

10-2015

The Demonstration of Effective Pedagogy to Secondary Education Candidates in an Early Field Experience

Kelly Welsh

University of Nebraska at Omaha, kwelsh@unomaha.edu

Connie L. Schaffer Dr

University of Nebraska at Omaha, cschaffer@unomaha.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/tedfacpub>

 Part of the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Welsh, Kelly and Schaffer, Connie L. Dr, "The Demonstration of Effective Pedagogy to Secondary Education Candidates in an Early Field Experience" (2015). *Teacher Education Faculty Publications*. 84.

<http://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/tedfacpub/84>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Teacher Education at DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Teacher Education Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.



The Demonstration of Effective Pedagogy to Secondary Education Candidates in an Early Field Experience

Kelly A. Welsh
Connie Schaffer

Abstract: This research examined an early field experience model supported by instructional coaching that was implemented within an undergraduate educator preparation program for secondary language arts and social sciences candidates. A mixed methods design examined candidates' stages of concern based on the Fuller (1969) stages of concern theory in relationship to Marzano's (2003) teacher-level factors of effective schools. While teacher candidates were able to demonstrate each component of effective classroom pedagogy, their level of success varied. At the beginning of the experience, self-concerns were high and characterized by candidates' identities as students and ego-driven considerations. As the experience progressed, candidates focused more on task concerns and the compliant engagement of students. Evidence of impact concerns was limited. Sustained time and university faculty supervision were key elements in a successful early field experience.

About the authors: Dr. Kelly Welsh is an assistant professor at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. She is the coordinator of the secondary English/Language Arts program. Dr. Connie Schaffer is an associate professor at University of Nebraska at Omaha. She is the coordinator of the secondary social sciences program.

Key Words: preservice teachers, early field experiences, effective teacher pedagogy

Introduction

The extent and quality of teacher education matter more than ever. Demands on teachers are growing as student populations become more diverse and standards are increasing. Effective educator programs must develop pedagogical skills and a teacher's ability to analyze teaching in order to maximize student learning (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Hiebert, Morris, Berk, & Jansen, 2007).

Despite the fact that field experiences are consistently embedded in educator preparation programs, numerous professional education organizations have called for these experiences to be transformed and become the centerpiece of the broader reforms being demanded of educator preparation. The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, NCATE, (now known as the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation) along with the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ), American Federation of Teachers (AFT), Council of Chief State School Officers, (CCSSO), and National Education Association (NEA) have criticized existing field experience models and called for programs to develop new approaches to improve this component of their programs (AFT, 2012; CCSSO, 2012; NCATE, 2010; NCTQ, 2011; & NEA, 2011).

The calls for change are asking for sweeping (NCATE, 2010) and wrenching (Darling-Hammond, 2005) changes. Rather than simply reacting to these demands, education preparation programs must conduct scholarly inquiry related to field experiences. This requires review of the purposes, delivery, and supervision that underlie field experiences as well as research investigations regarding possible models for enhancing field experiences.

Literature Review

Purposes of Early Field Experiences

Field experiences are an important means to advance a candidate's preparation

from what might be an apprenticeship of observation based on the personal experiences they had as a K-12 student (Lortie, 1975) to preparation based on professional pedagogy and opportunities they had in systematically structured field experiences. Early field experiences refer to educator preparation program or course expectations, which (a) require teacher candidates to apply their knowledge and skills within a K-12 classroom; (b) occur before student teaching. The purpose of early field experiences is to offer opportunities, guided by an educator preparation program, in which candidates have real-world learning experiences, apply what they have learned in their programs of study, and develop the effective teaching skills most likely to impact K-12 student learning (AFT, 2012; Darling-Hammond, 2005; CCSSO, 2012; NCTQ, 2011; NEA, 2011; Singer, Catapano, & Huisman, 2010; & Zeichner, 2010). In addition, early field experiences force candidates to come "face to face with their entering beliefs and assumptions" (Banks et al., 2005, p. 266) about schools, teachers, and their future students.

Field experiences often involve reflection as candidates go through a process of framing and reframing their past experiences as students as well as their new teaching pedagogy knowledge in the context of teaching opportunities in the K-12 schools (Darling-Hammond, 2005; Scherff & Sizer, 2012). In the process, candidates began to connect the theoretical and pedagogical concepts introduced in educator preparation programs to the practices found in K-12 schools (Scherff & Sizer, 2012). Effective educator preparation programs require candidates to continually and systematically analyze their teaching during field experiences (Hiebert, Morris, Berk, & Jansen, 2007). This analysis has its greatest impact on candidates when it focuses on "whether students achieve clear learning goals" and specifies, "how and why instruction did or did not affect this achievement" (Hiebert, Morris, Berk, & Jansen, 2007, p. 48).

Delivery

Connections between theory and practice are optimized when field experiences are delivered in conjunction with coursework (Darling-Hammond, Hammerness, Grossman, Rust, & Shulman, 2005). Co-delivery of pedagogical courses and early field experiences enhances candidates' understanding and application of important teaching concepts (Darling-Hammond, 2005; Zeichner 2010).

Sequencing and intentional scaffolding of early field experiences are also important. In many programs, candidates' early field experiences are limited and offer little preparation for the high-profile, high-stakes clinical teaching experience that marks completion of educator preparation programs. This approach has been challenged by Linda Darling-Hammond (2005), who completed a comprehensive review of field experiences and contends that intensive and extensive early field experiences should be sequenced throughout the entirety of a preparation program, which "allows candidates to gradually assume more independent responsibility for teaching" (Darling-Hammond, 2010, p. 40).

Comprehensive field experiences as outlined by Darling-Hammond necessitate resources not only from educator preparation programs but also from K-12 schools. Because of this, programs need to engage in meaningful partnerships with their K-12 colleagues. Within these partnerships candidates have opportunities to improve their skills and get meaningful feedback (Dean, Lauer, & Urquhart, 2005; Darling-Hammond, 2005; Sykes & Dibner, 2009). However, if field experience partnerships are going to be central to the transformation of educator preparation, the all-too-common "binaries such as practitioner and academic knowledge and theory and practice" must be rejected (Zeichner, 2010, p. 92). Using the concept of third space, Zeichner calls for partnerships which "involve the integration of what are often seen as competing discourses in new ways—an either/or perspective is

transformed into a both/also point of view" (2010, p. 92). In essence, educator preparation programs must find ways in which field experiences fuse two previously distinct spaces into one transformed learning environment.

Supervision

In order to create a third space as well as to ensure candidates are placed in classrooms in which effective teaching is modeled, educator preparation programs need to have a physical presence within K-12 schools (Darling-Hammond et al., 2005; Feldman & Kent, 2006; Zeichner, 2010). They must also carefully consider the support, guidance, and supervision received by candidates during their early field experiences and not solely depend on K-12 educators to provide this supervision and guidance (Scherff & Sizer, 2011). Several studies suggests the level of comfort and sense of preparedness of candidates are positively impacted when faculty from educator preparation programs not only teach but also supervise candidates during field experiences (Author, 2012; Feldman & Kent, 2006; Wyss et al., 2012).

However, supervision of early field experience can be a struggle for many educator preparation programs. Even in the capstone field experience, clinical teaching, the supervision of candidates is often assigned to graduate assistants and adjunct faculty rather than full-time, tenured or tenured-track faculty (AFT, 2012, CCSSO, 2012, NCATE, 2008, Zeichner, 2010). The part-time status may limit the coherency and integration between a program's coursework and field experiences that are the signatures of effective educator preparation programs (Darling-Hammond, 2005, Zeichner, 2010).

According to Beck and Kosnick (2002) as well as others, three deeply engrained and often institutionalized reasons offer an explanation regarding the lack of supervision by educator preparation faculty (AFT, 2012; CCSSO, 2012; NCATE, 2008; Zeichner, 2010).

First, supervision requires an overwhelming time commitment and may be perceived as a distraction from faculty research and teaching responsibilities. Second, the faculty members may underestimate the potential impact of supervision. Third, administrative structures within the university may undervalue the supervision and provide few reward structures for supervision (Beck & Kosnick, 2002).

Theoretical Framework

The research presented here was framed by Frances Fuller's (1969) stages of concern and Robert Marzano's (2003) teacher-level factors as elements of effective schools. The theories, based on Fuller's research with student teachers and Marzano's meta-analysis of research within K-12 schools, guided the examination of an early field experience.

While Fuller's research was completed 45 years ago and limited by the small number of participant, it has been supported, in general, in more recent literature (Cooper & He, 2012; Conway & Clark, 2003; Pigge & Marso, 1997; Reeves & Kazelskis, 1985; Young, 2012) and remains a widely-recognized conceptualization of the development of teacher candidates. In Fuller's developmental theory, teacher candidates pass through three stages of concerns while student teaching. At each of these stages, the areas of primary concern for the candidates differ. At the initial pre-teaching phase, their concerns are "amorphous or vague" (Fuller, 196, p.219). In the second early-teaching phase, their concerns are focused primarily on two areas: (a) themselves (self-concerns); (b) teaching tasks and student behavior (task concerns). Self-concerns include candidates' concerns about being liked and establishing positive relationships with their mentor teachers, their students, and others. Task concerns include candidates' sense of preparedness in terms teaching tasks related to instructional skills, classroom management, and curriculum and content knowledge.

In the final late-teaching phase, candidates focus on how their teaching affects student learning (impact concerns). Candidates characterize late-teaching impact concerns by focusing on how their teaching influences students' learning. Hiebert, Morris, Berk, and Jansen (2007) identified the focus on student learning as a central construct in preparing teacher candidates to learn from their own teaching.

Marzano's theory outlines school, teacher, and student factors that affect academic achievement. Teacher factors are those elements that are "primarily a function of the decisions made by individual teachers" (Marzano, 2003, p. 71) and include three interdependent characteristics of effective teaching: (a) instructional strategies; (b) classroom management; (c) curriculum design. Based on his extensive analysis of existing research studies, Marzano viewed effective teaching as the result of the complex interactions of these three elements.

Marzano identified nine instructional strategies used by effective teachers. These include identifying similarities and differences; summarizing and note taking; reinforcing effort and providing recognition; assigning homework and/or practice; using nonlinguistic presentations; implementing cooperative learning, setting objectives and providing feedback; generating and testing hypotheses; and questioning, cueing, and providing advanced organizers.

Marzano's (2003) analysis of research uncovered a variety of definitions and lists of teacher behaviors related to classroom management. He consolidated these and identified classroom management as the "confluence of teacher actions in four distinct areas: (1) establishing and enforcing rules and procedures, (2) carrying out disciplinary actions, (3) maintaining effective teacher and student relationship, and (4) maintaining an appropriate mental set for management" (p. 88-89).

Curriculum design according to Marzano (2003) included five distinct components. Curriculum design is the ability a teacher has to (a) identify and articulate content; (b) provide multiple exposures to content; (c) identify skills and procedures students need to master; (d) structure content in a manner that students can discern a level of sameness between tasks; (e) engage students with the content in unique and complex ways.

This study coupled Fuller's (1969) early-teaching and late-teaching phases with each of Marzano's (2003) three teacher-level factors. Specifically, the study investigated the types of concern (self, task, or impact) evidenced by secondary language arts and social science teacher education candidates within each of Marzano's components of effective instruction (instructional strategies, classroom management, and curriculum design) during a five-week, 50 hour field experience.

Research Questions

Several elements including the variation of delivery approaches, entrenched barriers to faculty supervision, and the pressure to re-invent early field experiences, combine to provide a strong impetus to investigate the impact of these experiences at the pre-service preparation level. Specifically, this research attempted to answer the following questions:

1. During an early field experience, how are secondary teacher education candidates evidencing Marzano's three components of effective classroom pedagogy?
2. During an early field experience, how are secondary teacher education candidates evidencing Fuller's three stages of concern?

Methodology

Participants

Study participants included pre-service teacher candidates seeking their initial teacher certification at the undergraduate level who had

been admitted into an educator preparation program in a large, public university in the Midwest. There were 29 participants, 17 female and 12 male candidates. Participants were seeking teaching certification in secondary language arts (21) or secondary social sciences (12) and were completing a content methods class in language arts or social sciences and its corresponding 50-hour early field experience. Four participants were seeking certification in both content areas and, as a result, were enrolled in both courses with a shared field experience.

In this study, the term "secondary education candidates" refers to pre-service teacher candidates pursuing middle school (grades 4-9) and high school (grades 7-12) teacher certification at the initial, undergraduate level. Participants included secondary education candidates seeking their teaching certificates in language arts (English, writing, literature, mass media, journalism, speech communication, and/or English) and social sciences (political science, psychology, sociology, economics, and geography, and/or history).

Two tenure-tracked teacher educators were the faculty instructors for the methods courses. All participants were enrolled in at least one of the courses. Both courses followed a similar design and had common assignments and assessments. As part of their educator preparation program, participating teacher candidates had completed approximately 50 hours of field experiences in prior education courses.

Procedures

Participants attended the methods class for six weeks (approximately 18 hours of scheduled classroom instruction) and were the released from class to complete a five-week field experience. In the field experience, candidates reported to a specifically assigned public middle or high school from 7:30–9:30 a.m., Monday through Friday, for a period of five consecutive weeks. Candidates were

matched with middle or high school mentor teachers (classroom teachers in their content area) and were required to deliver a minimum of four whole-class lessons. With guidance from the mentor teachers, candidates designed and delivered lessons based on the existing secondary language arts or social sciences curriculums. These lessons provided the experiences needed for candidates to complete several course assignments including four reflections.

During the field experience, candidates received direct supervision and instructional coaching from non-tenured track personnel whose sole responsibility was to provide support to candidates during early field experiences. The instructional coaches were full-time employees of the educator preparation program. They had no employment affiliation with the schools in which the teacher candidates completed the field experiences. Each instructional coach held a master's degree in an education related field, had recent secondary school teaching experience, and had received two days of professional instructional coaching training based on the model developed by the Jim Knight and the Kansas Coaching Project (Knight, 2007).

During the field experience, one coach was assigned to the language arts candidates while the other was assigned to the social science candidates. The coaches provided face-to-face coaching within the middle and high school buildings. Although the coaches worked closely with the faculty instructors of the corresponding content methods courses and provided the instructors summary notes of what they observed as coaches, the coaches did not teach the courses or grade any required course components. Full-time, tenured-track educator preparation faculty members taught and graded the content methods course associated with the field experience. The field experience represented 30% of the overall course grade. The faculty instructors based their evaluation of the field experiences and the grading of the

experience on the coaching notes and feedback provided by the instructional coaches as well as the field experience evaluations completed by the candidates as well as the mentor teachers. They also watched candidates teach, either in person or via video recordings. At the conclusion of the five-week field experience, candidates returned to their previous class schedule for the remaining five weeks of the semester (approximately 15 hours of scheduled classroom instruction).

Data Collection and Analysis

Data were gathered from a variety of sources, which provided the opportunity to triangulate findings. The first source of data included the electronic submission of selected items from the field experience evaluations, completed at the conclusion of the 50-hour field experience. The mentor teachers, the candidates, and faculty instructors who taught the course associated with the field experience completed the evaluations. For consistency purposes, only the evaluations completed by the faculty instructors were included for analysis. Candidates who were enrolled in both courses had evaluations completed by both instructors. The total number of instructor evaluations was 33: seventeen evaluations for the language arts only candidates, eight evaluations for the social studies only, eight (two each) for the four candidates in both language arts and social studies.

The field experience evaluation form followed the standardized performance levels used in all the educator preparation program's key assessments and included a total of 36 items. For purposes of this research, only those items related to Marzano's teacher-level factors were examined. The evaluation had four levels of performance. Candidates were considered proficient if they demonstrated competence in the knowledge, skill, or disposition, providing evidence of the sustained adeptness in integrating it routinely and intentionally as expected of a highly qualified teacher.

Candidates were considered developing if they demonstrated growth in the knowledge, skill, or disposition, providing evidence that the candidate was approaching the level of competence expected of a highly qualified teacher. Candidates were considered beginning if they provided evidence of an awareness of the knowledge, skill, or disposition and/or has demonstrated initial attempts to become skilled in this area; however, the candidate has not yet demonstrated a level of competence expected of a highly qualified teacher. The candidates' performances were rated as not demonstrated if they had not shown evidence of the knowledge, skill, or disposition.

Descriptive statistics summarize the findings from the field experience evaluation for each of 22 selected items as rated by the faculty instructors. Of the evaluation items chosen for analysis, ten reflected Marzano's teacher-level factor of instructional strategies; eight reflected the teacher-level factor of classroom management; four reflected the teacher-level factor of curriculum design.

The second source of data included four assignments associated with the corresponding methods course. The assignments consisted of a two to three page narrative in which the candidates reflected on a lesson they had taught. The reflections required candidates to address each of Marzano's elements of effective teaching pedagogy. The reflections related to each element in each of the four lessons were categorized as representative of one of Fuller's three stages of concern. The four assignments were submitted electronically and collected throughout the practicum. Qualitative analysis identified common themes emerging from the reflections and faculty observations notes. Themes within each of the Fuller's concerns (impact, task, and self) as related to Marzano's teacher-level factors of effective schools were examined using the constant comparative method (Strauss, 1990). This method, widely used in naturalistic studies, required constant comparing of previously coded data to newly

acquired data. Data analysis began with the very first set of emerging categories (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996) and continued as the initial categories were refined into consolidated themes. The stages (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994) of category coding, refinement of categories, exploration of the relationships across categories, and the understandings of the integrated data helped to identify the meanings from within the data sources.

Table 1

All (29)	Instructional Strategies				Classroom Management				Curriculum Design			
	#1	#2	#3	#4	#1	#2	#3	#4	#1	#2	#3	#4
Self-Concerns	75.86	31.03	24.14	55.17	79.31	41.38	51.72	51.72	75.86	44.83	44.83	51.72
Task Concerns	17.24	62.07	48.28	27.59	17.24	44.83	41.38	41.38	24.14	37.93	41.38	31.03
Impact Concerns	6.90	6.90	27.59	17.24	3.45	13.79	6.90	6.90	0.00	17.24	13.79	17.24

Findings

The first theme that emerged from the analysis of the lesson reflections was the focus on student identity. Candidates focused on their own survival in the classroom by being task-oriented in their teaching. Within this theme, two sub-themes emerged: conceptual recall and ego-driven considerations. The candidates who demonstrated conceptual recall referenced Marzano’s instructional strategies used but with little to no reflection or processing. “Ashley”¹ said she “used questions and cues, setting objectives and providing feedback, and homework and practice.” There was no mention of how she used these strategies or the impact on student learning. “Amber” used cooperative learning when the “focus of the teaching [shifted] from lecture to interaction.” “Dylan’s” list of strategies included “cues and questioning” that “included presenting new content with direct links to what they have previously studied,” “summarizing and note taking because [he]asked students to generate verbal summaries from the text,” and “nonlinguistic representations by asking students to draw pictures representing content.” These examples show that the candidates simply listed the strategies used instead of processing of the impact these strategies had on student learning. It seemed they were merely trying to complete the assignment rather than reflect on their teaching.

The teacher candidates who demonstrated ego-driven considerations were concerned with their self-confidence. “Alexis” was not fully confident with her content knowledge and worried she would be asked a question she could not answer. “Amanda” believed that the “students were still having a hard time trusting” her, which “made it hard at times to have total control of the classroom.” Not knowing names had “Cody” worried that he would not appear to be confident to his students. The ego-driven candidates did not discuss students or their learning in their reflections—only concerns about self and their own survival.

The second theme to emerge was the focus on compliant engagement. This theme had multiple facets. As the teacher candidates gained more experience, they had an increasing awareness of the students’ needs in their classroom and became more student-centered with their lessons. In the area of classroom management, Marzano explains that an effective teacher/student relationship is the “keystone that allows other aspects to work well” (2003, p. 91). The successful candidates gained understanding of the impact the teacher has on a lesson. “Jacob” realized his students needed to be more engaged in their reading assignments so he decided to implement a graphic organizer for the student to complete as they read. “Justin” discovered that “changing certain words within the questions could open [his] students up to a

¹ This is a pseudonym. All names have been changed to protect identities.

whole host of different answers.” Others found that slowing down when giving directions and practicing “wait time” for students to respond to questions cleared up the confusion that arose later in the lesson. Candidates worked to put the learning in the hands of their students, although some still struggled with being consistent with this.

Teacher candidates implemented learning strategies to better engage their students. “Think-Pair-Share” was a common strategy used in the lessons. “Katie” liked that the strategy “helped the students to be more reflective about their characters before writing down details.” “Sarah” reported that her “students better understood the material when they were allowed to discuss it with partners. When the class shared their organizers, I noticed they were more confident in their answers.” Graphic organizers allowed the teacher candidates to help their students focus on the material. “Abby” used a graphic organizer to help her students take notes that would be used later for test review. “Chelsea” realized that “by tailoring the lesson more towards what [she] wanted the students to do,” they accomplished more and do so faster than she anticipated.

A common challenge for the candidates was to be consistent with the implementation of instructional strategies. Jacob felt he should have created and graphic organizer from the start of the unit to help his students engage with their reading. Although she knew about it, Katie had never actually used a “think-pair-share” strategy in a lesson until now. David realized that he needed to move away from lecturing and toward “student centered [sic] teaching. I fell back on my comfort, which is doing lecture. I need to make it all about the students.” For the most part, the candidates had compliant students but not necessarily engaged students. Katie said her students were the most engaged she had ever seen because the class was compliant and “it did not take much time to get back to the task at hand.” Chelsea wanted a lesson “that made sure the students stayed on

task during group work.” “Nathan” estimated that ninety percent of his students were on task during the lesson. None of these candidates addressed the issue of either the non-engaged students or the learning that took place.

The third theme, a focus on an emergent teacher identity, came from the candidates who, by the end of the practicum experience, were thinking and behaving as classroom teacher—not a college student practicing to be a teacher. These candidates demonstrated a convergence of content knowledge with instructional strategies that fit within the curriculum design for the course. They gave specific evidence of student learning. By working first in small groups, “John’s” students were “able to think, brainstorm, and bounce ideas off each other,” which helped them be better prepared for the whole class discussion. The candidates incorporated multiple instructional strategies into their lessons to provide the students with multiple opportunities to learn the material. “Kevin” used direct instruction in the form of a lecture with notetaking on the first day and then used a Gallery Walk the next day, using “the same material, but in a more complex manner.” He ended with the students restructuring the information into a timeline so they could see the information chronologically. *Poll Everywhere* and *Plickers* allowed Nathan to know that 85% of his students met the lesson objective. This technology also let him know if everyone was participating in the lesson.

The candidates began to purposefully and intentionally choose instructional strategies that best fit with the content they were teaching. Alexis described how she chose a jigsaw because “there are many themes included in [the] book that it would be boring and take a significant amount of time if I just stood in the front and lectured to the class. Jigsaw allowed student to interact with the text and each other.” She knew student learning happened from the small group conversations she observed and the handouts students completed.

Across the four lesson reflections, six teacher candidates maintained their student identity and demonstrated no growth toward compliant engagement or emergent teacher identity. The reflections sounded the same regardless of the candidate and when the lesson was taught.

Amanda was concerned with the students' trust in her. Her self-confidence increased when she gained the students' trust. Their compliance with her directions was a matter of trusting her. Getting their attention when they were too loud was also a matter of trusting her. Amanda never discussed the impact of this trust on student learning or how it impacted her teaching.

Cody, Dylan, Devin, and Sean wrote lists of strategies they used in their lessons without any awareness of their students. All four seemed to be concerned with completing the assignment instead of analyzing the lesson's effectiveness. They could not get beyond their own survival and seemed to ignore the students and their learning.

Specifically, Tyler contradicted himself when describing his lessons. His instructional strategies "were slightly rickety" and he was "slightly disorganized and unclear" when he ignored a list of important points to cover; however, he still "engaged the students in a complex task that forced them to learn the content." Tyler did not give evidence of student learning in this lesson. Tyler deflected any weaknesses within a lesson onto his mentor teacher. When he struggled with engaging the students in a discussion, it was because the "environment [Tyler] stepped into is tense, and the students are compliant but hardly ever participate in discussion." Tyler decided the students felt "frustrated, bored, and not very highly respected" based on his observations. The problems were not his so he did not have to work to overcome them.

The quantitative analysis of the reflections are summarized in Table 1 and reveal that over 75% of the teacher candidates

evidenced self-concerns in all three Marzano's components of effective classroom pedagogy in the first lesson reflection. This supports the identification of the qualitative theme of student identity. However, the percentage of reflections representing self-concerns decreased as the teacher candidates gained more experience with planning and teach. There was a decrease in the percentage of self-concerns and an increase in the percentage of task concerns in the reflections related to the third and fourth lessons. Interestingly, the quantity of self-concerns increased from the third to fourth reflection in instructional strategies and curriculum design.

Task concerns were most evident in the second and third reflections, particular in the element of instructional strategies. This supports the qualitative theme of compliant engagement. The emerging teacher identity was the theme least represented in the analysis of the reflections as slightly more than one fourth of the candidates included evidence of impact concerns when reflecting on instructional strategies.

Evaluations

Percentages for the items from the field experience final evaluation form as rated faculty instructors are presented in Tables 2. A majority of the candidates were evaluated as either proficient or developing on the items representing instructional strategies. Many of the instructional strategy items relate to tasks concerns in that they reference instructional skills. However, instructional strategies items seven, nine, and ten referenced the candidates' impact on student learning. Candidates were evaluated lower on item nine, but items seven and ten follow similar patterns as those found in the other items.

More than 90% of all candidates were evaluated as proficient or developing on each of the classroom management items. All of the items represented various task concerns related to classroom management with the exception of

item six. Item six references the relationship candidates have with students, which is indicative of self-concerns.

As in the other two areas, faculty instructors rated the performance of candidates as either proficient or developing in the items related to curriculum design. All four items represent task concerns related to curriculum

and content knowledge. Item two evaluated candidates' ability to demonstrate knowledge of standards – the measures of what students are to learn. Of all the items in this and the other two elements of effective pedagogy, the fewest candidates (slightly over 12 %) were evaluated as proficient.

Table 2: Field Experience Evaluation Results – Instructional Strategies

	Proficient	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated
The candidate:				
1. uses non-verbal communication effectively to reinforce verbal and/or written communication.	72.73	24.24	3.03	-
2. demonstrates ability to effectively use technology to support instruction and assessment; understands ethical uses of technology.	84.85	12.12	3.03	-
3. plans well ahead of implementation; instruction reflects sufficient review and thorough thinking.	81.82	12.12	3.03	3.03
4. makes learning objectives clear.	75.76	15.15	6.06	3.03
5. plans and implements a variety of engaging learning activities.	66.67	27.27	3.03	3.03
6. plans and implements activities promoting student thinking at a variety of cognitive levels.	57.58	33.33	6.06	3.03
7. implements instruction that results in student learning.	72.73	18.18	9.09	-
8. differentiates instruction to meet individual learning styles/needs.	72.73	21.21	6.06	-
9. effectively uses on-going/formative assessment to monitor student progress related to learning objectives; makes adjustments to instruction as needed.	24.24	69.70	6.06	6.06
10. uses reflection to help determine when student learning has occurred as a result of instruction and when adjustments to instruction are needed.	84.85	9.09	6.06	-

Table 3: Field Experience Evaluation Results – Classroom Management

	Proficient	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated
The candidate:				
1. clearly communicates expectations and directions to students.	66.67	27.27	6.06	-
2. consistently enforces expectations with students	69.70	24.24	6.06	-
3. promotes the development of self-regulation in students.	69.70	24.24	6.06	-
4. effectively manages transitions within and between lessons.	78.79	18.18	3.03	-
5. effectively uses a wide repertoire of classroom management strategies.	60.61	30.30	9/09	-
6. establishes positive and appropriate rapport with all students.	87.88	12.12	-	-
7. is creative in problem-solving; shows insights in recognizing and dealing with a variety of situations.	81.82	12.12	3.03	3.03
8. is poised and self-confident; handles situations in a calm and composed manner.	81.82	15.15	3.03	-

Table 4: Field Experience Evaluation Results – Curriculum Design

	Proficient	Developing	Beginning	Not Demonstrated
The candidate:				
1. demonstrates sufficient knowledge of content area(s).	75.76	21.21	3.03	-
2. demonstrates sufficient knowledge of professional, state and district content standards.	12.12	81.82	6.06	-
3. demonstrates understanding of the conceptual difficulties students typically have with particular content.	60.61	30.30	9.09	-

4. demonstrates a repertoire of representations, examples, analogies, etc. to assist students in grasping particular concepts or ideas.	48.48	39.40	12.12	
---	-------	-------	-------	--

Discussion

The candidates were able to provide evidence of each element of Marzano’s effective classroom pedagogy. However, the evidence in their reflections rarely reached the impact stage. As might be expected, self-concerns were high (above 75%) in all three elements as candidates began the field experience and were meeting mentor teachers and students for the first time. The concerns about self were more balanced with task concerns as candidates progressed through the 50-hour field experience. There was considerably less evidence of impact concerns. Impact concerns represented less than 18% of the evidence in all but one of the reflections. Only in the third in the element of instructional strategies in the third reflection were impact concerns slightly more evidenced than other self-concerns. Evidence of impact concerns never surpassed task concerns.

The self-concerns were clearly evident in the theme of student identity as candidates listed concepts related to instructional strategies and classroom management. One possible explanation for this is that the student identity findings reflected the transition of the candidates from the familiar role or ego of university students responsible for learning concepts taught by faculty instructors within university classrooms to their new role as university students responsible for teaching content and managing behavior in 7-12 classrooms. An alternative explanation is that candidates only understood the concepts at a recall level and experienced struggles, at least initially, to apply and synthesize these concepts in a real-world setting.

Evidence of task concerns increased after the first lesson reflection. Candidates began to realize their teaching responsibilities involved more than simply meeting the

university’s requirements for the field experience. They began to realize that how they taught, the tasks of teaching, had implications on the engagement of their students. The qualitative evidence related to the theme of compliant engagement was heavily focused on having students comply with what was asked of them and stay engaged or on-task while the candidates were teaching.

The shift to task concerns may have been a result of several factors. First, an increase in the candidates’ confidence as they began to better understand the expectations of their mentor teachers, build rapport with students, and familiarize themselves with the content may have transferred the focus from themselves to the practice of teaching. The change may also have been a result of the feedback candidates received from the instructional coaches and their faculty instructors. The feedback, modeled on the Knight coaching model, focused on identifying teaching strengths and areas for improvement as well as setting goals for future teaching. This structure of feedback provided them the prompt to focus on the tasks of teaching and help candidates move beyond thinking about self. Finally, the field experience evaluation tool focused heavily on task concerns. Candidates reviewed the evaluation tool prior to beginning the practicum and again during practicum. Knowing tasks concerns were an important part of this evaluation may have also focused their attention on task concerns.

Candidates provided the least evidence of impact concerns. To reach this stage of Fuller’s model, candidates needed to implement instructional strategies, maintain classroom management, and understand the curriculum standards that students were to learn. The candidates may have understood concepts of

effective classroom pedagogy in isolation, but struggled to synthesize the all three of elements into their teaching. This supports the theme of emerging teacher identity. The candidates were beginning to evidence their impact on student learning, but its presence was still developing.

The limited time of the field experience may not allow adequate time or opportunity for impact concerns to fully emerge. As noted in the areas of task concerns, the field experience evaluation and structure of the instructional coaching model may have influenced the candidates. Only a few items on the evaluation focused on student learning and the instructional coaching did not prompt candidates to reflect on student learning.

Conclusions

In the early field experience, delivery and supervision are two key pieces. Candidates need adequate time to move beyond self-concerns and consider task- and impact-concerns. Furthermore, consistency and sequencing are necessary for candidates to experience each of Marzano's components of effective pedagogy. This is especially important for understanding the complexities of curriculum design. It may be possible to observe effective instructional strategies and classroom management in an isolated lesson, but to understand the interaction of the elements that contribute to curriculum design, teacher candidates need extended and consistent time in a classroom. Candidates' performance seemed to plateau after the third reflection, which suggests a saturation point or the need for more intentional supervision.

The structured reflection prompts ensured that candidates would reflect on Marzano's components of effective pedagogy. Had this structure been absent, candidates' reflections may not have focused on these elements. Because candidates provided less evidence of impact-concerns than self- and task-concerns, this may suggest the need for

additional prompts related specifically to student learning. This could be delivered via coaching and/or the faculty instructor.

There is great potential for early field experiences to have a positive impact on the development of teacher candidates. For the potential to be realized, programs must allocate appropriate resources, including candidates' time in field and university faculty supervision. For teacher candidates this can transform early field experiences from random encounters within 7-12 schools to intentional learning experiences that fuse the university to the 7-12 classrooms.

References

- American Federation of Teachers. (2012). Raising the bar: Aligning and elevating teacher preparation and the teaching profession. Retrieved from: <http://www.aft.org/pdfs/highered/raisingthebar2012.pdf>
- Author (2012). Urban immersion: Working to dispel the myths of urban schools and preparing teachers to work with diverse and economically disadvantaged students. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin: International Journal for Professional Educators*, 78(2), 42-49.
- Banks, J., Cochran-Smith, M., Moll, L., Richert, A., Zeichner, K., LePage, P.; Darling-Hammond, L., Duffy, H., & McDonald, M. (2005). Teaching diverse learners. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*, (1st ed.) (pp. 232-274). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Beck, C. & Kosnik, C. (2002). Professors and the practicum: Involvement of university faculty in preservice practicum supervision. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 6-19.
- Coffey, A. & Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making sense of qualitative data: Complementary research strategies*. London: Sage Publications.
- 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(5), 465-482.
- Cooper, J. E., & He, Y. (2012). Journey of becoming: Secondary teacher candidates' concerns and struggles. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 21(1), 89-108.
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2012). Our responsibility, our promise: Transforming educator preparations and entry into the profession. Retrieved from: http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2012/Our%20Responsibility%20Our%20Promise_2012.p
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2005). Constructing 21st-century education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57(3), 300-314.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of Teacher Education* 61(1-2), 34-47. doi: 10.1177/0022487109348024
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hammerness, K., Grossman, P., Rust, F., & Shulman L. (2005). The design of teacher education programs. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford, (Eds.), *Preparing Teachers For a Changing World: What Teachers Should Learn and Be Able To Do* (pp. 390-441). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dean, C., Lauer, P., & Urquhart, V. (2005). Outstanding teacher education programs: What do they have that the others don't? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87(4), 284-289.
- Feldman, P., & Kent, A.M. (2006). A collaborative effort: Bridging theory and practice in pre-service preparation. *The New Educator*, 2, 277-288.
- Fuller, F. F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualizations. *American Educational Research Journal*, 6, 207-224.
- Hiebert, J., Morris, A.K., Berk, D., & Jansen, A. (2007). Preparing teachers to learn from teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(1), 47-61.
- Knight, J. (2007). *Instructional Coaching: A Partnership Approach to Improving Instruction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

- Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marzano, R. J., & Thomson Gale (Firm). (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Maykut, P., & Morehouse, R. (1994). *Beginning qualitative research: A philosophic and practical guide*. London: Falmer Press.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2008). Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Institutions. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2010). Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers. Retrieved from: <http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=zzeiB1OoqPk%3d&tabid=715>
- National Council on Teacher Quality. (2011). Student teaching in the United States. Retrieved from: <http://www.nctq.org/edschoolreports/studentteaching/report.jsp>
- National Education Association. (2011). Transforming teaching: Connecting professional responsibility with student learning. Retrieved from: <http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/Transformingteaching2012.pdf>
- Pigge, F. L., & Marso, R. N. (1997). A seven year longitudinal multi-factor assessment of teaching concerns development through preparation and early years of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(2), 225-235.
- Reeves, C. K., & Kazelskis, R. (1985). Concerns of preservice and inservice teachers. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 78(5), 267-271.
- Scherff, L. & Singer, N.R. (2012). The preservice teachers are watching: Framing and reframing the field experience. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, (28), 263-272.
- Singer, N. R., Catapano, S., & Huisman, S. (2010). The university's role in preparing teachers for urban schools. *Teaching Education*, 21(2), 119-130.
- Strauss, A. (1990). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sykes, G., & Dibner, K. (2009). Improve teaching quality with aggressive support. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 90(8), 588-591.
- Wyss, V. L., Siebert, C. J., & Dowling, K. A. (2012). Structuring effective practicum experiences for pre-service teachers. *Education*, 132(3), 600-606.
- Young, S. (2012). Concerns of preservice physical education teachers participating in an early field experience. *Physical Educator*, 69(2), 119.
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*. 61(1-2), 89-99.