught her students routines to "help the flow of their day" (Post Observation Interview, 5/7/09). "Every morning the students correct two sentences together as a class. They know that's what will happen so they are ready to learn immediately" (Post Observation Interview, 5/7/09). By doing this, Laurie has established "a dependable classroom structure [that] frees children to concentrate on their activities without worrying about arbitrary interruptions or unexpected changes in the routine" (Hyson, 2008, p. 88). This allowed her to focus on instruction rather than redirecting student behavior back to the instruction. A dependable structure for instruction keeps students engaged and lessens management issues. Laurie added, "I want them to know exactly what's going to happen for the entire day. I can't prepare them for the unexpected that happens, but I can prepare them for what their learning will look like for the day" (Post Observation Interview, 5/7/09). Laurie believes her students are better prepared for those unexpected events if what happens routinely

during their day is deliberately planned, shared with the students and becomes expected as part of their day. While talking about all the routines she uses throughout the lesson Laurie said,

We always do these routines the same way. So when those things happen the kids know exactly what to do. I don't ever change that. They expect that so most of the things you'll probably see in this lesson we've been doing since the beginning of the year (Post Observation Interview, 5/7/09).

Again Laurie is reiterating the importance of establishing routines as norms (Evertson & Neal (2006) for student behavior. She firmly believes that if her students feel comfortable about their daily routines they will be more comfortable when it comes to learning. Ross (1985) reinforces this belief when explaining that teachers can reduce misbehavior and chaos by clearly defining the boundaries of their lessons through well-established routines.

By teaching these routines at the beginning at the year and being consistent in their use Laurie provided a "predictable environment" so her students were "able to be more focused, persistent and self-regulated" (Hyson, 2008, p. 88). These examples of Laurie's teaching demonstrate the focus, persistence and self-regulated behavior on the part of her students as a result of the well-established routines.

Cooperation/Self-Regulation - Diane

Cooperation is a skill necessary for developing caring communities, which are "places where teachers and students care about and support each other, actively participate in and contribute to activities and decisions, feel a sense of belonging and

identification and have a shared sense of purpose and common values” (Lewis, Schaps, & Watson, 1995, p. 547). In this study a caring community is part of the internal codes for the construct: cooperation and self-regulation. This internal code speaks to the strategies teachers use to encourage students to work well together and to learn how to be in control of and responsible for their own social and academic behaviors. Teachers create communities of learners in their classrooms for students to develop a sense of belonging and responsibility. Doing so helps the students to understand “how to respect and rely on others, listen, share and be constructive partners and team members” (Evertson & Neal, 2006, p. 8). This understanding brings with it minimized social issues because of the increased sense of membership in the classroom community and ownership of their learning. The teachers in this study talked about creating communities of learners using these various terms: community circle, community meeting, rug time, circle time and caring community.

When Diane, a third year teacher in the kindergarten grade, talked about achieving with her students over the course of the year she stated that she wanted to “develop the students’ cooperation skills” while “creating a caring community” (Planning Interview, 3/24/09). Diane explained, “We begin on day one. I talk about and model cooperation skills and making good choices as soon as school starts. So at this point in the year it is pretty routines, as much as it can be for kindergarteners” (Planning Interview, 3/24/09). Evertson & Neal (2006) note, “Building communities begins immediately and is negotiated and strengthened all year long” (p 8). Diane began

building her classroom community on day one and continues to build on the skills necessary to maintain that community throughout the year.

For this study Diane taught an integrated math and science lesson focusing on “measurement. They will be ordering objects from lightest to heaviest” (Planning Interview 3/24/09). While explaining what she was thinking about during the tailoring phase of her preactive planning (Yinger, 1978), Diane talked about how she intentionally incorporated active cooperation into her lesson by pairing the students up into groups. She expected them to work cooperatively during the activity and asked them to write their results on a common lab-reporting document. During the entire lesson Diane kept “track of whether they are cooperating. That’s a skill we work on a lot. It is a [DAC] skill. It’s a skill they’ll work on every year they are in this school” (Planning Interview, 3/24/09). By doing this everyday Diane was helping her students to develop cooperation skills that would help them to participate better during their activities, learn to participate in the classroom as a community and fulfilling district expectations.

When discussing the beginning of the lesson she would teach Diane planned to talk with children about what would happen during the lesson. When “they understand the process I will partner them up in pairs for the introduction and lab. This will not surprise them because they’ve been working in pairs for awhile now” (Planning Interview, 3/24/09). Diane has been consciously planning the development of cooperation skills for her students throughout the year. She understands it takes time, planning, modeling and practice for her students to internalize what cooperation is all about.

During this initial whole group instruction at the rug the children began practicing how they would measure the objects they were going to use during the lab that followed. Diane carefully planned how she will incorporate time for her students to practice the cooperation skills they have been working on. This excerpt from the lesson observation field notes demonstrates how the students worked in pairs during the lesson introduction.

Diane has positioned a table at the front of the rug where she has placed a scale and behind the scale she placed the three objects she brought out to show the students as part of the initial engagement. First she passes those three objects around the group so they can each touch them. 'You will each be able to hold all three of these things before we begin measuring them.' Diane selects a pair of children to come up to the table and measure the first object (these pairs were assigned before the lesson began). One child puts the object in one side of the scale. The other child begins putting individual bears (1" x 1" plastic bears, used as weights) into the opposite side. The group counts the bears as they are placed in the scale. As each object is weighted the two children decide if the group counted correctly and what they need to write under the heading number of bears on the chart. The children negotiate who will complete each task and if the group counted the number of bears correctly. Diane acts more as a facilitator at this point and allows the children to make their own decisions. When a problem arises Diane says, 'How do we cooperate when we are making these kinds of decisions?' From the look on the children's faces this question appears to trigger

their memories about cooperating. They shook their heads – ‘Yes’ and worked it out (Observation Field Notes, 3/25/09).

In this example Diane provided time during her lesson for her students to practice community-building skills like cooperation. Hatch (2005) states “a community of learners exists in any setting where learning is valued by everyone and where everyone is responsible for the learning of everyone else” (p.112). During this lesson these kindergarten children were practicing how to be responsible for each other’s learning through cooperatively learning about measurement. By teaching the children how to cooperate in pairs Diane was able to “shift [her] overall approach to classroom management from teacher direction and control to an emphasis on student engagement, self-regulation and community responsibility with teacher guidance” (Evertson & Neal, 2006, p. 8). This allowed the students to take responsibility for their own learning and behavior. After the lesson Diane commented,

I felt they did really well working with their partners for the demonstration. Sure I have to help them by asking questions about how they need to be cooperating, but they’re doing so much better. They took responsibility for what they were doing (Post Observation Interview, 3/26/09).

This demonstrates that Diane’s careful planning for incorporating ways the children can practice the cooperation skills she has been teaching them during the lessons is working. The children are progressing in their understanding of what cooperation is and, even though they have a ways to go, Diane can see they are beginning to take responsibility for their own learning and behavior. As Hatch (2005) points out “purposeful activity is the

glue that holds successful kindergarten programs together” (p. 113). Diane’s development and implementation of the purposeful activities that were part of this lesson demonstrate how important they are to building a community of learners within her own kindergarten classroom.

When talking about the questions she asked her students, Diane explained, “I use the same questions while talking to them about how they’re getting along so I’m being consistent. If they hear the same thing it’s easier for them to remember and respond” (Post Observation Interview, 3/26/09). She also talked about allowing the children to choose which job they would do during the introduction. She strongly feels “they have to learn to make their own choices and live with it. I can’t tell them how to negotiate with someone else. They have to do it themselves. But they still need a lot of work on it” (Post Observation Interview, 3/26/09). Diane’s desire for the children to learn to make their own choices and learn negotiation skills are all part of her overall desire to teach the children how to cooperate and become part of a caring community. This vignette demonstrates how Diane intentionally designed instruction to support her goal to help her students develop good cooperation skills and in the process teach the management aspects of learning as well.

As the lesson continued Diane asked the students before she sent them to their tables for the lab portion of the lesson, “If I am going to be partnered with [student A] what do I need to do as I work with them?” Several children say, “Cooperate.” or “Work cooperatively,” etc. Diane asks the children what that would look like and sound like. The children talk about helping each other, not fighting, getting along, liking each other,

etc. Again by asking these questions Diane is continually teaching and reinforcing for the students what she means by cooperation is. Diane is intentionally incorporating the teaching of good cooperation skills into her lesson to help the students to internalize what she is asking them to do.

Later during the exploration lab the children worked in the same pairs as they measured each object. Diane reminded them about cooperating several times. “How do we cooperate with our partner? Is that how we cooperate with each other? How do we cooperate when we are making these kinds of decisions?” (Observation Field Notes, 3/25/09) Diane said that she “keeps a small notepad with me while I walk around the room to jot down anything I see, especially how they are working in pairs” (Post Observation Interview, 3/26/09). Diane noted that she had “a few children who need help so I partnered them with children who are already doing well cooperating and I keep an eye on them to make sure all is well” (Planning Interview, 3/24/09). Diane intentionally planned how she would help children who were not as proficient with their academic skills as well as their cooperation skills by pairing them with a student who is doing well. “Students rely on both their own and others’ expertise and formulate ideas by interaction with others” (Evertson & Neal, 2006). Diane’s pairing the children with different expertise help them to learn from each other’s expertise and their abilities to formulate better ideas about measuring as a team.

Diane contributed part of her success in community building to:

Being less strict this year. I didn’t allow them to give me any hugs the first year, actually not many the second one either, but this year I do. I feel like my kids this

year are happier to be here and they smile more and they hug a lot (Post Observation Interview, 3/26/09).

Diane added, “I realized after all I learned the past two years if the children cooperate with each other the atmosphere in the room is much better and behavior is better” (Post Observation Interview, 3/26/09). In these statements Diane demonstrates an understanding of how this intentionally planning to teach her students cooperation skills affected their developing abilities to self-regulate their own behavior, which also affected the caring community she wanted for her students. The importance of Diane’s teaching strategies, designed to help her students’ develop self-regulation skills, is reflected in a conclusion made in Evertson & Neal’s (2006) research:

People differ in their capacity for self-regulation and these differences appear to be related to the teaching strategies of caregivers. Self-regulation is fostered when teachers, in working with students to accomplish a task, guide students by asking conceptual questions rather than by giving directions, encourage student engagement and sense of agency and gradually step back and withdraw as the child’s capacity to accomplish the task grows (p. 5; see also: Diaz, Neal and Amaya-Williams, 1990).

Diane noted in her post observation interview that she began focusing on the cooperation aspect of community building during her second year of teaching but felt she “really got a good handle on it this year (her third year)” (Post Observation Interview, 3/26/09).

Watson and Battistich (2006) “believe that community is a basic human need and that all students will be best served in classrooms and schools where building community is the

basis for discipline” (p. 269). This belief is evidenced in Diane’s comments about why she decided to focus on student cooperation. “I realized the key to changing the behavior problems was by teaching them to cooperate with each other and to feel a part of the classroom, like a family, as a community. They’ve learned to help each other” (Post Observation Interview, 3/26/09). Diane set the stage for successful learning in her classroom by consistently making the teaching and practicing of cooperation skills part of her planning. Evertson & Neal (2006) found that as students learned to work together cooperatively they also learned to self-regulate their own social participation. The caring community Diane desired for her classroom was supported by this focus and as a result the children were also working on their self-regulation skills as they worked on and practiced their cooperation skills.

Expectations - Anthony

“From house keeping and literacy centers in kindergarten classrooms to advance placement English classes, students are expected to participate in these environments with certain social and behavioral competencies” (Lane, Pierson & Givner, 2003, p. 413). The traditional means through which teachers have communicated these expectations are clear, explicit verbal directions that are taught, practiced and consistently utilized during instruction. Teachers must be able to clearly define and convey the expectations in order for their students to understand and internalize what their social and academic responsibilities are during instruction (Gathercoal, 1998). These are strategies, which can be difficult for novice teachers to do effectively. This is a strategy teachers use to “help students learn to act respectfully and responsibly” (Landau & Gathercoal, 2000, p. 450)

during instruction. It makes sense that unless students understand what their teachers expect of them socially and academically during lessons the only outcome can be misunderstanding and a less than optimal learning experience.

The external code expectations is one of the four external constructs developed to use as part of the data collection for this study. Anthony felt the “biggest problem my first year was with expectations. I basically didn’t have any and there were way more behavior problems back then” (Planning Interview, 5/12/09). By not having any expectations Anthony was not conveying what he expected “in terms of [his students’] academic achievement and their ability to behave responsibly” (Sprick, Garrison & Howard, 1998, p. 15) for successful student learning. As a result Anthony’s students did not understand what he expected of them both academically and socially, therefore unproductive student behavior became the norm interfering with student learning.

At the beginning of Anthony’s second year of teaching 2nd grade his principal required all teachers and staff at the school to be trained in and implement a program called *CHAMPS: A proactive and positive approach to classroom management* (1998), aimed at establishing a school wide set of expectations. During the planning interview Anthony explained how and why he started to use the *CHAMPS* program.

We’re all pretty new teachers in this building. The building opened a couple years ago and a lot of us were hired then. We had a lot of behavior problems in the school so [the principal] had to do something. *CHAMPS* totally changed this place. Using *CHAMPS* changed everything for me. I went from having tons of procedures and behavior issues to having a smoother second year and a better

third year. *CHAMPS* had a big part to play in that...I want to be told what to do until I've got a system of my own in place (Planning interview, 5/12/09).

Anthony's explanation about the transformation in his classroom after using *CHAMPS*, as a blueprint for how to integrate management with instruction, assists in understanding how the program helped this part of teacher thinking became routine for him and changed what had previously been the norm during his lessons. Later Anthony noted, "*CHAMPS* helped me see myself as a good teacher. The first year was way too rough. I probably wouldn't be teaching now if I hadn't gotten that help" (Post Observation Interview, 5/14/09). For Anthony this was a pivotal point in deciding whether he was capable of teaching and whether he would stay in teaching.

While discussing how he would start the lesson Anthony explained, "I always start the lesson by going to the *CHAMPS* chart and waiting. I'll ask them to tell me what expectations are right for this lesson. Then we'll go over the directions for each station. After that we revisit the *CHAMPS* chart" (Planning Interview, 5/12/09). During the lesson observation Anthony demonstrated how his planning became action during the interactive teaching of this lesson.

Anthony had been teaching the concept of sound vibrations in science for a few days. This lesson was a lab with different stations for the students to explore various types of sound vibrations. He started the lesson by standing beside the *CHAMPS* expectations chart. As soon as the students realized he was there they were quiet and looked at him expectantly. Anthony asked them, 'Which set of expectations will we be focusing on during this science lab?' Lots of hands go up.

While the students are responding Anthony realizes that one of the students starts talking without raising his hand. Anthony says, '[Student A] obviously doesn't have an answer because he doesn't have his hand raised.' Everyone, including student A and Anthony laugh. After they have successfully decided it is the group work expectations they read them together. Anthony then begins talking about the lab directions...When the directions are given he revisits the CHAMPS expectations by asking the students what the expectations were for the lab again. They repeated the expectations from the chart. Anthony asks, 'You sure you know what the expectations are? Okay, work safely. Go' (Observation Field Notes, 5/13/09).

Any time students ignored those expectations Anthony would ask them "What are our expectations?" (Observation Field Notes, 5/13/09) Anthony was consistent in relying on the established expectations demonstrating a high degree of confidence as he walked around the room and reinforced those expectations. Anthony talked about not understanding expectations as a first year teacher yet with the help of the CHAMPS program his second year he said:

I got it. I was happy to be told what to do...I just want to be told what to do until I got a system of my own...Tell me how to do it. Give me a model to go by and at least I have something I wouldn't have otherwise. I would have liked that my first year. I wished that happened in college (Planning Interview #3, 5/12/09).

Through the use of the *CHAMPS* chart Anthony was able to provide clear, consistent expectations for his students so they maintain successful participation in the labs with

minimal behavioral interruptions. “When your expectations are clear, students never have to guess how you expect them to behave” (Sprick, Garrison & Howard, 1998, p. 107).

For new teachers, like Anthony, programs’ like the *CHAMPS* program can provide explicit examples for how to present and teach instructional management techniques to their students.

The amount of movement, noise level and freedom this type of lesson stimulates created a level of excitement that was palpable. These labs could have been difficult for Anthony to manage prior to his learning how to use the *CHAMPS* posted expectations by his own admission. By referring back to the chart whenever necessary Anthony was able to redirect most unwanted behavior. While reflecting on the lesson Anthony was asked about these interactions and he responded, “It’s saved me. I hated all the behavior problems I had before and this group is really talkative and different from the past two groups. They really need that structure. At this point in the year they are, yea, okay” (Post Observation Interview, 5/14/09). Through the use of the *CHAMPS* program Anthony was made aware of why he had the lack of engagement during his lessons in the previous year. As a result Anthony has learned the importance of using clear expectations, delivered consistently to engage his students during instruction. “Clarity and consistency in communicating...expectations are of significant importance. If students do not know what their teachers expect of them, there is little reason to believe that they will be consistent in exhibiting those behaviors that their teachers desire” (Wiseman & Hunt, 2001, p. 15). As reflected in Wiseman & Hunt’s statement Anthony’s students exhibited the behaviors outlined on the *CHAMPS* expectations charts throughout the lesson because

the students knew what was expected of them and Anthony demonstrated the importance of the expectations for lab participation through his consistent reinforcement of those expectations. Anthony created an environment where student learning was optimized and behavior problems were minimized. Anthony's administrators provided him with a structure for understanding how to communicate learning expectations to his students through CHAMPS, which emphasized the importance of focusing on instruction and management as they relate to student learning and he took advantage of this learning opportunity by integrating CHAMPS into his classroom instruction.

In their words these five teachers explained how the actions they took while planning and teaching their lessons helped them to integrate management with instruction (Evertson & Neal, 2006). Each of the constructs the teachers talked about integrating during their instruction help them to maximize student participation in the content of the lesson (Hickey & Schafer, 2006). In answer to research questions one this is how these five teachers thought about planned for and implemented management and instruction in their lessons. The next section of this chapter will, in greater detail, examine how the second research question. When implementing this plan, how do they adjust their goals for management and/or instruction if their plan doesn't adequately address their preplanned goals? was actually addressed by the teachers in this study.

Adjusting Management and/or Instruction During the Tailoring Phase of Preactive Planning

After analyzing what occurred during each of the five teachers' lessons the data revealed that the initial theorizing that went into conceptualizing how teachers adjust the

lesson plans during the implementation of that lesson was flawed. Based on the work of Evertson and Neal (2006) and Yinger (1978, 1980, 1986) this study was designed to examine how these teachers adjusted their goals for management and/or instruction if their lesson plan didn't adequately address what actually happened during the interactive teaching (Yinger, 1986). Moreover how these teachers reflected on this adjustment was to be examined. However the observational and interview data revealed that because these teachers used the district aligned curricula to plan their instruction they made most of their adjustments prior to the lesson itself, rather than during the lesson, as found in the research of Evertson and Neal (2006) and Yinger (1986). The use of district aligned curricula has become, over the past decade, a driving force for lesson planning in most districts. As Hughes (2005) outlines the intense political push of state level standards on local schools creates increased demands on grade level and course curricula. District responses to this push have been to produce extremely detailed curricula that can reflect in the minute details of a teacher's daily lesson plans.

The type of planning teachers engaged in during the research of previous decades (Van Manen, 1995; Yinger, 1977, 1979, 1980, 1986) did not include this political reality the teachers in this study faced during their planning. But the original research on teacher planning (Popham & Baker, 1970; Taba, 1962; Tyler, 1949; Yinger, 1977) involves teacher decision-making at the classroom level and even though these teacher initiated their preactive planning (Yinger, 1977, 1978) by transferring lesson details from their DAC (the first phase of their preactive planning or the transmission phase) they still felt they needed to engage in a second phase of preactive planning or the tailoring phase,

which the teachers in the original planning research did not (Popham & Baker, 1970; Taba, 1962; Tyler, 1949; Yinger, 1977). The teachers in the previous research made adjustments to their lesson plans during the interactive teaching phase. In order to meet the needs of the students in their classrooms the teachers in this study created a tailoring phase in their preactive planning (Yinger, 1977, 1978) so they could engage in the decision-making described in the previous planning research (Popham & Baker, 1970; Taba, 1962; Tyler, 1949; Yinger, 1977) that the DAC took away from them during the transmission phase. But unlike the teachers in the earlier planning research these teachers actually made adjustments to their lessons prior to interactive teaching, during the tailoring phase of preactive planning, instead of during the interactive teaching. Research has found that teacher planning is an important part of creating instruction and where teachers make a significant amount of decisions which affect student learning at the classroom level (Brown, 1993; Clark & Peterson 1986). The findings of this study demonstrate that these teachers created the tailoring phase of preactive planning so they had a voice in making these important decisions for their students.

After the teachers transferred the goal(s) and lesson details from the district aligned curriculum to their own written lesson plan (initial team lesson plans) they moved into this tailoring phase of preactive planning (Yinger (1977, 1978, 1980) and began the real decision-making for designing their lessons. This tailoring phase of preactive planning (Yinger, 1977, 1978, 1980) proved to be the timeframe where these teachers modified and/or adjusted their official daily plans to best meet the needs of their students. This was actually the deep thinking part of their planning or when these teachers can be

described as a problem-solvers and decision-makers (Yinger 1978, 1986) when teachers internalized and personalized their plans to fit their students and their teaching beliefs. Research demonstrates that during daily lesson planning teachers “are mostly influenced by: (1) availability of materials, (2) student interest, (3) schedule interruptions, (4) school calendar, (5) district curriculum guides, (6) textbook content, (7) classroom management, (8) classroom activity flow and (9) prior experience” (Brown, 1988, p. 70). This was the case for the teachers in this study. Between the tailoring phase of their preactive planning and the actual lesson or interactive teaching (Yinger, 1986) the teachers in this study thought about what materials were available, their students’ needs and interests, textbook directions, management related to the lesson, what their prior experiences were with this lesson, if any and how they preferred to teach the concepts to their students. For instance Anthony noted, “We all start from these plans (team plans), but the way we teach them is so different. The plans that are in my head may not look at all like what I have on this paper [team plans]. I teach it the way my kids need it to be taught” (Planning Interview, 5/12/09). Laurie talked about using the curriculum guide to write the lessons she was required to have in electronic form for parents and administration. “But when I plan for my daily lessons they’re different. They’re not fancy. They may just be short bullets. They’re usable for me” (Planning Interview, 4/27/2009). Planning during this tailoring phase of lesson construction becomes a practical activity where teachers rarely produce a detailed, written document (Clark 1983, Roskos & Neuman, 1995). The data revealed that this was the norm for the teachers in this study during the lessons observed. I provide examples from each of the teachers making these types of adjustments during the

tailoring phase of planning to support this claim. As highlighted in the next subsection, each of these teachers made adjustments to their DAC lessons during the second phase or tailoring phase of their preactive planning.

Alicia -

The lesson on animal adaptations Alicia taught in this study was not originally part of the lesson plans developed from the DAC during the tailoring phase of preactive planning (Yinger, 1977, 1978, 1980). Alicia and her grade level teammate added this lesson to the science unit during the tailoring phase of preactive planning.

We wanted an authentic way to assess what they had learned about the animal they researched and the animals their classmates had researched. They love this unit anyway, but adding this type of higher-level thinking really enhances the joy they get out of learning. They get into lessons like this. The more lessons they can have that actively involve their minds and hands are a management dream. The better and more hands-on my lesson is the less I have to worry about behavior.

I'm all for that (Planning Interview, 3/10/09).

Alicia and her teammate made the decision to adjust the original plans for this unit after they had completed those initial lesson plans and made sure they had everything they needed to meet the requirements of their DAC. This was their way of personalizing their instruction to meet the needs of their own students. As Alicia explained the first set of plans derived from their DAC required adjustments in order to match the needs of the students in her classroom. Alicia's modification of her DAC lesson does what Bowers (1984) suggests. Also Alicia demonstrates her pedagogical knowledge about how to best

engage her students during instruction and, in turn, decreasing social implications during her lesson.

Marisa -

Marisa created an entirely new activity sheet from the one she planned in the initial plan for her literacy lesson from the DAC. Marisa was preparing to teach “a standard literacy lesson focusing on categorization skills” (Planning Interview, 4/14/09). She realized the activity she created, as an independent activity to follow the introduction of the lesson wasn’t going to work.

I wanted this to be an independent activity. I realized that the activity was academically too advanced for them but also that it would create a set of management issues. These children need to know exactly what they are doing to work independently. They get upset and out of control when the activity is too difficult. The original activity was definitely too hard for the students and I would have had to spent too much time dealing with discipline problems because of how hard it was (Post Observation Interview, 4/16/09).

After making her initial plans, which addressed the requirements of her district’s curriculum, Marisa made the decision to adjust that plan. During the tailoring phase of Marisa’s preactive planning she decided to create an experience that would better fit with the needs of her own students. After relying on the DAC to establish her first set of plans Marisa realized this component of that plan wouldn’t work for her students so she changed the activity altogether. In this way she adjusted that original plan to better meet the needs of her students and their abilities.

Anthony -

Anthony decided to take the three separate labs lessons planned in the original unit and make one lab with a set of 2 stations for each of those labs.

Well I changed it up. The original plan was for each of these labs to happen on different days. What I did differently is I had a table for each of those sounds in this lab instead of different days...The one thing I did was crush it into one so I probably had three different days of science planned in one day and I feel they got as much out of it as they would have if we had spent three days on it. I felt like it would have been a waste of time that I wanted to talk about other aspects of sound. I also had the guitar station that wasn't in the original plans (Post Observation Interview, 5/14/09).

Anthony also decided to change the original location for each of the stations to make more space and distance for the experiments to take place.

I watched them milling around getting ready for the lab and there it was. They were having trouble getting around the areas where the stations were set up. You can see the flow of the groups would have been a problem...There wasn't enough room for them to move from station to station or enough room to carry out the actual experiments (Post Observation Interview, 5/14/2009).

Both of these adjustments occurred after the initial plan was written to accommodate the requirements of the district's curriculum. During this tailoring phase of planning Anthony made adjustments that would make more sense for student learning in his classroom. The

plans developed during the first phase of planning did not sufficiently meet the needs of Anthony's students so he had to create another adjusted plan.

Laurie –

Laurie decided to drop the worksheet that was provided for practicing editing skills from her original plan and replaced it with the students editing each other's writing papers.

I want the students to have more personal experiences with their own writing.

Why add a worksheet when they had their own work that needed editing? I want them to use those skills when they peer-edit each others' papers anyway (Post Observation Interview, (5/7/09)).

Laurie change her initial plans during this tailoring phase of planning to better meet the needs of her students to utilize the students' own work and to limit the use of worksheets in her classroom to only those that are necessary. Laurie also had to engage in a second phase of planning to adjust the plan derived from the DAC so it would better meet the needs of her students within the context of their classroom.

Diane –

Diane rewrote the activity sheet from her original written lesson plan. This lesson's original plans called for the use of standard weights when the children were weighing the different objects. Diane decided it would be easier to just use the little plastic bears the children were used to playing with. She didn't want to add another concept to an already difficult lesson.

I added the bears this year instead of the standard weights. They didn't need all those new ideas in one lesson. I mean, we never used those weights before and now in this lesson we're expected to teach them so many new concepts. I realize each time I teach this lesson that it is too much for them. They have seen the scales before but they really haven't used them. But they know the bears because they play with them everyday. They were comfortable with them. But every year I have to change something (Post Observation Interview, 3/26/09).

Diane appears to understand the needs of her students and how much new information they could handle in each lesson, therefore she decided to adjust the initial plan to better fit with those needs prior to the interactive teaching (Yinger, 1986) of the lesson. Like the other four teachers Diane felt the original plans that came from the DAC had to be adjusted to fit the context of her classroom. This created another phase of planning for Diane to take curriculum designed for an entire district and retrofit those plans to reflect her individual students' needs.

As each of the teachers explained above they made the adjustments they felt were necessary to their DAC lesson plans during preactive planning rather than during interactive teaching as was found in earlier studies of experienced teachers (Yinger, 1986). In the next subsection the process for adjustments in this study will be examined further in relationship to how teachers traditionally have adjusted their lesson plans to accommodate the contexts within their individual classrooms.

Traditional Teacher Planning Meets DAC

In explaining how the teachers in his study adjusted their lesson plans during interactive teaching Yinger (1986) stated, “teaching practice is based on thoughtful and systematic (though often implicit) notions about students, subject matter, teaching environments and the teaching process itself” (p. 274). The adjustments the teachers in this study made to their initial DAC lesson plans during the tailoring phase of preactive planning was necessary to engage in this thoughtful and systematic notions Yinger (1986) found in his study. Unlike the teachers’ in Yinger’s study the teachers in this study had to adapt their planning to include the DAC requirements of their individual districts, which created this two phase preactive planning. This adapting forced them to move their professional thinking from the interactive teaching phase to a second preactive planning phase creating the tailoring phase in order to think “about students, subject matter, teaching environments and the teaching process itself” (Yinger, 1986, p. 274) prior to their actually teaching the lesson.

The DAC these teachers were required to use were developed for an entire district rather than the specific needs of individual students within a classroom. This is the responsibility of the classroom teacher to make any required changes to meet their students’ needs. According to Bowers (1984) while being entrenched in the high-stakes testing of today’s ‘technocratic’ climate teachers must use their professional judgment and continue to make the choice to engage in good lesson planning or modify their DAC to make it work in the context of their individual classrooms. Even though the district curriculum guides supplied these teachers with the required goals, objectives and actual

lesson plans during the transmission phase the classroom teachers used their professional judgment, like Bowers (1984) stated and made the choice to engage in good lesson planning during the tailoring phase of planning to adjust that plan to meet the specific needs of their students.

Adjusting Management and/or Instruction During Interactive Teaching

After examining the prior literature on teacher planning (Hughes, 2005; Popham & Baker, 1970; Taba, 1962; Tyler, 1949; Yinger, 1977) this study was originally designed to examine the adjustments teachers make to the lesson plans they make during preactive planning as they interactively taught the lesson, which was a practice found in that literature. As outlined previously in this chapter the teachers in this study didn't follow this practice rather they created a second phase of preactive planning not found in the prior literature to make adjustments to their DAC lesson plans. There was however one teacher who did make an additional adjustment beyond those she made during her second phase or tailoring phase of her preactive planning.

One adjustment was documented during the five lessons that were observed. It took place during Marisa's literacy lesson. The topic of the literacy lesson was "Our Homes." The nonfiction story read during this lesson was called *A Home for Me*. Marisa planned to have the students listen to an audiotape about homes. There are audiotapes provided to support each story for the teachers to use. However while previewing the audiotape prior to the lesson Marisa "decided it wasn't great" (Post Observation Interview, 4/16/09). As the lesson moved along she realized she needed to leave out this audiotape.

I left out the tape we talked about. I listened to it that morning and decided it wasn't great and it wouldn't help the kids a lot. If those tapes don't really make good connection and it needed to in order to keep their attention they can get in trouble. And the kids were really getting into the lesson so I didn't want to interrupt the flow of the lesson. I was also pressed for time so I needed to make sure I used what worked so I skipped it (Post Observation Interview, 4/16/09).

Marisa realized this part of the lesson plan could be left out without any problem. This was six months into her second year of teaching and "This is the first time I dared to leave something out of the literacy lesson...I'm just now experimenting with moving things around so they work better" (Post Observation Interview, 4/16/09). During Berliner's (1988) advanced beginner stage teachers may still find it hard to break established routines or change set curricular requirements such as the literacy lesson plans provided for Marisa on the DAC. This adjustment was actually an extension of her preactive planning preparation, but she made the decision not to use it during that moment in the lesson. This decision was based on potential management issues, the audiotapes lack of importance in supporting the lesson concepts and Marisa's concern about the pacing of the lesson. The adjustment demonstrates her intentional thinking about the relationship between management and instruction.

Out of the five lessons observed Marisa was the only one to make an adjustment to her lesson plan during the interactive teaching of the lesson. Marisa is a second year teacher and one out of a group of five second and third year teachers. The other four

teachers made adjustments to their lessons during the tailoring phase of their preactive planning. This could indicate a paradigm shift in the established lesson planning process written about prior to the introduction of high-stakes testing and DAC. The significance of that possibility will be explored further in chapter five.

Developing Knowledge about Integrating Management with Instruction

Throughout the interviews, prior to and after the teachers taught their lessons, the teachers talked about what they were thinking while preparing their lessons and then while actually teaching the lessons. As they talked the teachers made connections between what they were doing and how they became cognizant about integrating management with instruction throughout the process. In this section those connections will be examined and how the findings help answer research question three of this study: If they are successful in implementing lesson plans that integrate the management of engagement with instruction in their lessons, how did they learn to do this? There were two common themes that emerged after this data was analyzed. Those two themes were survival learning or the experience gained during their first year(s) of teaching and university learning or how that experience triggered memories about what they learned in their university classrooms. First, how surviving their first year(s) of teaching helped these teachers gain the experience needed to begin to shape their awareness of how to integrate management with instruction during their lessons will be examined.

Theme #1: Survival Learning

Evertson and Neal (2006) discussed that as teachers “work to improve their practices, teachers often rely solely on personal experience because they do not have

opportunities to engage in conversations with colleagues or to access and utilize external resources” (p. 17). The authors emphasized the need to move away from relying predominantly on teacher learning being personal experiences they have within their own classrooms. Researchers have frequently written about how teachers gain new knowledge and understanding of their students, schools, curriculum and instructional methods by living the practical experiments that occur as a part of their professional practice (Dewey, 1963; Evertson & Neal, 2006; Schön, 1983). Throughout the interviews all five teachers used words like chaos, frustrating, survival, keeping their head above water and tough as adjectives to describe their first year of teaching. These are common feelings for most new teachers not just the five in this study (Tauber, 1999, Veenman, 1984). During the past three decades many developmental theories have been created that focus on the lives of teachers and describe this experiential learning process (such as: Ammon & Hutcheson, 1989; Berliner, 1988; Bullough, 1989; Fuller & Brown, 1975; Huberman, 1989; Kagan, 1992; Lidstone & Hollingsworth, 1992; Ryan, 1986, 1992; Sprinthall, Reiman & Thies-Sprinthall, 1996). These theories provided several different perspectives on teacher thinking, which helped me to examine how surviving their first year of teaching helped the five teachers in this study better understand the importance of planning for the integration of management and instruction for their lessons.

For the first theme, surviving the first year, I chose to rely on Berliner’s (1988) model of the development of teacher expertise for data analysis because it represents an information-processing view of teacher cognition. As such the data was analyzed in relationship to how the role of experience assisted these teachers in understanding the

integrated relationship between management and instruction as part of their development of teacher expertise. Teacher learning "is usefully understood as a process of increasing participation in the practice of teaching and through this participation, a process of becoming knowledgeable in and about teaching" (Adler, 1991, p. 37) occurs for the teacher.

Berliner's (1988) model places these adjectives the teachers used to describe their feelings about their own personal learning during their first year of teaching in stage one or the novice stage. Generally this stage corresponds with student teachers and many first year teachers. During this time the myriad of things teachers deal with in the course of their days are unknown at first to new teachers. "It is a stage for gaining experience. And it is the stage at which real-world experiences appear to be far more important than verbal information" (Berliner, 1988, p. 3). In addition to learning all these new aspects of teaching, they are expected to deliver instruction that results in student learning.

As a result of this experiential learning during the first year of teaching the teachers in this study did become more knowledgeable in and about the integration of management and instruction. Having experienced teaching lessons without integrating management with instruction they knew how it felt to suffer through the behavioral implications. Trial by fire made a lasting impression on each of these teachers and as the data demonstrates was the impetus for their understanding about integrating management with instruction.

Berliner's (1988) model for the development of teacher expertise was used to examine the data and compare the relationship between teacher thinking and learning

about the integration of management and instruction and the teachers' individual development of expertise. This data is drawn from discussions the teachers in this study had about the planning and implementation of their lessons. The data was used to analyze how the role of experience, during the first year, assisted them in recognizing and understanding how integrating management with instruction during their lessons would help minimize the behavioral incidents they experienced, allow for extended instructional time and enhanced student learning.

Survival Learning for the Second Year Teachers – Marisa and Alicia

During Berliner's (1988) novice stage learning takes place through real world experiences. The novice stage is where new teachers learn about commonplace tasks related to teaching, rules that are without context and what happens when children are added to the mix. For these teachers, as indicated by their own words, the predominantly believed method for developing an understanding about integrating management with instruction happened as result of real world experiences. The reality of loosing control of a classroom full of elementary students is a real and lasting experience. This learning was evidenced through the growth in Marisa and Alicia's understanding about how to integrate management with instruction as a result of their own real world learning during their first year.

Berliner's (1988) second stage is known as the advanced beginner stage. According to Berliner's hypothesis the advanced beginner stage usually occurs during the second and third years of teaching. At this point as a result of their experiential learning during the novice stage, their behaviors are also influenced by the context in which they

teach. “Here experience can become melded with verbal knowledge, similarities across contexts are recognized and episodic knowledge is built up. Strategic knowledge – when to ignore or to break rules and when to follow them – is developed as context begins to guide behavior” (Berliner, 1988, p. 3). As Alicia and Marisa gained a strategic knowledge, through experiencing how their students would socially react in relationship to their instruction, they began by adjusting the management of their lessons. Berliner’s description paralleled these teacher’s explanations and descriptions of their own experiences about recognizing and making those adjustments. The next subsections will examine Marisa’s and Alicia’s explanations and descriptions of their experiences and how they began to connect those experiences with what they remembered learning at the university.

Marisa -

Marisa noted, “I really feel like I’m doing a better job this year. Last year was the year of survival” (Planning Interview, 4/14/09). When talking about how she establishing routines Marisa talked about her first year.

They seem to be able to follow established routines that don’t change. I learned from last year that I have to be consistent with what I expect them to do...I didn’t do that last year. I kept jumping from one thing to another because I didn’t think they were getting it. But then I realized I wasn’t giving them enough time to get it (Planning Interview, 4/14/09).

Establishing consistent instructional routines to help students understand what is expected of them during lessons became important for Marisa after experiencing what happened

when she didn't use any during her first year. Carter and Doyle (2006) explain, "participation structures, or the system of rules governing speaking and turn taking, come into play to define the program of action for interactive phases of a segment" (p. 386) during the lesson. Marisa's experiential learning during her first year of teaching taught her the importance of what Carter and Doyle (2006) were talking about. She realized her students needed clear routines for socially participating in the lesson if she was going to minimize the behavior she dealt with during her first year.

Marisa also discussed what she learned during her first year in relationship to pacing, "I've noticed this year that if the pacing isn't right the students let me know by the way they react. Didn't even notice that last year" (Planning Interview, 4/14/09).

Again, in relationship to student behavior Marisa felt she was:

Still having difficulty with calling out. But this year I talk to them about it. I ask them why they are shouting out. I'm comfortable with it. That is something I feel more comfortable doing this year...Another thing I do is have them do things over and over again if necessary. I never thought about that last year. I was so frustrated. I tried everything I could think of but never stuck to anything long enough for it to work (Planning Interview, 4/14/09).

During the first year Marisa felt the frustration of continued behavioral issues because she didn't use effective management strategies consistently. She had to reflect and figure out why she was having those issues resulting in her figuring out that by integrating management with instruction she could change what was happening in her classroom. This is consistent behavior with Berliner's (1988) advanced beginner stage. As a result of

what she learned during her first year the context of the lesson is influencing Marisa's behavior during her second year.

During the post observation interview Marisa talked about how she monitored the class during the lesson and compared it to her first year. She explained, "I try to scan the room as I read the book. I'm more aware of what is happening as I read. I do that better this year. Last year I would turn my back and read just to turn around and find the kids were somewhere else (Post Observation Interview, 4/16/09). Marisa explained that she had to do something as a result of what she learned during her first year. She realized she was responsible for what happened in her own classroom.

After the year of chaos I had to do something different. I realized the chaos was because they didn't know what I wanted them to do. I didn't give them any clear directions. So now I have explained and taught them how I want them to do almost everything...I realized I have to create an environment that helps them to do well. I didn't do that last year (Post Observation Interview, 4/16/09).

Marisa repeatedly referred back to what she did during her first year of teaching to explain the growth she had made in each of these areas and why she was experiencing more success in different aspects of her teaching practice. Berliner's (1988) advanced beginner stage is where this reflective understanding of how the social behaviors of children are directly related to the instructional design of a lesson. The experiences of being a first year teacher and surviving all those brand new experiences helped Marisa to feel more comfortable about her roles as a teacher and helped her to begin recognizing how management and instruction work together to create a successful lesson.

Alicia -

Alicia's experiences during this novice stage reflected similarity in her real world learning as that of Marisa and supports Berliner's (1988) hypothesis about the importance of experience during this first stage in the development of teacher expertise. When Alicia was explaining why she considered where she would conduct her science lesson on animal adaptation to be important, she reflected back on how she gained this knowledge her first year.

Last year when I first experienced how they would react to what I planned was when I realized that I had to think about things like where I'd teach the lesson, like at the rug or at the tables. I think just knowing how kids react better this year than last year helps me to think this way for all my lessons. I realized how important it is after falling on my face in relationship to student behaviors last year (Planning Interview, 3/10/09).

While talking about modeling her expectations at the beginning of the lesson this year in comparison to her first year Alicia said, "This class knows that the first thing I do for every lesson is model what they will be doing. The first year I didn't do those things and so many things went wrong. So this year I model everything" (Planning Interview, 3/10/09).

While reflecting on the lesson afterwards, Alicia talked about why she felt she was so successful modeling expectations this year. "I feel like I'm doing a good job this year. It only makes sense to me now having experienced what it was like last year when I didn't do it (model what she expected). Now I can't imagine doing it any other way"

(Post Observation Interview, 3/12/09). Alicia's vivid memories of the way her students reacted to not being provided the modeling for what was expected socially and academically was the impetus for Alicia making sure she provided that modeling during her second year of teaching. And as Berliner (1988) explained, the experience gained during the novice stage is critical for the teacher to make that connection between what happens during instruction and the verbal knowledge gained during their university training. It isn't until they make this connection that teachers can change their practices and focus on their role in creating the successful integration of management and instruction during their lessons.

Alicia made a comment about her first year while reflecting on her lesson, which demonstrates the difficulty new teachers experience as they begin teaching.

I was just trying to keep my head above water last year. I just wanted to get through the day and get the lessons taught. I didn't really think beyond the lessons until after the lesson was finished and I had problems. But it wasn't until later in the year when I started thinking about what the reasons for those problems were. I realized it was me. I wasn't thinking beyond the content and thinking about what the kids needed. Now I always think about that and I have changed how I do everything, everything from day one so that they understand everything I want them to do (Post Observation Interview, 3/12/09).

Again this statement demonstrates how much impact the trial by fire experiences during the novice stage of development had on Alicia and most probably has on any teacher who has had these types of experiences during their first year (Berliner, 1988). Alicia didn't

choose to leave teaching rather she chose to change her teaching practices and make sure those experiences were not relived during her second year of teaching.

Alicia and Marisa also talked about the struggles they were still experiencing during their second year of teaching as they continued to learn from the real world experiences of teaching. Marisa talked about continuing to be frustrated to some degree even after all she learned during her first year of teaching. “I’m still frustrated about pacing because the changes I’ve made aren’t enough. I use new strategies and that’s better, but it’s still not enough” (Post Observation Interview, 4/16/09, Marisa).

Alicia admitted,

I feel as though I’m just skimming along the top of the water sometimes... it’s a continuous learning cycle. Try something new. Sometimes it works like a charm and other times you’ve got to rethink it...I’ll think I’ve thought everything through and then all of a sudden they’re gone (Post Observation Interview, 3/12/09).

At this point in their development of expertise their previous experiences teaching are “affecting [their] behavior, but the advance beginner still has no sense of what is important” (Berliner, 1988, p. 3). These thoughts about the frustration of continued learning Marisa and Alicia are experiencing during their second year supports Berliner’s (1988) ideas about how pedagogical expertise is developed. As new teachers gain experience they move from the novice stage where everything is new to the advanced beginner stage where they are recognizing the affect of context on instruction and management and in response they are developing the knowledge necessary to

fundamentally influence their thinking. And as a result of the real world learning experiences Alicia and Marisa had during their first year of teaching they have been able to systematically begin the journey from not recognizing the importance of planning for the management of their lessons to it becoming part of their thinking during planning. Still these two-second year teachers are still focusing on the initial learning about integrating management with instruction. Evertson and Neal (2006) suggest that management “carries messages about content and should be seamlessly interwoven with instruction to attain learning goals” because “schools are all about student learning” (p. 12). Marisa and Alicia recognized the influence management had on their instruction, but the data did not demonstrate their understanding about how that integration affects student learning.

Survival Learning for the Third Year Teachers - Anthony, Diane and Laurie

Anthony, Diane and Laurie talked less about the first year than Marisa and Alicia did. Anthony referred to his first year learning more than Diane and Laurie. Perhaps this means they were further into Berliner’s (1988) advanced beginner stage or even moving into the next stage, the competent level, but each of these three teachers was at a different level of development within these stages. Berliner (1988) said, “Competent performers...have rational goals and choose sensible means for reaching them [and] they can determine what is and what is not important” (p. 4). For many teachers this level begins during their third or fourth year. For the third year teachers in this study they were making decisions, setting priorities and planning their lessons based on rational goals. They could distinguish what was important to instruction and what was not. Anthony,

Diane and Laurie also felt more personally competent and in control of their classroom and their planning.

In this section the influences of first year experiences teaching for these third year teachers in their understandings about the importance of integrating management and instruction during their lessons will be addressed to help answer the third research question of this study: if they are successful in implementing lesson plans that integrate the management of engagement with instruction in their lessons, how did they learn to do this? Berliner's (1988) model of developing teacher expertise will be utilized to help compare the third year teachers' levels of development to how they talked about surviving and learning from their experiences during their first year of teaching.

Anthony –

Anthony did reference his first year experiences when talking about the *CHAMPS* program his principal introduced to the faculty at the beginning of his second year. Of that first year's expectation learning curve Anthony explained, "If I remember anything from my first year it's the lack of expectations. I just didn't get it, so I just didn't do it" (Planning Interview, 5/12/09). After teaching his lesson, while reflecting back on using the *CHAMPS* chart of expectations to start the lesson and about referring back to it throughout the lesson he compared what he did during his third year of teaching in comparison to his first year: "Before the *CHAMPS* charts I didn't know how to use expectations. But that was the main problem I had and that put me in survival mode that first year. If I just knew what I figured out by the end of that year those students would have learned more (Post Observation Interview, 5/14/09). Anthony's reflections did not

demonstrate any frustration on his part just the knowledge he gained from the experience that influenced him to change his teaching practices. The experiences of his first year combined with the “verbal knowledge” he gained through using the *CHAMPS* program his second year, Anthony recognized the role of management integrated during instruction. As Berliner (1988) described for a teacher at the competent level of expertise Anthony was distinguishing what was important to instruction and what was not.

At the end of the last interview when Anthony was asked to think about his expectations and the instruction he planned for the lesson he said,

I really feel that my experiences in my first year taught me how important it was to teach expectations for a long time at the beginning of every year. Since I have done that the last couple of years the management aspect doesn't usually come up in my mind a whole lot while I'm planning the lesson. We taught expectations using the *CHAMPS* method and we came up with rules together that were combined into a short list that they could remember. Those rules and expectations were touched before, during and after every lesson for the first couple of months. Since I spent so much time on it earlier in the year I'm generally only thinking about the content of the lessons while I'm planning them (Post Observation Interview, 5/14/09).

After three years of teaching experience Anthony could reflect back on how tough his first year was and better understand why he didn't teach, practice and reinforce the expectations necessary for his students to understand what they needed to do during instruction. As a result of being given this tool Anthony has added to his experience a

higher level of knowledge about how important the integration of management and instruction are to his lessons. Lidstone and Hollingsworth (1992) found in their study that before teachers could focus specifically on student learning, as a result of their instruction, they must routinely integrate management, organization, subject area content and subject pedagogy. For Anthony the management and organizational components of his lessons became routine as he began to understand what expectations were and how to use them effectively. At this same time he was seeing the connection between the types of expectations he needed to have for different types of instruction and pedagogy he was choosing to use. Anthony was beginning to put it all together and associate it with student learning. Anthony's development is well into Berliner's (1988) advanced beginner's stage and advancing into the competent stage because Anthony is beginning to accept responsibility for what happens during instruction and is setting priorities in relationship to what will be taught.

Diane –

During the planning interview Diane commented about what she had learned through her first year of on the job training as well. "I have learned how important it is to model everything for them. The first two years I experienced degrees of chaos because I hadn't adequately shown them what they needed to do" (Planning Interview, 3/24/09). Thus Diane's recognition that she needed to do more modeling for her students. When discussing how this lesson worked in previous years Diane said, "The first year I did this I thought they would remember what each object was, heaviest or lightest. What a mistake! The original worksheet assumes this, too. But there was no way they would. It

got really chaotic” (Planning Interview, 3/24/09). Again her recognition of the relationship between the lack of management during instruction versus the integration of management with instruction was a result of her experience teaching.

While reflecting on the lesson Diane also talked about learning to change the worksheet after the experiences of her first year.

I remember how frustrated I was the first year trying to teach this lesson. The first year I wasn't out to make a new worksheet. If something didn't work that first year it would never have dawned on me to change the worksheet. I thought it was that I hadn't modeled the procedures enough so I really worked on modeling last year. But they still had problems. I thought if I modeled and added the bears for them to use I would solve the problem this time. But as you could see they still had difficulty. It dawned on me as they were struggling that it was the worksheet. I needed to change the worksheet. So I went home last night and made my own worksheet for this activity to use with the reteach group. I'm going to test it out with them. And I'm going to divide the lesson into two sessions (Post Observation Interview, 3/26/09).

Through the repeated teaching of this lesson over three years Diane has gained knowledge about the use of different management strategies. As demonstrated through this vignette, Diane has gained the perspectives found in Berliner's (1988) competent stage. She can look beyond just how she manages instruction to the instruction itself. She is feeling more in control of what she is teaching and is willing to make changes to how she delivers the instruction. Diane said that, “every time I teach this lesson they (the

students) show me more ways to improve on it. There's always something I haven't anticipated" (Post Observation Interview, 3/26/09). She has become a more confident teacher and, as a result, she demonstrates her ability to learn more about her developing teaching practices through how much her students are learning from her lessons. "I feel confident now in documenting on my clipboard what my students actually know about the concept of measurement. I can tell you what each of my students does and doesn't know about measurement" (Post Observation Interview, 3/26/09).

Learning about the importance of being consistent happened during that first year for Diane as well. She talked about how she learned to be consistent during her post observation interview.

I have learned that consistency is critical. I have to make sure that I always use the routines the same way so they don't get confused. If they know what you expect and that you are going to hold them to those expectations they just do it. I didn't realize my first year that I had to be consistent. Wow, what a mistake. I just couldn't get them to understand what I wanted. It was new everyday. It's easier for all of us this way (Post Observation Interview, 3/26/09).

Diane learned through the experience of her first year about using management strategies consistently to provide her students with an understanding about what is expected of them. Diane explained about her first year, "I think that first year I was just trying to keep my head above water. There was so much new to do. I couldn't wrap my head around it. Now, it's different. It's comfortable" (Post Observation Interview, 3/26/09). Diane learned through experience how her lesson and the management of that lesson worked

together to create an environment where appropriate student behavior enhanced student learning. Diane demonstrated the reason why the integration of management and instruction became clear for her and how her development of teacher expertise was positioned in Berliner's (1988) competent stage. She explained it was through the integration of management and learning that her students were becoming focused on the learning and she became comfortable with her role as their teacher.

Laurie -

Laurie's body language and spoken language were the most confident of the third year teachers. She spent her last two semesters of her field placement during her university program in this same school, at this same grade level, in this same classroom. When she finished her training program she was hired to replace her mentor teacher. So Laurie explained, "I feel at home here. I got along so well with my mentor teacher and I loved this placement from the first day. I didn't feel like a first year teacher when I got this job (Planning Interview, 4/27/09). These comments indicate where the foundation for Laurie's confidence originated. Laurie talked the least about her first year of experience during the interviews. Laurie said,

Even in my first year I thought lessons were not successful unless they were managed correctly and that took planning. I'm a planner. But now I've got that down. Now I think about what I want to teach and then what management implications might there be and what's the best way to prevent it.

The preventative is so important. I need to have dialogue with them on a regular basis if I expect them to internalize what I expect of them' (Post Observation Interview, 5/7/09).

Laurie was the most comfortable talking about how she planned for her lesson of all the teachers in this study. She was comfortable with her ability to plan and her understanding about the role management played in her lessons. Her comments emphasize her learning curve during those first two years of teaching helped her to "get that down. I know when my students know what I am trying to teach and when they don't" (Post Observation Interview, 5/7/09). Laurie clearly had an understanding about how to plan for the integration of management with instruction in her lessons and how that planning insured student learning.

At the end of the post observation interview Laurie explained what she felt was the most important learning for her during those first two years.

What those first two years really taught me was how important the context my lessons were taught in were to my management strategies. The more I experienced how my students handled the different lesson models I use the better I've understood the relationship we've been talking about between management and instruction and how that affects how much my students learn (Post Observation Field Notes, 5/7/09).

These statements demonstrate a very high degree of confidence on Laurie's part in comparison to how the other two-second year teachers talked about their levels of learning. Berliner's (1988) model of the development of teacher expertise indicates that

the fourth stage or the proficient stage begins to emerge around the fifth year. Laurie, even as a third year teacher, seemed to have developed some of the skills of a stage four proficient teacher. Her intuition and ability to analyze her teaching along with her deliberate decision-making are the hallmarks of stage four. Berliner (2001) explains, “Some smaller set of these teachers then moves on to proficient and expert stages of development” (p. 478). The level of comprehension about the integration of management with instruction and its ultimate affect on learning, Laurie articulated in the previous excerpt from her interviews, indicates her ability to analyze how experience has affected her developing practices.

Laurie had an advantage none of the other teachers had. She spent two consecutive semesters during her preservice training in the classroom she is teaching in, she was then hired to replace her mentor teacher and has been teaching in that same room for three years now. Laurie’s situation adds to the body of research that says the context into which new teachers find themselves teaching during these formative years influences their development (Berliner, 2001). Berliner (2001) also states the power of context is often overlooked in determining what affects teacher development. Berliner (2001) would probably say Laurie’s development could be attributed to the interaction between the person and the environment she is learning to teach in. Even though Laurie connected her development of teacher expertise to surviving her first years of teaching less than the other teachers her dialogue still reinforced the notion that novice teachers utilize the experience of surviving their first years of teaching in developing their understanding about how to integrate management with instruction during their lessons.

The data for each group of teachers demonstrated how their knowledge grew sequentially over time through their experiences teaching in their own classrooms, progressing through up to three of Berliner's (1988) stages. For Marisa and Alicia, it appears that they still need more time to internalize what they were learning through the experiences of their first year and were continuing to experience during their second year of teaching. With more experience they will probably not feel the continued frustrations they talked about during their second year of teaching. These two teachers are at the point in their development of expertise where they are continuing to work on getting their classroom management under control so they can effectively deliver the content and increase their understanding of instructional pedagogy (Lidstone & Hollingsworth, 1992). As Lidstone and Hollingsworth's (1992) research and Berliner's (1988) research acknowledges, this must be accomplished before they can begin focusing on their students' learning.

For Anthony, Laurie and Diane their thinking has gone beyond just managing student engagement during instruction and internalizing the ways they do so. They've figured that out and are comfortable with their own strategies for doing so. They have been talking about how the content of their lessons affect not only student engagement but student learning as well. Their decision-making was not only based on their integration of instruction and management but how that integration enhanced student learning. Lidstone and Hollingsworth's (1992) research emphasizes that in order for teachers to be able to focus on student learning they must understand how to integrate management with instruction. Berliner's (1988) model of the development of teacher

expertise encompasses this focus as teachers connect student learning to their own personal decision making as a competent teacher. As their conversations revealed the third year teachers have advanced at this point in their development.

Theme #2: University Learning

Survival learning was by far the most prominently reflected way these teachers talked about learning the importance of thinking about the integration of management and instruction during their planning. The second was how that experience triggered memories about what they learned in their university classrooms. This “melding” of experience with verbal knowledge learned during their teacher training is what Berliner (1988) hypothesized happens as teachers, in their second or third year of teaching, move into his advanced beginners stage. This was part of the discussion of only the two second year teachers, Marisa and Alicia. The third year teachers did not discuss their university learning. Even though only the second year teachers talked about their training these examples in the data revealed the development of teacher expertise outlined in Berliner’s (1988) advanced beginner stage, that new teachers begin to internalize what was presented in the university classrooms as they make connections with their experiences teaching in their own classrooms.

The two second year teachers, Marisa and Alicia, talked briefly about how they first started linking what they learned at the university to the management issues they experienced during their first two years of teaching. While Marisa talked about the management strategies she was using, she indicated the strategies she was trying to use didn’t always work out as she envisioned they would so she had to make even more

changes. “It’s not until you do it that you get what was being said in our (university) classes. It took me all of last year to get to the point where I could think about it long enough to say, Yea, that’s what the professors were saying” (Post Observation Interview, 4/16/09). Marisa’s reasoning for why it took her the entire year to make this connection supports what Carter, Cushing, Sabers, Stein, & Berliner’s (1988) research findings that new teachers can’t “think aloud because they [are] cognitively overloaded” (p. 475). In fact new teachers become so overwhelmed that it is difficult for them to put into words what they are thinking and feeling (Carter, Cushing, Sabers, Stein, & Berliner, 1988; Martin & Childo; 2001). For Marisa this was the reality for how she was starting to internalize what was taught in her university classes and to use that information in improving how she integrated management with instruction during her lessons.

Alicia also shed light on why she might not have understood what her professors were talking about while she was at the university.

In school you hear model, model all the time but I think as new teachers you don’t take it that literally. Actually being in front of kids trying to get them to understand what you want from them is when you start to understand and take it literally (Post Observation Interview, 3/12/09).

Alicia’s statements stress the connection between experiential learning or on-the-job training, being in front of children in a her own classroom as her trigger for thinking about what she learned at the university again paralleling the findings of Carter, Cushing, Sabers, Stein, & Berliner’s (1988) research. By adding the context of the classroom to

what she learned in her university classes she realized exactly what her professors meant when they talked about modeling what you want your students to accomplish.

Marisa and Alicia both realized it was being in the real world classroom and experiencing the context of actual teaching on their own, with their own students that enabled them to connect their developing practice with what they learned at the university. What they remembered about their university learning was triggered by the struggles Marisa and Alicia experienced during their first two years of teaching.

As Hollingsworth (1992) learned through her research, “although teachers both appreciated and came to believe the academic theories on learning...promoted by their programs, they felt few connections between formal teacher education settings, their personal beliefs about teaching and their particular classroom problems” (p. 374). The second year teachers, Marisa and Alicia, talked about triggering their memories of what they learned at the university but not as much as they talked about the importance of experiencing teaching during their first year. The way they talked about these memories seemed to be appreciative. However Diane, Laurie and Anthony, the third year teachers in this study, appear to have matured as teachers and moved beyond the struggles of their first two years of teaching. They have become comfortable with their practices. Does that mean they have lost that connection or has it decreased as Hollingsworth (1992) indicates? The data doesn't directly identify an answer. Instead the data demonstrates that Marisa and Alicia were continuing to deal with some of the struggles during their second year of teaching that they had experienced during their first year. The search for the best

ways to deal with their struggles lead them back to what is still fresh in their memories, their university training.

During these discussions the teachers explained at great length what they considered while planning: what they were thinking as they taught their lessons, what worked, what didn't work, how they came to make their decisions, how they felt about student needs, why they became teachers, what they expected of themselves and much more. These teachers seemed to go far beyond the questions asked in explaining their deeply held convictions about their own practices and how they believed they formed their convictions. Through their discussions they portrayed a deep desire to understand the "why" behind their students' reactions to their teaching. Anthony said, "I see it, but I continue trying to figure out why [the students] react differently sometimes. Not like you'd expect" (Post Observation Interview, 5/14/2009). In fact the teachers were so absorbed and detailed in talking about their teaching they seemed almost desperate in their need to do so. As a result the teachers provided rich detail to help find answers to this studies third and final research question: How did the teachers talk about learning to integrate management with instruction during their lessons? The reliance of surviving the first year of teaching as the impetus for making the connections they needed to better understand the relationship between management and instruction during their lessons supports the findings in prior research about new teacher learning (such as: Ammon & Hutcheson, 1989; Berliner, 1988; Bullough, 1989; Fuller & Brown, 1975; Huberman, 1989; Kagan, 1992; Lidstone & Hollingsworth, 1992; Ryan, 1986, 1992; Sprinthall, Reiman & Thies-Sprinthall, 1996). The connections Marisa and Alicia made between

what they experienced while surviving their first year of teaching and what they learned in their university classrooms is not as thoroughly researched in the literature (Featherstone, 1992; Flores & Day, 2006; Weinstein, 1988), but these two teachers did make those connections.

Findings Conclusion

The teachers in this study, like many teachers in Texas, had to include their district's aligned curricula as part of their preactive planning (Yinger, 1977). The inclusion of this added step resulted in these teachers altering the traditional preactive planning process found in prior literature (Bowers, 1984; Popham & Baker, 1970; Taba, 1962; Tyler, 1949; Yinger, 1977). The preactive planning process engaged in by these teachers included two phases named in this dissertation as the transmission phase and the tailoring phase. The first phase or the transmission phase was when the teachers transmitted or copied the lessons from the DAC. These prewritten and approved district lessons, as Hughes (2005) points out, play "a significant institutional role that tells teachers directly what plan should be taught (subjects as well as subject-matter) while setting teachers up with planning created to endure encroaching high-stakes standardized tests" (p. 115).

During the transmission phase the teachers focused on the content, which was present in the DAC. Having been developed from state curriculum standards or instructional standards the DAC in the district these teachers taught in did not include management standards. As Stough (2006) found through her research on standards, "The extent to which knowledge and skills of classroom management is included in these

standards appears exceedingly limited” (p. 920). The teachers believed the plans copied from the DAC did not adequately address the context of their individual classrooms and therefore engaged in a second phase of preactive planning.

The second phase or the tailoring phase was where the teachers tailored or adjusted the DAC plans to match the needs of the students in their classrooms. It was at this time that they started talking about the management they would need to include with the instruction for their lessons. The teachers seemed to understand the need to go beyond just managing the lessons they transferred from their DAC (Apple, 2007; Woods & Jeffrey, 1998). They understood the need for an additional step to adjust or tailor their original written lessons, derived from their DAC, to address integrating management and instruction in relationship to the diversity within the context of their own classrooms.

The dialogue of the teachers in this study unveiled their developing teacher expertise (Berliner, 1988) in understanding how to integrate management with instruction during their lessons. There was a distinct difference in the complexity of their expertise in relation to the experienced teachers examined in Evertson and Neal’s (2006) similar research. As new teachers they learned about the importance of instructional management having survived their first year(s) of teaching and experiencing lessons without planning for the social aspects of engagement in the content of their lessons (Hickey & Shafer, 2006). These experiences also helped the second year teachers Marisa and Alicia connect what they learned at their universities to these experiences. Those connections assisted them in recognizing the relationship between the social and academic aspects of their lessons. The teachers in this study struggled within the confines of their DAC but

professional thinking and knowledge prevailed. These teachers adjusted their plans to include the integration of management and instruction even though the DAC did not indicate they should do so.

The understanding of how new teachers begin to develop teacher expertise about integrating management and instruction is imperative to creating better ways of supporting new teachers as they enter their own classrooms. These findings are but one piece of this puzzle. In Chapter 5, I will examine what implications and future research can be inferred from the findings in this chapter, which have been drawn from the words and actions of the teachers in this study.

CHAPTER 5: MAKING SENSE OF THE FINDINGS

IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The purpose of this research was to examine how second and third year early childhood teachers integrate management with instruction into their lessons during preactive planning, adjust their lesson plan during interactive teaching and reflect on that process. Where they believe they learned to integrate management and instruction in their lessons, as reflected through their discourse during the interviews, was also examined. The conceptual framework for this study was influenced by the extensive research conducted by Carolyn Evertson (see Appendix I: Carolyn Evertson Publications). Dr. Evertson's research, over the past four decades, has examined the social context of classrooms, how these contexts influence what students have the opportunity to learn and how the participants in her studies defined learning. As such her research will assist in defining and supporting the significance of this study. This quote from Evertson and her colleagues' work summarizes the purpose of this study:

We have argued that management is not a precondition for content instruction; rather, it carries messages about content and should be seamlessly interwoven with instruction to attain learning goals (Evertson & Neal, 2006, p. 12; see also: Evertson & Randolph, 1999; Randolph & Evertson, 1994).

My understanding about what this statement really means has transformed as a result of this research. My understanding of management and instruction have changed to realize management and instruction are inseparable, flowing through each other as well-orchestrated lessons engage the minds of students. The messages carried through such

well-orchestrated lessons are part of every instructional decision teachers make. Recognizing how those messages are part of that instructional decision-making process during the preactive planning process and then how teachers facilitate the interactive teaching of their lessons transforms the traditional view of management. The next section will delve into this transformation and its importance for teacher decision-making during planning.

Transforming the Meaning of Management

Traditionally management has been viewed “as a matter of first-order importance, or a necessary precondition, after which effective instruction follows” (Evertson & Weade, 1991, p. 136; see also: Evertson, Emmer, Sanford, & Clements, 1983; Emmer, Sanford, Clements & Martin, 1983), not as a “seamlessly interwoven” orchestration between management and instruction. Evertson recognizes her prior research as part of this traditional view (Evertson & Weade, 1991) but through further research began to realize the false dichotomy that had “emerged in the ways we view[ed] relationships between management and instructional processes (Evertson & Weade, 1991, p. 136; see also: Weade & Evertson, 1988). As research has embraced the examination of the classroom as a rich space filled with complex communications among its players the awareness of the inherent dualism of that traditional belief has evolved. As Evertson & Neal (2006) so aptly explained in their previous quote research now recognizes the relationship between management and instruction is complex and “as these processes evolve, they are intertwined, intermingled and in continual dynamic relation” (Evertson & Weade, 2006, p. 136; see also: Brophy, 1988; Erickson, 1986; Weade, 1987).

However with the onset of the 21st century and “as new conceptions of learning begins to inform [teacher] practice” (Evertson & Neal, 2006, p. 1) research examining this relationship within the classroom context has decreased. Even in the existing research that investigates this relationship, such as that of Evertson and Neal (2006), the teaching practices of experienced teachers are most often examined (Danforth Working Group, 1999; Branford, Brown & Cocking, 1999; Marshall, 1992). This creates a gap in the current literature about how teachers integrate management and instruction during interactive teaching and specifically, how new teachers develop these expertise.

This study addresses that gap in current literature by seeking to examine how new teachers describe their understanding about the integration of management and instruction during planning and how they demonstrate that understanding during interactive teaching. Evertson and Neal (2006) examined the practices of two teachers with 15 and 26 years of experience to create benchmarks for understanding what it looks like to manage learning centered classrooms. The authors highlight the complexities of how these two teachers internalized and implemented integrated management with instruction in their classrooms. This study began with this idea and a desire to examine where it starts for new teachers and how they begin to implement this knowledge during interactive teaching. It sought to achieve this goal by investigating three research questions:

1. How do second and third year teachers plan for integrating the management of engagement with instruction in their lessons? And how do they reflect on this planning after the lesson is completed?

2. When implementing this plan, how do they adjust their goals for management and/or instruction if their plan doesn't adequately address their preplanned goals?
And how do they reflect on those adjustments after the lesson is completed?
4. Finally, how did the teachers talk about learning to integrate management with instruction during their lessons?

The study's methodology was purposefully designed to address these research questions by providing the participants with the opportunity to define their perceptions about the relationship between management and content instruction as they planned their lessons. Their lesson planning process included preactive planning (Yinger, 1978), which was divided into two subsection named the transmission phase and the tailoring phase, interactive teaching (Yinger, 1986) and reflective planning (Van Manen, 1995). The observation component of the methodology was needed to cross reference what was being said by the teachers during the planning interviews as well as to document any changes in these teachers' lessons as they implemented their plans (Yinger, 1986). The observation was then followed with another interview in which the teachers reflected on the connections between the initial lesson planning and what actually happened during the lesson (Van Manen, 1995). During this process the teachers talked about their thinking during planning, how they adjusted their lesson plans to accommodate the context within their classrooms and where they felt they learned about planning for and think about the integration of management and instruction.

An Unexpected Realization

At the beginning this study was designed to examine new teachers' thinking about

the integration of management and instruction during their lessons. As the data was analyzed the realization emerged about the extent of change in how the teachers in this study planned as a result of district created DAC to deal with the push by policymakers at all levels of governance to hold teachers and schools accountable for students' academic achievement. These findings expanded the focus of this study to incorporate the influence planning had on new teacher thinking about the integration of management with instruction and how the DAC, which was designed to address this issue of accountability, influenced that planning and thinking. An attempt was made to find the most recent literature on teacher planning and specifically on teacher planning in today's high-stakes environment; however this perspective was missing in the literature. This concurs with what Hughes (2005) stated about the recent research on planning, "There is a paucity of recent research about lesson planning, arguably the most significant part of teacher and student preparation" (p. 106; see also: Johnson, 2000, p. 72). The reality of the pressure high-stakes testing policies place on today's classroom contexts and the need to address this gap in the literature this study will begin the conversation about how teacher planning may actually be changing as a result of the DAC some districts have created for their teachers to use for planning.

The Contributions of this Study

As a result of the transformation in the meaning management brings to instructional planning and the realization about how teacher planning changed for the teachers in this study as a result of their districts' use of DAC new insights can be gained about teacher planning. The findings from this study make several contributions to the

literature on new teacher development of expertise in understanding how to integrate management with instruction during lesson planning and the affect district aligned curricula has on new teacher planning. These contributions add to the current literature by identifying the ways new teachers begin to understand how the relationship between management and instruction affects their abilities to teach and support learning. In addition they fill in the gap between previous literature on traditional teacher planning and the affect the DAC many districts have created “to endure encroaching high-stakes standardized tests” (Hughes, 2005, p. 115) have on new teacher planning. These contributions are as follows:

1. The findings addressing research question one, which examined how the teachers in this study planned for the integration of management and instruction in their lessons, revealed that these teachers changed the traditional model of teacher planning in order to integrate management with instruction in their lessons. This change occurred because they had to deal with their district aligned curricula, which each of their districts required teachers to use for planning, before they could accommodate planning for the integration of management and instruction and the needs of the students in their classrooms. This divergence from traditional teacher one phase preactive planning to a two phase (named the transmission phase and traditional phase) preactive planning affected the way these teachers thought about lesson planning. This realization adds to

the literature on teacher planning and begins to address the affect of district-created DAC on new teacher planning.

2. The second and third year teachers in this study did make adjustments to the lesson plans they created during the transmission phase of their preactive planning. Traditionally teachers have created a plan for instruction during the preactive planning and then adjusted those plans during interactive teaching when the context of the classroom required them to do so. The findings related to research question two indicated the teachers in this study made their adjustments during their preactive planning and, for the most part, then followed through with their adjusted plan during interactive teaching. These findings add to the literature on teacher planning by demonstrating the affect DAC have on new teacher planning.
3. The second and third year teachers in this study discussed how they believed they learned to integrate management with instruction during their lessons (research questions three) as they talked about their current planning and teaching practices. Throughout the interviews all five teachers used words like chaos, frustrating, survival, keeping their head above water and tough as adjectives to describe their first year of teaching. Having experienced teaching lessons without integrating management with instruction they knew how it felt to suffer through the behavioral implications. Trial by fire made a lasting impression on each of these

teachers and as the data demonstrates was the impetus for their understanding about integrating management with instruction. This adds to the literature how new teachers' learn-to-teach and to the literature concerned about the prevalent way new teachers learn-to-teach is through personal experience.

Each of these three contributions will be addressed in the following sections and how they create new questions for future research.

Planning and Thinking about Integrating Management with Instruction

As stated earlier in this chapter the primary focus of this study was examining how new teachers integrated management and instruction in their lesson planning and instruction. Teacher thinking during lesson planning seemed a logical place to begin this examination. Yet, the extent to which the teacher planning process would influence these findings was astounding. As outlined in chapter four the field of education has long followed Tyler's (1949) model for instructional planning, which begins with the learning objective(s) as a guide for classroom instruction. In Clark and Yinger's (1980) research examining the planning practices of experienced teachers 40 years after Tyler developed his model they found that teachers did not necessarily follow Tyler's model in its linear, sequential format. Rather than start with the specific objectives in mind the teachers in their research started planning with the idea for an activity in mind with objectives and assessment following those decisions.

In this study the teachers did follow Tyler's model because unlike the teachers in Clark and Yinger's (1980) research they had no alternative. The choice in lesson planning

is no longer an option in many Texas school districts. The way many districts in Texas have responded to implementing the state standards better known as the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS), which are to prepare students for the state's high-stakes assessments, the TAKS tests is by creating these strict teaching guidelines, termed the district aligned curricula in this study and mandating teachers use them to guide their instruction. In the four districts these five teachers taught in they were required to follow the DAC. This is significantly different than the context of teaching that the teachers in Clark & Yinger's (1980) study taught in. As a result the participants in this study began the first phase of preactive planning by transmitting, in some cases actually cutting and pasting or copying, the information from their DAC to their official weekly written lesson plans. For this reason the first preactive planning phase was named the Transmission Phase of preactive planning for this dissertation.

As Hughes (2005) explained prewritten and approved district lessons play "a significant institutional role that tells teachers directly what plan should be taught while setting teachers up with planning created to endure encroaching high-stakes standardized tests" (p. 115). Unlike teachers in previous research (Clark & Yinger, 1980; Tomey, 1978) the teachers in this study faced a different set of issues during preactive planning because of the creation of DAC, which was their district policymakers' response to Texas's "encroaching high-stakes standardized tests". The teachers were expected to address the goals and objectives first because that is how the DAC are designed. The interesting dilemma created for these teachers was as a result of being handed lesson plans they had no ownership in designing there was a disconnect at the classroom level.

Therefore the teachers felt the need to adjust these prescribed lessons to better address the needs of the students in their classrooms and to address the potential management issues created by certain aspects of the lessons. Berliner's (1988) model of teacher expertise would call this survival experience during the novice stage (preservice through roughly the first year). If Berliner's model is accurate the first and/or second year of teaching gave these teachers the experience to understand what happens to a lesson when management is not orchestrated with instruction during planning. These teachers discussed how their real life experience with classroom 'chaos' forced them to figure out how to make sure the 'chaos' didn't become routine. Johnson (2000, p. 72) describes thoughtful planning as a prerequisite to better lessons and argues "lesson planning is what links the curriculum to the particulars of instruction...enhances the possibility of effective lessons...[and] affects classroom management by reducing chaos, guiding the flow of events and keeping students interested and engaged" (as cited in: Hughes, 2005, p. 112). As described by the teachers in this study their experiences became "melded with verbal knowledge, similarities across contexts [became] familiar and episodic knowledge [was] built up" (Berliner, 1988, p. 3). This experience allowed them to recognize the importance of integrating management and instruction and helped them to actually include an additional step in their preactive planning to address this integration at the classroom level.

This additional phase of their preactive planning was named the Tailoring Phase to describe how the teachers' tailored the DAC to more appropriately align the instructional component of the DAC with the instructional and management needs of

their students. Therefore these findings were categorized and named the Transmission Phase to describe the process of transferring what was on the DAC to their official, written lesson plans and the Tailoring Phase to describe how they tailored those official lesson plans to address the academic and social needs of their own students as part of these teachers' preactive planning process.

As stated previously in Chapter 4 the specifics of the teacher planning process was not part of the interview protocol design for this study and therefore the teachers were not asked about the details of their planning process. The protocols and methods for this study were not designed to examine how the teachers actually thought about being required to use the DAC. So much of the data that would have helped to glean light on how the teachers felt about being asked to "copy and paste" their lessons from the DAC was not collected. The focus for this study was on teacher thinking in relation to the integration of management and instruction during planning. As these findings emerged in my analysis of the data I attempted to uncover any dialogue that might indicate if these teachers ever questioned what they were doing during the transmission phase or why they were copying the lessons from the DAC. There was no evidence found in the teachers' dialogue to indicate if they asked these types of questions or even thought about what they were doing.

There are several possible reasons for this: the interview questions for this study were not designed to elicit this dialogue and/or the teachers were not developmentally ready to ask these questions so they didn't come out through the dialogue. Perhaps they are still somewhat novice in this area and still "relatively inflexible and tend to conform

to whatever rules and procedures they were told to follow” (Berliner, 1988, p. 2). This creates several other research questions. How do new teachers describe their reactions to these mandates? Is this indeed a rote process for them? What messages do these prescribed lessons transmit to the new teacher? What precipitated these teachers’ decisions to adjust their DAC lessons and tailor them to the needs of their students? And is this practice of adjusting the plans prior to interactive teaching a common practice among new teachers? What do experience teachers do in response to using a DAC? These questions go beyond the scope of this study but nonetheless it is important to better understand new teacher thinking while they are using their DAC. These are questions for future research.

Reflecting back on Clark and Yinger’s (1980) findings several historical perspective questions come to mind. What affect did this change in teacher planning, as noted by Clark and Yinger (1980), have on student achievement and ultimately the onset of the high-stakes testing environment the teachers in this study planned their lessons in? Perhaps it was this earlier deviation away from the Tyler (1949) model, which brought about the need for the assessment driven instruction reflected in the high-stakes assessment form of planning evidenced in this study. If or when, the pendulum should swing away from this stringent high-stakes testing form of planning to a more professional decision-making, teacher-directed form of planning again, educators need to make sure history (Clark & Yinger, 1980; Tomey, 1978) does not repeat itself. This is a research area which needs to be addressed in future studies about teacher planning. What type of planning can be proposed that focuses on state standards and accountability, yet

honors the professional thinking and decision-making of teachers at the classroom level, again, so history doesn't repeat itself? These are not questions that can be answered through the research in this study but these are questions that need to be addressed. DACs may be designed to reduce the professional decision-making of teachers and teachers may not be overjoyed using them and, in fact, might be offended by the implication of the DAC required use. Still what is a viable alternative to replace them? Practical alternatives need to be investigated and created as a result of sound research if there is to be any change. This two-phased preactive planning process that emerged through the analysis of this study's data was not in the original plans for this study so many questions arose that could not be answered as part of this study. What was indicated through the literature is that research about teacher planning within the confines of the DAC has not been researched adequately. More needs to be known about how these changes in teacher planning affect teacher development and these changes need to be addressed through research. Findings from such studies can then be addressed as part of teacher training and professional development.

Adjusting Lesson Plans to Include Management in the Context of Classrooms

The practice of teachers adjusting the lesson plans they develop during preactive planning to accommodate the social and academic needs of students during interactive teaching is an age old teacher practice (Tyler, 1949). This is the concept of adjusting lessons to match the context of classrooms, which drove the second research question in this study. The realization about how much affect the DAC had on new teacher thinking and planning totally changed this conceptual foundation. As discussed in the previous

section the tailoring phase of these teachers' preactive planning addressed the contextual needs of their classrooms and was in response to the required use of their DAC in the transmission phase of preactive planning. By deciding to make those adjustments prior to interactive teaching the original intent of the second research questions had to be changed to reflect this realization. As previously stated the intent of this question originally reflected the traditional planning of prior research (Tyler, 1949; Taba 1962; Popham & Baker, 1970; Yinger, 1977).

Traditionally teachers have adjusted their preactive lesson plan during interactive teaching in response to the “immediacy...responsive action...social interchange” (Yinger, 1986, p. 263) and ongoing teacher decision-making that occurs while teaching lessons in real classrooms with real students (Clark & Yinger, 1980; Yinger, 1986). When examining these adjustments made by experienced teachers Van Manen (1995) found “while [teachers] are involved in teaching, good teachers ‘thinkingly act’ and often do things with immediate insight” (p.36) during interactive teaching. In other words traditionally teachers created lesson plans during preactive planning and then during interactive teaching they adjust those plans to work in response to the academic and social needs of their students.

The teachers in this study made their primary adjustments during the tailoring phase of their preactive planning after copying the lessons from the DAC during the transmission phase of their preactive planning. In fact only one teacher made any adjustments to her original plans from the transmission phase during interactive teaching. Marisa made that change when she decided to drop the tape that was part of the DAC

plans she used. While previewing the audiotape, during the tailoring phase of preactive planning, Marisa “decided it wasn’t great” (Post Observation Interview, 4/16/09) giving herself permission if she decided not to use the tape during interactive teaching.

I left out the tape we talked about. I listened to it that morning and decided it wasn’t great and it wouldn’t help the kids a lot. If those tapes don’t really make good connection and it needed to in order to keep their attention, they can get in trouble. And the kids were really getting into the lesson, so I didn’t want to interrupt the flow of the lesson. I was also pressed for time so I needed to make sure I used what worked so I skipped it (Post Observation Interview, 4/16/09).

Some might consider Marisa’s decision as being part of the tailoring phase because she previewed the tape and decided it wasn’t critical to the lesson prior to interactive teaching. Others might consider it part of Marisa’s “reflection-in-action” because she consciously thought about it and modified it during the lesson (Schon, 1987). Either way it reflects Marisa’s development of teacher expertise as she begins to be more flexible about deviating from the prescribed lessons of the DAC (Berliner, 1988).

As described in Chapter 4 all the teachers made adjustments to their DAC lesson plans during the tailoring phase of preactive planning. This is when the teachers began to talk about the connections they made between management and instruction. The two second year teachers, Alicia and Marisa, made the most direct reflections concerning how they thought about management issues while adjusting their lessons. For example Alicia explained, “The more lessons they can have that actively involve their minds and hands

are a management dream. The better and more hands-on my lesson is the less I have to worry about behavior” (Planning Interview, 3/10/09). Marisa commented, “I realized that the activity was academically too advanced for them but also it would create a set of management issues” (Post Observation Interview, 4/16/09). Both teachers understood the needs of their students and knew “they were better behaved when the content and structure of the lesson engaged them” (Lidstone & Hollingsworth, 1992). Using that knowledge they strived to make the lessons they were required to use from the DAC work for their students and adjusted them in accordance with that knowledge.

The DACs are developed from state curriculum standards or instructional standards, not management standards and as Stough (2006) found through her research on standards, “The extent to which knowledge and skills of classroom management is included in these standards appears exceedingly limited” (p. 920). This is a possible reason why these teachers engaged in the tailoring phase of preactive planning. They recognized they had to consider the social needs of their students to make their lessons successful and that required adjusting their DAC plans and consciously considering the management strategies necessary for that instruction. Also Boudah et al. (1997) noted that new teachers with less than four years of experience are more likely to follow exactly what the DAC or “model lesson plans” outline than would their veteran counterparts. If new teachers were more likely to adhere strictly to the DAC it would make sense to model integrating management and curriculum in these documents. This would be beneficial for new teachers, especially during their first year of teaching when they are not as likely to understand the relationship between management and instruction. This is

another area where research is needed to extend the understanding about how new teachers can be more adequately supported as they are learning to teach in the high-stakes testing environment of the 21st century.

New Teachers Dialogue About Learning to Integrate Management with Instruction

Survival during the first years of teaching and university learning were the two themes that emerged as a result of the data analysis process. The five teachers in this study talked most about how much they learned as a result of their struggles during the first year of teaching and of gaining a better understanding about the interrelationship of management and instruction as a result of those experiences. As researchers know the struggles with classroom management are common feelings among new teachers (Tauber, 1999, Veenman, 1984) and this was true for these five new teachers. While talking about the areas of engaged student participation (Hickey, 2003; Hickey & Schafer, 2006) the teachers often reflected back on how they learned to improve their practices as a result of the experience they had dealing with student behavior without the understanding they now possess as a result of those experiences during their first year(s) of teaching.

As highlighted in Chapter 4 there were numerous comparisons provided by these teachers but it was interesting to see Berliner's model of the development of teacher expertise be reflected in the change of focus between the second year teachers and the third year teachers. I've struggled with the controversy that surrounds the literature about stage theories and the models for teacher expertise but this is the first time I have actually attempted to compare more than one teacher's development in relationship to one of

these models. This is a small group of teachers but their development seems to support Berliner's (1988) model. The second year teachers, Marisa and Alicia, both used examples from their first year to demonstrate how much better they were doing in their second year as a result of surviving the struggles management presented for them during their first year. They also indicated there was still some degree of struggle during the second year of teaching. These thoughts about the frustration of continued learning Marisa and Alicia are still experiencing during their second year supports Berliner's (1988) theory about how new teachers gain expertise as they move between the novice stage (first stage) into the advanced beginner stage (second stage). As new teachers gain experience they move from the novice stage where everything they experience is new into the advanced beginner stage where, as a result of previous experience, they recognize the affect of context on instruction and management. At this time they are developing the knowledge necessary to fundamentally influence their thinking during teacher planning.

The three third year teachers, Anthony, Diane and Laurie, talked less about the first year than the second year teachers. Berliner's (1988) model of teacher expertise would indicate they were moving between the advanced beginner stage (second stage) to the competent stage (third stage). This higher level of pedagogical expertise was demonstrated through how they talked about their lessons and the management of those lessons working in coordination to create an environment where appropriate student behavior enhanced student learning. In this way the third year teachers reflected Everson and her colleagues' argument that management "carries messages about content"

(Evertson & Neal, 2006, p. 12; see also: Evertson & Randolph, 1999; Randolph & Evertson, 1994). This was not true for the second year teachers who were at the stage where they were beginning to recognize the relationship between management and instruction. The third year teachers took it a sequential step forward by recognizing that if their lessons are engaging and well-orchestrated student behavior will improve and as a result student learning will be enhanced.

A question that comes to mind is: Did these teachers engage in the tailoring phase of preactive planning during their first year of teaching? Having not included first year teachers in this study a conclusive answer to these questions cannot be made. Yet closer examination of a comment Alicia made when reflecting back on her interactive teaching of the lesson might provide insight into the possible answers to this question. Alicia noted that, "I've learned a lot from the trials of my first year. I wouldn't have gone back over that last year. They would have had problems and I wouldn't have figured out what to do" (Post Observation Interview, 3/12/09). The initial years of teaching are filled with so many new learning experiences that new teachers cannot seem to "think aloud because they [are] cognitively overloaded" (Carter, Cushing, Sabers, Stein, & Berliner, 1988, p. 475). Like Alicia new teachers become so overwhelmed that it is difficult for them to put into words what they are thinking and feeling (Carter, Cushing, Sabers, Stein, & Berliner, 1988; Martin & Childo; 2001). This inability to talk about what is happening in their classrooms makes it difficult for new teachers, first year teachers in particular, to figure out the connection between management and instruction. Alicia's description of what happened during her first year of teaching would lead one to believe new teachers

probably follow the DAC as it is written therefore the tailoring phase described as part of these teachers' preactive planning process would not appear until the second or third year for most new teachers depending on their development of teacher expertise. The understanding that most management issues are directly related to instruction becomes internalized as new teachers gain experience through designing and implementing lessons and reflecting on the outcomes.

The second theme called university learning, which encompassed the connections the teachers made between their experiences and corresponding knowledge they gained at the university, emerged through the words of the second year teachers, Marisa and Alicia. They talked about their struggles the first year and how those struggles triggered connections with what they learned at the university. One of the findings from Featherstone (1992) research indicated "that the voices of teacher educators sometimes echo forward into these first years of teaching; the novice sometimes rehears, with a new ear, propositions which have seemed to make little impact on them at the time they were offered" (p. 111). For Marisa and Alicia these finding are reflected in their realization that it was being in the real world classroom and experiencing teaching on their own with their own students that enabled them to connect their practice with what they learned at the university. This connection between experiencing difficulties with instruction and management and remembering what their professors talked about while they were at the university helped them to better understand how to change their practices so their lesson reflected an integration of management and instruction. I believe, based on what these two teachers and the teachers in Featherstone's (1992) research said, that what they

learned in their university classes emerged and provided them with an understanding about what was happening in the immediacy of their own classrooms. I also believe the reason the third year teachers didn't talk about this connection is because they are not cognizant, at this point in their development, of how much they rely on what they learned at the university on a daily basis. As Levin (2003) stated about the four teachers she studied during her longitudinal study of teacher development,

Their deep understanding of children's development continued to be foundational to their thinking and their classroom practice throughout their careers. This is evident in both the language they use to express their understandings of pedagogy and in the instructional strategies they use in their classrooms today (p. 283).

I believe this is probably true for most teachers as they develop their own expertise as teachers.

One additional note needs to be made about the findings in relationship to how these teachers talked about learning to integrate management and instruction in their lessons. The expectations construct discussed by Anthony in Chapter 4 was coded as survival learning because that data was interpreted as something he realized through what he experienced during his first year of teaching. Anthony felt the "biggest problem my first year was with expectations. I basically didn't have any and there were way more behavior problems back then" (Planning Interview, 5/12/09). At face value that interpretation makes sense. Anthony also talked extensively about learning how to use expectations through the *CHAMPS* program. During the planning interview Anthony explained how and why he started to use the *CHAMPS* program.

We're all pretty new teachers in this building. The building opened a couple years ago and a lot of us were hired then. We had a lot of behavior problems in the school, so [the principal] had to do something. *CHAMPS* totally changed this place. Using *CHAMPS* changed everything for me. I went from having tons of procedures and behavior issues to having a smoother second year and a better third year. *CHAMPS* had a big part to play in that...I want to be told what to do until I've got a system of my own in place (Planning interview, 5/12/09).

This vignette speaks to his learning as a result of professional development at the building level. So this could have been a third way new teacher learning took place for Anthony. But the original coding of these vignettes occurred because it was through Anthony's first year's experiences that he understood the importance of this management strategy being integrated into the instruction of his lessons. Perhaps new teacher learning isn't so cut and dry. This learning process described by Anthony should probably have been coded as both survival learning and professional development.

Professional development for inservice teachers encourages them to "continue to be learners and develop their pedagogical understandings by engaging in ongoing professional opportunities" (Levin, 2003, p. 279). The introduction of the *CHAMPS* program in Anthony's own words, "totally changed this place. Using *CHAMPS* changed everything for me" (Planning interview, 5/12/09). Like Anthony the teachers in Levin's (2003) research made similar comments about the professional development opportunities in which they took part.

Implications

For Teachers and Students:

All schools for miles and miles around

Must take a special test.

To see who's learning such and such —

To see which school's the best.

If our small school does not do well,

Then it will be torn down,

And you will have to go to school

In dreary Flobbertown.

(Suess *et al.*, 1995)

Hughes (2005) used this passage from Dr. Suess to introduce her ideas about teacher lesson development, which aptly highlights “the potential damage inherent in this nation’s present course with “outcome-based bureaucratic accountability” (O’Day, 2002, p. 293). And unfortunately how it will affect today’s least considered factor in this accountability craze – our students. This two-phase model of teacher planning, as evidenced in this study, indicates the need to adjust the district aligned curricula to bring the professional thinking and decision making of teachers back into the fold of planning. There is an inherent danger in devaluing the important role teacher thinking and decision-making has in student learning (Hughes, 2005, Lidstone & Hollingsworth, 1992) as is demonstrated when district policymakers mandate the creation of the type of DAC documents used in these teachers’ districts. The need for the teachers in this study to

engage in a two phase preactive planning process creates an added burden to their lesson planning that would not be necessary if their professional skills were honored. It also demonstrates how easy it is to forget what education is all about – the students and their ability to enter the workforce upon graduation from high school or college and become a productive member of a democracy (Dewey, 1933/1993, 1915/1956). These ideas were not the original intent of the research for this study but I have come to realize, as a result of this study, that everything teachers do in an effort to effectively insure student learning has become overshadowed by the accountability blinders educators are forced to wear in the name of good education.

The implications this two-phase process for teacher preactive planning has on teachers and students can be analyzed in many ways. In relationship to the focus of this study I believe one significant implication policymakers need to consider is how this change in teacher planning creates another unnecessary level of planning for teachers. There is no question that teachers need to plan to deliver instruction like an architect plans to build a skyscraper and this planning “blueprint” needs a great deal of forethought. The teacher planning of previous research (Van Manen, 1995; Yinger, 1977, 1978, 1980) illustrates this planning taking “place before and after school, during recess and at other times when the teacher is alone in the classroom” (Yinger, 1979, p.163). The planning of the teachers in this study demonstrated them using that same quiet time primarily to copy the plans from their DAC into a set of official written plan during the Transmission phase of preactive planning (Yinger, 1977, 1978). If this is how the use of the DAC affects their use of the minimal quiet time teachers actually have then teachers

must be provided additional quiet time to engage in the tailoring phase of preactive planning (Yinger, 1977, 1978) that this study indicates these teachers needed to engage in to tailor their written plans from the DAC to fit their classroom context.

Districts should also begin to provide more time as part of teaching schedules for teachers to access and read professional literature and research, keep up with best practice at any moment in time, engage in discussions with colleagues and have sufficient time to reflect, in order to develop greater levels of expertise in planning for the integration of management and instruction (Evertson & Neal, 2006). Planning for instruction is an intensely cognitive activity requiring a great deal of reflection on the part of the teacher. Teachers are constantly having internal, reflective conversations with themselves about what they need to do (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000). In order for teachers to recognize and learn about the interconnected nature of management and instruction, they need to be provided the time and space to reflect on their own practices and the experiences they have had teaching their lessons with real children to come to this understanding.

If the experiences of the teachers in this study are reflective of how other teachers address the use of DAC then perhaps most teachers engage in a second phase of preactive planning (Yinger, 1977, 1978) in order to tailor their district aligned curricula to fit their own teaching context. I'm not advocating eliminating district curricula but the implications of this second phase of planning may indicate a need to rethink the depth and requirement of these documents. In designing these documents districts need to consider how they honor individual teacher thinking, knowledge, expertise and

experience during curricular planning. Schoenfeld (1998) recognized the decisions teachers make about lesson planning are an important part of their craft knowledge. The decisions teachers make while creating the segments within their lesson plans “provide the infrastructure for effective and ineffective teaching” (Marzano, 2007, p. 176). If this is true, how can this critical teacher decision-making about lesson planning be taken away from teachers through the strict adherence to the DAC that are handed to them, not created by them and there still be an expectation for effective teaching during those lessons? Teachers must own their lessons. They must know them inside out. This can only happen if they are allowed to utilize their craft knowledge through professional thinking and decision-making during lesson planning.

Professional development came to light as another way to analyze Anthony’s learning experiences resulting from the *CHAMPS* training Anthony received during his second year of teaching. As stated previously in this chapter the data related to Anthony’s discourse about learning to integrate management, in particular expectations, with instruction during his lessons was originally coded as survival learning because his understanding about the lack of management during his lessons he discussed as part of what he experienced while teaching his first year. But it was important to also note that this could have been coded as professional development because the inservice he received during his second year was the impetus for his making the connection between those experiences and the use of expectations in alleviating his management difficulties of the first year. The type of professional development Levin (2003) found the four experienced teachers in her study participated in were conferences through content area

associations they belonged to, workshops presented by other outside organizations and by continuing to stay connected with the university to further their own individual professional practices. Levin (2003) suggested teachers should have “opportunities to interact with colleagues at conferences or workshops and time to learn about current best practices are vital forms of professional development and support” (p. 279). Evertson and Neal (2006) emphasized similar suggestions when they concluded that teachers “need occasions to read professional literature, access research theory, study exemplars of best practice, engage in reflective discussion with peers and make sense of complex classroom events” (p. 17). It is difficult to compare the findings in the research of Levin (2003) or Evertson and Neal (2006) with the findings of this study because they examined the practices of more experienced teachers rather than new teachers. What might be gleaned from a comparison is that perhaps it is with experience that teachers begin to participate in the types of professional development discussed by these researchers. The teachers in this study needed this type of professional development to help them make sense of all the new experiences they were encountering as they learn to teach during the first few years of teaching. Without it they were relying on what they had experienced through surviving as new teachers and what they remembered from their university training. The process new teachers go through in learning to teach and the types of learning, specifically found through the dialogue of the five new teachers in this study, have many implications for inservice induction programs and preservice teacher educators.

For New Teacher Induction Programs and Preservice Teacher Educators

While exploring preservice teachers' ideas about order and caring, Weinstein (1998) concluded that preservice teachers need to recognize how good relationships with their students and engaging in well-orchestrated lessons have a direct effect on social interactions during lessons. Students know their teacher care about them when that teacher presents well thought out, engaging lessons in a safe and orderly environment. I believe one of the implications of this research is that teacher educators should take Weinstein's observation one-step further. Teacher educators need to assist preservice teachers in developing their understandings about how engaging, well-orchestrated lessons not only have a direct effect on order during lessons but the effect integrating management with instruction has on student learning (Evertson & Neal, 2006; Lidstone & Hollingsworth, 1992).

When new teachers step into that first classroom having already learned about this relationship they can be prepared to address both the social and academic contexts of their lessons and perhaps eliminate some of the management struggles of their first year of teaching. Teacher educators and district induction programs need to address how the DAC affects teacher planning. Teacher educators should add to not limit preservice teachers' exposure to the prior research on teacher planning (Van Manen, 1995; Yinger, 1977, 1978, 1980) in order to help their preservice teachers develop strategies for tailoring their district aligned curricula to meet the specific needs of the diverse population of students they will have in their classrooms. Preservice teachers still need to understand teacher thinking in relationship to planning along with understanding how teacher thinking today must incorporate the district aligned curricula.

To follow through with this introduction to teacher thinking and planning that should begin at the university the school district mentors need to continue helping new teachers develop this practical understanding about teacher thinking in relationship to planning and district aligned curriculums. This process should also include a practical understanding of the interconnectedness of management and instruction in relationship to student learning. I would also like to suggest that districts help model this relationship by including the management of instruction in their DAC documents. Unlike experienced teachers beginning teachers focus on the instructional content of a lesson rather than the management of the lesson (Emmer, Evertson & Anderson, 1982; Ball & Fieman-Nemser, 1988; Rust, 1994). This would help new teachers to see the connection between management and instruction during their transmission phase of preactive planning (Yinger, 1977, 1978, 1979) and encourage continued teacher thinking that includes this relationship during their tailoring phase of preactive planning (Yinger, 1977, 1978, 1979).

In today's high-stakes testing environment it is more important than ever to strategically begin teaching preservice teachers about how to integrate management with instruction to achieve optimal student learning and to continue that teaching as they become employed and begin planning for instruction in their own classrooms. Add to this the implications of how the teachers in this study altered the traditionally held practices for teacher planning and the affects DAC have on their development of teaching expertise (Berliner, 1988) in the area of planning for the integration of management and instruction. There are many ideas throughout the literature about how education should

handle high-stakes testing and district aligned curriculums. Some of them have been discussed in this dissertation. But one thing is for sure if educators continue to maintain the status quo and don't address these issues teacher attrition out of this profession will only grow because the frustrations associated with an inability to successfully handle management issues before they occur has a lasting effect on new teacher self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy & Hoy, 1998).

Limitations and Future Research

This study adds to the body of research on how teachers integrate management with instruction through engaged student participation in learning-centered classrooms (Evertson & Neal, 2006; Evertson & Randolph, 1999; Hickey, 2003; Hickey & Schafer, 2006). Rather than follow the majority of research in these areas and examine the developmental learning of experienced teachers through a quantitative methodology this study focused on exceptional second and third year teachers' developmental learning through a qualitative case study methodology like that of Evertson & Neal (2006). Even through this study makes substantive contributions to these discussions and the teachers in this study demonstrated an understanding about the importance of integrating management and instruction the required use of district aligned curricula by the teachers in this study affected a change in the traditional model for teacher planning. There are still inherent limitations to this work.

First, the qualitative case study design and scope used for this study limits these findings (Yin, 2003) due to the small number of participants. Conversely, the qualitative case study did allow for the collection of rich, thick, uncommon data (Wolcott, 2001) that

can be added to these discussions. Second, this study relies on the interviews and observations for one lesson for each of the five teachers, which places limitations on the generalizations that can be made as a result. Third, each of the four districts these teachers worked in had district aligned curricula. In districts where DAC are not developed there would be different findings, therefore the findings of this study are limited to teacher planning in districts where DAC are utilized during preactive planning. Fourth, the teachers in this study were early childhood teachers in regular classrooms. The findings might have looked different at higher-grade levels or in alternative programs, which limits the generalization of this study's findings. Fifth, the protocol questions and methods designed for this study were not designed to allow for the kind of detailed data collection required to fully address the way the teachers in this study altered the traditional planning process. The heartache of this study is the lack of data to support more in depth analysis of the multitude of ways these teachers fine tuned their lessons as they taught. The dialogue just wasn't there because the protocol questions were not designed to elicit that type of dialogue. Therefore, the conclusions drawn from this study can only be considered conclusions for these five teachers.

The beauty of research is its ability to continually generate more ideas for future research. This research is no exception. In the area of teacher planning this study demonstrates a need for more research on teacher development to identify the altered planning process used by these five teachers as a result of the district aligned curricula. For example including Hughes (2005) ideas: How has the "institutional role that tells teachers directly what plan should be taught" (p. 115) affect the quality of teacher

planning and the instruction it creates? As far as teacher cognition more research should be conducted to examine the professional thinking of first through fifth year teachers as they develop understandings about the integration of management and instruction during preactive planning. For example: What are the stages for teacher development as they learn about how to integrate management with instruction during planning? And finally, there is a need for research that examines what is being taught at the university to support preservice teacher learning about the integration of management and instruction during planning. For example: How is the concept of the integration of management and instruction during the planning process being presented at the university level and in the field by mentor teachers? These are the ideas for future research this study has created for me as I continue to investigate teacher development in the area of management and instruction. Through researching management and instruction as part of this dissertation process I have changed my understanding of what it means to integrate management with instruction. These are not two different ideas working together to create well orchestrated lessons that engage children in the content. Management and instruction are one and the same. One cannot occur without the other if student learning is expected to happen. They are inseparable and intertwined to become a well orchestrated symphony of learning.

A Final Word

The most important wisdom I take from the process of conducting this study and the insights the five teachers in this study so generously provided is the reaffirmation that children must be our primary focus in educational mandates and there is no one more qualified to make instructional decisions for children than their teachers. As a result of

the national, state and local legislative mandates public education have moved so far off center in how they are orchestrating the role of education in the lives of children that they have lost our most important focus...the child. As teacher education programs and induction programs try desperately to meet the needs of novice teachers as they learn to teach in the 21st century student learning and professional development for novice teachers needs to take center stage.

APPENDICIES

Appendix A: IRB Letter of Consent

IRB Protocol #2005-09-0078

Title: Classroom Management and Beginning Teachers

Conducted by: Debra E. Bay-Borelli / University of Texas @ Austin / C & I

Telephone: 512-296-6241; **Email:** db2@mail.utexas.edu.

You are being asked to participate in a research study. This form provides you with information about the study. The person in charge of this research will also describe this study to you and answer all of your questions. Please read the information below and ask questions about anything you don't understand before deciding whether or not to take part. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you can refuse to participate without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You can stop your participation at any time by simply telling the researcher.

The purpose of this study is to examine the classroom management strategies of beginning teachers.

If you agree to be in this study, we will ask you to do the following things:

1. Allow the researcher access to your classroom to observe the strategies you use to establish the classroom management strategies in your classroom.
2. Meet with the researcher to discuss those observations and clarify questions and add your personal interpretations.

Total estimated time to participate in study will be the spring semester during the 2008-2009 school year. There will three initial interviews, one or two planning interviews followed by an observation of that lesson and then a post-observation debriefing.

Risks and benefits of being in the study:

- Risk – loss of loss of confidentiality in relationship to personal perceptions when discussed in conferences with researcher.
- Risk – sessions will be audio taped; tapes will be coded so that no personally identifying information is visible; Tapes will be kept in a secure place (locked in researcher's file cabinet); tapes will be heard only for research purposes by the research and her associates. Should vide taping be used to collect data the same conditions will be adhered to.
- Benefits – discussions may give the participant a better understanding of his/her developing teaching practices.

Compensation:

- None.

The **records** of this study will be stored securely and kept private. Authorized persons for the University of Texas at Austin and members of the Institutional Review Board have the legal right to review your research records and will protect the **confidentiality** of those records to the extent permitted by law. All publications will exclude any information that will make it possible to identify you as a subject.

Contacts and Questions:

If you have any questions about the study please ask now. If you have questions later or want additional information, call the researcher conducting this study. The researcher’s name, phone number and email address are at the top of the page.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact Jody Jensen, PhD, Chair of the University of Texas at Austin Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, (512) 232-2685. My faculty advisor is Christopher Brown, PhD, (512)-232-2288.

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.

Statement of Consent:

I have read the above information and have sufficient information to make a decision about participating in this study. I consent to participate in this study.

_____ Date: _____
Signature of Participant

_____ Date: _____
Signature of Investigator & Principal Obtaining Consent

Appendix B: Initial Interview Protocols

Introductory Interview #1

We will be talking today about you and your insights into how you got to this point as a teacher. Our goal is to get to know each other so that you feel more comfortable when we talk and when I come to observe you teach a lesson. Remember, I'm not supervising you. I'm hoping to learn with you from your experience about how you plan for, manage and teach instruction.

1. Pre-service education.
 - Where did you go to school?
 - Why did you select that school?
 - What did you like best about their certification program?
 - How well do you feel you were prepared to teach? (coursework / student teaching experiences)
 - Explain about the coursework you had dealing with classroom management and lesson planning?
 - Anything you feel like you weren't prepared for when you started to teach?

2. Tell me about your decision to become a teacher.
 - What made you decide to become a teacher? Why did you choose teaching?
 - What other choices did you consider?
 - Tell me about a favorite teacher. What made him/her such a special teacher?
 - What about the worst teacher you ever had? What wouldn't you do that he/she did?

3. Tell me about your class.
 - How many are there? Boys? Girls? What are they like?
 - What seems to be going well? Strong personalities? Learning difficulties?
 - Any surprises?
 - Anything else you want to share about your students?

4. Tell me about the school.
 - How many years have you taught (grade level) at (school name)?
 - Is it similar/different to any of the schools where did your student teaching?
 - What about your colleagues in general? Do you like the other teachers and staff? Do you find your administration supportive? Grade level team? Do you meet? Plan together? Have a lot of autonomy?
 - Anything else you want to share?

5. Is there anything you would like to add or ask me?

6. *Let's set up a time for the next interview.*

Introductory Interview #2

Let's see what I can remember from our last discussion. (Recap what was discussed at the previous interview.) Today, I would like to get you know how you feel about teaching.

1. How would you describe your role as a teacher in your classroom? What about your role as part of the school community?
2. Describe what "good teaching" means to you.
3. What "feeds" you as a teacher? What brings you to work everyday?
4. What "depletes" you as a teacher? What makes you want those days off?
5. Reflecting back to your first year teaching...what things surprised you?
6. Again, reflecting back on your first year of teaching and those first weeks of school...describe how you communicated to your students what your expectations were in relationship to classroom management? Were you successful? How did it change your second year?
7. Last time we talked about lesson planning while you were doing your student teaching...how has that changed as you gained experience? How has teaching those lessons changed?
8. Where do you go when you don't know what to do? When you're stumped? Do you have a mentor to go to? If yes, how did this person become your mentor? How often do you meet with your mentor? Is this part of a district program to support novice teachers?
9. Explain why some lessons really grab you; you love to teach them. What subjects/lessons grab you like that? How do your student react to these lessons? What kind of planning does it take to prepare for these lessons? Explain what (if any) differences there are managing the class during these lessons?
10. Thank you. Is there anything we haven't discussed that you would like me to know? Do you have any questions for me?
11. During our next interview I would like you to talk to me about a lesson you have planned. Then I would like to observe you teach that lesson and follow that with a post-observation interview. This doesn't mean I want a "formal" lesson plan like you wrote during your preservice training. However you

normally plan that is what I want you to do, don't change anything. I would like to see one of the lessons you just described that you love to teach.
(Discuss timing for the three parts with the next phase of data collection. Arrange the times. The lesson plan interview will probably happen the day before the lesson, the next day the lesson will be observed and that same day the post observation interview will take place.)

Appendix C: Planning Interview Protocols

Preactive Planning Interview

1. First I would like you to show me your lesson plan. Don't let that bother you. As a teacher and administrator I have seen every kind of planning imaginable...even none! I'm not looking for a document like the one you use during your training. I just want to see how you write down what you've planned, even if it is just a few lines in your plan book.
2. What subject are you planning for? What's the topic?
3. Please talk to me about how you planned this lesson from start to finish. What did you do first? (Possible questions: Why this lesson and topic? Where did you get your ideas? What did you use to help you with the ideas?)
 - *While listening to the teacher talk about planning the lesson I will only ask for clarity when needed. I do not want to influence the planning or the lesson in any way. I will take note of any deliberate planning for the management of instruction.*

Appendix D: Post Observation Interview Protocols

Post Observation Debriefing Interview

During the actual lesson I will take note of the relationship between management and instruction and how the lesson plan is used. During this debriefing I will ask questions about the following constructs as/if they come up in the discussion –

- *Expectations,*
- *Monitoring instruction,*
- *Pacing of lesson,*
- *Planned routines and procedures and*
- *Activities that include cooperative behavior among students and development of self-regulation on the part of the students.*

I will also be looking for any additional constructs I have included in my original external codes list.

Questions for debriefing -

1. Tell me how you felt about the lesson.
2. Did it go as planned? Explain.
3. Explain what parts of that original plan worked during the actual lesson and why.
4. Tell me what didn't work and why?
5. *At this point I will encourage the teacher to discuss the times during the lesson when the constructs I have previously established (Constructs of Instructional Engagement) are present and discuss the presence of any constructs that haven't been noted that appear during the lesson. Each teacher's lesson will be different therefore the questions will be different.*

Appendix E: Constructs Table

Constructs/Combination of External & Internal Codes

Constructs	Teacher behaviors (What the teacher does.)
<p>Expectations (Strategies used to ensure the students always know what is expected of them both socially and academically.)</p>	<p>External Expectation Codes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicates expectations for student participation and learning consistently; • Provides precise, specific, easy to follow directions; • Discusses rationale for whatever they are asking students to do; • Begins lessons by explaining what the academic and social expectations are and consistently reminds students what those expectations are throughout the lesson; • Sets high expectations for student achievement; <p>Internal Expectations Codes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None <p>(e.g. Brophy, 1985, 1987; Brophy & Good, 1986; Dolezal et al, 2003; Evertson & Randolph, 1999; Krasch, & Carter, 2009; Pressley et al, 2003)</p>
<p>Monitoring/ Pacing (Strategies used to actively keep track of what the students are doing both socially and academically.)</p>	<p>External Monitoring and Pacing Codes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moves throughout the classroom monitoring student engagement, understanding and social interactions consistently; • Scanning the classroom routinely; • Monitors the pace of lesson keeping in mind the needs of all students; • Watches for signs of confusion; • Keeps all students in line-of-sight consistently; <p>Internal Monitoring and Pacing Codes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time Management - Provides adequate time for students to finish assignments while providing deadlines throughout the process. <p>(e.g. Dolezal et al, 2003; Evertson & Randolph, 1999; Gump, 1982; Hoadley, 2003; Wharton-McDonald et al, 1998)</p>
<p>Routines/ Procedures (Strategies used to develop consistent ways for students to do what they need to do on a daily basis without assistance and with total understanding of the process.)</p>	<p>External Routines and Procedures Codes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creates routines and procedures to help students both socially and academically during the lesson; Teaches, practices and reinforces routines and procedures that will assist with optimal learning for students; <p>Internal Routines and Procedures Codes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitions - Establishes routines and procedures to ensure smooth transitions within the lesson and between activities. <p>(e.g. Barr & Dreeben, 1983; Bohn, Roehrig & Pressley, 2004; Bernstein, 1990; Dolezal et al, 2003; Earle, 1996; Ensor <i>et al.</i>, 2002; Evertson, et al, 2000; Evertson & Randolph, 1999; Hyson, 2008; Yinger, 1979)</p>

**Cooperation/
Self-
Regulation**

(Strategies used to encourage students to work well together and to learn how to be in control of and responsible for their own social and academic behaviors.)

External Cooperation and Self-Regulation Codes:

- Emphasizes and encourages students to work together, help each other and to do so cooperatively and collaboratively;
- Provides ways for students to monitor their own learning, self-regulate one's self and make transitions independently;
- Encourages students to organize their own time whenever possible;
- Encourages students to follow through with activity tasks without being teacher prompting.
- Provides opportunities for students to make decisions about their own learning;
- Uses strategies that are about cooperation, not competition;
- Models enthusiasm for learning & excitement about content;

Internal Cooperation and Self-Regulation Codes:

- Creates a community of learners in classroom for students to develop a sense of belonging (i.e. community circle, community meeting, rug time, circle time);

(e.g. Dolezal et al, 2003; Emmer & Gerwels, 2002; Evertson, et al, 2000; Evertson & Randolph, 1999; Nicholls, 1989; Noddings, 2003; Pressley et al, 2003; Wentzel, 1997, 1999; Zimmerman, 1990; Zimmerman & Schunk, 2001)

Appendix F: Engagement Constructs Worksheets

Engagement Constructs Worksheet #1

- What the teacher does.

<p>Expectations (management & instructional)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clearly states 2. Precise, easy to follow 3. Discusses rationale for instruction, management procedures, etc. 	
<p>Monitoring/Pacing</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Checks for understanding 2. Assesses for instructional & social engagement 3. Scans classroom consistently 4. Monitors entire class even during one-on-one assistance 5. Constantly assesses pacing, adjusts as needed, mindful of ability levels 6. Moves around room monitoring progress & giving assistance 	
<p>Routines/Procedures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Devises/Establishes – Introduces new, teaches, practices 2. Previously introduced and taught, students understand and use easily 3. Smooth transitions 	
<p>Cooperation/Self-Regulation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Emphasizes/Encourages children to help each other and work together 2. Provides ways for students to monitor their learning & self-regulate own selves 3. Provides ways for student to make transitions independently 4. Creates environment of warmth, care and concern for students 5. Models enthusiasm for learning and excitement about lesson 	

Engagement Constructs Worksheet #2

- What the teacher does. Second set of additions from data. Third set of thoughts.

<p>Expectations (social & instructional) *Should I separate social and instructional? NO</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Clearly states; precise, easy to follow 5. Discusses rationale for instruction, management procedures, etc. 6. Expectations for transitions 	<p>*Expectations/routines/modeling inter-related.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. 3. *Move transitions. / Nothing added here.
<p>Monitoring/Pacing</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Checks for understanding 8. Assesses for instructional & social engagement 9. Scans classroom consistently 10. Monitors entire class even during one-on-one assistance 11. Constantly assesses pacing, adjusts as needed, mindful of ability levels 12. Moves around room monitoring progress & giving assistance 13. Time management - pacing 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. *Move Time Management to this construct – pacing issue with teachers.
<p>Routines/Procedures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Devises/Establishes – Introduces new, teaches, practices 5. Established -previously introduced, taught, students understand and use easily 6. Smooth transitions 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. 3. *Transitions.
<p>Cooperation/Self-Regulation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Emphasizes/Encourages children to help each other and work together 7. Provides ways for students to monitor their learning & self-regulate own selves 8. Provides ways for student to make transitions independently 9. Creates environment of warmth, care and concern for students 10. Community Circle or Meeting 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. *Community of Learners emphasis – better? Or sense of community?

Appendix G: Methodology – District & School Information Tables

Participant & District/Elementary School Information Sheet

	Grade Level	Yrs Ex	Age	Ethnicity	Degree	School SES/% Econ Disadv	District TAKS Ratings	Campus TAKS Ratings
Anthony	2	3	mid 20's	White	BS	49%	Brighten AA	Selleck AA
Alicia	2	2	mid 20's	White	BS	6%	Englewood AA	Starlight E
Laurie	1	3	mid 20's	White	BS	12%	Knoll AA	Harrison R
Diane	K	3	Early 30's	White	BS	6%	Englewood AA	Starlight E
Marisa	K	2	Mid 20's	Hispanic	BS, ESL	95%	Norton AA	Martinez AA

TAKS Ratings – Exemplary - E, Recognized - R, Academically Acceptable - AA, Academically Unacceptable – AU

District Info – Gold Performance Acknowledgements

	Brighten SD - Suburban	Englewood SD - Suburban	Knoll SD - Suburban	Norton SD - Urban
ADV				
APBID		++		
ATTD				
COMM READ		++	++	
COMM MATH				
COMM WRIT	++		++	
COMM SCIE				
COMM SSTD	++	++	++	
RHSP				
SAT ACT				
RSI ELA				
TSI MATH				

Elementary School Info – Gold Performance Acknowledgements

	ATTD	COMM READ	COMM MATH	COMM WRIT	COMM SCIE	CI READ	CI MATH
Selleck				++			
Starlight	++	++	++	++	++	++	
Harrison		++	++		++		
Martinez							

Appendix H: Research of Carolyn Evertson and Her Colleagues

- Evertson, C. M., & Weinstein, C. S. (Eds.). (2006). *The handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, & contemporary issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Evertson, C. M., & Weinstein, C. S., (2006). Classroom management as a field of inquiry. In C. Evertson & C. Weinstein (Eds.), *The handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, & contemporary issues*. (pp. 3-15). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Emmer, E. T., Evertson, C. M., & Worsham, M. E. (2006). *Classroom management for middle and high school teachers* (7th ed.), Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Evertson, C. M., Emmer, E. T., & Worsham, M. E. (2006). *Classroom management for elementary teachers* (7th ed.), Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Schussler, D. L., Whitlock, T. R., Poole, I. R., & Evertson, C. M. (in press). Layers and links: learning to juggle "One more thing" in the classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education*.
- Evertson, C. M. & Neal, K. W. (2005). Looking into learning-centered classrooms: Implications for classroom management. In B. Demarest (Ed.) *Benchmarks for excellence*, Washington, DC: NEA.
- Hough, B. W., Smithey, M. W., & Evertson, C. M. (2004). Using computer-mediated communication to create virtual communities of practice for intern teachers. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*.
- Smithey, M. W., & Evertson, C.M. (2003). System-wide mentoring for new teachers: A school system and university partnership. *Teacher Education and Practice*, 16(3), 212-231.
- Evertson, C. M., Emmer, E. T., & Worsham, M. E. (2003) *Classroom management for elementary teachers*, 6th ed. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Emmer, E. T., Evertson, C. M., & Worsham, M. E. (2003) *Classroom management for secondary teachers*, 6th ed. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Evertson, C. M. & Smithey, M. W. (2000). Mentoring effects on protégés' classroom practice: An experimental field study. *Journal of Educational Research*, 93(5), 294-304.
- Evertson, C. M., & Randolph, C. H. (1999). Perspectives on classroom management in learning-centered classrooms. In H. Waxman & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *New directions for teaching practice and research* (pp. 249-268), Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Evertson, C. M., & Harris, A. H. (1999). Support for managing learning centered classrooms: The Classroom Organization and Management Program. In H. J. Freiberg (Ed.), *Beyond behaviorism: Changing the classroom management paradigm* (pp. 57-73) Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Evertson, C. M., & Smithey, M. W. (1999). Supporting novice teachers: Negotiating successful mentoring relationships. In R. J. Stevens (Ed.), *Teaching in American schools* (pp. 17-40), Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Evertson, C. M. (1997). Classroom management. In H. J. Walberg & G. D. Haertel (Eds.), *Psychology and educational practice*, (pp. 251-272), Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Evertson, C. M. (1996). Who's in charge here?: Learning about classroom management. In G. Brannigan (Ed.), *The enlightened educator: Research for the classroom*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Randolph, C. H., & Evertson, C. M. (1995). Managing for learning: Rules, roles and meanings in a writing class. (1995). *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 30 (2), 17-25.

Smithey, M. W., & Evertson, C. M. (1995). Assessing the mentoring process: A multi-method approach. (1995). *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*. (Special issue: Peer coaching)

Evertson, C. M. (1995). Classroom management in the learning centered classroom. In A. Ornstein , (Ed.), *Teaching: Theory and practice*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Randolph, C. H., & Evertson, C. M. (1994). Images of management in a learner-centered classroom. *Action in Teacher Education*, 16(1), 55-65.

Evertson, C. M. (1994). Classroom rules and routines. In T. Husen & T. N. Postlethwaite (Eds.) *International encyclopedia of education: Research and studies* (2nd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 816-820). Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.

Evertson, C. M. (1994). Classroom rules and routines. *International Encyclopedia of Education*, (2nd ed.). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Clift, R. T., & Evertson, C. M. (Eds.). *Focal points: Qualitative inquiries in teaching and teacher education* (1992). Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse.

Evertson, C.M., & Murphy, J. F. (1992). Beginning with the classroom: Implications for redesigning schools. (1992). In H. Marshall, (Ed.), *Redefining student learning: Roots of educational change*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Evertson, C.M., & Harris, A.H. (1992). What we know about managing classrooms. *Educational Leadership*, 49(7), 74.

Evertson, C.M., & Randolph, C. H. (1992). Teaching practices and class size: A new look at an old issue. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 67(1), 85-105 (Special issue on Project STAR).

Evertson, C. M., & Harris, A. H. (1992). What we know about managing classrooms. *Educational Leadership*, 49(7), 74-78.

Evertson, C. M., & Randolph, C. H. (1992). Teaching practices and class size: A new look at an old issue, *Peabody Journal of Education*, 67(1), 85-105.

REFERENCES

References

- Adler, S. (1991). The reflective practitioner and the curriculum of teacher education. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 17*(2), 139-150.
- Ammon, P. & Hutcheson, B. P. (1989). Promoting the development of teacher's pedagogical conceptions. *Genetic Epistemologist, 17*(4), 23-29.
- Anderson, G. (1998). *Fundamentals of educational research*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Apple, M. W. (2001) Markets, standards, teaching and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(3), 182-196.
- Ball, D.L. & Fieman-Nemser, S. (1988). Using textbooks and teachers' guides: A dilemma for beginning teachers and teacher educators. *Curriculum Inquiry, 18*, 401-423.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-Efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191-215.
- Berliner, D. C. (1988). Implications of studies of expertise in pedagogy for teacher education and evaluation. In *New directions for teacher assessment. Proceedings of the 1988 Educational Testing Invitational Conference*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Berliner, D. C. (2001). Learning about and learning from expert teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research, 35*, 463-482.

- Blumenfeld, P. C., Puro, P. & Mergendoller, J. R. (1992). Translating motivation into thoughtfulness. In H. H. Marshall (Ed.). *Redefining student learning: Roots of educational change*. (pp. 207-239). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Boekaerts, M. (1999). Motivating learning: The study of student-situation transactional units. *European Journal of Psychology of Education* 14, 41-55.
- Borich, G., & Tombari, M. (1997). *Educational psychology: A contemporary approach*. (2nd Ed.). NY: Longman.
- Boudah, D. J., Deshler, D. D., Schumaker, J. B., Lenz, B. K. & Cook, B. (1997) Student-centered or content-centered? A case study of middle school teachers' lesson planning and instruction in inclusive classes, *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 20(3), 189–203.
- Boudah, D, Schumaker, J.B., & Deshler, D. D. (1997). Collaborative instruction: Is it an effective option for inclusion in secondary classrooms? *Learning Disabilities Quarterly*, 20(4), 293-316.
- Bowers, H., Eicher, K., & Sacks, A. (1983). Reducing stress in student teachers. *The Teacher Educator*, 19(2), 19-24.
- Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience and school*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Brophy, J. (2006). History of research on classroom management. In C. M. Evertson and C. S. Weinstein, (Eds.). *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice and contemporary issues*, (pp. 17-43). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.

- Brophy, J. (1987). Socializing students' motivation to learn. In M. L. Maehr & D. A. Kleiber (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement: Enhancing motivation*, (Vol. 5, pp. 181-210). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Brophy, J. (1985). Classroom management as instruction: Socializing self-guidance for students. *Theory into Practice*, 24(4), 233-240.
- Brown, D. S. (1988). Twelve middle school teachers' planning. *Elementary School Journal* 89, 69-87.
- Brown, D. S. (1993). Descriptions of two novice secondary teachers' planning. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 23(1), 63-84.
- Bruer, J. T. (1993). *Schools for thought: A science of learning in the classroom*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bullough, Jr., R. V. (1987). Planning and the first year of teaching. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 13(3), 231-250.
- Bullough, Jr., R. V. (1989). *First-year teacher: A case study*. NY: Teacher's College Press.
- Carter, K., Cushing, K., Sabers, D., Stein, P., & Berliner, D. C. (1988). Expert-novice differences in perceiving and processing visual information. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 39, 25-31.
- Chiodo, J. J. & Chang, L. (1999). First year teachers: Analysis of their concerns related to the research on professional development. *National Forum of Teacher Education Journal* 10(1), 31-40.

- Carter, K. & Doyle, W. (2006). Classroom management in early childhood and elementary classrooms. In C. M. Evertson and C. S. Weinstein, (Eds.). *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice and contemporary issues*. (pp. 373-406). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.
- Clark, C. (1983). Research on planning: An inventory of the knowledge base. In D. Smith (Ed.), *Essential knowledge for beginning educators*. (pp. 5-15). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.
- Clark, C. M., & Peterson, P. P. (1986). Teachers' thought processes. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*. (3rd Ed., pp. 255-296). New York: Macmillian.
- Clark, C. M. & Yinger, R. J. (1980). The hidden world of teaching: Implications for research on teacher planning. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, 1980).
- Cohen, D. K., McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. E. (Eds.) (1993). *Teaching for understanding*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Conway, P. F. (2001). Anticipatory reflection while learning to teach: From a temporally truncated to a temporally distributed model of reflection in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 89-106.
- Conway, P. F. & Clark, C. M. (2003). The journey inward and outward: A re-examination of Fuller's concerns-based model of teacher development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19, 465-482.

- Danforth Working Group on Professionalism in Education. (1995). *Practical professionalism: Support for student learning through professional development*. St. Louis, MO: Author.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1996). The quiet revolution: Rethinking teacher development. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 56, 4-10.
- Darling-Hammond, L. & Bransford, J. (Eds.) (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- DeCorte, E., Greer, B., & Verschaffel, L. (1996). Mathematics learning and teaching. In D. C. Berliner and R.C. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp.491-549). NY: Macmillan.
- Dewey, J. (1933/1993). *How we think: A re-statement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process*. Boston: Heath, & Co.
- Dewey, J. (1915/1956). *The child and the curriculum and the school and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Diaz, R. M., Neal, C. J., & Amaya-Williams, M. (1990). "The social origins of self-reflection." In *Vygotsky and Education*, (Eds.). L. C. Moll, 127-154. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dolezal, S.E. Welsh, L. M. Pressley, M., & Vincent, M. M. (2003) How nine third-grade teachers motivate student academic engagement. *The Elementary School Journal*, 103(3), 239-267.
- Eisner, E. W. (2002). The kinds of schools we need. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83(3), 576-583.

- Emmer, E. T., Evertson, C., & Anderson, L. M. (1980). Effective classroom management at the beginning of the school year. *The Elementary School Journal*, 80, 219-231.
- Emmer, E. T. & Gerwels, M. C. (2002). Cooperative learning in elementary classrooms: Teaching practices and lesson characteristics. *Elementary School Journal*, 103(1), 75-91.
- Emmer, E. T., Sanford, J. P., Clements, B. S., & Martin, J. (1983). Improving classroom management and organization in jr high schools: An experimental investigation (R&D Report No. 6050). Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED226452).
- Erickson, F. (1986). Tasks in times: Objects of study in a natural history of teaching. In K. K. Zumwalt (Ed.) *Improving teaching*. (pp. 121-148). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Evertson, C. M. (1982). Differences in instructional activities in higher- and lower-achieving junior high English and math classrooms. *The Elementary School Journal*, 82(4), 329-350.
- Evertson, C. M., Emmer, E. T., Sanford, J. P., & Clements, B. S. (1983). Improving classroom management: An experiment in elementary classrooms. *The Elementary School Journal*, 84, 173-188.
- Evertson, C. M., & Harris, A. H. (1992). What we know about managing classrooms. *Educational Leadership*, 49(7), 74-78.

- Evertson, C. M., & Neal, K. W. (2006). Looking into learning-centered classrooms: Implications for classroom management. (NEA Benchmarks for Best Practices Working Paper Series). Washington, DC: NEA Research Division.
- Evertson, C. M., & Randolph, C. H. (1999). Perspectives on classroom management in learner-centered classrooms. In H. Waxman & H. Walberg. *New Directions for Teaching: Practice and Research*. (pp. 249-268). California: McCutchan.
- Evertson, C. M. and Weinstein, C. S. (Eds.). (2006). Classroom management as a field of inquiry. In C. M. Evertson and C. S. Weinstein, (Eds.). *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice and contemporary issues*. (pp. 3-16). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.
- Evertson, C. M. & Weade, R. (1991). The social construction of classroom lessons. In H.C. Waxman and H. J. Walberg, (Eds.). *Effective Teaching: Current Research*. (pp. 135-160). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Featherstone, H. (1992). Learning from the first years of classroom teaching: The journey in, the journey out. *Teachers College Record*, 95(1), 93-112.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 103(6), 1013-1055.
- Flores, M. A., & Day, C. (2006). Contexts which shape and reshape new teachers' identities: A multi-perspective study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22, 219–232.

- Fuller, F. F., & Brown, O. H. (1975). Becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (Ed.) *Teacher education*. (74th Yearbook of the National Society of Education, pp. 25-52). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Garrahy, D. A., Cothran, D. J., & Kulinna, P. H. (2005). Voices from the trenches: An exploration of teachers' management knowledge. *Journal of Educational Research*, 99, 56-63.
- Gathergoal, P. (1998). Judicious discipline. In R. Butchart & B. McEwan (Eds.), *Classroom discipline in American schools: Problems and possibilities for democratic education*. p. 197-216. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Genishi, C., Ryan, S., Ochsner, M. and Yarnell, M. M. (2001). Teaching in early childhood education: Understanding practices through research and theory. In V. Richardson (Ed.). *Handbook of Research and Theory*. (pp. 1175-1210). New York: Macmillian.
- Gore, J. and Zeichner, K. (1991). Action research and reflective teaching in preservice teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 7, 119-136.
- Goyette, R., Dore, R., & Dion, E. (2000). Pupils misbehaviors and the reactions and causal attribution of physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 20, 3-14.
- Graue, M. E., & Walsh, D. J. (1998). *Studying children in context: Theories, methods and ethics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Griffin, G. (1986). Thinking about teaching. In K. K. Zumwalt (Ed.) *Improving teaching*. (pp. 101-114). Washington DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Gump, P. V. (1982). School settings and their keeping. In D. L. Duke (Ed.), *Helping teachers manage classrooms* (pp. 98-114). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Albany, NY: SUNY press.
- Hatton, N. & Smith, D. (1995). Reflection in teacher education: Towards definition and implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 11*, 23-32.
- Henley, M. (2006). *Classroom management: A proactive approach*. Columbus, Ohio: Pearson.
- Hickey, D. T. (2003). Engaged participation versus marginal nonparticipation: A stridently sociocultural approach to achievement motivation. *The Elementary School Journal, 103*(4), 401-429.
- Hickey, D. T., & Schafer, N. J. (2006). Design-based, participation-centered approaches to classroom management. In C. M. Evertson and C. S. Weinstein, (Eds.). *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice and contemporary issues*. (pp. 281-308). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.
- Hollingsworth, S. (1992). Learning to teach through collaborative conversation: A feminist approach. *American Educational Research Journal, 29*(2), pp. 373-404.

- Huberman, M. (Ed.). (1989). Research on teachers' professional lives. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 13(4), 343-466.
- Hughes, S. A. (2005). Some canaries left behind? Evaluating a state-endorsed lesson plan database and its social construction of who and what counts. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 9(2), pp. 105-138.
- Johnson, A. P. (2000). It's time for Madeline Hunter to go: a new look at lesson plan design. *Action in Teacher Education*, 22(1), 72-78.
- Kagan, D. M. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(2), 129-169.
- Kounin, J. S. (1970). *Discipline and group management in classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston,
- Krasch, D. & Carter, D.R. (2009). Monitoring classroom behavior in early childhood: Using group observation data to make decisions. *Early Childhood Education*, 36, 475-482.
- Landau, B. & Gathercoal, P. (2000). Creating peaceful classrooms: *Judicious discipline* and class meetings. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81(6), 450-454.
- Lane, K. L., Pierson, M., & Givner, C. C. (2003). Teacher expectations of student behavior: Which skills do elementary and secondary teachers deem necessary for success in the classroom? *Education and Treatment of Children*, 26, 413-430.
- Lambert, N. M. (1995). "Seating arrangements". In L. W. Anderson (Eds.). *International Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education*. (pp. 196-200). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Levin, B. B. (2003). *Case studies of teacher development: An in-depth look at how thinking about pedagogy develops over time*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Lidstone, M. & Ammon, P. (2002). A key to successful teaching is understanding an focusing on student learning. *Implications for Teacher Development: ERS Spectrum*, 27-37.
- Lidstone, M., & Hollingsworth, S. (1992). A longitudinal study of cognitive change in beginning teachers: Two patterns of learning to teach. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 19(3), 39-57.
- Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Liston, D., Whitcomb, J. and Borko, H. (2006). Too little or too much: Teacher preparation and the first years of teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57(4), 351-358.
- Marshall, H. H. (1992). *Redefining student learning: Roots of educational change*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Martin, S. D. (2004). Finding balance: Impact of classroom management conceptions on developing teacher practices. *Teacher and Teacher Education*, 20, 405-422.
- Martin, L. A. & Chiodo, J. L. (2001). First-year teachers: Looking back after three years. *Action in Teacher Education*, 23(1), 55-63.

- Marzano, R. J. (2007). *The art and science of teaching: A comprehensive framework for effective instruction*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J., & Marzano, J. S. (2003). The key to classroom management. *Educational Leadership, 6*, 6-13.
- McCann, T. M., & Johannessen, L. R. (2004). Why do new teachers cry? *The Clearing House, 77(4)*, 138-45.
- McCaskin, M., Bozack, A. R., Napoleon, L., Thomas, A., Vasquez, V., Wayman, V., & Zhang, J. (2006). Self-regulated learning and classroom management: Theory, research and considerations for classroom practice. In C. M. Evertson and C. S. Weinstein, (Eds.). *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice and contemporary issues*. (pp. 223-252). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.
- Meece, J. L. (2003). Applying learner-centered principles to middle school education. *Theory into Practice, 42(2)*, 109-116.
- Meister, D. G., & Jenks, C. (2000). Making the transition from preservice to inservice teaching: Beginning teachers' reflections. *Action in Teacher Education, 23(3)*, 1-11.
- Meister, D. G., & Melnick, S. A. (2003). National new teacher study: Beginning teachers' concerns. *Action in Teacher Education, 24(4)*, 87-94.
- Mergendoller, J. R., Markham, T., Ravitz, J., & Larmer, J. (2006). Pervasive management of project-based learning: Teachers as guides and facilitators. In C. M. Evertson and C. S. Weinstein, (Eds.). *Handbook of classroom management:*

- Research, practice and contemporary issues.* (pp. 583-615). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.
- Mertens, D. M. (1998). *Research methods in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative & qualitative approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *An expanded sourcebook: Qualitative data analysis.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Mok, Y. F. (2005). Teacher concerns and teacher life stages. *Research in Education, 73,* 53-73.
- . O'Day, J. A. (2002). Complexity, accountability and school improvement. *Harvard Educational Review, 72,* (3), 293-329.
- Popham, W. J. & Baker, E. L. (1970). *Systematic instruction.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Randolph, C. H., & Evertson, C. M. (1994). Images of management for learner-centered classrooms. *Action in Teacher Education, 16,* 55-63.
- Raphael, L. M., Pressley, M., & Mohen, L. (2008). Engaging instruction in middle school classrooms: An observational study of nine teachers. *The Elementary School Journal, 109(1),* 61-81.
- Rink, J. E. (2002). *Teaching physical education for learning.* Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Romano, M., & Gibson, P. (2006). Beginning teacher successes and struggles: An elementary teacher's reflections on the first year of teaching. *The Professional Educator, 28(1),* 1-16.

- Roskos, K. & Neuman, S. B. (1995). Two beginning kindergarten teachers' planning for integrated literacy instruction. *The Elementary School Journal*, 96(2), 195-215.
- Rust, F. O. (1994). The first year of teaching: It's not what they expected. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 10(2), 205-217.
- Schoenfeld, A. H. (1998). Toward a theory of teaching-in-context. *Issues in Education*, 4(1), 1-94
- Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schon, D. A. (1987). *Education the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Seidman, I. (1998). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and social sciences*. (2nd Ed.) New York: Teachers College Press.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57, 1-22.
- Simons, H. (2009). *Case study research in practices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Smith, M. A. (1996). The national writing project after 22 years. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 77(10), 688-693.
- Sprick, R., Garrison, M., & Howard, L. M. (1998). *CHAMPS: A proactive and positive approach to classroom management*. Eugene, OR: Pacific Northwest Publishing, Inc.

- Sprinthill, N. A., Reiman, A. J. & Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1996). Teacher development. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed.). New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Stough, L. (2006). The place of classroom management and standards in teacher education. In C. M. Evertson and C. S. Weinstein, (Eds.). *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice and contemporary issues*. (pp. 909-924). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Taba, H. (1962). *Curriculum developmental theory and practice*. New York, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Tauber, R. (1999). *Classroom management: Sound theory ad effective practice*. (3rd ed.). Westport, EN: Bergin & Garvey.
- Turley, S. (2002). A longitudinal study of new teacher concerns: Induction in a district consortium. Paper presented at *the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association*, New Orleans. Available E-mail: <hsturley@csulb.edu>.
- Tomey, R. (1978). What can we recommend to teachers about instructional planning? *The South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 6,215-219.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68, 202–248.

- Turley, S., Powers, K., & Nakai, K. (2006). Beginning teachers' confidence before and after induction. *Action in Teacher Education*, 28, 27-39.
- Van Manen, Max. (1995). On the epistemology of reflective practice. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 1, 33-50
- Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 54(2), 143-178.
- Watxon, M. & Battistich, V. (2006). Building and Sustaining Caring Communities. In C. M. Evertson and C. S. Weinstein, (Eds.). *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice and contemporary issues*. (pp. 253-280).Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.
- Watzke, J. L. (2003). Longitudinal study of stages of beginning teacher development in a field-based teacher education program. *The Teacher Educator*, 38(8), 209-229.
- Watzke, J.L. (2007). Longitudinal research on beginning teacher development: Complexity as a challenge to concerns-based stage theory. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23, 106-122.
- Weade, R. (1987). Curriculum 'n' instruction: The construction of meaning. *Theory into Practice*, 26, 15-25.
- Weade, R., & Evertson, C. (1988). The construction of lessons in effective and less effective classrooms. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 4(3), 189-213.
- Weinstein, C. (1988). Preservice teacher's expectations about the first year of teaching. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 4(1), 31-40.

- Weinstein, C. (1998). "I want to be nice, but I have to be mean": Exploring prospective teachers' conceptions of caring and order. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 14(2), 153-163.
- Weinstein, C. and Mignano, A. W. (1997). *Elementary classroom management: Lessons from research and practice*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Wenger, E. (1999). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Wiseman, D. G. and Hunt, G. H. (2001). *Best practice in motivation and management in the classroom*. Springfield, Ill: Charles C Thomas, Publisher, LTD.
- Wolcott, H.F. (2001). *Writing up qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Woods, P. and Jeffrey, B. (1998). Choosing positions: Living the contradictions of OFSTED. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 19, 547-570.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. (2nd Ed.). London: Sage.
- Yinger, R. (1986). Examining thought in action: A theoretical and methodological critique of research on interactive teaching. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 2(3), 263-282.
- Yinger, R. (1980). A study of teacher planning. *The Elementary School Journal*, 80(3), 107-127.
- Yinger, R. (1979). Routines in teacher planning. *Theory Into Practice*, 18(3), 163-169.

Yinger, R. (1978). A study of teacher planning: Description and a model of preactive decision making. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting, *American Educational Research Association* (Toronto, Canada, March 27-31, 1978).

Yinger, R. (1977). A study of teacher planning: Description and theory development using ethnographic and information processing methods. (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1977). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, AAT 7810138.

Zumwalt, K. K. (1986). Working together to improve teaching. In K. K. Zumwalt (Ed.) *Improving teaching* (pp.169-185). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.