

Knowledge Base for
Huntington University's
Teacher Education
Conceptual Framework:
Teacher as Effective Steward



Revised July 2012

Terrell M. Peace, editor

Introduction

Huntington University is a liberal arts University which prepares young people and others to “impact the world for Christ.” The Education Department of Huntington University offers programs leading to teacher licensing in elementary and secondary schools. Licensing programs include the following:

- Elementary Education with content area concentrations
- Elementary and Special Education
- Elementary Education with EL Certification
- Elementary and Middle School Education
- Secondary Education: Middle School and High School Education
- All-Grade Education: Physical Education, Art Education, and Music Education
- A Master of Education program is also offered for teaching professionals

Preparation for teaching includes a broad exposure to both the liberal arts and professional preparation courses. All teacher education programs at Huntington University meet all relevant content and developmental standards (NCATE standards, national specialty area standards, and Indiana Department of Education P-12 standards). Students seeking a secondary license must major in an academic area. The programs in teacher education include a planned sequence of courses, a series of field experiences, and student teaching during the senior year. All students proceed through the three checkpoints of the Unit Assessment System. The assessment system’s checkpoints are designed around professional expectations for current, research-based, best practices. This document is the philosophical foundation for the unit’s Conceptual Framework and assessment system.

Philosophy, Goals, and Objectives

The overall goal of the Education Department at Huntington University is to develop teachers who are Effective Stewards—that is, effective and reflective professionals who wisely manage the curriculum, their instructional strategies, their knowledge of their students, and the learning environment.

*Like a man going on a journey,
who called his servants and
entrusted his property to them.
Matthew 25:14*

Stewardship is a biblical concept that fits well not only with the mission of Huntington University but also with our responsibility to the state of Indiana to prepare candidates for the teaching profession. The biblical “Parable of the Talents” in Matthew 25 portrays stewards as people who are assigned responsibility for the growth and development of someone else’s assets. The state of

Indiana and its school corporations will give graduates of our teacher preparation programs responsibility to exercise stewardship over the growth and development of some its most precious assets—its school children. Based on this overall goal of developing effective stewards for our schools, the Education Department has developed nine goals for graduates of our programs. Teacher education graduates of Huntington University will:

1. Understand the concept of biblical stewardship.
2. Acquire a broad liberal arts education as a foundation for their development as professionals.
3. Be thoroughly grounded in the content of the curriculum that they will be responsible for as educators.
4. Realize the importance of professional training for educators.
5. Understand the developmental context in which learners learn, addressing various forms of developmental stages, including physical, cognitive, and psychosocial.
6. View the diverse population of students in our schools as a positive factor which requires special training and sensitivity.
7. Approach management of the classroom environment with confidence and skill.
8. Be able to deal effectively with constituencies outside of the classroom; i.e., parents, administrators, community resources, bargaining units, legal constraints, etc.
9. Apply instructional skills in a manner that best facilitates learning.

Conceptual Framework and Knowledge Base

These nine objectives for graduates of our teacher education programs are at the heart of our Conceptual Framework: "Teacher as Effective Steward." And this conceptual framework is the basis for everything we do in the teacher education program, including our course design, field experiences, and assessment system. We see teachers acting as stewards in four domains. Within each of these domains different areas of stewardship emerge. In addition, an evaluation component is built into the Conceptual Framework. We believe that the purposes, processes, and outcomes of our program are illustrated within this Conceptual Framework. We do not want the Conceptual Framework to become stagnant and we review its relevance and suitability regularly. We are very pleased to see its robustness and continuing appropriateness through changes in state and national standards, policies, and accreditation procedures.

From the one who has been entrusted with much, much will be asked.

Luke 12:48

Developing the kind of teaching that is needed will require much greater clarity about what students need to learn in order to succeed in the world that awaits them and what teachers need to know and do in order to help students learn it. (Darling-Hammond, 1998, p. 347)

An outline of the Effective Steward Conceptual Framework follows:

1. Steward of Knowledge
 - a. Liberal Arts Knowledge
 - b. Content Knowledge
 - c. Professional Knowledge
2. Steward of Learner Development
 - a. Developmental Characteristics
 - b. Diversity Characteristics
3. Steward of the Learning Environment
 - a. Classroom Environment
 - B. School Environment
 - C. Community Environment
4. Steward of Instruction
 - a. Planning
 - b. Thinking
 - c. Classroom Interaction
 - d. Assessment of Student Learning

Steward of Knowledge

As a Christian University, we hold that all truth and knowledge comes from God. In their preparations to be Effective Stewards of knowledge, candidates in teacher education programs must develop strong knowledge bases in three areas: general and liberal arts knowledge, content area knowledge, and professional knowledge (Tom & Valley, 1990). Although the Effective Steward Conceptual Framework recognizes that competent teachers must be able to "do" as well as "know" (Darling-Hammond, 1998; Schrag, 1989), it is our contention that only a very knowledgeable teacher can engage students most effectively in learning. "The idea of a subject that calls to us is more than a metaphor....the knower is not the only active agent—the subject itself participates in the dialectic of knowing" (Palmer, 1998, p.105). Concerns about content knowledge are at the heart of the standards movements that have swept through almost all the states (Scherer, 2003). Further, solid content knowledge is a crucial prerequisite for teachers as they seek methods of helping learners construct knowledge in their own styles. "Content and process are not dichotomous" (Hausfather, 2003).

My people are destroyed from lack of knowledge. Hosea 4:6

Liberal Arts Knowledge

The place of the liberal arts in the preparation of teachers has been an issue in teacher education for some time and has gained new momentum with the standards movements represented in national and state attention to content knowledge of teachers and students. The *Journal of Teacher Education* focuses on this issue in one of its 1980 editions; the consensus among the several writers is that a broad liberal education is "vital" (Raths, 1980) to the preparation of teachers. Ducharme (1980) contends that a liberal education provides prospective teachers with the cultural literacy they need to understand the content they will be teaching. Although Ducharme did not use the actual term "cultural literacy" in his article, his description of what a liberal education can provide teachers is almost identical with Hirsch's (1987) description of cultural literacy. Carbone (1980) asserts that a liberal education helps teachers develop and use their cognitive skills and rational abilities, allowing them to contextualize the day-to-day learning that takes place in their classrooms. He insists that without this contextualization teachers risk slipping into a sort of "intellectual parochialism" in which they become merely competent technicians rather than true professionals. Carbone also stresses the importance of the relationship between foundational studies in education and the liberal arts, a relationship that can provide the bridge between the liberal arts and later studies of teaching methods.

In fact, much national attention in the last two decades on teacher preparation and school reform has focused almost entirely on general and content knowledge. E. D. Hirsch's *Cultural Literacy* (1987) and *The Schools We Need* (1996) have shined a national spotlight on the "core knowledge" needed by students and their teachers. Likewise, William Bennett's books such as *The Educated Child* (1999) and Diane Ravitch's *Left Back* (2000) show that these national figures are

progressively decrying not only the perceived dearth of content knowledge among our K-12 students but also the purported lack of content knowledge among teachers and apparent lack of content emphasis in the curriculum. Debates can go on indefinitely about whose standards are being measured here and whether the measurements are valid, but the spotlight on content has gotten the public's attention, and schools of education must have clear answers about the role of content knowledge in their teacher preparation programs.

Huntington University's teacher education program regards general knowledge as crucial for teacher candidates. This general knowledge includes knowledge of key topics in society and education such as diversity in American society and the many issues concerning technology in our culture. Maxine Greene (2001) comments on the nature of knowledge and why teachers teach:

I know one can never fully know. I suspect we will never reach a full consensus on what is taken to be true and right, and I rather hope people will see the value in tension, the wide-awakeness that comes with a consciousness of difference and incompleteness. I think I teach for wide-awakeness and for a more reflective, more physical, and less ossified living in the world. (p. 88)

Content Knowledge

In addition to general knowledge in many areas, Effective Stewards must develop strong backgrounds in the content areas of the curriculum.

In a review of research related to the issue of content knowledge, Grossman, Wilson and Shulman (1990) found only a small overlap between what scholars know about a subject and what teachers need to know about a subject to teach it. However, a teacher's lack of minimal content knowledge can be rather devastating to his or her effectiveness in the classroom. Such teachers may avoid teaching content in which their preparation is inadequate; they may rely heavily on a textbook; and they tend to ignore innovative teaching strategies. Grossman et al. contend that teachers need to know the central concepts and organizing principles of subject matter and know how to acquire new knowledge in a particular area so that they may learn new content as they are teaching. Teacher education programs must be sure that teachers know not only how to teach but what to teach. "Liberal education needs to tie itself to practice in order to make it more meaningful" (Wilson in Shulman, 2003, p. 13).

Methods courses in all licensing programs at Huntington University thoroughly expose candidates to Indiana Department of Education P-12 content standards, requiring that standards be linked to objectives in candidates' lesson plans and instructional units. Consequently, for our reflective and effective stewards of knowledge, "what" is not in opposition to "how," since the only point of the "what" is how well it is learned by the students:

Although the efforts needed to implement a standards-linking system are great, so are the rewards. Celebrating student learning is the most fundamental, most motivating, and most powerful affirmation for the learning community. Celebration of progress and success provides the impetus for continuous systems-based improvement. (Carr & Harris, 2001, p. 156).

Similarly, Darling-Hammond (2001) encourages the profession to give standards a chance, assuring us that the efforts are worth it. The most recent standards, she argues, are great improvement over older attempts; the newer standards are authentic, participatory, and well-linked to other professional expectations.

Huntington University's teacher education program is committed to making sure all teacher education candidates meet all relevant content standards, including the Indiana standards for all content areas in a candidate's licensing program and professional content area organizations' national standards.

Pedagogical Knowledge

Teachers teach content *and* students. Although it is necessary for education candidates to have a solid understanding of the concepts, facts, ideas, theories, explanations, and procedures in a given field of inquiry—what McDiarmid (1990) refers to as substantive knowledge—this type of knowledge is not in itself a sufficient foundation for effective teaching. Pedagogical content knowledge is equally crucial. Shulman (1986) defines pedagogical content knowledge as:

(1) those analogies, illustrations, examples, explanations, demonstrations, etc. that communicate content knowledge effectively to students. In addition, pedagogical content knowledge includes (2) understanding what is easy or difficult content for students and understanding why some content is easy for students to understand while other content is more difficult. It also involves (3) understanding the conceptualizations and misconceptions about content that students bring to the classroom. (p. 8)

Additionally, much more than a minimal acquaintance with pedagogical content knowledge is necessary for teachers to be most effective. Grossman (1989) found that subject-specific teacher education course work made a difference in terms of conceptions of the purposes for teaching English, ideas about what to teach, and knowledge of student understanding. Teachers trained in pedagogical content knowledge are substantively more effective teachers than those who do not receive such training, according to Grossman.

In a review of literature related to this subject, Darling-Hammond (1991) presents a powerful case that professionally trained teachers perform significantly better in classrooms than do teachers who are not professionally trained and that professionally trained teachers produce better student learning. And some states are finding that teachers with professional education training are

lasting longer in the classroom than teachers with alternative-route programs that limit professional education preparation.

What should a professional education component for teachers entail? Maxine Green (1986) has captured part of the elusive quality of what it means to become a teacher:

Kierkegaard spent much of his life "trying to become a Christian," in the full knowledge that a completion of the effort or a righteous declaration that he was indeed a Christian would contradict what being a Christian entailed. So it may be with becoming a teacher. To teach, after all, is to engage in an ongoing effort to move others to learn to learn, to come to know, to think, to see. Most philosophies of teaching view this as a process, perhaps a self-correcting process, one that is itself educative without a predetermined stopping place. For people to announce that they are teachers with nothing further to discover or to attain might well contradict what being a teacher means. (p. 490)

So, clearly a professional humility and desire to continue to grow are crucial to teachers' and teacher educators' dispositions.

Dinham and Stritter (1986) have examined what it means to be a professional in a variety of vocations. Their primary conclusions are that a reliance on theory is what distinguishes a profession from a trade or craft, that professions possess specific technical knowledge, and that a professional's service role requires action that is primarily in the best interest of the client. In the profession of teaching, this reliance on theory, technical knowledge and fiduciary responsibility must be integrated with practical experiences in the field. Moore (1999) emphasizes the importance of experiential learning for preservice teachers. Barnes (1989) states that novice teachers must develop elaborate schemata that tie theoretical and practical knowledge to action. She contends that this can only be accomplished through a "reflective conversation with the situation" (p. 17), i.e., field experiences filled with theoretical, practical, and reflective components.

Reflection, therefore, is a key component in the acquisition and stewardship of knowledge. Professional contemplation is what professionalizes theory and practice. Reflective thinking is enhanced as teacher education students are exposed to differing, sometimes competing, theories. Pearson (1994) argues that "complex domains of human inquiry" such as teaching and human relations must be examined from varying perspectives. "The more complex the problem, the more lenses learners need" (p. 14). Further, it is through reflection on one's knowledge that a teacher can move beyond simply knowing something to knowing how to teach that something to diverse learners. It is through knowledgeable reflection that preservice teachers become effective stewards of not only content knowledge but also learner development, learning environments, and instructional techniques. Learning *about* a crucial education issue such as diversity is not enough, therefore; teacher candidates must be challenged to reflect on how the issue affects them personally and be given opportunities to try out their theories in authentic practical situations: "Becoming more culturally aware requires deliberate reflection and action" Lazar, 2004, p. 7).

Reflective teaching contrasts sharply with the simplistic, almost technical teaching in the 1980s, which included a very effective teaching approach of direct instruction. As educators have realized that teaching is a complex, situation-specific activity, however, an increasing number have become proponents of reflective thinking and teaching. (Farris, 1999, p. 356)

Knowledgeable pre-service teachers and practicing teachers alike make better stewards of all the areas of knowledge that God gives to us. Thorough backgrounds in the liberal arts, content areas, and pedagogical knowledge make teachers responsible and effective managers of this area of professionalism.

Steward of Learner Development

Clearly, learners are not just empty boxes for teachers to stuff with information and then send on their merry way. They are growing and developing, unique human beings who must grow and mature in many different ways, including physical and emotional maturation, ethical and moral growth, and cognitive development (Brandt & Gunter, 1981). Christian professionals see that each student is made in the image of God and worthy of respect, love, and focused attention. Teachers who wish to glorify God and truly love others in their profession will do so by understanding not only their content areas but also their students.

Whoever welcomes a child welcomes me. But if anyone causes one of these to sin, it would be better for him to have a millstone hung around his neck and to be drowned in the depths of the sea.

Matthew 18: 5-6

The concept of image of God takes on ever more profound meaning as we realize that everyone is wired differently, that the upstairs filing systems are organized slightly differently—depending on experiences, connections made, and retrieval strategies, not to mention hemispheric differences, gender and racial differences, and learning styles and multiple intelligences in place already at birth. (Holtrop, 1999, p. 343)

An Effective Steward must be familiar with theories and research related to learner development and brain behavior and must be able to use this information in an effective manner in the classroom. This is especially crucial in an age of heightened accountability and public scrutiny not only concerning content but also methods. For example, Gatto (2000) charges that American schooling “doesn’t teach the way children learn” (p. xvi). Palmer (1998) points to the crucial link between a teacher’s view of the learner and her teaching approaches:

Our assumption that students are brain-dead leads to pedagogies that deaden their brains. When we teach by dripping information into their passive forms, students who arrive in the classroom alive and well become passive consumers of knowledge and are dead on departure when they graduate. But the power of this self-fulfilling prophecy seems to elude us: we rarely consider that our students may die in the classroom because we use methods that assume they are dead. (p. 42)

Developmental Characteristics

Effective teachers need to thoroughly know their students—their developmental, social, and cultural characteristics as well as individual learning styles and personality types. An effective steward approaches learners from a developmental perspective, which assumes that the natural development of the individual learner provides the basis for determining both materials and methods (Eichner & Liston, 1990). Clay (1998) points out that keeping the learner at the center of the teaching-learning process involves more attention to who the learner is than to theories of motivation. Physical, cognitive, and psychosocial changes occur in learners as they progress through the school years, and teachers need to provide learning experiences that capitalize on these changes.

In the physical domain, the school years are extremely important. Children enter kindergarten at one-third their adult weight and a little over half their adult height and leave the twelfth grade at full adult size. They enter kindergarten with gross- and fine-motor skills only partially developed and leave the twelfth grade with them fully developed. They enter kindergarten with many androgenous characteristics and leave the twelfth grade thoroughly differentiated as males and females (Berger, 1986). Effective stewards need to know where their students are on these various continuums of physical development and what impact this knowledge will have on their teaching. For example, children in the primary grades need to engage in various forms of physical play to help not only the development of fine- and gross-motor skills but also self-confidence, self-esteem, and cognitive development (Bunker, 1991). Brewer (2004) states,

Play contributes to the development of gross and fine motor skills, to cognitive growth, and to social and emotional development. In playing, children strengthen many problem-solving abilities, learn to express emotions in socially acceptable ways, and learn the social skills necessary for success in groups. (p. 168)

Children in the intermediate grades begin developing much faster reaction times than primary age children and are ready to engage in tasks that require quickness (Harris, 1986). Early adolescents in the middle school grades are experiencing intense hormonal changes, and both teachers and students need to understand the impact and significance of those changes (Stevenson, 1992).

Concerning the cognitive domain, Jean Piaget (Piaget & Inhelder, 1969) has delineated a series of stages of cognitive development that can guide a teacher in making curricular and

pedagogical choices in the classroom. Children who enter school are typically in the preoperational stage of cognitive development and need to engage in educational tasks that include observing, gathering, sorting, and classifying objects. Around seven years of age most students begin to enter what Piaget calls the concrete operational stage and need to begin performing mental operations with objects and concepts. Students at the secondary level begin to enter the formal operations stage, although many continue to think and learn primarily in terms of concrete operations (Smith, 1981). To assist students in making the transition from concrete operational to formal operational thinking, secondary teachers need to challenge students to look at divergent viewpoints, investigate multiple causalities, and engage in logical-deductive reasoning activities.

In the psychosocial domain, Erik Erikson (1963, 1968) has outlined a series of stages of psychosocial development that effective stewards must understand. For most students three of the eight stages that Erikson proposes—initiative versus guilt, industry versus inferiority, and identity versus role confusion—overlap with the school age years. Elementary teachers need to be aware of the need for recognition that fosters initiative and industry in elementary age children. Secondary teachers need to be aware of how important forming an identity is to adolescents and then capitalize on that need by choosing curricula that speaks to the adolescent's quest for identity.

A growing area of interest among educators, parents, and policy makers is that of character development. Added to the cries for tougher academic standards is the call for higher behavioral expectations. Matera (2001) outlines a post-Columbine view of character development in the schools that goes back to what he says is an 18th century idealism about manners, morals, and character that could “reverse the plague of violence and decay in America’s schools” (p. 14). In introducing his book, he piques the reader’s interest:

Brace yourself for a high school story that doesn’t involve automatic weapons, pipe bombs, bloody hallways, drugs, coed showers, oral sex clubs, teen pregnancies, AIDS, foul language, tragic suicide, illiterate seniors, or any other headline grabbing horrors of the late 20th century. Brace yourself for a story about the return to the concept of young people wanting to exhibit traits of dignity, class, and personal character. (p. 14)

Diversity Characteristics

Additionally, learners have a variety of social, cultural, and ethnic backgrounds and do not all share the same white, middle class, non-urban environments from which many prospective teachers come (Grant & Secada, 1990). Payne (2001) points to dozens of differences in assumptions and behaviors among the poor, middle class, and rich. Teachers must deal with increasing numbers of students from special needs populations as schools practice inclusion approaches rather than separate students with exceptionalities into special education classrooms (Alper & Ryndak, 1992). Another diversity challenge is the influx of students from other countries that many small, rural Midwestern towns have experienced in the last ten years. Gender and learning styles are also crucial areas of learner diversity. Finally, the diversity among students remains much higher than

diversity among teachers, and the lack of diversity among teachers may be hindering many students' learning (National Collaborative on Diversity in the Teaching Force, 2004).

An Effective Steward must have an affirming disposition about student diversity in its broadest sense, a solid knowledge base about diverse learner characteristics, and the ability to work effectively with diverse student populations. Since our nation is built upon diversity, diversity in education plays a significant role in uniting diverse populations and unifying a community's sense of the country's purpose.

Educators today are faced with an overwhelming challenge to prepare students from diverse cultural backgrounds to live in a rapidly changing society and a world in which some groups have greater societal benefits than others because of race, ethnicity, gender, class, language, religion, ability, or age. Schools of the future will become increasingly diverse.... To work effectively with the heterogeneous student populations found in schools, educators need to understand and feel comfortable with their own cultural backgrounds. They also must understand the cultural setting in which the school is located to develop effective instructional strategies. (Golnick & Chinn, 1998, p. 2)

Banks (1995) challenges educators to act quickly to create a "more humane and caring world" (p. 625) in the face of rapidly changing demographics in which a third of all U.S. residents are members of ethnic minorities.

[Schools are] the principal institution charged with transmitting the identity and mission of the United States from one generation to the next. If we fail in our school policies and classrooms to model and to teach how to live with differences, we endanger our experiment in religious liberty and our unity as a nation. (Haynes & Thomas, 1996, p. 12)

Tiedt and Tiedt (1990) identify numerous sources of diversity among learners. Some of these include: gender, national origin, social class, learning style, language background, religious beliefs, and physical and mental abilities. A teacher who is an effective steward will view the diverse population of students in our schools as an opportunity for the personal and cultural enhancement of those students. This view of diversity as natural and necessary, like the different parts of a body (1 Corinthians 12), helps educators move away from the stress of feeling that one or two students in the classroom are different. Instead, all bring a variety of differences that can complement and enhance each other. Children who will be citizens in a country of diversity need to learn about that diversity in a manner that fosters respect for all individuals. Regardless of a student's background and genetic makeup, learning is making connections between past experiences and relevant learning experiences.

Knowledge is organized and constructed in a way not unlike the design and construction of a building. Just as numerous raw materials are used in the construction of a building, information exists in various and multiple forms. (Kammeenui & Carnine, 1998, p. 24)

Ravitch (1990) warns that this new emphasis on multicultural perspectives in American education has the potential for both positive and negative impacts. The idea that differences between ethnic groups are a national resource rather than a problem to be solved (as may be implied in the "melting-pot" perspective) has great potential for fostering what Ravitch terms "cultural pluralism." Cultural pluralism fits well with longstanding American traditions of openness and acceptance and has the potential to foster the development of "multicultural literacy" (Ladson-Billings, 1991) among all students. On the other hand, there is potential for multiculturalism to degenerate into "cultural particularism," which assumes that American culture belongs to those who are white and of European ancestry and that the only culture that people of color can belong to is that of their ancestors. According to Ravitch, cultural particularism does not fit into American traditions, and we at Huntington University feel that it does not fit into the Effective Steward Conceptual Framework either. Effective stewards need to choose curricula and methods that promote a perspective of cultural pluralism and engage students in constructive dialogue about their respective cultures. And diversity knowledge cannot be just head knowledge: Since most of our candidates come from homogeneous, small-town or rural, Midwestern backgrounds, we have required all candidates to participate in a three-week, all-day January term multicultural practicum in racially and SES diverse, urban schools.

Many students who are racially, ethnically, or economically different from the dominant culture continue to lag behind in academic achievement. Brown (1990) contends that solving this problem will involve more than holding high expectations for these students. In addition, teachers need to teach disadvantaged students the necessary skills to attain high achievement. These skills do not tend to be taught in basic skills classes, where rudimentary tasks are repeatedly drilled. Rather, those higher order thinking skills, which students from the dominant culture use to advance educationally, must be taught in context with content that has meaning to students from diverse backgrounds. In addition, other changes in instructional practices may be necessary. Specific activities that relate particular content areas to culturally diverse students are available in mathematics (Zaslavsky, 1991), social studies (Renner & Carter, 1991), and language arts (Fox, 1990; Rasinski & Padak, 1990).

Similarly, Effective Stewards who encounter students with limited English speaking skills will employ new strategies for helping these children succeed in school. The most important of these strategies involves developing a supportive atmosphere in the classroom for these children. Like any learner, ELL students (students learning English as a second or additional language) need to be given opportunities to express themselves in a safe environment. For example, specific activities that can foster a safe environment include pairing an ELL student with a native English speaker, employing more storytelling activities, and engaging ELL students in writing activities that allow them to share information about their cultural background (Harbaugh, 1990).

Exceptional needs learners pose another set of diversity characteristics that Effective Stewards must be prepared to address. Educators have been challenged for many years with diversity in learners' physical and mental abilities. During the last half century, public support and legislation—

such as PL 101-467, PL 94-142, and PL 105-17 (IDEA '97)--have secured recognition and support for students with physical and mental handicaps. Although classroom teachers can still expect specially trained personnel to provide them with specific support when dealing with these children, the trend toward mainstreaming and inclusion has meant that these children are spending more time in regular classrooms (Alper & Ryndak, 1992). In addition, because early identification of exceptional needs children is difficult, regular classroom teachers must help identify learners' special requirements (MacMillan, Keogh, & Jones, 1986; Rothstein, 1990). Further, a teacher who has an exceptional needs child in the classroom must be able to follow and administer an individual education plan (IEP) that may include a variety of pedagogical procedures that are not standard practice in the classroom (York, Vandercook, MacDonald, Heise-Neff, & Caughey, 1992).

An Effective Steward must have background knowledge of the needs of children with specific challenging or disabling conditions as well as experience in working with exceptional needs children who are integrated into a regular classroom. Finally, Effective Stewards are not going to be just "dealing with" exceptional needs learners and helping them "get by." Teachers need to realize that "having a disability should not prevent [one] from having dreams and 'going the distance'" (Lehmann et al., 2004, p. 208). All teacher education candidates, both elementary and secondary, take special education courses.

A third diversity characteristic that Effective Stewards must manage is giftedness. Unless gifted learners are well understood and the learning environment is well designed, a gifted learner may be quite frustrated: "school must be made for someone else, because it just doesn't work for me" (an eight-year-old quoted by Rotigel, 2004, p. 189). Identification of gifted students has been a long-standing challenge. Most definitions of giftedness address a variety of abilities (Maker, 1986), although most gifted programs focus only on academic success (Parke, 1989). Since gifted programs are less clearly defined than other special education programs, local schools and individual teachers often have the responsibility of determining the best ways to promote learning among the very able. Enrichment, acceleration, sophistication, and novelty are four common ways to differentiate curriculum for gifted students, with schools using many combinations of these approaches (Torrence, 1986). Of course, effective stewardship of a gifted learning situation involves not only complete understanding of the gifted learner(s) but also differentiation of one's curriculum and teaching methods.

A fourth diversity characteristic that Effective Stewards must attend to is gender. Sadker, Sadker, and Steindam (1989) have conducted extensive research on the differing treatment and performance of male and female students. Although on average girls enter school scoring ahead of boys on standardized tests, they leave school scoring behind the boys. At the secondary level, many girls tend to avoid advanced courses in mathematics and the sciences, though just as many girls as boys enter high school qualified to take these courses. Sadker et al. (1989) attribute these inequities to the differences in treatment of boys and girls in the classroom. Essentially, boys get much more attention from teachers than girls do and have more opportunities and encouragement to take risks and engage in discussion. Even the additional reprimands and corrections that many

boys receive a formative kind of attention, validation, encouragement, and stimulation that better-behaved and quieter learners do not get.

An Effective Steward will be aware of this phenomenon and will encourage female students to take the same risks and engage in the same kinds of verbal interchanges as boys. Teachers are often told that math and science differences between the sexes are genetic, but several studies indicate that biological differences are tiny (5%) at most and that “gender-role socialization can account for most of the differences in academic performance” (Aldridge & Goldman, 2002, p. 164). Effective stewards understand these gender differences as mainly social constructs and take care not only to avoid perpetuating them but also to deliberately counter them in their work with children and adolescents:

Gender does not stand alone, but rather it is always connected to raced, classed, and sexualized subjectivities.... The study of gender means that while attending to difference we must also study relationships between girls and boys, gay and straight youth, traditionally gendered and transgender people. We need approaches that observe connections as well as distinctions that promote dialogue without privileging those that educational institutions decide have the most cultural capital. (Biklen & Pollard, 2001, p. 744)

In an age of increasing public scrutiny, dwindling resources, proliferating curriculum standards, and massive amounts of standardized testing, teachers must still do their utmost to understand their students’ individual characteristics and backgrounds. Amid all these professional distractions, it is more important than ever to discover one’s students’ likes and dislikes, their learning styles, their personality types, their various intelligences, even their ability to learn with different technologies. “Educators can align curriculum, instruction, and assessment with both standards and students in mind so that standards serve teaching and learning—instead of the other way around” (Strong, et al., 2001. p. 56).

Clearly, teaching involves interacting with diverse people intellectually, emotionally, and spiritually. For example, some learners thrive more in groups than in individual tasks. Others may respond well to different learning technologies. Many retain information much longer if the learning is linked to similar concepts in another content area (such as with thematic teaching or integrated curriculum). Knowing one’s learners gives teachers the background they need to set up effective learning environments (our next component of the Teacher as Effective Steward framework).

Palmer (1998) says that teaching involves the heart as well as the mind and that a teacher's heart is the loom on which the fabric of learning is woven. As a Christian institution of higher learning, Huntington University seeks to integrate Christian faith and the pursuit of knowledge, especially knowledge about human nature and knowledge about how dedicated, young professionals can best care for and challenge the variety of people whom they have chosen to serve in their careers:

There is no conflict between giving our hearts to the Lord and giving our minds to the logical pursuit of natural truth. All truth is God's truth. Therefore the objective pursuit of truth does not conflict with faith. Educational psychology is a scientific discipline which focuses on the nature of the teaching-learning process.... It can, and does, provide wonderful insights for those who wish to excel in helping others learn. (Yount, 1996, p. 37)

Caring pre-service teachers and practicing teachers are Effective Stewards of the differing learner characteristics that appear in God's image-bearers in our classrooms. Thorough backgrounds in learner development and learner diversity make teachers responsible and successful managers of this area of professionalism.

Whatever is true, whatever is noble, whatever is right, whatever is pure, whatever is lovely, whatever is admirable—if anything is excellent or praiseworthy—think about such things. Philippians 4:8

Steward of the Learning Environment

A third area for exercising responsible stewardship of something entrusted to us by God is the area of learning environment. Teachers must manage their classrooms and other educational resources with an attitude of responsibility and accountability to God, their students, their students' parents, and society (Holtrop, 1997).

Understanding learner development and learner differences and effectively setting up a learning environment are inextricably tied:

When discussing the child as a learner, it is important to paint a complete portrait of the child, including the social and family context in which he or she lives.... Once we recognize the individuality of each child and the complex and unique forces and the circumstances that act on and surround him/her it is easier to choose or create the most appropriate strategies and the most suitable learning environment. (Kirk, Gallagher, & Anastasiow, 2000, p. 7)

Beyond the classroom an effective teacher must establish strong bonds within the school and the community at large. Teachers must be equipped to communicate with various audiences, including parents, business representatives, and community leaders. Today's competent teacher

must be an Effective Steward of the classroom setting, the overall school environment, and of relationships with parents and the community. These environments must be conducive to the intellectual, social, moral, creative, and emotional growth of learners. Learners with diverse backgrounds and learning styles need diversity in their learning environment. Teachers need to "create an instructional environment that accommodates students' academic needs" (Ransinski & Padak, 2000, p. 20).

Classroom Environment

A teacher must use available elements including space, materials, facilities, time, and people to make sure that specific learning tasks are accomplished. In addition, a teacher must draw on what we know about personality types, learning styles, brain research, and individual differences, and attempt to create an atmosphere that promotes feelings of safety and encourages productive interaction. This requires the teacher to develop and implement a format to provide order, promote positive learner behavior, hold learner attention, and provide intellectual stimulation for all learners. Wolfe (2001) recounts brain research that indicates that an enriched environment contributes to increased brain development.

One aspect of teaching that causes fear and trembling among novice (and sometimes even experienced) teachers is classroom management (Johns, MacNaughton, & Karabinus, 1989). An Effective Steward of the classroom environment will look at classroom management from a holistic perspective, which views the classroom in three different contexts: first, a context in which the teacher may not share the same cultural and social experiences of the learners (Cazden & Mehan, 1989); second, a learning context in which the teacher and students may not share the same learning styles (Dunn, Beaudry, & Klavas, 1989); and third, a control context in which proactive management rather than reactive management is pursued as the most effective strategy (Evertson, 1989).

Gallego and Cole (2001) look at the research on the culture of the classroom, concluding that a culture of the classroom exists, it is unique, and schools should "think critically and creatively" about the culture of the learning environment. Cazden and Mehan (1989) argue that learners need to understand particular codes and aspects of a classroom culture to operate effectively as students. They cite classroom norms regarding turn-taking and the asking and answering of questions as examples. In addition, learners must recognize various sub-contexts during the school day and choose appropriate behaviors for times such as recess, sharing, reading group, discussion, cooperative learning, and lecture. Shifts in sub-contexts are often subtle, requiring learners to pay attention to indirect verbal messages, shifts in posture, and changes in conversational rhythm. Cazden and Mehan refer to a "default classroom culture" and contend that many learners, particularly those from low income and nonwhite backgrounds, have difficulties picking up on these subtle cues, resulting in poor academic performance and inappropriate behavior.

Evertson (1989) asserts that the problem of the default classroom culture can be overcome if prospective teachers receive training in the planning, organization, and implementation of social and academic systems in the classroom. Such planning, organization, and implementation involve much more than merely executing a set of techniques. Rather, these activities entail constructing an environment from a jumble of disparate parts that includes students (in all their differentiations), curriculum, time, space, materials, and local considerations. Evertson is a strong advocate of extensive planning for classroom management well before the school term begins.

Although learning styles and preferences obviously fit under the previous section on Learner Characteristics, these differences are crucial in the learning environment as well. Different learning styles (Dunn et al., 1989) and brain differences (Wolfe, 2001) predispose certain students to learn best in specific ways and in physical environments that may differ from the traditional classroom structure. For example, some students learn and act better with low lighting or reduced stimulation; others may work best in groups, lying down, or while listening to music. Effective Stewards of the learning environment must keep abreast of research on learning environments.

A teacher who is an Effective Steward will be sensitive to the different learning styles and needs of her students and will have the confidence to experiment with different learning environments that may seem unorthodox yet may encourage increased academic performance and positive student behavior. Recent brain research helps educators understand individual learner differences even more specifically. “Information about the brain and how it learns...is an essential element in the foundation on which we should base our educational decisions. The brain matters because our children matter” (Wolfe, 2001, p. 191).

Understanding diversity among learners—differences in learning styles, gender, class, ethnicity and culture (again primarily issues of Learner Characteristics)—allows a teacher to better manage the learning environment. In fact, an openness and eagerness to the variety represented in a classroom ties together a teacher's stewardship of knowledge, instruction, and the overall learning environment. Technology in the classroom offers new avenues for ensuring that all students, regardless of differences in backgrounds or learning styles, have access to knowledge and learning opportunities (Curry, 2003).

Of all the new things a teacher will see with a multicultural perspective, the three most important are the following: (1) effective teaching is *directly* linked to multicultural education, (2) every classroom and school has the potential to be a multicultural setting, and (3) a classroom becomes a multicultural setting when the students in that room experience a multicultural curriculum. In our eyes, the multiculturalness of the setting is not determined by the type of students in the class; it is created by the perspective and knowledge base the teacher works with. (Davidman & Davidman, 1994, p. 8)

An environment conducive to effective teaching and learning also involves an effective classroom management system. Perrone (2000) discusses the essential elements of a well-run, “productive” classroom: thorough preparation, challenging ideas and materials, consistency, respect

for the learners, and comprehensive knowledge about the learners. Evertson (1989) feels that the first few weeks of school are crucial in establishing an effective classroom management system. During these weeks effective managers deliberately teach their management systems to their learners. From this direct introduction, students know in advance what they should expect if they follow prescribed rules and procedures and what they should expect if they do not. It is crucial for teachers to model these rules and procedures and have students practice desired behaviors. The teacher also must provide students with feedback regarding the appropriateness of their actions. Further, students can be involved in the formation of the classroom rules and procedures. If the teacher is successful in thoroughly teaching a management system to the learners, it is less likely that the culture of the classroom will "go to default" (Cazden & Mehan, 1989).

There is some disagreement among theorists about the relationship between classroom management and instruction. Some say that classroom management must occur before effective instruction can take place, whereas others contend that management should be at the center of instruction, and still others caution that management concerns should not subordinate instruction and content (Doyle, 1986). While the Effective Steward Conceptual Framework stresses the importance of proactive classroom management espoused by Evertson (1989), a successful manager does not rely exclusively on management instruction given during the first few weeks of school. After a management system has been presented it is important that ongoing instructional methods also promote positive student behavior. The sequencing of activities in a systematic and logical fashion and the employment of robust pedagogical techniques enhance student on-task behavior and increase learner confidence in the competence of the teacher (Doyle, 1986). Still, Marzano (2003) asserts that classroom management strategies are just as relevant and important today as ever.

In addition to employing robust instructional techniques, teachers who are Effective Stewards employ the general management techniques that Jacob Kounin (1970) has established in his landmark study, *Discipline and Group Management in Classrooms*. In this study, Kounin and his associates observed 80 first- and second-grade classrooms and attempted to determine what factors distinguished well-managed classrooms from poorly managed classrooms. Kounin found that teacher monitoring was of paramount importance, particularly two aspects of monitoring that he termed "withitness" and "overlapping." Withitness involves being aware of what is going on in the classroom and communicating this awareness to students. This concept of withitness was later expanded by Evertson and Emmer (1982), who found that effective managers not only can spot student misbehavior in its early stages but also can anticipate student misbehavior before it even starts and prevent it. Overlapping involves the ability to attend to two or more events at once. Other factors that Kounin found important were smoothness, momentum, variety, and challenge (Kounin, 1970).

Teachers who employ such a proactive management system very rarely need to employ what Doyle (1986) calls "desists"—actions or statements that intervene in student misbehavior. However, when those occasions do occur, an Effective Steward will have a repertoire of responses

ready to counter undesirable student behavior in the classroom. Redl and Wattenberg (1959), in their classic text *Mental Hygiene in Teaching*, have developed a set of "influence techniques" that tend to promote smoothness and momentum while a teacher addresses student misbehavior. Three of these techniques—signals, proximity control, and nonpunitive exile ("time-out")—are time-honored resources for the Effective Steward of the classroom environment.

Several theorists have introduced systems for dealing with learner misbehavior (Gordon, 1974; Canter & Canter, 1976; Dreikers, Grunwald, & Pepper, 1982; Glasser, 1986). The Effective Steward must employ procedures from among these various systems, choosing strategies according to the age of the students (Lasley, 1989), the type of instructional techniques that the teacher is employing (Goodman, 1990), the teacher's personal philosophy of education, and school policy.

Marzano concludes his 2003 review of classroom management strategies by asserting that effective classroom management is possible everywhere:

Decades of research provide clear guidance on the critical aspects of effective management and the strategies that work best to achieve it. Equipped with this knowledge and understanding, schools and classroom teachers can educate students in a safe, orderly, and respectful environment that maximizes the possibilities for effective teaching and real learning. (p. 115)

In a climate of assessment and accountability, it is especially important for teachers to be Effective Stewards of student motivation and behavior and effective managers of productive learning environments. Testing and accountability are a central focus in our learning environments during the last decade, with recent books for teachers reflecting the new continuous improvement emphasis. The following publications from the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development illustrate the sharply focused spotlight on testing and accountability: *Transforming Classroom Grading* (Marzano, 2000), *The Truth about Testing* (Popham, 2001), *Accountability for Learning* (Reeves, 2004), and *Transforming Schools: Creating a Culture of Continuous Improvement* (Zmuda, et al., 2004). None of these books has a chapter or section on classroom management, but the sharp shift toward standards-based and testing-based accountability requires more effective and efficient overall learning environments in all schools and at all levels.

School Environment

An effective learning environment should promote personal bonds between adults and students and among students (McLaughlin, Talbert, Kahne, & Powell, 1990). Unfortunately, many teachers typically feel very isolated from each other (Cooper, Iorio, & Poster, 1990) and many teachers often have difficulty developing personal bonds with their students (Schlosser, 1992). The spirit in which these personal bonds develop at a particular school is often called school climate,

and it is important for an Effective Steward of the learning environment to contribute to a positive school climate.

Taylor (1989) has described several components of a positive school climate among teachers, including trust, respect, involvement opportunities for social and academic growth, morale, and a high degree of collegiality. Adams and Bailey (1989) found that teachers who foster the development of these positive components of school climate have high feelings of self-efficacy. These teachers also tend to encourage one another (Adams & Bailey, 1989) and get more involved in school-wide activities (Taylor, 1989).

Another important factor in developing a positive school climate is the relationship between students and teachers. Surprisingly, students may have many of the same priorities as teachers concerning the climate they desire in their school. Phelan, Davidson, and Cao (1992) found that the most important factor in students' preferences regarding school climate was caring teachers. The second most important factor was the degree of emotional safety that students feel in the classroom. They do not want to be put down or made to feel stupid by either the teacher or their peers. Most students prefer a well-managed classroom and dislike the disruptive actions of their peers. The authors contend that these preferences are remarkably similar to what teachers want in terms of school climate:

Teachers want to be respected and want to work with students who care; who exhibit humor, openness and consideration; and who are actively involved in subject-area content. Furthermore, teachers want to be in safe and tension-free environments. (Phelan et al., 1992, p. 695)

Teachers who are warm, caring, and friendly set a positive emotional tone in the classroom.... Contrast this with teachers who are cold, uncaring, and aloof. The former concentrate on students as persons, the latter on lessons to be taught. The former concentrate on thinking and sharing and learning, the latter on deadlines and punctuality and performance. The former engage all students in an effort to help them learn, the latter confront students in an effort to combat ignorance. It is clear which kind of classroom produces openness, curiosity, and freedom to ask questions. (Yount, 1996, p. 296)

Often, a small group of disruptive students can have a profoundly negative effect on overall school climate. Schlosser (1992) has found that schools in which these "marginal" students are brought into the mainstream of the school culture tend to have much more positive climates. Schlosser asserts that the single most important distinguishing feature between teachers who have a low impact on marginal students versus teachers who have a high impact on marginal students is the distance teachers maintain between themselves and their students. Low-impact teachers tend to blame student marginality on external factors and claim there is nothing they can do. High-impact teachers, on the other hand, involve marginal students in their classrooms in several ways: first, they share personal details about their own lives; second, they ask about their students' personal lives; third, they attempt to connect the school and the curriculum to the personal lives of their

students; fourth, they describe in detail classroom procedures and thinking processes; and fifth, they provide an appropriate balance between a high degree of structure and an effective amount of student independence.

Discipline should not, however, be the main focus in an effective learning environment. Though crucial to a teacher's success, management must be an integral part of the big picture in the classroom that includes the teacher's knowledge, curriculum, professional skills, and proactive planning. The successful learning environment is an exciting environment:

Most often, [surveyed students] describe influential teachers in terms of their ability to generate enthusiasm for learning through personal involvement with the subject matter and skill in teaching it. Such responses far outnumber mentions of power, status, or intelligence. Adolescents respond to teachers who communicate a sense of excitement, a contagious intellectual thrill. When excitement is present, learning becomes a pleasure instead of a chore. Thus teachers' involvement with subject matter translates into effective learning for students. (Csikszentmihalyi & McCormack, 1998, p. 5)

Schools that can evoke a contagious excitement for learning have fewer discipline problems, more engaged students, and teachers who are spending more time being creative in the classroom and less time being stressed troubleshooters. Such schools are well-positioned to tap fully into the educational opportunities outside their walls in the wider learning community.

Community Environment

Parent and community involvement in the schools is an important factor in facilitating a positive school climate. Greenwood and Hickman (1991) report that parent involvement results in students' increased academic achievement, sense of well-being, attendance, appropriate behavior, and educational aspirations. Similarly, Epstein (1991) states that teachers feel more effective as professionals when a successful parent involvement program is in place at their school. These programs should emphasize collaboration (Coleman, 1991; Comer & Haynes, 1991) and should include parent education (Hendrickson, Gable, & Omer, 1990; Chils, 1991; Redding, 1991), two-way communication between teachers and parents (Wolf & Stephens, 1989; Flippo & Smith, 1990; Warner, 1991), parental involvement in classrooms (Hunter, 1989), and parental involvement with their children at home (Davis, 1991; Nuckolls, 1991; Tregaskis, 1991).

The family and the school are important parts of a student's learning environment. But "the child's social context includes environmental forces beyond the family" (Kirk, Gallagher, & Anastasiow, 2000, p. 22). Driscoll and Nagel (1999) add:

An effective...teacher must understand the community dynamics and how these dynamics affect the child. These dynamics can be psychological, physical, economic, political, or

social, and the variation in children and their families will be better understood within ecological perspective. (p. 202)

Business involvement programs can provide many benefits for schools including new funding resources, an opportunity for students to interact with positive role models and affirmative frameworks in the community, and sources for new ideas. In return schools can offer benefits to these businesses such as improved public image and improved employee morale (MacDowell, 1989).

MacDowell (1989) reports that businesses are becoming increasingly involved at the pre-University level. Companies and community agencies are expressing concern about K-12 education and want entry-level employees who have developed adequate job skills. A teacher who is an Effective Steward of the community environment will tap into these various sources of involvement and use them to their fullest potential. In the State of Indiana, specifically, government and business entities are quite concerned about the quality of Indiana high school graduates as well as the growing brain drain of University students leaving the state after graduation.

Finally, the learning environment includes the nation's and the world's political structures, social problems, economic structures, and power struggles. John Taylor Gatto (2002), once a Teacher of the Year and now a school critic, cautions, "What is currently under discussion in our national hysteria about failing academic performance misses the point" (p. 14):

Global economics does not speak to the public need for meaningful work, affordable housing, fulfilling education, adequate medical care, a clean environment, honest and accountable government, social and cultural renewal, or simple justice. (p.15)

Christian philosopher Nicholas Wolterstorff, with book titles like *Educating for Responsible Action* (1980) and *Educating for Shalom* (2004), urges that schooling be designed to prepare students to take responsibility for solving the world's problems and promoting community. Pre-service teachers and practicing teachers with an attitude of conscientious accountability make for better stewards of the various educational resources provided to them by God and society. Thorough understanding of the classroom environment, the school environment, and the community creates teachers who are responsible and effective managers of this area of professionalism.

Teachers who are good stewards of knowledge, learner development, and the learning environment will have an easier time designing effective instruction, to which we now turn.

Steward of Instruction

Instruction is the visible application of educational theories; it is the product that results from the synergy between a teacher's professional and content-specific knowledge bases. Thus, managing and delivering instruction are some of the more obvious ways in which stewardship occurs in the classroom. And this is where professionals wanting to maximize the gifts, knowledge, and calling given them from God can effectively apply their areas of professional knowledge to everyday practical applications.

And what does the Lord require of you? To act justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with your God.
Micah 6:8

Teaching requires relating content from varied disciplines to the concepts under study and to the experiences of learners. This requires that teachers establish balance in the curriculum and help learners see both the nature of theory and its applications to life. In addition, teachers must demonstrate clarity, foster inquiry and discussion, and enhance student visualization in their lessons. Through an understanding of current research, theories, and practice in instruction, teacher education candidates are able to become effective teachers.

Since honing one's planning skills is a career-long pursuit at the heart of what practicing teachers do daily, a teacher education program must put heavy emphases on helping candidates explore and reflect on different aspects of planning, critical thinking, classroom dynamics, and classroom assessment. In fact, these are not only at the heart of Huntington University's undergraduate methods courses, but also at the heart of most of the proposed masters level courses.

Planning

One of the biggest surprises that many education students encounter when they begin actually working in the schools is the amount of planning that teaching involves; effective teachers do not just get up in front of a class and teach without preparation. Effective teachers have goals and objectives, and they know what achievement outcomes they want to see in their students at the end of a lesson or unit.

There are three reasons why lesson planning is important. First, thoughtful planning creates more purposeful instruction....Second, thoughtful planning enhances learning.... Finally, thoughtful planning enhances the teacher's effectiveness. (Johnson, 1999, p. 15)

A key area of expertise related to fostering stewardship of instruction involves developing competence in the writing of instructional objectives. The Effective Steward Conceptual Framework stresses thorough understanding of Bloom's Taxonomy (Bloom, et al., 1956; Krathwohl, Bloom & Masia, 1964) and practice in the formulation of learning objectives.

Scardamalia and Bereiter (1989) describe dilemmas facing beginning teachers who want to distinguish between good and bad teaching as they struggle with how to get started, how to get students interested, how to make real-world applications, and how to take students beyond themselves. Scardamalia and Bereiter advocate planning that includes setting high standards, taking or pushing students to ever higher levels, organizing learning environments for growth, playing the role of co-investigator with students, and using student errors as opportunities for growth.

Therefore, curriculum and planning go hand in hand with a teacher's philosophy and assumptions (Jackson, 1992). As they learn to plan a variety of lesson types, teacher education candidates need to know that teaching is not merely a matter of isolated treatments or procedures. They need to see different perspectives on curriculum. And although few teachers hold to absolute, entirely "teacher-centered" or "student-centered" philosophies, for example, dichotomies are a useful way in teacher preparation settings of reflecting on the teaching spectrum (Pearson, 1994; Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1986). Models of different lesson plan formats are also useful here.

Further, the concept of instructional scaffolding as introduced by Vygotsky (1962) and Bruner (1986)—and expanded by Langer and Applebee (1987)—also can serve as a lens through which to examine planning and instruction. Anderson (1989) defines scaffolding as:

a temporary and adjustable structure that allows accomplishment of a task that would be impossible without the scaffold's support. . . . The more knowledgeable adult simplifies the situation so that the child is capable of responding independently. . . . Teachers model, then coach, then fade. (pp. 106-107)

Beginning teachers are "learning a new role in a familiar setting" (Florio-Ruane, 1989), but they are not just crowd controllers, nor are they just "managers of instruction" (Zumwalt, 1989). Instead, says Zumwalt, they are professional specialists in specific curricular areas. In other words, they manage not just products, nor just processes, but a product-process marriage, a union of what and how and whom.

In short, teachers must be experts. Getting novices onto the road to expertise is a challenge, however; and learning to plan effectively is one of the most important components of teacher education. Despite the widespread prescriptive use of her materials, Hunter (1991) cautions, "Information need not come from direct teaching!" (p. 27). Moreover, she allows that "content decisions of each discipline should be made with someone who is well-versed in that discipline" (p. 29).

So an effective teacher is also a reflective teacher. Maxine Greene (1986) calls for increased teacher reflectiveness on intentions, values, and ends:

The main concern is to clarify the language used in describing or explaining the practice of teaching, to penetrate the arguments used in justifying what is done, to make visible what is presumed in the formation of purposes and aims. (p. 479)

Thoughtful planning is hard but rewarding, for in effective planning teachers can have the best shot at effective instruction. Owen (1991) likens planning to prewriting, actual teaching to writing, and reflection afterward to revision. "Teaching and learning are active processes of discovering meaning" (p. 57). Though freedom and spontaneity are key elements of effective instruction for her, she insists that all teachers do need to plan. They need to read and study their highway maps, get on the right expressway, but then also be "willing to leave the expressway of their lesson plans" (p. 62) at times.

Thinking

Teaching and learning are both all about thinking. Effective teachers in the act of instruction are not on some sort of automatic pilot merely ticking off the checkpoints on a carefully designed roadmap. Teachers interact with a group of human beings who are unpredictable and require them to think constantly about what they are doing. Consideration of students, the learning environment, and content demands requires constant "interactive decision making" by teachers (Clark & Peterson, 1986). A Hunter (1979) article title proclaims, "Teaching is Decision Making" and goes on to describe the enormous variety of decisions a teacher makes during a single lesson.

Because each classroom is different and presents different demands on a teacher, classrooms must be seen as separate cultures instead of unvarying treatment centers. According to Cazden and Mehan (1989), there is a "need for beginning teachers to vary instructional circumstances to take full advantage of students' often unrecognized resources" (p. 49).

[Students'] displays of intelligence and language vary depending upon the circumstances of their assessment. They are not general abilities that appear uniformly in all situations. They are specific skills that will be activated differently in one type of situation or another. (p. 49)

Teachers are not the only ones thinking in the classroom, of course. However, if teachers do not attend to class-specific needs, then students may not have the best opportunity truly to think about what their teachers are covering. Recitation often replaces real discussion. Teachers frequently fall into Cazden and Mehan's (1989) default patterns of classroom language (p. 51)—the teacher initiates a topic, nominates a student to respond, and evaluates that response (IRE: Initiation-Response-Evaluation); and so it goes hour after hour in many if not most classrooms. Avoiding this kind of pseudo-discussion "requires a slower pace and relaxation of the teacher's control over turn-taking and departure from the three-part IRE sequence" (p. 49).

A thorough grounding in information processing theory also contributes to development of Effective Stewards of instruction. The information processing model can be broken down for education students into three components: sensory registers (Sperling, 1960), short-term memory (Miller, 1956), and long-term memory (Bower, et al., 1969; Craik & Lockhart, 1972; Paivio, 1971; Posner, 1987; Pressley, et al., 1987). As each component of the system is illustrated, teaching

methodologies that aid information processing can be discussed with students. For example, Ausubel's (1968) concept of advance organizers is a means to assist top-down processing in the sensory registers.

Further, critical thinking is not something that can be taught in a vacuum; effective teachers know not only their students and the basics of learning theory but also the background of the content they are teaching. Grauerholz and Bouma-Holtrop (2003) talk about the need to help students assess an argument or problem in the context of awareness and sensitivity to the situation.

Classroom and Community Interaction

If knowledge acquisition is an on-going, interactive, and contextualized phenomenon, and if reflection on both products and processes is important for teachers and students alike, then it is crucial for prospective teachers to be exposed not only to a variety of teaching methods such as individualized instruction, mastery learning, problem solving, cooperative learning, reciprocal teaching, role-playing, and scaffolding, but also to the new paradigms (Phelps, 1988), new philosophies (Braddock, et al., 1963), and new worldviews (Lloyd-Jones, 1986; Schrag, 1992) that these methods entail. For example, Anderson (1989) warns, "Fact-oriented and recitation-oriented teaching is incompatible with a cognitive-mediational perspective of learning" (p. 107).

Since effective teaching is not merely talking in front of a class, teachers who are Effective Stewards of classroom interaction must engage students in carefully planned instructional activities, activities that honor and exploit the diversity represented in the classroom and community. These activities may include listening to teacher talk but also may include cooperative learning, whole-class discussions, small group work, activities with manipulative materials, directed reading and writing experiences, and work with various media or technologies. Obviously, this aspect of managing instruction dovetails thoroughly with stewardship of the learning environment.

According to Cazden and Mehan (1989), the task of learning in any given lesson is embedded within the overall context of the lesson, classroom, school, and community. Understanding the specific instructional context is more important, even, than cramming to learn specific students' ethnic characteristics, they argue. Knowing a little about each student's ethnic group can lead to dangerous stereotyping, they warn; whereas thoroughly understanding classroom dynamics is much more productive in ensuring equal access to learning for each student.

Students come from vibrant cultures outside the classroom. Cazden and Mehan found that "the frequency of parent-teacher contact—whether initiated by parent or teacher—correlated significantly with student gains in reading" (p. 55). Moreover, like Heath (1983), they found that gaining information from the school's surrounding community and "transform[ing] it for pedagogical use" (Cazden & Mehan, 1989, p. 55) is extremely important, especially for beginning teachers who may be new to a community. Since they believe instruction should be adapted to community norms and expectations (p. 53), they advocate an emphasis in teacher education on

helping beginning teachers "learn how to learn experientially about students and their families and ... reflect on their own cultural background" (pp. 54-55). Thomas, Fazio, and Steifelmeyer (1999) reiterate that educators should seek new ways to communicate with families, especially families from diverse backgrounds in order to maximize connections between school learning and home support systems.

Important factors in developing stewards of instruction, therefore, include varied field experiences and conceptual mastery of ideas such as Bandura's (1977) social learning theory. The phases of observational learning, the influence of model characteristics, and the effects of extrinsic feedback should all be discussed within the context of their impact on instructional practices in the classroom. Hunter's (1986) applications of social learning theory and information processing to direct instruction also should be addressed in this context.

Additionally, theories of motivation relate to developing instructional stewardship. An Effective Steward of instruction draws on theoretical viewpoints regarding motivation: self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977), attribution theory (Heider, 1958), cognitive theory (Tolman, 1932), and Maslow's (1954) theory of a hierarchy of needs. Again, our Conceptual Framework stresses practical applications of these theories of motivation to the varied situations in the classroom.

Many new teaching strategies and new twists on old strategies dominate the professional literature, which prospective teachers must be encouraged to read. Further, their training should include thorough exposure to and discussion of many of these methodologies. Research in cognitive-strategy instruction and self-instructive processes denotes "a relationship between academic success and an active student role in learning" (Wang & Palincsar, 1989, p. 80).

Cooperative learning is an alternative for Cazden and Mehan (1989) to the thoroughly pervasive whole-class IRE discourse patterns they identify--teacher Initiation, student Response, teacher Evaluation. With heterogeneous grouping, they argue, the lower achieving students get individualized attention; as for the higher achievers, "those who teach learn best" (p. 53). However, they caution that extensive in-service training is necessary to use cooperative learning effectively. Nonetheless, pre-service teachers can begin to get this training in their undergraduate education program and field experiences. Graduate programs can further train practicing teachers in effective uses of alternative classroom discourse and critical thinking activities.

Cooperative learning should not be seen as some mysterious method opposed to conventional instruction, however. In a study of direct instruction, cooperative learning, and traditional instruction, Stevens et al. (1991) found that cooperative learning and direct instruction can be used effectively together, allowing, for example, for improved use of class time while the teacher is with a small reading group. Stevens et al, like many others, counsel that the keys to effective cooperative learning activities include incentives to cooperate and individual accountability (p. 9).

So, instruction so far encompasses effective planning, reflective thinking (both the teacher's and her students'), and efficient use of the educational setting—all within a context of solid

knowledge of content, pedagogy, the specific learners, and the broader learning environment. However, two additional components of effective instruction must be added to this list: keeping up with professional development opportunities and using assessment to verify that students are meeting their learning objectives.

Keeping Current

Teaching, like all professions, requires continuous upgrading of one's professional knowledge and skills. Teaching involves daily use of both old and new knowledge and skills about content and students. Beginning teachers must be thoroughly aware of developments in specific content areas and research concerning best practices in the teaching of those areas and teaching in general. They must understand the major arguments and take a preliminary stand, for example, in the decades-long process/product debate in writing instruction and the phonics/whole language debate in reading instruction. They must keep current in areas such as using technology, teaching English language learners, celebrating diversity, and accommodating special needs. They must be aware of the newest standards in content areas such as math education, stressing open-ended problem solving, real-life applications, collaboration, exploration, and communication (Frye, 1989a, 1989b). And they must read about hands-on learning, advance organizers, wait-time considerations, and questioning techniques in science teaching.

Beginning teachers in any area of teaching need to know about the field's explorations of error-analysis, student ownership, and individualization. They must be aware of the downplaying of competition, top-down control, and whole-group instructional approaches proposed in recent research and theory. Future teachers also must know about the push for interdisciplinary teaching in the arts, critical thinking in moral education, and decision-making and qualitative social inquiry in social studies education. And, crucially, they must be ready to jump into the continuous improvement/assessment environment of today's schools.

Additionally, prospective teachers need to know the best ways to deliver their fresh content to specific students in specific classrooms. Given the technological explosion of the last half of this century, it makes no sense for schools to remain in the first half of the century technologically. Nor does it make any sense for teachers to have computers available but not know how to use them. Esfahani (1989) insists, "Technology. . . can increase teaching effectiveness by addressing students' individual learning patterns" (p. 16).

Yet another crucial way to stay current is through professional relationships. Principals and veteran teachers should provide an atmosphere of continuous learning and promote professional interactions (Heller, 2004). Educators at all levels benefit, as do their students, as barriers are broken down among higher education, secondary education, and elementary education. Futurists are confident that the walls and age divisions that so characterize current educational structures will yield to more integrated, holistic, and life-long models of education. Experiments in collaboration have been very positive. Our program completers are Effective Stewards of instruction as they

develop ways for themselves and their students to be connected to a wide variety of learning situations and develop networks and resources that rely on research and professional wisdom while fostering discernment as educational fads come and go.

Assessment of Student Learning

To determine the best learning opportunities for their students, teachers must be able to diagnose students' educational strengths and weaknesses and their knowledge and skill needs. Further, teachers need to determine whether their instructional strategies are successful. Evaluation, then, is not merely an examination of what students have learned after teaching occurs. Instead, assessment of learning should provide continuous self-reflection on the part of both teachers and students and include performances and informal evaluation as well as traditional tests. "The impact of recent learning theory on instruction and assessment seems to make all of the sense in the world; it endorses the adage that the best way to learn something is to *do* it" (Farr & Tone, 1994, p. 3).

It is particularly important, that teachers see assessment as a tool for effective learning and instruction. All teacher education candidates, both elementary and secondary, have required courses in educational assessment.

In school, being wrong has always carried negative consequences for students. Sadly, in this climate of increasing accountability, being wrong carries even more severe consequences. But being wrong is often the first step on the path to greater understanding. (Brooks & Brooks, 2003, p. 167)

Maxine Greene (1989) urges that the main type of evaluation in classrooms ought to be daily self-evaluation by the teacher: a questioning of one's norms and assumptions and methods. Teachers need to know not only the structures of the social and political contexts in which they operate but also how to question prevailing norms when the norms hamper effective and equitable educational opportunities for their students. Greene maintains that first testing the waters for hidden curriculums, social assumptions, and power relationships makes more sense than merely testing the students—some of whom may be victims of unclear social inequities—and then wondering why they score poorly. Therefore, through simulations, videotapes, peer evaluation, written and oral self-assessments, and field experiences, Huntington University's pre-service teachers are trained to evaluate and adjust their teaching styles and strategies and to match instruction to their learners' needs, something the unit faculty overtly model.

Formal testing of students can, of course, be one piece of the assessment puzzle. Just as the literature on instruction advocates varying one's teaching styles to address different student learning styles, so teachers should vary their testing mechanisms to embrace student diversity. Beginning teachers need to know that there are a variety of ways to assess student learning and teaching effectiveness. They should grasp the advantages and the pitfalls of various testing alternatives, recognizing especially the special challenges that formal testing poses for learners with certain

learning styles and learners from low SES groups and different cultural backgrounds. They should grasp the pros and cons of using technology in various ways for assessment. Additionally, the Effective Steward of instruction should understand constructs such as validity and reliability as well as practical uses and limitations of standardized, norm-referenced achievement, aptitude, and intelligence tests (Hopkins & Stanley, 1981).

Finally, Effective Stewards of instruction must come out of education programs that are practicing what they preach. It is a sad situation in many teacher education programs when students have to think more about what not to use from the methods they observe in their professors and cooperating teachers than what to emulate. Huntington University's teacher education faculty members are evaluated regularly with the IDEA course evaluation system. Additionally, a close working relationship within the department allows constructive peer support, and a spirit of openly modeling our teaching methods invites reflection and feedback from candidates throughout the course.

The constraints found in most teacher-education programs have created a situation wherein *what* teacher educators teach is contradicted by how they teach it. Despite these constraints, some teacher educators are now attempting to "live" their theories and are using teacher research to understand what is happening in their classrooms.... Some educators have modified the curricula of already existing courses; others have redesigned courses or entire programs; still others have focused on establishing more effective university-school collaborative projects and in-service programs. (Short, 1993, p. 157)

Pre-service teachers and practicing teachers with an attitude of responsible effectiveness make good stewards of planning, instruction, and assessment. Thorough understanding of these areas makes teachers effective managers of this area of professionalism entrusted to them by God and society.

Evaluation in and of the Conceptual Framework:

The Personal and Conceptual Development of Effective Stewards

Evaluation of the Effective Steward Conceptual framework is viewed from two perspectives. First, from a metacognitive perspective we must evaluate the Conceptual Framework itself. Is this an appropriate Conceptual Framework? Is it congruent with the mission and

philosophy of education of the institution? Does it account for established knowledge bases in teacher education? Second, we must evaluate the degree to which we are successful in implementing the Conceptual Framework we have established. Are our students becoming Effective Stewards as they progress through the Huntington University teacher education programs? What values, attitudes, and beliefs are guiding our students as they progress through our programs and enter the teaching profession?

Evaluation of the Conceptual Framework

The Huntington University teacher education program's Conceptual Framework is our philosophical underpinning and as such includes both secular and Christian scholarship. The language we use to organize and describe reality plays a decisive role not only in language education but in any subject at any level. Postman and Weingartner (1969) write, "The idea that the study of any subject is essentially a study of language seems to be recognized everywhere except in school" (p. 115). Like deconstruction theories that spilled out of literary criticism into cultural criticism, Postman and Weingartner's position calls into question views of not only subject matter, students, and schooling, but all of life: "The study of language is the study of our ways of living, which is to say our ways of perceiving reality" (p. 104). Therefore, the issue of perspective is not limited to the study of literature, history, and religion; it is pertinent to all pursuits. Armstrong and Wiese (1992), for example, view business education graduates from Christian liberal arts Universities as "salt and light"—a reference to the biblical conclusion to the Beatitudes in Matthew 5:13-14, where Christians are urged to make a difference in the world.

Is it appropriate for such religious metaphors as "salt and light" or "stewardship" to guide professional training programs in Christian liberal arts Universities? Our position is that we would betray not only the mission of our institution but also our own integrity if we did not attempt to build these kinds of metaphors. Noll (1994) argues that the separation of nurturing the mind from nurturing the soul is scandalous in American religious and intellectual history. Further, if religion includes one's view of the world—of society, culture, human purposes, and eternity—as well as one's individual calling, then no education can be nonreligious. That is, everyone has a worldview. McCarthy et al. (1981) maintain that teachers who deny that they bring their values and worldviews into the classroom simply fool themselves and display a worldview, or religion, that is inarticulate and confused. Beversluis (1971) asserts that teachers with a clear sense of their mission will consciously address holistic development in their students, focusing on learning experiences that develop students intellectually, morally, and creatively. Further, Habecker (1990), a former president of Huntington University, contends that true leaders are servants (stewards) for their constituencies. Citing numerous biblical examples, such as Christ's washing his disciples' feet, Habecker illustrates the powerful link between leadership and service. This biblical principal about being a humble servant to those one is leading has been popularized widely by authors such as Robert Greenleaf and Steven Covey (Greenleaf, Spears, and Covey, 2002).

Is “Teacher as Effective Steward,” then, an appropriate Conceptual Framework for this institution in the first decade of the Twenty-First Century? Given the insistence of educational scholars that teachers be true to their worldviews and the assertion of a former president of this institution about the importance of stewardly servanthood, we can be assured that we are proceeding in the right direction.

This Conceptual Framework originated in the early 1990s as the institution prepared for its first NCATE visit in 1993. Then the education unit reevaluated the Conceptual Framework as the state and NCATE moved toward a performance-based approach to program accreditation and candidate licensing. The framework mapped well onto INTASC Principles and state content and developmental standards and continued to guide our thinking about the crucial components of our teacher preparation program at Huntington as we prepared for our second NCATE visit in 2000 (see the linkage charts in the Unit Assessment System and the Institutional Report’s discussion of the Conceptual Framework) . The unit reexamined the framework yet again as we launched a special education program, proposed a Master of Education program, and began to prepare for our third NCATE visit (2005). In fact, the fit and usefulness of the Conceptual Framework is an annual topic during our summer departmental work days. Although we evaluate the framework regularly and have made wording adjustments and updated this *Knowledge Base*, the basic four-part Conceptual Framework continues to capture who we are, who we want to be, and how we want our candidates to organize their thinking about effective, reflective, professional, and Christian teaching.

As the knowledge base within teacher education changes we will attempt to assimilate those changes within our Conceptual Framework. Or we may come to a point where we will need to part with this Conceptual Framework and develop a new one. Our annual departmental work days each summer and our weekly department meetings provide the mechanism for us regularly to test our Conceptual Framework, our approaches, our assessment data, and our assumptions.

Evaluation in the Conceptual Framework

Teaching is not for everyone. Knowing this, many Huntington University education candidates have a keen sense of idealism and purpose as they enter their professional programs. Additionally, many Huntington University students have chosen to become teacher candidates because they feel that God has called them to that vocation. We encourage students to seek God's will in their lives. Self-reflection—through personal prayer, professional reading, and reflective journals—and success in education-related pursuits, including coursework, field experiences, and volunteer opportunities, are ways they may find evidence that teaching is (or is not) for them.

Successful teacher education candidates must sense that though teaching is not for everyone, it is for them. They must have a sense of calling and mission. Additionally, positive and enthusiastic attitudes toward learning, their subject areas, and toward children are vital. Other critical personal qualities include commitment to freedom, democracy, and responsibility. These dispositions are assessed in the interview at the beginning of the teacher education program,

through recommendations, in education courses, in field experiences, and in advising sessions and other individual meetings between candidates and the unit's faculty. Evaluation forms and recommendation forms used throughout the program (for example, for the interviews, field experiences, and portfolio checks) reflect the four components of the Teacher as Effective Steward framework.

Teaching can be conceived in many different ways. Bullough (1991) encourages candidates to develop metaphors for teaching. Candidates' metaphors evolve as candidates develop images such as "teaching as gardening" and "teaching as an extension of parenting" to "teacher as butterfly." Here at Huntington University we introduce our candidates to our metaphor of teaching, the Effective Steward Conceptual Framework, and then encourage them to develop their own philosophies of education and relate those philosophies to ours.

The metaphors by which we organize our thoughts about teaching can have a profound influence on how we actually teach. Sztajn (1992) argues that many recent efforts to recast perspectives on schooling still operate with old metaphors. "Changing the school as a factory metaphor for the school as an enlightened corporation is just updating the business metaphor" (p. 36)—a metaphor that Sztajn says needs to be abandoned immediately since "we are still seeing students as raw materials to be processed in the most efficient way."

Wood (1985) cautions that beginning teachers change their attitudes very little once they enter the profession. Teachers' philosophies, though continuously shaped as they teach, do drive how they teach. All humans operate according to the metaphors they use to describe reality (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980); therefore, there is quite a significant difference, for example, between teaching to cover and teaching to facilitate or teaching to enable different learners to learn to their fullest. Lortie (1975) describes the idealism that accompanies new teachers into their jobs and the harsh awakening some teachers encounter within the first few years of the profession. Instead of presenting jaded perspectives before candidates become teachers, however, the purpose of teacher education programs should be "to increase the person's awareness of...beliefs and preferences about teaching and... expose them to personal examination" (Lortie, p. 231).

However, Kay (2003) believes that teachers can and often do combine their reflective minds and magnanimous hearts with their ideals and determination to forge new paradigms and new views of professionalism and to demand fresh kinds of support to prepare their students for the new worlds they will encounter. Teacher education programs such as Huntington University's must strive to introduce candidates to the philosophical issues in teaching and the cultural realities. But, more than that, they must seek to help future teachers cultivate and nurture the ideals that attracted them to the field while simultaneously helping them to reflect productively on their weaknesses and the weaknesses of the educational system. This effort, then, involves nothing less than empowering pre-service teachers to appreciate teaching not as just a job, nor as a temporary adventure, but as a profession, and, more importantly, as a personal vocation, a calling, and ideally: a divine calling.

Therefore it is very important that the interplay of the Effective Steward Conceptual Framework with candidates' personal philosophies of teaching results in the establishment of attitudes and beliefs that are conducive to effective teaching. Rose (1989) specifies attitudes that characterize effective teachers: positive views of other people, positive opinions toward democratic classroom activities, ability to see others' viewpoints, and seeing students as capable and creative instead of subjects that teachers "do things to." Similarly, in describing the effects of an expanding youth culture, rapidly changing technology, and disappointing results in vocational education, Goodlad (1984) points out that "we want it all" in modern schooling. Teachers, then, need to search for effective alternatives to business as usual as they attempt to meet, single-handedly, educational goals that have until recently been divided among the school, the church, and the family. Innovation and flexibility are more crucial than ever in school structures, teacher training programs, and teacher attitudes (Goodlad, 1990).

So, how do we know that our candidates are called to be teachers, that they are flexible and innovative, that they are democratic, positive, caring, reflective, and responsible—in short that they are well on their way to being Effective Stewards? Or, that they are mature, that is, able to see “both the destination and the journey” for both their students and themselves (Yount, 1999)? Our ability to judge the personal and conceptual development of our candidates is entirely dependent on the degree to which we develop relationships with our candidates. We read our candidates' papers, lesson plans, and journals; we engage them in discussions both in and out of class; we watch them present lessons to their peers and to students in real classrooms; we give them tissues when they cry; and we applaud them when they do well. In short, we *know* them, and we nurture them on multiple levels. And we respect them enough to allow ourselves to learn from them. And we expect them to thoroughly know and nurture and respect their students. And we get to watch them grow and mature into reflective professionals who are Effective Stewards of what has been entrusted to them in their classrooms.

References

- Adams, B., & Bailey, G. D. (1989). School is for teachers: Enhancing the school environment. *NASSP Bulletin*, 73(513), 44-48.
- Alper, S., & Ryndak, D. L. (1992). Education students with severe handicaps in regular classes. *The Elementary School Journal*, 92, 373-386.
- Aldridge, J., & Goldman, R. (2002). *Current issues and trends in education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Anderson, L. M. (1989). Classroom instruction. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher* (pp. 101-115). New York: Pergamon.
- Armstrong, K., & Wiese, M. D. (1992, Winter). Salt and light: A paradigm for the Christian business program. *Faculty Dialogue*, 17-33.
- Ausubel, D. P. (1968). *Educational psychology: A cognitive view*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Bandura, A. E. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Banks, J. A. (1995). Multicultural education: Its effects on students' racial and gender role attitudes. In Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (617-627). New York: Macmillan.
- Barnes, H. (1989). Structuring knowledge for beginning teaching. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher* (pp. 13-22). New York: AACTE/Pergamon.
- Bennett, W. J., Finn, C., Jr., & Cribb, J. T. E., Jr. (1999). *The educated child: A parent's guide from preschool through eighth grade*. New York: The Free Press.
- Berger, K. S. (1986). *The developing person through childhood and adolescence* (2nd ed.). New York: Worth.
- Beverluis, N. H. (1971). *Christian philosophy of education*. Grand Rapids, MI: National Union of Christian Schools.
- Biklen, S. K. & Pollard, D. (2001). Feminist perspective on gender in classrooms. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 723-748). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.
- Bloom, B. S., Englehart, M. B., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives. The classification of educational goals. Handbook I: Cognitive domain*. New York: McKay.
- Bower, G. H., Clark, M., Winzenz, D., & Lesgold, A. (1969). Hierarchical retrieval schemes in recall of categorized word lists. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 3, 323-343.
- Braddock, R., Lloyd-Jones, R., Schoer, L. (1963). *Research in written composition*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Brandt, R. M., & Gunter, M. A. (1981). Teachers are made, not born. *Educational Leadership*, 39, 149-151.
- Brewer, J. A. (2004). *Introduction to early childhood education: Preschool through primary grades* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

- Brooks, M. G., & Brooks, J. G. (2003). The courage to be constructivist. In Noll, J. W. (Ed.), *Taking sides: Clashing views of controversial educational issues* (12th ed.), (159-167). Guilford, CT: McGraw-Hill/Dushkin.
- Brown, T. J. (1990). The impact of culture on cognition. *The Clearing House*, 63, 305-309.
- Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bullough, R. V., Jr. (1991). Exploring personal teaching metaphors in preservice teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 42, 43-51.
- Bunker, L. K. (1991). The role of play and motor skill development in building children's self-confidence and self-esteem. *The Elementary School Journal*, 91, 467-471.
- Carr, J. F., & Harris, D. E. (2001). *Succeeding with standards: Linking curriculum, assessment, and action planning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Canter, L., & Canter, M. (1976). *Assertive discipline*. Los Angeles: Canter & Associates.
- Carbone, P. F. (1980). Liberal education and teacher preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 31(3), 13-17.
- Cazden, C. B., & Mehan, H. (1989). Principles from sociology and anthropology: Context, code, classroom, and culture. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher*, pp. 47-57. New York: AACTE/Pergamon.
- Chils, D. B. (1991). Changing the school environment to increase parent involvement. *NASSP Bulletin*, 75(535), 84-88.
- Clark, C. M., & Peterson, P. L. (1986). Teachers' thought processes. In Merlin C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (3rd ed.), (pp. 255-296). New York: American Educational Research Association/Macmillan.
- Clay, M. (1998). *By different paths to common outcomes*. York, Maine: Stenhouse.
- Coleman, J. S. (1991). A federal report on parental involvement in education. *Education Digest*, 57, 3-5.
- Comer, J. P., & Haynes, N. M. (1991). Parent involvement in schools: An ecological approach. *Elementary School Journal*, 91, 271-277.
- Cooper, B. S., Iorio, J. E., & Poster, J. (1990). Organizing schools for teacher collegiality: The New York City experience. *Education*, 111, 68-76.
- Craik, F. I. M., & Lockhart, R. S. (1972). Levels of processing: A framework for memory research. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 11, 671-684.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. & McCormack, J. (1998). The influence of teachers. In Ryan, K. & Cooper, J. M. (Eds). *Kaleidoscope: Readings in Education* (8th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2-8.
- Curry, C. (2003). Universal design: Accessibility for all learners. *Educational Leadership*, 61(2), 55- 60.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1991). Are our teachers ready to teach? *Quality Teaching*, 1(1), 6-10.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). What matters most: A competent teacher for every child. In Ryan, K. & Cooper, J. M. (Eds). *Kaleidoscope: Readings in Education* (8th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 346-358.
- Darling-Hammond (2001). Standard-setting in teaching: Changes in licenses, certification, and assessment. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 751-776). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

- Davidman, L., & Davidman, P. T. (1994). *Teaching with a multicultural perspective: A practical guide*. New York: Longman.
- Davis, P. S. (1991). Parents writing with students. *English Journal*, 80(4), 62-64.
- Dinham, S. M., & Stritter, F. T. (1986). Research on professional education. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.), (pp. 952-970). New York: American Educational Research Association/Macmillan.
- Doyle, W. (1986). Classroom organization and management. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.), 392-431. NY: American Educational Research Association/Macmillan.
- Dreikers, R., Grunwald, B., & Pepper, F. (1982). *Maintaining sanity in the classroom*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Driscoll, A. & Nagel, N. G. (1999). *Childhood education: Birth-8*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Ducharme, E. (1980). Liberal arts in teacher education: The perennial challenge. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 31(3), 7-12.
- Dunn, R., Beaudry, J. S., & Klavas, A. (1989). Survey of research on learning styles. *Educational Leadership*, 46(6), 50-58.
- Eichner, K. M., & Liston, D. P. (1990). Traditions of reform in U.S. teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(2), 3-20.
- Epstein, J. L. (1991). Paths to partnerships: What we can learn from federal, state, and school initiatives. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72, 345-349.
- Erikson, E. (1963). *Childhood and society* (2nd ed.). New York: W. W. Norton.
- Erikson, E. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Esfahani, R. (1989). Ed tech and learning styles. *Instructor*, 99, 16-17.
- Evertson, C. M. (1989). Classroom organization and management. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher*, pp. 59-70. New York: AACTE/Pergamon.
- Evertson, C. M., & Emmer, E. T. (1982). Effective management at the beginning of the year in junior high classes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74(4), 485-498.
- Farr, R. & Tone, B. (1994). *Portfolio performance assessment: Helping students evaluate their progress as readers and writers*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace University.
- Farris, P. J. (1999). *Teaching, bearing the torch*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Flippo, R. F., & Smith, J. A. (1990). Encouraging parent involvement through home letters. *The Reading Teacher*, 44, 359.
- Florio-Ruane, S. (1989). Social organization of classes and schools. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher* (pp. 163-172). New York: Pergamon.
- Fox, T. (1990). Basic writing as cultural conflict. *Journal of Education*, 172(1), 65-83.
- Frye, S. M. (1989a). The challenge of implementation. *Arithmetic Teacher*, 37, 58-60.
- Frye, S. M. (1989b). The NCTM standards—challenges for all classrooms. *Arithmetic Teacher*, 36, 4-7.
- Callego, M. A., Cole, M. & The Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition (2001). Classroom cultures and cultures of the classroom. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 951-997). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

- Gatto, J. T. (2000). *The underground history of American education: A schoolteacher's intimate investigation into the problem of modern schooling*. New York: The Oxford Village Press.
- Gatto, J. T. (2002). *Dumbing us down: the hidden curriculum of compulsory schooling*. Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers.
- Glasser, W. (1986). *Control theory in the classroom*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Golnick, D. M. & Chinn, P. C. (1998). *Multicultural Education in a Pluralistic Society*, 5th ed. New York: Macmillan University Publishing.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1984). *A place called school*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Goodman, K. (1990). *Managing the whole language classroom*. *Instructor*, 99(6), 26-28.
- Gordon, T. (1974). *Teacher effectiveness training*. New York: Peter H. Wyden.
- Grant, C. A., & Secada, W. G. (1990). *Preparing teachers for diversity*. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 403-422). New York: ATE/Macmillan.
- Greene, M. (1986). *Philosophy and teaching*. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on Teaching* (3rd ed.), (pp. 479-501). New York: American Educational Research Association/Macmillan.
- Greene, M. (1989). *Social and political contexts*. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher* (pp. 143-154). New York: Pergamon.
- Greene, M. (2001). *Reflections on teaching*. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 82-89). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.
- Greenleaf, R. K., Spears, L. C., & Covey, S. R. (2002). *Servant leadership: A Journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Greenwood, G. E., & Hickman, C. W. (1991). *Research and practice in parent involvement: Implications for teacher education*. *Elementary School Journal*, 91, 279-288.
- Grossman, P. L. (1989). *A study in contrast: Sources of pedagogical content knowledge for secondary English*. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(5), 24-41.
- Grossman, P. L., Wilson, S. M., & Shulman, L. S. (1990). *Teachers of substance: Subject matter knowledge for teaching*. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), *The knowledge base for the beginning teacher* (pp. 23-36). New York: AACTE/Pergamon.
- Grauerholz, L., & Bouma-Holtrop, S. (2003). *Exploring critical sociological thinking*. *Teaching Sociology*, 31(4), 485-496.
- Habecker, E. B. (1990). *Leading with a follower's heart*. Wheaton, IL: Victor Books.
- Harbaugh, T. J. (1990). *Celebrating diversity*. *Instructor*, 100(2), 44-48.
- Harris, A. C. (1986). *Child development*. St. Paul, MN: West.
- Hausfather, S. (2003). *Where's the Content? The Role of Content in Constructivist Teacher Education*. In F. Schultz (Ed.), *Annual Editions: Education 03/04*, 13th ed (pp. 74-78). Guilford, CT: McGraw-Hill/Dushkin.
- Haynes, C. & Thomas, O. (1996). *Finding common ground: A first amendment guide to religion and public education*. Nashville, TN: The Freedom Forum First Amendment Center.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: John Wiley.
- Heller, D. A. (2004). *Teachers wanted: Attracting and retaining good teachers*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Hendrickson, J. M., Gable, R. A., & Omer, D. (1990). Television viewing and the role of the middle school educator. *The Clearing House*, 63, 267-270.
- Hirsch, E. D. (1987). *Cultural literacy: What every American should know*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Hirsch, E. D. (1996). *The schools we need and why we don't have them*. New York: Doubleday.
- Holtrop, S. D. (1997). Christian philosophy of education: A responsibility model. In H. Van Brummelen & D. C. Elliott (Eds.), *Nurturing Christians as reflective educators*. Claremont, CA: Learning Light.
- Holtrop, S. D. (1999). Concluding thoughts: Authentic Christian teaching. In D. C. Elliott & S. D. Holtrop (Eds.), *Nurturing and reflective teachers: A Christian approach for the 21st century*. Claremont, CA: Learning Light.
- Hopkins, K. R. & Stanley, J. C. (1981). *Educational and psychological measurement and evaluation* (6th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hunter, M. (1979). Teaching is decision making. *Educational Leadership*, 37(2), 62-64.
- Hunter, M. (1986). Madeline Hunter replies: Develop collaboration; build trust. *Educational Leadership*, 43(6), 68.
- Hunter, M. (1989). Join the "par-aide" in education. *Educational Leadership*, 47(2), 36-41.
- Hunter, M. (1991). Generic lesson design: Does science fit the mold? The case for. *The Science Teacher*, 58, 26-28.
- Jackson, P. W. (1992). Conceptions of curriculum and curriculum specialists. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 3-40). New York: Macmillan.
- Johns, F. A., MacNaughton, R. H., & Karabinus, N. G. (1989). *School discipline guidebook: Theory into practice*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Johnson, A. P. (Fall, 1999). Effective lesson planning for effective skills instruction. *Journal of Reading Education*, 24, 15-19.
- Kammeenui, E. J. & Carnine, D. W. (1998). *Effective teaching strategies that accommodate diverse learners*.
- Kay, J. K. (2003). *Quality teaching: Reflection as the heart of practice*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow.
- Kirk, S. A., Gallagher, J. J., & Anastasiow, N. J. (2000). *Educating exceptional children*, 9th ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Kounin, J. S. (1970). *Discipline and group management in classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S., & Masia, B. (1964). Taxonomy of educational objectives. *Handbook II: Affective domain*. New York: McKay.
- Lazar, A. M. (2004). *Learning to be literacy teachers in urban schools: Stories of growth and change*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1991). Coping with multicultural illiteracy: A teacher education response. *Social Education*, 55, 186-187, 194.

- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Langer, J. A., & Applebee, A. N. (1987). *How writing shapes thinking*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Lasley, T. J. (1989). A teacher development conceptual framework for classroom management. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 71, 36-38.
- Lehmann, J. P., Davies, T. G., & Laurin, K. M. (2004). Listening to student voices about postsecondary education. In Freiberg, K. L. (Ed.), *Annual editions: Educating exceptional children*, 16th ed. (pp. 204-209). Guilford, CT: McGraw-Hill/Dushkin.
- Lloyd-Jones, R. (1986). Introduction. In G. Hillocks, Jr., *Research on written composition: New directions for teaching* (pp. xiii-xiv). Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, and the National Conference on Research in English.
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- MacDowell, M. A. (1989). Partnerships: Getting a return on investment. *Educational Leadership*, 47(2), 8-11.
- MacMillan, D. L., Keogh, B. K., & Jones, R. L. (1986). Special education research on mildly mentally handicapped learners. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.), (pp. 686-726). New York: American Educational Research Association/Macmillan.
- Matera, D. (2001). *A cry for character: How a group of students cleaned up their rowdy school and spawned a wildfire antidote to the Columbine effect*. Paramus, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Maker, C. J. (1986). Developing scope and sequence in curriculum. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 30(4), 151-158.
- Marzon, R. J. (2000). *Transforming classroom grading*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J., with Marzano, J. S., & Pickering, D. J. (2003). *Classroom management that works: Research-based strategies for every teacher*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- McCarthy, R., Oppewal, D., Peterson, W., & Spykman, G. (1981). *Society, state, and schools*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans.
- McDiarmid, G. W. (1990). The liberal arts: Will more result in better subject matter understanding? *Theory Into Practice*, 29(1), 21-29.
- McLaughlin, M. S., Talbert, J., Kahne, J., & Powell, J. (1990). Constructing a personalized school environment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72, 230-235.
- Miller, G. (1956). The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for information processing. *Psychological Review*, 63, 81-97.
- Moore, R. A. (1999). Pre-service teachers engage in reflective classroom research. *The Teacher Educator*, 34, 259-275.
- National Collaborative on Diversity in the Teaching Force. (2004). *Assessment of diversity in America's teaching force: A call to Action*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.
- Noll, M. A. (1994). *The scandal of the evangelical mind*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

- Nourie, B. (1990). Camcorder and classrooms. *The ClearingHouse*, 63, 363-365.
- Nuckolls, M. E. (1991). Expanding students' potential through family literacy. *Educational Leadership*, 49(1), 45-46.
- Owen, F. (1991). Teaching as a composing process. *English Journal*, 80, 57-63.
- Paivio, A. (1971). *Imagery and verbal processes*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Palmer, P. (1998). *The courage to teach*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.
- Parke, B. N. (1989). Educating the gifted and talented: An agenda for the future. *Educational Leadership*, 46(6), 4-5.
- Payne, R. K. (2001). *A framework for understanding poverty*. Highlands, TX: aha! Process.
- Pearson, P. D. (1994). Integrated language arts: Sources of Controversy and seeds of consensus. In L. M. Morrow, J. K. Smith & L. C. Wildenson. *Integrated language arts: Controversy to consensus*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Perrone, V. (2000). *Lessons for new teachers*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Phelan, P., Davidson, A. L., & Cao, H. T. (1992). Speaking up: Students' perspectives on school. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 73, 695-704.
- Phelps, L. W. (1988). *Composition as a human science: Contributions to the self-understanding of a discipline*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Piaget, J., & Inhelder, B. (1969). *The psychology of the child*. New York: Basic Books.
- Popham, W. J. (2001). *The trusth about testing: An educator's call to action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Posner, M. I. (1987). Structuring and function of selective attention. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York.
- Postman, N., & Weingartner, C. (1969). *Teaching as a subversive activity*. New York: Dell.
- Pressley, M., McDaniel, M. A., Turnure, J. E., Wood, E., & Ahmad, M. (1987). Generation and precision of elaboration: Effects on intentional and incidental learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 13, 291-300.
- Rasinski, T. V., & Padak, N. D. (1990). Multicultural learning through children's literature. *Language Arts*, 67, 576-581.
- Rasinski, T. V., & Padak, N. D. (2000). *Effective reading strategies: Teaching children who find reading difficult*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Raths, J. (1980). Suggested standards for general education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 31(3), 19-22.
- Ravitch, D. (1990). Multiculturalism: E pluribus plures. *American Scholar*, 59, 337-354.
- Ravitch, D. (2000). *Left back: A century of Failed School Reforms*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Redding, S. (1991). Creating a school community through parent involvement. *Education Digest*, 57(3), 6-9.
- Reeves, D. B. (2004). *Accountability for learning: How teachers and school leaders can take charge*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Redl, F., & Wattenberg, W. W. (1959). *Mental hygiene in teaching* (2nd ed.). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

- Renner, S. M., & Carter, J. M. (1991). Comprehending text—appreciating diversity through folklore. *Journal of Reading*, 34, 602-604.
- Rose, A. C. (1989). What do effective teachers do? *The Clearinghouse*, 63, 181-183.
- Rothstein, L. F. (1990). *Special education law*. New York: Longman.
- Rotigel, J. V. (2004). Understanding the young gifted child: Guidelines for parents, families, and educators. In Freiberg, K. L. (Ed.), *Annual Editions: Educating Exceptional Children*, 16th ed. (pp. 188-192). Guilford, CT: McGraw-Hill/Dushkin.
- Sadker, M., Sadker, D., & Steindam, S. (1989). Gender equity and educational reform. *Educational Leadership*, 46(6), 44-47.
- Scardamalia, M. & Bereiter, C. (1986). Research on written composition. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.), (pp. 778-803). New York: American Educational Research Association/Macmillan.
- Scardamalia, M. & Bereiter, C. (1989). Conceptions of teaching and approaches to core problems. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher* (pp. 37-46). New York: Pergamon.
- Schlosser, L. K. (1992). Teacher distance and student disengagement: School lives on the margin. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43, 128-140.
- Scherer, M. (2003). How and Why Standards Can Improve Student Achievement: A Conversation with Robert J. Marzano. In F. Schultz (Ed.), *Annual Editions: Education 03/04*, 13th ed (pp. 65-68). Guilford, CT: McGraw-Hill/Dushkin.
- Schrag, F. (1989). On teacher knowledge - Expanding the dialogue. *Educational Theory*, 39, 269-270.
- Schrag, F. (1992). Conceptions of knowledge. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp.268-297). New York: Macmillan.
- Short, K. G. (1993). Teacher research for teacher educators. In Patterson, L., Santa, C. M., Short, K. G., & Smith, K. (Eds.) *Teachers are researchers: Reflection and action*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association, 155-159.
- Shulman, L. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4-14.
- Smith, A. (1981). Piaget's Conceptual Framework of child development: Implications for educators. *The Clearing House*, 55, 24-27.
- Sperling, G. (1960). The information available in brief visual presentations. *Psychological Monographs*, 74(11).
- Stevens, R. J., Slavin, R. E., & Farnish, A. M. (1991). The effects of cooperative learning and direct instruction in reading comprehension strategies on main idea identification. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83, 8-16.
- Stevenson, C. (1992). *Teaching ten to fourteen year olds*. New York: Longman.
- Strong, R. W., Silver, H. F., & Perini, M. J. (2001). Making students as important as standards. *Educational Leadership*, 59(3), 56-61.
- Sztajn, P. (1992). A matter of metaphors: Education as a handmade process. *Educational Leadership*, 50(3), 35-37.
- Taylor, E. E. (1989). A plan for improving school climate. *NASSP Bulletin*, 73(516), 103-108.

- Thomas, A., Fazio, L., & Steifelmeyer, B. L. (1999). *Families at school: A guide for educators*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Tiedt, P. L., & Tiedt, I. M. (1990). *Multicultural teaching: A handbook of activities, information, and resources* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Tolman, E. C. (1932). *Purposive behavior in animals and man*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Tom, A. R., & Valley, L. (1990). Professional knowledge for teachers. In W.R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 373-392). New York: Macmillan.
- Torrence, E. P. (1986). Teaching creative and gifted learners. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (pp. 630-647). New York: American Educational Research Association/Macmillan.
- Tregaskis, O. (1991). Parents and mathematical games. *Arithmetic Teacher*, 38(7), 14-16.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wang, M. C., & Palincsar, A. S. (1989). Teaching students to assume an active role in their learning. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher* (pp. 71-84). New York: Pergamon.
- Warner, I. (1991). Parents in touch: District leadership for parent involvement. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72, 372-375.
- Wilson, S. M. (2003). Introduction. In L. S. Shulman, *The Wisdom of practice: Essays on teaching, learning, and learning to teach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wolf, J. S., & Stephens, T. M. (1989). Parent/teacher conferences: Finding common ground. *Educational Leadership*, 47(2), 28-31.
- Wolfe, P. (2001). *Brain matters: Translating research into classroom practice*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Wolterstorff, N. (1980). *Educating for responsible action*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Wolterstorff, N., Joldersma, C. W., Stronks, G. G. (2004). *Educating for shalom: Essays on Christian higher education*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Wood, K. E. (1985). Good, bad or growing? Education students examine their attitudes about children. *Childhood Education*, 62, 8-12.
- Yount, W. R. (1996). *Created to learn*. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman.
- Yount, W. R. (1999). *Called to teach: An introduction to the ministry of teaching*. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman.
- York, J., Vandercook, T., Macdonald, C., Heise-Neff, C., Caughey, E. (1992). Feedback about integrating middle-school students with severe disabilities in general education classes. *Exceptional Children*, 58, 244-258.
- Zaslavsky, C. (1991). Multicultural mathematics education for the middle grades. *Arithmetic Teacher*, 38(6), 8-13.
- Zumwalt, K. (1989). Beginning professional teachers: The need for a curricular vision of teaching. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher* (pp. 173-184). New York: Pergamon.
- Zmuda, A., Kuklis, R., & Kline, E. (2004). *Transforming schools: Creating a culture of continuous improvement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.