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This paper focuses on how one Student Teacher (ST) shifted his planning from teacher activities to student learning during a semester-long student-teaching practicum course in social studies. The study of this shift provides a glimpse of the enormity of the ST’s task and the ways in which he responds to the complexity of the work. Data include: lesson plans, providing a written record of activities, and classroom discourse. Analyses of the data rendered three areas relevant to the shift, including: 1) evidence of initiation-response-evaluation (IRE) script as a default script before the shift, 2) evidence of a shift to planning for student learning, and 3) evidence of movement away from the IRE to increasingly open-ended questioning. Preliminary evidence indicates increments that appear inconsequential taken individually, combine to present a picture of an incipient, developmental shift by the ST from planning for teacher activities to planning for student learning.
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Introduction

For student teachers (STs), the teaching process often begins — and quite naturally so — with a primary focus on their perceived roles in the teaching-learning process, often with the unintended result that students’ roles are of secondary concern, seen uniquely in relation to teacher plans. That is, students’ roles are conceived of and measured by their mastery of subject matter that mirrors rather precisely the teacher’s understandings and presentations. Student teachers often begin by asking themselves questions such as, “What am I going to do in this lesson?” “What kind of an activity can I have students do?” “Which materials should I use?” “What do I want students to know?” “What questions should I ask them?” “How should I test their knowledge?”

The preoccupation of STs with their activities in the classroom setting ends up lending itself to a focus on telling, with STs telling and explaining to students what they are to learn. This focus on transmission of knowledge from teachers to students is consonant with more general views and constraints that conceive of history education as the careful display of names, dates, events, and descriptions for student consumption, whose mastery is then tested by mandated, external evaluations. As such, there is field support for such a view of history teaching, one that seems to coincide with STs’ own insecurities about how to decide what they are going to do when standing in front of their class. Thus, for STs, the idea is that if they are able to organize their presentation in such a way that students can give back the desired information that represents prevalent curricular and testing goals, then they have done their job well.

For those who work with STs, and who hope to encourage their movement away from
a curriculum that is, (a) driven by a focus on names, dates, and events, and (b) delivered as transmission of information, the question arises as to how one can support a shift in perspective. Perhaps a more basic question is how the developmental arc of such shifts manifests itself in the ST’s teaching and practice. This study follows John through a semester of student teaching with the aim of tracking his development as he shifted from a mostly transmission, univocal pattern of classroom discourse to incorporate an investigative, dialogic pattern.

Related Literature

The Discourse of Teaching and Learning

To talk about teaching history is to discuss both what is being taught, as well as how it is being taught. It is our contention that these elements are reciprocal insofar as our beliefs about the nature of the content to be taught influence how we teach that content. Likewise, how the content is taught builds the way we come to understand that content. Nested within this reciprocal relationship, our beliefs about the roles and capacities of both teachers and students become evident. In the discussion below we will explore this reciprocal relationship from various points of view and relate them to the task John faced.

In his elaboration of folk pedagogy, Jerome Bruner (2006) outlines the ways teachers think about students’ minds and consequently how they instruct learners depending on their conception of human capacity. Bruner (2006) proposes four perspectives of teaching and learning that explore different models of minds organized around how children are seen:

1. “as imitative learners:” Adult demonstrations of skilled actions to a learner based on the adult’s belief that the learner does not know how to perform the action and can learn how to do so by being shown (p. 165).

2. “as learners from didactic exposure:” Didactic exposure is “usually based on the notion that pupils should be presented with facts, principles, and rules of action which are to be learned, remembered, and then applied” (p. 166). Teacher “views the child from the outside, from a third-person perspective rather than trying to ‘enter her thoughts’” (167). It is a one-way telling by the teacher to student.

3. “as thinkers: the development of intersubjective interchange: The teacher, on this view, is concerned with understanding what the child thinks and how she arrives at what she believes.” Children and adults are constructing a model of the world to aid them in accounting for their experience, and pedagogy is to help the learner “understand better, more powerfully, less one-sidedly” (p. 167).

4. “as knowledgeable participants: the management of ‘objective’ knowledge: Teaching should help children grasp the distinction between personal knowledge, on the one side, and ‘what is taken to be known’ by the culture, on the other” (p. 170). Learners have personal knowledge they bring to the learning task that must be reconciled with objective knowledge.

“The preoccupation of STs with their activities in the classroom setting ends up lending itself to a focus on telling, with STs telling and explaining to students what they are to learn.”
Instruction from either of the first two perspectives would be more unidirectional/univocal. Because the premise of the first two perspectives assumes the learner to be in the position of not knowing what needs to be taught, she is the receptacle of new knowledge. The major way to gain this new knowledge is for the teacher to transmit it, either through modeling or didactic instruction. The construction of knowledge, for this reason, is seen as more unidirectional/univocal, from teacher to student.

This transmission model of teaching, sometimes referred to as “learning about” history (Hawkins, 2001, p. 368-372) is characterized by teacher display questions; that is, questions the teacher asks not because she wants new information, but for students to display their knowledge about the topic (Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). There are at least two important consequences of this discourse pattern in relation to Bruner’s first two pedagogical perspectives: (1) it allows for on-going evaluation by the teacher, and (2) it reinforces the role of the teacher as knower and students as recipients of the teacher’s knowledge. Such discourse has been identified and well-documented as the initiation-response-evaluation (IRE) sequence (Bransford 2000; Cazden, 2001; Gardner, 1995; Mehan, 1979; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Werstch & Toma, 1995). In summary, display questions produce asymmetrical discourse patterns in which the teacher poses questions to which students must find an acceptable, pre-determined answer. This kind of culturally embedded discourse appears to be the default script to which teachers continually revert (Stigler & Hiebert, 1999).

In contrast, instruction from either of the last two perspectives (i.e., learners as thinkers and as knowledgeable) would be more bidirectional/dialogic. That is, the premise of the last two perspectives assumes an active role in knowledge construction on the part of the learner. Because the learner is a thinker, the teacher must discover both what she is thinking and how she came to that thinking. This is an impossible task if it is not bidirectional/dialogic. Likewise, because the learner is knowledgeable, (i.e., brings personal knowledge to the learning task, which may or may not match objective learning) the teacher must dialogue with the learner to discover her personal knowledge.

Classroom discourse generally is primarily transmission or primarily thought-generating, although neither one is used exclusively in any setting. In their discussion of dialogic (generating new meanings) discourse, James Wertsch and Chikako Toma (1995) suggest that,

… it is reasonable to expect that when the dialogic function is dominant in classroom discourse, pupils will treat their utterances and those of others as thinking devices. Instead of accepting them as information to be received, encoded, and stored, they will take an active stance toward them by questioning and extending them, by incorporating them into their own external and internal utterances, and so forth. (p. 171)

What tends to happen in dialogic discourse, then, is that sincere questions, where information is truly sought, begin to replace the preponderance of display questions. Over time, this pattern of discourse allows the perspectives of the learner as thinker and knowledgeable to emerge and flourish.

“If a teacher views the content as static and predetermined, it is reflected in a predominantly transmission model of instruction, whereas if he sees it historiographically it is reflected in a discourse of investigation.”
Views of Teaching and Learning History

When John Dewey (1990) wrote about the role of history in education he clearly did not consider its study to be merely a presentation of a record of the past. He instead recommended educators envision history as a way for students to understand society and human motives. He suggested that the aim of teaching history is to support children’s understanding of the complex nature of societal and individual values, organizational structures, and behavior toward one another. Dewey thus states,

History must be presented, not as an accumulation of results or effects, a mere statement of what happened, but as a forceful acting thing …. To study history is not to amass information, but to use information in constructing a vivid picture of how and why men did thus and so; achieved their successes and came to their failures. (p. 151)

Dewey argues for a dynamic conception of history as a way of learning about and making sense of the past and present. Teaching history from a Deweyan perspective requires seeing students as thinkers/innovators, and requires teachers to plan for more open-ended learning (Hawkins, 2007).

Robert Bain (2005) echoes Dewey when he encourages teachers to “design historiographic problems” to help students experience a world that is potentially far removed from their experience, both in time and geography (p. 183). He cautions against a pedagogy that encourages teachers to limit historical content by treating it as already analyzed, understood, and decided. He points out: “History teachers are charged with teaching their students a history that others have already written; thus they typically begin with course outcomes in hand, determined curricular mandates (i.e., district or state) or the imperatives of external testing” (p. 182). His call to teach historiographically, is a call for teachers to teach learners how “to do” history rather than learn simply “about” history. This shift in perspective on the content of history calls for a parallel pedagogical shift away from the recitation script (Tharp & Gallimire, 1988) associated with IRE discourse (i.e., univocal) to a discourse of investigation (i.e., dialogic). It is in this sense that we are able to see the reciprocity between the teacher’s understanding of the content of history and the pedagogy he uses. If a teacher views the content as static and pre-determined, it is reflected in a predominantly transmission model of instruction, whereas if he sees it historiographically it is reflected in a discourse of investigation. Adjacent to this is the developing student view on the nature of history. If a student is taught that history is names and dates through a transmission, uni-vocal model that is what she will come to believe both history and history teaching is about. If, on the other hand, a student is taught that history is about “constructing a vivid picture of how and why men did thus and so …” (Dewey, 1990, p. 151) through an investigative dialogic model, then that will be what she believes history and history teaching to be. The reciprocity applies first to the teacher’s understanding and presentation of history, which then shapes the student’s view of history and history teaching.

Studying the Shift in Student Teacher Planning

The shift from planning for teacher activities to planning for student learning appears central to understanding how STs build expertise. For the purposes of this study, planning for teacher activities aligns with Bruner’s first two perspectives, whereas planning for student learning aligns with his latter two perspectives (see table 1). Likewise, planning for teacher activities aligns with Bain’s (2005) description of more static notion of history content and instruction, whereas planning for learning aligns more closely with Bain’s and Dewey’s
notions of history content and instruction as dynamic. For those working in pre-service professional development it helps to ground STs experiences in the process of reflection and critical analysis of their lessons to help them become aware of the discourse of teaching and learning, the views of teaching and learning history, and the elements of shifts in planning. The collaborative retrospective evaluation of their practice can support their improvement (Aulls & Shore, 2008; Feiman-Nemser, 2008; Darling-Hammond, 1999). That is, as STs have opportunities to examine their own instructional practices in light of new ideas being presented in the collaborative supervision sessions, the more likely they are to expand their skills for teaching history with understanding.

Specifically, this paper addresses the following questions:

1. Is there evidence of John’s development towards a shift in planning from teacher activities to planning for student learning?

2. How is John’s shift recognized in terms of teacher and student roles in the classroom discourse?

Table 1. Elements of Shifts in Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning for Teacher Activities</th>
<th>Planning for Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univocal/unidirectional</td>
<td>Dialogic/bidirectional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imitative/didactic</td>
<td>Thinker/knowledgeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static notion of history and content</td>
<td>Dynamic notion of history and content</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Method

This work was conducted over a semester long student teaching practicum at a college of education in a large metropolitan area. Although there were six STs from whom data were collected, this will be a qualitative case study that focuses on one ST, John. The data from the other STs were analyzed and considered for a broader perspective of ST shifts.

Participants

This is a case study of one pre-service ST, John, and his university supervisor (US). Although John had a Master Teacher, the logistics did not allow for his participation in the study. Peripheral participants in this study were the high school students in John’s classes. John had a strong history background and was enrolled concurrently in methods and content courses related to the high school curriculum he would be required to teach.

The US served as the researcher, and had ten years of accumulated experience in teacher education. Her experience included both extensive work in course offerings and student teaching supervision.

Data Collection

John was observed teaching throughout the semester, but data for two lessons were systematically collected and analyzed, including: lesson plans, lesson tables that the US generated while observing, and finally post-observation reflections jointly produced by John and the US (a discussion of the lesson plan and lesson table). For the purposes of this study, we will primarily focus on the data from the lesson table and the discussion it generated during the post-observation reflection.

The Lesson tables included a written record of activities, as well as extensive notes on the classroom discourse. Each entry for the Lesson table included the following information: the
lesson topic and objectives, the grade level, the date of observation, specific, on-going descriptions of the content and discourse as the lessons unfolded, the task (activity; e.g., “read the lyrics”), the situation (genre; e.g., song), and a space for comments germane to lesson activities.

Once the lesson tables were completed, they were then used to generate the Post-observation reflection data by anchoring the discussion between John and the US. These meetings allowed for analysis and reflection on the instructional practices. The lesson tables also were used to evaluate the extent to which the lesson plan was implemented as planned.

**Data Analyses**

A. John’s lesson plans became a formal part of the post-observation reflection, in that they were used by him and the US to evaluate the degree to which the lessons were implemented as planned. They were not used before the lesson to either help create or critique the lesson plan. The US intentionally generated the lesson table without reference to the lesson plan to promote an instructional conversation (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988) during the post-observation meeting. Not knowing the specifics of what the lesson plan entailed beforehand allowed the researcher to more freely interrogate the lesson from John’s point of view in that it resulted in an open-ended task for the US (Hawkins, 2007).

B. The lesson tables were coded and analyzed to find evidence of conversations about a current lesson that appeared in plans and execution of future lessons. The assumption underlying this procedure was that it would be a way of tracking the shifts in John’s thinking over time. The lesson table data were re-coded according to tasks, situations, and discourse function in to insure that what might have been missed in the on-going presentation of the lesson appeared in the final analysis. As described above, coding for tasks and situations followed the delineation of what teachers were asking students to do at any given time in the lesson.

To determine the discourse function, the unit of analysis was defined as an interaction around one teacher or student question. A new coding segment began with each new question. Lesson segments categorized as “teacher lecture” that included facts, stories, events, and definitions with few rhetorical questions did not receive further coding as these segments represent the default recitation script. These categories were examined for frequency and position across lessons. Once the segments were indentified, the questions were coded on a continuum of univocal to dialogic, so that an entire segment could be categorized as univocal, univocal-dialogic, or dialogic.

The lesson tables from the initial observation then were compared with the lesson tables of the final observation to examine any differences in student and teacher discourse. When differences appeared they were examined in light of the shifts in John’s understandings that may have occurred.

**Results and Discussion**

Analyses of the data rendered three areas relevant to the research questions. These include: (1) evidence of the IRE script as a default script before the shift, (2) evidence of a shift to planning for student learning, and (3) evidence of movement away from the IRE to increasingly open-ended questioning. Within the context of this evidence, we will examine John’s on-going development towards a shift from planning for teacher activities to planning for student learning.

Planning for Teacher Activities: The Default Script in Action

John initially introduced history content by employing univocal questions and representation of facts, events, and stories, even though he believed that open-ended activities pro-
moted student understanding. His planning showed great concern for student understanding of historical information, but as a result of the pressure to disseminate large amounts of information in a short time period, he consistently used the default recitation teaching scripts. Because John was concerned with student participation and thinking, he posed many questions, which turned out to be display questions, resulting in a discourse that was primarily univocal and served to force students into answering the teacher’s questions correctly.

John’s first lesson started with a “Do Now” activity in which he asked students to respond in their own words to the question, “What is a monopoly?” After a few minutes of seatwork three students offered the following:

S1 When a business has one kind of merchandise and if someone wants to buy what they have, they must pay what the business is asking.
S2 Control over price; no competition.
S3 Power concentrated.

John responded by writing the textbook definition on the board: “Monopoly is a market situation in which there is only one seller of a particular good or service.” He then proceeded to the next activity. This segment was clearly designed to present an expert definition to the class. In allowing students to give their definitions, the teacher felt that students contributed to the task even though their responses were quickly de-emphasized in submission to the textbook definition.

In the next segment, John passed out two graphs showing how the price and availability of bread will differ in competitive and monopolistic environments. The graphs depict an identical pair of supply and demand lines for loaves of bread in a competitive environment and a monopolistic environment. The supply line shows that as the available number of loaves of bread increases, the cost per loaf decreases. The demand line indicates that as the demand for loaves of bread increases, the cost per loaf increases. This pair of lines, one increasing (supply) and the other decreasing (demand), cross at a single point. In the graph that depicts the competitive market, the cost per loaf is determined by the point of intersection of supply and demand lines. For a price of $1.48 per loaf, the supply will equal the demand with both values being 54.5 million loaves of bread. The graph of the monopolistic market indicates that the cost of bread will be held at $1.72 per loaf, which corresponds to a situation where the demand exceeds the supply. After handing out the two graphs, John asks his students to answer two questions:

1. What is the difference between the price per loaf of bread paid by the consumer in the competitive environment versus in the monopolistic environment? What is the difference in the quantity of bread produced in the two examples?

2. Using these two graphs to help you, why are monopolies bad?

John alerted students to the two graphs and mentioned that each represents a different market (i.e., competitive and monopolistic). As students looked at each graph, however, they were initially unable to distinguish any differences. Students in Group 1 did not look beyond the similarities of the graphs to distinguish the supply and demand in each environment:

S1 It’s the same graph
S2 No difference
S3 It doesn’t look like it is going anywhere

Most groups were having similar conversations as John was walking around trying to explain that each graph has a point that indicates the price of a loaf of bread for each mar-
ket. One student began to think about the teacher’s hint and asked his other group members, “Is it that in a monopolistic environment there is more demand than supply?” Students began to see the graphs as a problem and were asking questions of each other’s understandings. The discourse was primarily dialogic as students were actively involved in understanding the graphs and how to interpret them. John, seeing the struggle and some confusion, decided to have students share their findings.

As the class reorganized, John began a series of univocal questions about what students found out and about the law of supply to convey a particular meaning.

1 T I’d like to get your attention. Some people are having a little trouble. What did you find out?
2
3 S The price is more expensive in the monopoly.
4 T The supply and lines stay the same (in reference to the graph).
5 S But they are producing more and charging less.
6 S (inaudible)
7 T What is the law of supply?
8 S As price increases, supply increases.
9 T Is this what the law says?
10 Ss No.
11 T Why are monopolies bad?
12 S They keep prices high.
13 T Why are monopolies bad?
14 S They keep prices high.
15 T Why is that bad?

The above discourse shows students answering John’s questions. There are many things to point out about this interaction that show that it is univocal in nature. The first point is that John interrupts the students dialogic conversation during seatwork to pursue what he fears is a misunderstanding that only he can clear up. Secondly, all of his questions are display questions characterized by the fact that he ignores what he considers to be wrong student responses (lines 3 and 4), repeats the same question when students do not provide the desired answer (lines 11 and 13), and finally rephrases a question for which he did not get the desired answer (line 9). The questions themselves set strict boundaries on student responses as they are pressured into a definite answer, although it is clear that the students are not yet able to define monopolies in John’s terms. John is not able to help them rectify their personal knowledge with the objective knowledge of monopolies. Instead, his concentration on a textbook definition undermines his ability to pursue a more in-depth understanding of the nature of monopolies (e.g., U.S. Post Office). In this lesson monopolies are defined and evaluated within a static, narrow construct, situated in time and place (i.e., monopolies in 19th Century U.S.). The lesson content was directed toward transmitting knowledge with a specific orientation (i.e., monopolies are bad). As a result, students miss out on the complexity of events, practices, and understandings that the social studies content has the potential to highlight.

Initial Steps Toward a Shift in Planning for Student Learning

John’s initial shift in planning began during the post-observation meeting. During this meeting it became clear to John and the US that he had presented himself in the lesson as the voice of authority, disregarded his students as knowledgeable participants, and controlled the discourse in such a way that it reflected both of these views.

During the meeting, the first thing John did was share his view that the lesson went pretty well, although he had not anticipated the difficulty students showed with the graphs. He expressed discomfort at their struggle to create meaning from the activity, and decided to reconvene the class to go over the significance of the graphs. This, in itself, marked his inability to consider his students as knowledgeable, helping them to reconcile their personal
John then began to use the lesson table to attend to his interaction with the students. The first issue that arose was ignoring the students’ definition of monopoly in favor of the one found in the textbook (indicating there is only one right answer, that of the teacher; display questions), which upon examination, John found to be less detailed than the collective offering by the students. When the US commented on John’s characterization of monopolies as bad, he stated he was thinking uniquely about Adam Smith’s ideas on monopolies and competitive markets (a static interpretation of history). In general, the examination of the lesson table led to John’s realization that he needed to plan for more open-ended experiences. That is, John became more aware of planning for student learning by thinking about more student involvement with the content, more in-depth student explanations, more dialogic discourse opportunities; a shift to planning for student learning began in this session.

Planning for Student Learning: The Shift Begins

John’s second lesson was on the Great Depression. He introduced the lesson by stating the trajectory of instructional events: “We’re going to look at the Great Depression. Want to look at how the depression affected the people, to think about what needed to be done, and how the nation was to survive and return to prosperity.” The content is designed to inform students, while leaving some room for thinking about the problems and solutions during the time of the Depression. To start, John passed out the lyrics to the song, “Brother, Can You Spare a Dime,” and had students listen to a recording of the song. Immediately, students were hooked. The following discourse indicates how students shared their understandings when the teacher left space for their interpretations.

John began with an open-ended question (line 16), and pursued this open-ended line of questioning through several turns (lines 17, 19-23, 25-32). During this interaction, he acknowledged the value of student contributions by writing their comments on the board (line 23), and by asking sincere clarification questions (line 29, 30, 32). Finally, he legitimized student participation, as he included them in the evaluation of the contributions (line 25). In short, there is not a single display question during the course of the interaction. Likewise, the time that John took to uncover students’ personal knowledge is evidence of a shift in his ability to think of his students as knowledgeable participants.

16 T What are the narrator’s complaints?
17 S Here is a man who was working and wasn’t receiving pay for his work.
18 T Written in ’32.
19 T Want to add?
20 Ss transformation from a well-paid worker to a machine. He followed the mob and wasn’t making money. “Don’t you remember me?”
21 T Memories about how hard he worked, but doesn’t have anything to show for his work.
22 S And how he doesn’t get acceptance into society.
23 T Anyone else want to add?
24 T Do we agree with these? (pointing to comments on board))
25 T And how he doesn’t get acceptance into society.
26 T The dream he believed in but after the depression he doesn’t believe in it.
27 T What dream?
28 S He has worked hard and no one remembers.
29 S Society? (T reformulates “no one” as society))
30 T Maybe the American dream?
31 T That’s what the Depression did to people.
As the lesson went on, John presented content about the effects of the Great Depression. He gave detailed information on dates and events, and the next excerpt shows the interaction John had with students about unemployment and its effects on citizens.

36  T  Unemployment (Written on blackboard)
37  1929 – 400,000 1933 – 13,000,000
38  S  When you say 1929, is that before the market crash?
39  T  Yes, right before the market crash.
40  T  Even people who were working, their labor wages decreased 42.5%.
41  T  The number is dry—Remember that 13 million people are a lot of people.
42  T  Reduced person to a level that person didn’t think.
43  T  There is a story of a person who was a justice of the peace and who was foreclosed on his house. His house was sold and he wouldn’t leave.
44  T  National Guard came to evict him and he fought them.
45  S  All of this happened because of bank failures?
46  T  Well, it’s complex. Buying stocks on margins didn’t pay for them. Built factories and couldn’t pay, one sector gets hurt and by 1933 one-fourth of the population is out of work.
47  T  Unemployment
48  1929 – 400,000 1933 – 13,000,000
49  S  When you say 1929, is that before the market crash?
50  T  Yes, right before the market crash.
51  T  Even people who were working, their labor wages decreased 42.5%.
52  T  The number is dry—Remember that 13 million people are a lot of people.
53  T  Reduced person to a level that person didn’t think.
54  T  There is a story of a person who was a justice of the peace and who was foreclosed on his house. His house was sold and he wouldn’t leave.
55  T  National Guard came to evict him and he fought them.
56  S  All of this happened because of bank failures?
57  T  Well, it’s complex. Buying stocks on margins didn’t pay for them. Built factories and couldn’t pay, one sector gets hurt and by 1933 one-fourth of the population is out of work.

In this interaction, we witness a truly remarkable moment when a student self-nominates and asks an information question of the teacher (line 38), something which almost never appears in the transmission model. What’s more, John treats the question seriously and not as an interruption to his plan (line 39). John then provides an extended narrative to characterize the hardships of the Depression (lines 40-45), constructing in situ “a vivid picture of how and why men did thus and so; achieved their successes and came to their failures” (Dewey, 1990, p. 151). The resulting engagement of students is evidenced in the next line when a student asks a question that relates the narrative back to the objective historical knowledge (line 46). The excerpt closes with John once again taking the student question seriously allowing it to sidetrack his narrative for the moment (lines 47-49).

John’s second lesson represents a significant shift in terms of both content and instructional discourse. What is clear is that John attunes himself to student voices in the second lesson in ways he never did in the first lesson. Students are taken as sincere interlocutors in the discourse surrounding the content; i.e., John takes their questions and comments seriously and does not see them as interruptions in his delivery of content. By virtue of the fact that students are engaged in historiography, sharing the role of interpretation of history with their teacher, with historical documents and information, their task is elevated from “learning about” history to “learning to do” history. This engagement marks a departure both in terms of the content of history and the teaching of history. That is, while history moves from static to dynamic content, pedagogy moves reciprocally from transmission to investigation.

Conclusions

This study set out to find evidence for John’s development towards a shift in planning for teacher activities, to planning for student learning during his student teaching practicum. To this end, we examined the changes in his enacted planning over the course of about six weeks. We began with an examination of an early lesson on monopolies that showed John to rely on the transmission model for both what he presented, and how he presented it.

We then examined a post-observation session of the monopolies lesson in which we see how John and the US used the data from the observation to critically analyze his instruction, both in terms of content and discourse. As John realizes the closed nature of his instruction, he begins to change his lesson planning orientation. This marks a developmental step,
in that John is aware of what he needs and wants to change to open up his instruction.

By the end of the second lesson analyzed (there were other lessons observed, but not systematically documented), we see a dramatic shift in John’s instruction. In the post-observation data for the Great Depression lesson, John expressed the various ways he changed his preparation to plan for student learning. He was very aware of how his earlier planning and instruction had been controlled by his needs and shut students out, and he was determined to make a change. This shift in planning from teacher activities to student learning was evidenced in the data from the second analyzed class observation. This marked another step in John’s development to a more sophisticated, more nuanced understanding of the interaction that makes up teaching and learning. In summary, John went from being unaware of his underlying beliefs about learners and teaching, to an awareness of the effects of his teaching, to a desire to change his instruction, and finally to planning and executing teaching for student learning.

A second question in this study is how John’s shift is recognized in terms of teacher and student roles. In the first lesson we see that John has little tolerance for students’ lack of understanding, he closes down conversations through a series of display questions, and controls the turn-taking of the discourse. The default script, associated with imitative/didactic perspectives of teaching, permeates his classroom discourse. This limits both students’ opportunities for contributions and their engagement with the material.

In the second lesson, we see that John asks no display questions. Instead, students are sincere interlocutors who ask real questions which he takes seriously as evidenced by his engagement with them. He does not consider student utterances to be interruptions of his lesson, but rather signals that students are engaged in contributing to the lesson. Finally, he engages in an extended narrative, which helps to bring a dynamic perspective to the history he is teaching. This is confirmed when a student connects the story to the objective historical knowledge under consideration (i.e., the failure of a bank as a cause of the Great Depression).

In summary, John’s change in discourse is more open-ended, thus allowing for student input in the direction and content of the discourse. These shifts in discourse mirror John’s shifts in the way he considers the students and the task of teaching history. In the beginning, his discourse tells us that he sees the students as imitative and in need of didactic instruction. In the end, his discourse shows a teacher who sees his students as thinkers and knowledgeable participants. As his discourse opens up opportunities for student participation there is a reciprocal open-endedness in the way he and students contend with the content.

This study offers an exciting documentation of one ST’s journey. It needs to be expanded to study a larger group of student teachers, such that we become even more aware of and sensitive to teacher development. Developmental changes are often tiny and can be easily overlooked. It is only when we endeavor to document this development systematically that we become aware of the tremen-

“His planning showed great concern for student understanding of historical information, but as a result of the pressure to disseminate large amounts of information in a short time period, he consistently used the default recitation teaching scripts.”
dous amount of learning with which STs are faced. Finally, this study stopped at the end of the student teaching semester, although we all know that STs continue to develop during their induction years. It would be helpful to include studies of their development as they move into the school system that typically privileges teacher activities over student learning.
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