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Abstract

This dissertation research examines a teacher educator’s instructional practices and preservice teachers’ learning in two elementary social studies methods courses. As self-study, it focuses on learning to teach preservice teachers how to select and use visual images to teach history and social studies. The research uses the Grossman Framework for professional education in representing, decomposing and providing opportunities for preservice teachers to approximate practice while learning to enact an Inquiry with Visual Images Discussion (VID) in elementary field classrooms (Grossman, 2011; Grossman et al., 2009). Preservice teachers working in pairs from each course serve as case study examples to describe preservice teachers’ learning about image selection, content knowledge, lesson planning, rehearsal and enactment.

Analysis of two years of instruction suggests the importance of preservice teachers understanding and applying criteria for effective image selection, in addition to increasing their content knowledge of the selected image and its context. This study also points to role that metacognition and rehearsal play in developing preservice teachers’ skillful practice. Preservice teachers benefitted through strategic opportunities to practice responding to children in increasingly authentic settings. The findings pointed to three factors critical in teaching others the Visual Inquiry Discussion strategy, and possibly other multi-faceted instructional practices: the importance of increasingly sophisticated opportunities to approximate practices, including rehearsal in the teacher education classroom, and the role of identifying detailed features of the instructional strategy.

This study details the ways the teacher educator represented, decomposed and provided opportunities to successively approximate the Visual Inquiry Discussion practice across two
different classes in two years. The analysis of preservice teachers’ lesson plans and reflections on their experiences trying to engage children in Visual Inquiry Discussion revealed significant challenges preservice teachers faced. The study explains the modifications the teacher educator made to her practice and describes the improvements in preservice teachers’ performance. Overall, preservice teachers reported successes in enacting the VID in field classrooms with pupils. This dissertation research adds to the literature on the relationship between teacher educators’ instructional practices for preservice teachers’ learning to enact an inquiry lesson with visual images in the elementary social studies classroom.
Chapter 1:

Introduction

Social Studies, according to many reports has become marginalized due to focus on literacy and mathematics and the impacts of high-stakes testing in those areas (Au, 2011; Fitchett & Heafner, 2010; McCormick & Hubbard, 2011; Passe, 2006). This recent turn of events combined with disagreements about the purpose of history and social science instruction in schools threatens the status of social studies in the school curriculum (Au, 2011; Moreau, 2003; Zimmerman, 2002). This is true for elementary schools, where language arts and mathematics are consuming the time once allocated to other subjects, including social studies (Fitchett & Heafner, 2010; McCormick & Hubbard, 2011; Passe, 2006).

This, I think, is shortsighted and counter-productive. In addition to the role of social studies in fostering students’ participation in civic society, there is a connection, often overlooked, between social studies content and literacy practices. Social studies instruction can and should utilize informational text, including visual images, to enhance both content knowledge and literacy skills and practices. The use of images offers teachers important and rich opportunities to extend students’ skills in understanding informational texts, and examining evidence in historical and social science contexts (Barton & Levstik, 2008; Levstik & Barton, 2005; National Governors’ Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010; Seixas, 1998). However, teachers and teacher educators often overlook the use of images as an opportunity to enhance students’ literacy skills while maintaining – or
restoring – the role of social studies in the elementary school curriculum (Barton & Levstik, 2008; Brugar, 2012; VanSledright, 2002).

This dissertation explores the relationships between teacher preparation, social studies teacher education and inquiry with visual images (VID) in the elementary classroom by examining how preservice teachers respond to teacher education practices in two elementary social studies methods courses and their subsequent analysis of school based opportunities to approximate practice. It discusses the author’s own teacher education instructional experience for an elementary social studies methods course and subsequent revisions to the instructional practices for another course. The dissertation research has two objectives: 1) to refine and improve the instructional practices used by social studies teacher educators to prepare elementary preservice teachers to implement the instructional methods in the classroom and 2) to help preservice teachers learn to use visual images and inquiry, considering the thinking skills of elementary students. The research questions are:

- How did one teacher educator decompose, represent and provide opportunities for preservice teachers to approximate practice in learning to use VID to teach elementary social studies?
- How did preservice teachers take up the VID practice during two elementary social studies methods courses? What challenges did they face? Were there any differences in the ways preservice teachers planned for and reflected on VID?

Drawing upon the academic literature, I create a set of classroom activities which were piloted with two cohorts of elementary teacher preservice teachers. The study includes description and analysis of the instructional methods I used to teach preservice teachers of social studies how to
incorporate VID in inquiry lessons, and the influence of my own instructional design on their preparation and enactment.

My interest in social studies and visual images arises from my experience as a social studies museum teacher using images and artifacts to help students learn content. As a teacher for ten years in an urban school district I observed that visual images and artifacts were engaging for the students, historically significant, useful for illustrating social scientific concepts and fostering their historical thinking (Barton & Levstik, 2008; McCormick & Hubbard, 2011; Seixas, 1998). Teaching young children to examine the evidence in a visual image required me to engage in focused planning and to carefully structure questioning to help my pupils make connections between the images and artifacts and the content I expected them to learn.

As a graduate student in teacher education at a large Midwestern university, a course in Image-Based Ethnography opened my mind to the levels of complexity and sophistication required to “see” an image. For example, visual characteristics that draw a viewer’s attention to certain features of an image, such as line and color and scholarship, related to reading visual images that encompass the term, “visual literacy” (Arnhem, 1969; Dondis, 1973; Fransecky & Debes, 1972; Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006). In the graduate course we investigated the purposeful composition of images in photography to create contexts for policies related to immigrants and law enforcement and the influence of such images on unsuspecting viewers (Tagg, 1988). Much of the structure related to visual literacy is “unseen” to the casual observer, yet the creators of images are very purposeful in terms of composition and how they should be “read” by the viewer.

Situating this work against my previous experience using images in teaching, I recognized the issue of image context and unsuspecting viewers in educational settings,
particularly in relation to children’s textbooks. As a project in the course, I examined the images of African Americans in elementary social studies textbooks published by the MacMillan/McGraw-Hill companies from 1952-2005. I argued that the images were actually an important part of a larger national narrative related to political, historical and social influences, which in turn influenced image inclusion and exclusion in the textbooks (Moreau, 2003; Perlmutter, 1997; Sewall, 2005; Zimmerman, 2002). In this instance, the history represented and portrayed visually related to segregation, religious beliefs, the Civil Rights movement, culture wars and efforts to standardize textbooks.

I also noted that recent publishing company policies assign the task of image selection to the graphics department, which typically selects images for segments of text, rather than the author. In most reference sections of textbooks the images are sourced by name of the collection and not by artist. Most often, the images in elementary social studies textbooks have no or very limited captions and are not referenced in the body of the text. Teachers’ manuals rarely indicate how images should be directed or used (McKean, 2002). Additionally, while history educators have argued (and demonstrated) that visual images enhance a student’s historical thinking, there is little information in the teachers’ materials about how to help teachers better utilize visual images in the elementary classroom (Barton & Levstik, 2008; McKean, 2002; VanSledright, 2002).

In teaching an undergraduate methods course that included an assignment related to helping preservice teachers learn to use the evidence in visual images to teach social studies content, I studied the relationship between teacher education practices and helping preservice teachers use visual images in elementary classrooms. My desire as a teacher educator to deepen beginning teachers’ pragmatic skills arose from my ten years of experience in the classroom,
when, out of necessity, I undertook to find what worked effectively, and acquired effective instructional practices through trial and error. I recognized that beginning teachers require strategies and support to gain automaticity in teaching performance. Like many other educators and researchers, I have concluded it is unethical to send beginning teachers into the classroom to practice on their pupils, as I did, rather than equipping them to do the work of teaching (Ball & Forzani, 2009, 2010).

I study the world of teacher education at a time when it is again under attack by those who question the need for formal professional training needed even as other pundits offer scorn and ridicule. I recognize the merits in many of the criticisms, yet I maintain my belief that quality teacher preparation equips teachers to engage in ambitious, rigorous instruction (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Cibulka, 2009; Darling-Hammond, 2010, Hollins, 2011). This is particularly important if we are to engage teachers to meet the demands of the US student population’s changing demographics (Chu et al., 2012; Cohen, Raudenbusch & Ball, 2003; Feiman Nemser, 2001; Hollins, 2011; Lampert, Boerst & Graziani, 2011; Lampert & Graziani, 2009; Moje, 2008; Windschitl, Thompson & Braaten; 2011).

To help me with my teacher education practices, I found that research on representations, decompositions and opportunities to approximate practice offered promise for preparing teachers to start their careers with appropriate strategies to foster teaching and learning (Grossman, 2005, 2011; Grossman et al, 2009, Grossman, Hammerness & MacDonald, 2009; Lampert & Graziani, 2009). The Grossman Framework includes useful instructional practices for combining my interest in teaching with visual images and an interest in structuring practice for preservice teachers in elementary social studies. The framework includes decompositions – in which a teacher educator defines the components of complex practice; representations of practice
where a teacher educator provides examples of practice to make visible the underlying structure of instructional practices to preservice teachers; and approximations of practice – in which a teacher educator assists preservice teachers by enabling them to rehearse the components of complex practice in a university classroom. Chapter Two focuses on scholarship related to preservice teacher education, the Grossman Framework for professional education, teaching and learning in social studies, visual literacy and visual images in social studies. In the chapter I outline considerations for each of these themes in relationship to teacher preparation. I conclude that each area could benefit from further study related to teacher education pedagogy in social studies.

Chapter Three describes the research methodology I used in two elementary social studies methods courses. It explains the setting, participants and mode of analysis and selection of case studies across two elementary social studies methods courses. I explain the analysis and its relationship to my contemplations on my instructional practices in the courses.

Chapter Four describes my theory of learning as a teacher educator in the elementary social studies methods course. It presents the data analysis from the first elementary social studies methods course related to decomposition, representation and approximation of teacher education practices. I identify features of preservice teachers’ learning to do VID, and the limitations they identified in their instructional practices. I end with some observations on my instructional practices and their relationship to preservice teacher learning in the first methods course and my plans for a second methods course.

Chapter Five describes my theory of learning as a teacher educator in a second elementary social studies methods course based on what I learned in my first course. I examine modifications during the second course and subsequent preservice teachers’ reflections on
learning to teach a VID. Finally, I use this data to develop possibilities for future teacher educators’ decompositions, representations and approximations of practice for VID.

Chapter Six discusses the implications of my findings related to teacher educators’ practices in helping preservice teachers learn to teach with visual images in elementary social studies methods courses. I consider how this data can be used for teacher preparation in teacher education courses on social studies education. I conclude that this research is useful for future social studies teacher education practices.
Chapter 2:

Literature Review

This chapter reviews what scholars have told us about preparing teachers to engage in rigorous instruction through teacher preparation. I describe the Grossman Framework for professional education as a source of information about teacher education. I give the current definitions of visual literacy and describe the research on the use of visual images in general classrooms and social studies classrooms specifically. I conclude with an explanation of the utility of the Grossman Framework in preparing preservice teachers to work with visual images in social studies classrooms.

Preservice Teacher Preparation

Teacher preparation falls along a continuum related to increasing research and scholarship related to teacher knowledge (Feiman Nemser, 1986; Grossman, Hammerness & McDonald, 2009; Hollins, 2011; Lampert, 2001; Wilson, Shulman & Richert, 1987). Early models of transitioning to practice were based on scientific models (Hirst, 1974; Schwab, 1978; Shulman, 1986). Science was privileged in education rather than craft knowledge, and the academic disciplines offered an existing structure through which to view teaching. Feiman Nemser gave the following description of early teacher preparation programs (1986):

The prevailing view, modeled after the natural sciences, is that general principles about good teaching can be derived from social science theory and research and applied in the classroom. This view is institutionalized in the structure of the
standard preservice curriculum – separate courses in educational foundations (psychology, philosophy, and sociology) and methods of teaching followed by practice teaching (p.154).

Feiman Nemser explained an academic perspective that attributed the knowledge base for teaching to scientific or theoretical disciplines. Academicians believed that teachers needed to learn the foundational scientific concepts and principles in order to teach. The knowledge of practicing teachers was not held in the same regard as the knowledge of academicians; scholars described teaching as based on unscientific heuristics and sought to improve teaching by focusing on disciplinary structures.

As the teacher education continuum progressed from the 1980s into the 1990s and beyond, teachers’ knowledge, and thinking moved to the forefront with the realization that teachers’ decision making is hidden. Teachers have dilemmas and make choices about how and what to teach. The complexity of teaching is revealed in Lampert’s *Teaching Problems and the Problems of Teaching* (2001). Multiple decisions are made by teachers in each episode of teaching. In addition to highlighting the teachers’ thought process, Lampert emphasizes the need for teachers to know content, learners and how to best teach content to them (Lampert, 2001; Shulman, 1986; Wilson et al, 1987). Lampert discusses a knowledge base for teaching that is discipline specific and located in the practices of expert teaching professionals. The connection between teacher knowledge and problem solving in teaching is related to discussions of expertise (Berliner, 1987; Dreyfus, 2004). An expert teacher notices different features of content, learning and environment than a preservice teacher. How do we prepare preservice teachers for the type of thinking they need to do to transition into successful teaching practice?
Teacher educators can contribute to work in classrooms by accounting for the teachers’ perspective from the level of instructional practice. Examining how teachers characterize instruction is useful in breaking the work of teaching into smaller components to lead to more successful transitions to practice (Grossman 2005, 2011; Grossman et al., 2009; Boerst et al., 2011; Sleep et al., 2007). In their scholarship there is no divide between theory and practice, i.e. the instructional practices at the university become part of a continuum of learning to teach successfully. With the acknowledgement that there is a trajectory of learning, the preservice teacher can become an expert over time with appropriate scaffolding. Lampert (2010) states:

From the perspective of what we know about the work of teaching as both intellectual and social, the common understanding of practice as separate from theory does not seem applicable (p.9).

Given the fluidity of the process involved in learning to teach, why do the perceptions of divergent processes in university and school classrooms persist in the minds of teacher educators, preservice teachers and teacher practitioners? Two tasks in teacher education are making the connection between theory and practice clear to preservice teachers, and helping them to use the university classroom to learn a complex practice. In current educational practice, the work of teacher education includes helping preservice teachers understand multiple facets of teacher knowledge as part of the process of transitioning to practice (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Grossman, 2005, 2011; Grossman et al, 2009; Grossman & McDonald, 2008; Hollins, 2011; Lampert, 2010). Grossman, Hammerness & McDonald (2009) state:

Shifting teacher education from a curriculum organized by knowledge domains to a curriculum organized around practice of the profession will require at least two fundamental shifts on the part of teacher educators: first, teacher educators must
work to develop programs that un-do the historical separation between foundation and methods courses; second, teacher educators must focus upon helping novices develop and refine a set of core practices for teaching. Such shifts will require changes in focus both at the pedagogical and organizational level of teacher education (p.6).

While teacher education assists in moving preservice teachers from the university classroom to the school classroom, it does not enable them to move immediately from training to expertise. If we can shift the expectation for beginning teacher as expert to beginning teacher as “well started” and if teacher educators can provide supportive bridging opportunities for novice teachers, practice in academic settings will be applicable to and useful for work in the classroom.

Scholars maintain that the teacher education setting is particularly powerful because it is a type of community that allows preservice teachers to engage in boundary practices, including legitimate peripheral participation (Wenger, 1998). Boundary practices enable beginners to learn in a supported setting. Legitimate peripheral participation is beneficial for preservice teachers, teacher educators, students and the community, because it allows preservice teachers to first practice teaching in the relative safety of the university and then move gradually to classroom instruction as they gain more strategies and confidence (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Grossman et al., 2009, 2011; Wenger, 1998).

Scholars, who advocate for the importance of teacher education in preparing teachers, conclude that the university classroom provides a unique and valuable setting to assist preservice teachers in transitioning to practice (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Colby, 2009; Grossman, 2011; Hollins, 2011, Sullivan et al, 2006). Colby’s (2009) argument illuminates the strength of university settings to begin practice:
In many ways, it is not optimal to immerse students right away in the complexities of real professional practice even if it is feasible to do so. Instead, we can take advantage of our academic settings to provide successive approximations to authentic practice that evolve as students become more skilled and knowledgeable during the time they spend in training (p.2).

The notion of teacher educators providing preservice teachers with key instructional practices to enact effective instruction is building momentum in teacher education and policy. Researchers advocate further study on the most promising methods for helping preservice teachers enact the type of instruction that influences teacher and thereby student effectiveness (Forzani & Ball, 2009; Hollins, 2011; National Academy of Education, 2011).

**Grossman Framework for Professional Education**

In 2009, Grossman et al. studied the practices of professional educators to identify some of the key features of their work in teaching beginners to master complex practices. They identified three key features of the practice of professional educators in the fields of clergy, psychology and teaching. In each field, professional educators used representations, decompositions and approximations of practice as the vehicles by which they helped beginners master unfamiliar practices:

- **Representations of practice** comprise the different ways that practice is represented in professional education and what these various representations make visible to novices. Decomposition of practice involves breaking down practice into its constituent parts for the purposes of teaching and learning. Approximations of practice refer to opportunities for novices to engage in practices that are more or less proximal to the practices of a profession (p.2058).
The work of Grossman et al. (2009) on representations, decompositions and approximations of practice describe them as characteristic of professional education in teaching novices in the fields of religion, nursing, psychology, law and medicine (Grossman, 2011). Methods based on professional practice in these fields currently serve as a basis for emerging scholarship across multiple disciplines (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Grossman et al., 2009; Lampert, Boerst & Graziani, 2011; Lampert & Graziani, 2009).

In decompositions of practice teacher educators select elements or components of complex instructional practices. Teacher educators offer representations and opportunities to approximate or rehearse instructional practices to make visible the invisible components of complex practice. Decompositions of practice are segments of instruction that teacher educator identify as influential in assisting preservice teachers in gaining automaticity in an instructional practice:

Part of the work of professional education lies in identifying components that are integral to practice and that can be improved through targeted instruction. We refer to this work as the ‘decomposition’ of practice-breaking down complex practice into its constituent parts for the purpose of teaching and learning. Decomposing practice enables students both to ‘see’ and enact elements of practice more effectively. Some examples of the decomposition of practice might include focusing on the elements of lesson planning in teacher education, teaching aspects of speech and delivery for preachers, or targeting the development of the therapeutic alliance during the preparations of therapists. All these represent only a small piece of the work in these fields, but they are seen as critical to the overall practice of professionals (Grossman et al., p.2069).
Representations of practice are visible portrayals that explain the work of teachers. They can include written cases, lesson plans, student work, observations of teaching and videos of teaching. They do not make visible how teachers prepare to engage in instructional practices such as personal interactions, curriculum materials, content or planning:

Most professional education programs provide a wide variety of representations of practice through both coursework and clinical experiences. The key questions to ask about such representations include, What facets of practice are visible through these various representations? Which facets remain hidden from view? How do these representations open up opportunities to investigate practice? How do novices use these various representations of practice and practitioners to construct their own professional identities? What do they learn from these representations that may go well beyond the instructor’s purpose in using them? (Grossman et al., p.2068)

Rehearsals or opportunities to approximate the components of instructional practice enable preservice teachers to practice smaller segments of instruction before enacting a strategy with children (Grossman et al., 2009; Kallenbach & Gall, 1969; Lampert & Graziani, 2009; Meier, 1968; Vander Kloet & Chugh, 2012) These authors argue that each of the aforementioned groups of educators utilize structured rehearsal and coaching as part of their educational practice with novice teachers (Colby, 2009; Sullivan et al, 2006).

Scholars maintain that teaching is a practice that requires rehearsals and habituation of practices as a means to increase instructional proficiency so that novices possess a repertoire of standard pedagogical practices (Ball et al., 2009; Edwards & Protheroe, 2003; Grossman et al., 2009; Colby, 2009; Lampert & Graziani, 2009). Traditionally, scholars related core instructional
practices to particular disciplinary methods (Hirst, 1974; Schwab, 1978). There are particular methods that each discipline uses to engage with the content: a foreign language, science, social studies, and mathematics discussion look and sound very different (Ball et al., 2009). Yet, there are key features of the notion of discussion, for example, that teacher educators could teach to beginning teachers in a way that is useful in multiple domains (Ball et al., 2009). In some teacher education programs, these core instructional practices are taught as sets of related practices in teacher education, as Lampert (2010) has proposed:

A strong congruence seems to exist between the notion that teaching is made of component practices, and that teaching can be learned by practicing, though there are several aspects of this link that could be clarified. These would include:
defining the characteristics of the context in which practicing should occur, given the relational specificity of many aspects of teaching; choosing an appropriate grain size for what should be practiced; attending to the learning of the composition of separate practices in actually performing the work of teaching; and specifying what an instructor or coach could add to what is casually referred to as learning from experience. (p.31)

Lampert and others who advocate teaching a repertoire of strategies, suggest that teacher educators can assist preservice teachers by teaching component practices and coaching them as they practice new instructional strategies (Ball et al., 2009; Grossman et al., 2009; Grossman, Hammerness, & McDonald, 2009: Lampert & Graziani, 2009). Specifically, what is not evident in the literature is which component practices and instructional strategies should be part of the elementary social studies preservice teachers’ repertoire.
This section outlined the research on preservice teacher preparation through teacher education. Despite the scholarship related to the promising aspects of the Grossman Framework of decompositions, representations and approximations of practice to help preservice teachers master complex practices, few studies focus on engaging the elementary social studies preservice teacher through teacher education and specifically teaching preservice teachers to engage in inquiry with visual image students in elementary social studies classroom as a habitual practice. While representations, decomposition and approximations of practice include influential strategies for teacher education in some disciplines, it is unclear as to how these methods can be used in the case of teaching preservice teachers to master complex practices for elementary social studies. Further, although this research presents strong arguments for structuring teacher education using a framework for decomposing, representing and approximating instructional practice, it does not address existing expectations related to social studies education or visual literacy (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Hollins, 2011; Kee, 2012; Libman, 2012; Lloyd et al., 2012; Tamir, 2010). What is the best way for social studies teacher educators to utilize research on preparing “well-started” beginning teachers in elementary social studies? To answer this question, the next section examines social studies instruction practices in the elementary classroom (Adler, 2008; Brugar, 2012; Barton & Levstik, 2008; Monte-Sano, 2011; VanSledright, 2002).

**Teaching and Learning in Social Studies**

One complex area of instruction that preservice teachers need to master is *inquiry* in social studies. Inquiry is a strategy in history, social studies and science that involves formulating hypotheses, analyzing evidence and reaching conclusions based on the information (Lévesque, 2008; Wineburg, 2001). In history education, scholars argue that examining evidence through
inquiry is a relevant instructional practice for the classroom and beyond (Lévesque, 2008; Levstik & Barton, 2005; Parker, 2010, Rael, 2005). Examining evidence through inquiry includes analyzing primary and secondary source documents, i.e. letters, journals, drawings, paintings, photographs and music. These scholars also maintain that primary sources have to be analyzed as evidence in conjunction with the historical context, so that teachers should reference both the text as well as the economic, political and social aspects of the source (Levesque, 2008; Seixas, 1998). For example, in his study of secondary preservice social studies teachers, Seixas (1998) concludes that the texts (primary sources) and the historical context must be analyzed together to construct meaning:

A text as ‘illustration’ does not help to build the context: it tacitly assumes that the context is complete and fixed prior to the analysis of the text. But equally deficient is the anachronistic exercise which fails to understand the text in relation to its historical context. Students need opportunities to read historical texts in dynamic tension with their historical contexts. (p.314)

He argues that when teachers engage students in inquiry by discussing both the evidence and the historical context, this teaching strategy enables learners to develop research questions, analyze and collect evidence to support their hypotheses. These instructional practices increase students’ literacy skills and abilities (Brugar, 2012; VanSledright, 2002). Moreover, teacher educators need more studies on methods for teaching preservice teachers to incorporate inquiry strategies to engage students at the K-8 level as a means to support both disciplined inquiry and to enhance literacy skills and abilities (Barton & Levstik, 2008; Brugar, 2012; Levstik, 2008; Levstik & Barton, 2005).
The question for social studies teacher educators becomes how to help preservice teachers develop the skills to engage in inquiry with the analysis of evidence at the elementary level. Scholars of history and social studies support the careful and considered structuring of assignments and discussions related to using primary sources to analyze evidence as a means to scaffold instruction for learners (Chiaravalloti, 2010; Barton & Levstik, 2008; Lévesque, 2008; Parker, 2010; Seixas, 1998; VanSledright, 2002; Wilen, 2004). The same scaffolding techniques should be applied to facilitating the learning of social studies preservice teachers, as Seixas (1998) contends: “As we begin increasingly to teach (and to advocate teaching) with primary historical sources, teacher educators must think far more about what it will take to prepare new teachers for that task (p.337).” He suggests structuring assignments in teacher education to supports novices’ use of disciplinary strategies in the classroom.

With the notable exception of Brugar (2012), Levstik & Barton (2005, 2008) and VanSledright (2002), studies of elementary social studies’ instructional practices utilizing primary source images are limited. These authors argue that visual images are a powerful medium for teaching students to engage in inquiry by analyzing evidence. The next section examines how and why images can be productive texts for teaching and learning in social studies.

**Visual Literacy in the Classroom**

John Debes (1969) devised the term, visual literacy”, to describe the competencies developed by an individual which relate to integrating sight and other experiences involving the senses:

Visual Literacy refers to a group of vision-competencies a human being can develop by seeing and at the same time having and integrating other sensory
experiences. The development of these competencies is fundamental to normal human learning. When developed, they enable a visually literate person to discriminate and interpret the visible actions, objects, symbols, natural or man-made, that he encounters in his environment. Through the creative use of these competencies, he is able to communicate with others (p.7).

A number of scholars have attempted to clarify the definition for wide use with mixed success (Ausburn & Ausburn, 1978; Bieman, 1984; Curtiss, 1987; Levie, 1978). Averignou & Ericson (1997) in their empirical study of the parameters, significance and aims of visual literacy argue that visual literacy is defined by disciplines in ways that are most useful to the orientation of the specific discipline and that a common definition of visual literacy is needed.

Early critics of visual literacy suggest that it is not a sustainable concept as an area of study due to its lack of precise definitions, or unclear criteria (Cassidy & Knowlton, 1983; Sless, 1984; Suhor & Little, 1988). Despite criticism and multiple definitions of the term since the mid-1960s, the International Visual Literacy Association founded in 1970 today acknowledges multiple disciplinary perspectives for improving the visual communication skills of viewers—this is particularly pertinent for elementary students. Scholars of visual literacy argue that the prevalence of visual communication makes it imperative that schools begin to prepare students to “navigate, evaluate, and communicate with visual information” (Avgerinou, 2009; Kress & van Leeuwen, 1995). Avgerinou (2009) argues that the power of visual culture carries the responsibility to educate students to critically evaluate the functions of visual communication.

Engaging in inquiry with visual images involves a type of visual literacy in which teachers can help students derive meaning by looking at those images with historical significance (Barton & Levstik, 2008; Brugar, 2012; Levesque, 2008; VanSledright, 2002). In my dissertation
research, my use of the term visual literacy is most closely aligned to the ability to understand (read) and use (write images) in order to think and learn visually (Hodes, 1993; Hortin, 1983; McDougall, 2010; Rowsell, McLean & Hamilton, 2012; Sinatra, 1986). Some studies identify the ability to create visual images as one component of visual literacy (Avgerinou & Ericson, 1997; Fransecky & Debes, 1972; Rowsell et al., 2012). Additionally, visual literacy can encompass the artistic features of color and line that may cause the viewer to look closely at a particular object in the image or to read an image to identify the artistic purpose (Ausburn & Ausburn, 1978; Dondis, 1973, Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006; Tagg, 1988). However, these features are beyond the scope of my dissertation research.

Studies also suggest that visual images can be analyzed as a form of text (Housen, 2001; Madison, 2004; Padurano, 2011; Rothwell, 1997, Tishman, 2008; Tishman & Palmer, 2005; Yenawine, 2003). Some researchers make a case for content area teachers to integrate visual texts in the classroom because of the prevalence of the out-of-school visual culture practices of students (Avgerinou, 2009; Flynt & Brozo, 2010; Moje, Ciechanowski, Kramer, Ellis, Carrillo & Collazo, 2004). These researchers argue that success in disciplinary content can be attained by integrating visual texts and literacy across the curriculum; however, the majority of this scholarship is limited to practitioners or practicing teachers rather than fostering the use of visual images to enhance the literacy skills of students via teacher education for preservice teachers.

While research into teaching students to analyze evidence in the form of visual images often focuses on the secondary level, young learners may be particularly suited to analyzing visual images in connection with both expository and narrative texts (Barton & Levstik, 2008; Brugar, 2012; Bousted & Ozturk, 2004; Britsch, 2010; Levstik & Barton, 2005; VanSledright, 2002). Researchers purport that strategies for engaging students with visual images in textbooks
at upper elementary and secondary grade levels increase student literacy abilities (Brugar, 2012; Callow, 2008; Flynt & Brozo, 2009; Gillenwater, 2009; Kajder, 2006; Long & Gove, 2003; Marquez-Zenkov & Harmon, 2007; Seglem & Witte, 2009; Sinatra, 2000). The next section surveys the literature on visual images in social studies.

**Visual Images in the Social Studies Classroom**

Researchers contend that teacher educators need to teach preservice teachers how to select appropriate primary and secondary sources, textbooks and electronic media for the social studies classroom (Jaffee, 2003; Lévesque, 2008; Masur, 1998). Textbooks, for example, may include visual evidence such as illustrations that are not referenced in the written text, and manuals may lack instructions as to how to use them to highlight a historical concept or theme (Masur, 1998; McKean, 2002). Masur’s study of secondary level history textbooks led him to conclude that while the books contained multiple images, they did not necessarily connect the images to the text in a way that allowed readers to analyze the images as historical evidence:

> It is astonishing that textbook publishers and authors should treat pictures so offhandedly, since images serve as primary sources that illuminate the past in ways speeches, sermons, letter, and laws may not. (Masur, p.1410)

Given the increased calls for the analysis of evidence, including primary source texts and images in many state standards, and the rich and valuable resource that visual images provide (Barton & Levstik, 2008; Brugar, 2012; Levstik & Barton, 2006; National Governors’ Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010), I suggest that this is an avenue for research that needs attention. Teacher educators can teach elementary social studies preservice teachers to enact inquiry lessons using visual images. Researchers argue that analyzing visual images as evidence is a powerful strategy for teaching history and social studies.
(Barton & Levstik, 2008; Levstik & Tyson, 2008; Barton, 2008; Kieff, 2007; Long & Gove, 2003; Madison, 2004; Padurano, 2011; Rothwell, 1997; Teachers’ Curriculum Institute, 1998; VanSledright, 2002).

**Conclusion**


Visual images are particularly useful as a component of teaching and learning in social studies. Through visual images, social studies teachers can provide a connection to the content for their pupils. Like other fields of study, visual literacy has to be taught first to teachers who can then teach it to their pupils. Studies of preservice teachers learning to teach students with visual images as a means to analyze evidence in elementary social studies are rare. The next chapter describes the research methodology I used to study my teacher education practices as I prepared preservice teachers to lead social studies discussions by using evidence in visual images for elementary classrooms based upon the Grossman Framework.
Chapter 3:
Research Design and Methods

This chapter discusses my instruction of the Visual Inquiry Discussion method for elementary school preservice teachers in the second semester of their professional program. In two separate elementary social studies methods courses, I determine which instructional practices best serve as the basis for leading VID in the elementary social studies classroom. In both courses, I represent and offer opportunities for elementary preservice teachers to engage in activities that enable them to prepare for enacting social studies VID with elementary pupils. I situate my instructional practices against the backdrop of what the preservice teachers learn and subsequently what I learn to inform my instruction. The two research questions are:

- How did one teacher educator decompose, represent and provide opportunities for preservice teachers to approximate practice in learning to use VID to teach elementary social studies?
- How did preservice teachers take up the VID practice during two elementary social studies methods courses? What challenges did they face? Were there any differences in the ways preservice teachers planned for and reflected on VID?

Instructional Theory and Framework

My teacher education practices for both courses were patterned after the work of Grossman et al. (2009) in describing the framework of instructional practice in professional education and specifically for teacher education (2011). Grossman and her colleagues describe three specific instructional practices to help beginners develop the expertise to engage in skilled
practice: decompositions of practice, representations of practice and approximations of practice. Each of these practices enables teacher educators to guide preservice teachers in the relatively short time, typically two to four semesters, of instruction before preservice teachers go into the classroom. Table 1 lists the key features of the Grossman Framework relevant to my instruction.

Table 1. – Examples of Decompositions, Representations and Approximations of VID Practice in Elementary Social Studies Methods Course One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decompositions of Practice</th>
<th>Representations of Practice</th>
<th>Approximations of Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Image selection</td>
<td>• Modeling VID</td>
<td>• Role play students as I modeled VID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Constructing leveled questions</td>
<td>• Anecdotes related to enactment</td>
<td>• Creating leveled questions in small groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Content Knowledge</td>
<td>• Content knowledge</td>
<td>• Selecting a visual image; designing a lesson plan for VID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Historical Context</td>
<td>• Image selection</td>
<td>• Microteaching/rehearsing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Selecting and modifying curriculum objectives for VID</td>
<td>• Curricular objectives</td>
<td>• Enacting VID in the field classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lesson planning</td>
<td>• Lesson plan template</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Written assignment and rubric for VID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Decomposition of Practice**

Grossman et al. (2009) define decomposing practice as identifying the component elements that constitute an instructional practice in preparation for scaffolding preservice teachers’ learning. In decomposing practice, teacher educators determine the components that underlie the structure of their instructional practice, and develop a series of representations and opportunities for preservice teachers to practice each component. Teacher educators make the parts of the complex practice visible and offer a language to describe them, which Grossman et al. term “grammar”, meaning the protocols around which the discussion of instructional practices occurs. To decompose complex practices, teacher educators focus preservice teachers’ attention
on the elements of practice in the protocols which best support their learning. The components of complex practice for VID were: selecting an image, constructing leveled questions, researching the historical context of a visual image, selecting and modifying curriculum objectives and developing a lesson plan in preparation to enact VID in the field classroom with pupils (see Chapters Four and Five for details). The decompositions for preservice teachers were structured representations and opportunities for targeted practice would be useful for each course so that the preservice teachers might begin to approximate, or move toward authentic practices first in the structured setting, i.e. the university classroom, and then in a field classroom with pupils as described in the literature on professional education preparation (Colby, 2009; Grossman, 2011; Grossman et al, 2009; Sullivan et al., 2009).

**Representations of Practice**

Representations of practice are examples of the work of teaching that a teacher educator makes visible to preservice teachers. Since representations and opportunities to approximate or rehearse the components of complex practice are closely connected to VID, I often moved between representations and opportunities to approximate in an iterative cycle. In both elementary social studies methods courses, I represented practice by modeling with an inquiry with VID. While modeling makes some practices visible in representing practice, beginners often do not see the elements of practice that are invisible, e.g., planning or management routines. Therefore, I provided them with additional representations of practice including: offering anecdotes about enacting VID, explaining the role of historical context in relation to a visual image, demonstrating the process for selecting and modifying objectives in preparation for lesson planning, and constructing and providing a lesson planning template, written assignment and rubric for VID.
I constructed the rubrics for Part I of the VID assignment to include aspects of each component of the VID so that preservice teachers could recognize the connections between the components in preparation for their enactment in classrooms with pupils including image selection, learning goals and objectives, planned questioning and anticipating student thinking (Appendices D, H). I prepared documents for Part II of the VID assignment to help them understand how the components of their instructional planning related to their teaching practice. I adhered to the guidelines of the instructional rubrics when scoring preservice teachers’ assignments to increase objectivity in my assessment of their practice.

**Approximations of Practice**

Opportunities to approximate practice enable preservice teachers to work on strategies that are similar, but not identical to the work of practicing teachers. They allow beginners to try new strategies under less stressful conditions than the field classroom. In the two social studies methods courses, the preservice teachers could approximate practice for VID through role play as students by developing leveled questions in small groups, by selecting an image and preparing lesson plans using the lesson planning template, assignment and rubrics, by enacting the lesson in a field classroom with pupils and, in the second course only, teaching VID to a small group of their peers.

In Elementary Social studies Methods Course Two, I led preservice teachers through a microteaching/rehearsal experience that offered a more authentic approximation of practice for VID by building on the two theoretical perspectives, microteaching and rehearsal for practice (Kallenbach & Gall, 1969; Lampert, 2010; Lampert & Graziani, 2009; Vander Kloet & Chugh, 2012). Grossman et al. (2009) describe microteaching as a practice that fell out of favor in studies of teacher education, but which may bear consideration in relation to approximations of

In my two courses, preservice teachers engaged in each of these practices separately, and then I assisted them in putting the components together in successively more complex ways that eventually approximated practice in the field classroom with pupils. In each course I offered targeted verbal feedback via one-on-one communications as the preservice teachers participated in role play, developed leveled questions, selected images and identified relevant goals and objectives for VID. I also gave written feedback on their initial lesson plan drafts, final lesson plans and written analytic reflections using the instructional rubrics for VID (Appendices D, H). These rubrics serve a dual purpose: to guide preservice teachers in planning for VID and to assist me in understanding how they used the opportunities to approximate practice. Grossman et al. (2009) suggest that approximations of practice fall along a continuum based on the relationship between preparing to practice and engaging in actual practice. Figure 3.1 shows the continuum of authenticity for the approximations of practice in my elementary social studies methods courses.
Figure 3.1 - Authenticity in Approximations of Practice for VID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Authentic</th>
<th>More Authentic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in role play as students as teacher educator modeled</td>
<td>Enacting a VID lesson in an elementary social studies field classroom and preparing a written analytic reflection of the enactment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing leveled questions for images provided by the teacher educator in class</td>
<td>Selecting a visual image based on the curriculum with support from the teacher educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating a VID lesson plan around the image using structured assignment, lesson planning template and feedback from teacher educator</td>
<td>Enacting VID with a small group of peers in the methods course (microteaching/rehearsal) with feedback from peers and teacher educator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Setting and Participants

I taught at a Midwestern university with a population of approximately 6,000 undergraduate students. Its School of Education had 310 undergraduate teacher certification students, of which 124 were in elementary education. Teacher certification requirements for elementary undergraduate preservice teachers were 45 credits of liberal studies courses including nine credits in each of the following disciplines: humanities, natural science, social science, mathematics and nine creative arts. The voluntary participants in the research study were 45 undergraduate preservice teachers enrolled in two sections of elementary social studies methods courses in academic years 2009–2010 and 2010–2011. They were required to take the course as one of the academic requirements in the elementary teacher education program. Undergraduates were admitted to the teacher education program following an application and review, most commonly in the third year. The application included transcripts from other institutions (if applicable), three letters of recommendation, an essay about interests in the field of education
and the School of Education and a CV. The School of Education’s undergraduate elementary certification program consisted of four semesters (Table 2).

**Table 2. - Undergraduate Elementary Education Certification Courses - 2009–2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Year One</th>
<th>Winter Year One</th>
<th>Fall Year Two</th>
<th>Winter Year Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Literacy Course Part I</td>
<td>• Literacy Course Part II</td>
<td>• Science Course</td>
<td>• Students w/exceptionalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching in the Elementary School</td>
<td>• Social Studies</td>
<td>• Mathematics</td>
<td>• Teaching with Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Field Practicum w/teaching partner 2 days/week | • Field Practicum w/teaching partner | • Field Practicum               | • Student Teaching 5 days/week |}

The School of Education’s teacher education office placed preservice teachers in cohorted groups for their education courses. In each cohort the preservice teachers were assigned by the teacher education office to work with one or two teaching partners in the elementary field classroom. In each academic year, cohorts and teaching partners from the first semester were maintained in the second semester of the first year. In the first year, semesters one and two, the preservice teachers worked in field classrooms with a teaching partner(s) two days per week; in semester two, the preservice teacher served as the lead teacher for eight of the fifteen weeks. In semesters three and four, they worked individually as student teachers in local classrooms (field
classroom with pupils). Also in semester four, they spent all week in the classroom and were gradually given increasing responsibility. In the second year, semester four, the preservice teachers attended a student teaching seminar and took short, specialized courses on technology and working with special needs students.

**School Settings**

I accessed local school district websites to identify districts where the preservice teachers in my courses were placed by the teacher education office. I obtained demographic data for each school (number of students in the school and district, teacher/student ratio and percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch). The preservice teachers remained in the same school setting for two semesters.

**Eagle Elementary**

Twelve of the 24 preservice teachers in Course One were placed in Eagle Elementary for the fall and winter semesters 2009–2010. Eagle Elementary is located within a five-mile radius of the School of Education. The school district has a population of 16,440 pupils, and spends approximately $12,000 per pupil. The student/teacher ratio is 19:1. The school has 346 pupils, of which 18% receive free and reduced lunch.

**Tower Elementary**

The remaining 12 preservice teachers in Course One were placed at Tower Elementary School for the fall and winter semesters 2009–2010. Tower Elementary is located in the same school district as Eagle Elementary School. The student/teacher ratio is 14:1. The school has 317 pupils, of which 31% receive free and reduced lunch.

---

1 The names of all School Settings are pseudonyms
Ivy Elementary

The 21 preservice teachers in Course Two were placed at Ivy Elementary the fall and winter semesters of 2010–2011. The school is approximately twenty miles from the School of Education. The school district has a population of 19,000 students in twenty-six schools, and spends approximately $8,517.00 per pupil. The student/teacher ratio is 18:1. The school has 475 students, of which 10% receive free and reduced lunch.

Preservice Teachers - Elementary Social Studies Methods Course One

Twenty-four women preservice teachers participated in course one. Fourteen were majoring in Language Arts, six in mathematics, two in science and two in social studies. Two self-identified as Black, one as Asian and the remaining 22 as White (I include information about race to support research on the teaching population in the United States as predominately White while the national student population grows more diverse (Gay & Howard, 2001). On an information sheet that I asked each preservice teacher to complete at the beginning of each course, 11 of the 24 indicated that they needed more information about “history”, including admissions of their own lack of history knowledge, inability to memorize facts or interest in making history engaging and interactive for their pupils. They defined social studies as history. Their perception of social studies was that its content and curriculum were centered around history exclusively. They were unaware of other social sciences in the field of social studies. As part of the University’s requirements for the 34-credit major, undergraduates had to select from a number of social sciences courses. Undergraduates pursuing social studies majors were required to take two introductory survey courses in American History and could also select from numerous social science courses in the College of Liberal Arts.
Preservice Teachers - Elementary Social Studies Methods Course Two

Twenty-one women participated in course two. Nine were Language Arts majors, seven were mathematics majors, one was a science major and four were social studies majors. Two self-identified as Black and 19 as White. Six indicated that they were interested in methods for teaching social studies in an interactive and engaging way but did not feel confident about their knowledge levels. Three groups worked in their field placements as part of a triad (three teaching partners) at the fifth-grade level while the others worked in pairs in third- and fourth-grade classrooms.

Elementary Social Studies Methods Course

The elementary social studies methods course required in the second semester of the teacher education program was designed by history and social science teacher educators to prepare elementary and middle grade teachers to plan and enact effective instruction in social studies for diverse populations of students. While the preservice teachers had multiple assignments in the social studies methods course, the assignment that is the focus of this research study included requirements for designing a lesson using objectives from the state curriculum and an instructional protocol (structured lesson plan) to help students analyze the evidence from an image, e.g., photograph, painting or illustration. In the methods courses I designed instruction for the preservice teachers to identify and work through issues of planning and teaching social studies such as:

- Understanding the key concepts and methods of inquiry/practice within the social scientific disciplines;
- Examining readings, standards documents, and formal assessments to make decisions about what and how to teach;
- Framing “enduring” social studies questions to drive learning and teaching;
• Evaluating and modifying curricular and instructional resources for social studies; and

• Engaging *all* students in learning content and acquiring thinking skills.

Additionally, I expected them to apply Backward Design to create social studies lessons.

Backward Design is characterized by choosing and articulating worthwhile objectives and purposes, developing assessments that aligned with lesson objectives, designing lessons to attain the purpose and utilizing a range of resources for teaching social studies, including standards documents and curriculum materials (Wiggins & McTighe, 2006). Finally, I wanted them to examine their personal experiences teaching social studies during the course and identify how their experiences might shape their approach to teaching.

**Data Set**

I built my case study around my two experiences teaching VID and an analysis of what the preservice teachers demonstrated they were able to do in designing and teaching VID, and then reflecting on their practices. The data set included:

• PowerPoints, lesson plans and assignments for teaching VID;

• Preservice teachers’ lesson plans for VID;

• Preservice teachers’ microteaching/rehearsal analysis; and

• Preservice teachers’ written analytic reflections.

Below is a table to explain which data sources I used, the rationale for using those sources and their link to the Grossman Framework:
Table 3. Data Set and Grossman Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Link to Grossman Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PowerPoint slides, lesson plans and assignments for teaching VID</td>
<td>Examples of teacher educators’ representations of practice</td>
<td>Decompositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice teachers’ lesson plans for VID</td>
<td>Assist teacher educator in understanding how preservice teachers were planning for VID using the lesson planning rubric</td>
<td>Representations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice teachers’ microteaching/rehearsal analysis</td>
<td>Examine the role of microteaching/rehearsal as an opportunity to approximate practice</td>
<td>Approximations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice teachers’ written analytic reflections</td>
<td>Source of information on the teaching enactment in the field classroom and related teacher education practices that preceded the enactment</td>
<td>Decompositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approximations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mode of Analysis**

My analytic approach is based on Glaser and Strauss’s (1967) constant comparison methods as employed in grounded theory (Charmaz, 1990, 2001; Sbaraini et al., 2011; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). I created conceptual memos to capture my findings (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). I selected representative artifacts from the textual data to develop consistent and coherent analysis of their possible meanings. I utilized the texts to illustrate facets of representation and opportunities to approximate practice related to VID.

Chronologically I evaluated the lesson plans and gave targeted feedback using the instructional rubric when I taught the Elementary Social Studies Methods Courses. As a researcher, rather than starting with the lesson plans I initially turned to quotations from the
preservice teachers’ written analytic reflections to identify emerging patterns in the data. The preservice teachers wrote analytic reflections for VID using rubrics that I provided in the elementary social studies course (Appendices D, H). I used this data element first because it provided me with an overview of many facets of the VID enactment, rather than only the aspect of planning. I wanted to begin the study with a broad understanding of preservice teachers’ perceptions of enacting VID that I found in the written analytic reflections. In each elementary social studies methods course, Part II of the rubric included categories to assist preservice teachers in evaluating their VID planning and teaching. I constructed the rubric for Course One to help them analyze the planning and teaching of the lesson using the following criteria (Appendix D):

- Anticipating, eliciting and facilitating student thinking and suggested modifications for the lesson based on their appraisal;
- An evaluation of five student assessments to determine the alignment between learning goals, interpreting student thinking and to present evidence to warrant their claims related to the evaluation; and
- An appraisal of video clips of their teaching enactment with a detailed description of how they elicited and facilitated student thinking, with supporting data and justification for their selection of the video clips.

I determined preservice teachers’ scores using the categories from the rubric as outlined above. I assigned points to each preservice teacher based on my reading of their reflection and their adherence to the criteria on the rubric in writing their analytic reflections.

I constructed a similar rubric for Part II of the VID assignment for Course Two. The terminology for the rubrics changed between the two courses to include considerations related to
the grading scale and the lesson planning template (Appendix G). The preservice teachers’ analysis of VID for Course Two included the following criteria:

- Examination of planning and teaching focused on attending to learners (anticipating student ideas and making the content accessible to all students) and suggested modifications for the lesson based on this appraisal;
- Evaluation of five student assessments focusing on alignment of assessment to learning goals, attending to the learners and providing evidence to support the evaluation; and
- Assessment of video clips from DVD of teaching enactment to explain the alignment between learning goals, attending to learners, justification for the selection of clips and explanation of how evidence from the clips supports the assessment.

I evaluated preservice teachers’ scores in Course Two using the categories from the rubric as outlined above. I ascribed points to each preservice teacher based on my reading of their reflection and their compliance to the criteria on the rubric. In each course I assessed the preservice teachers as proficient, adequate or inadequate as outlined on the instructional rubric (Appendix C, G).

I created charts to record the frequency of the themes which emerged from my examination of the written analytic reflections (Appendices I, J). On the themes frequency chart I listed the name of the preservice teacher on the left and placed an x in the box for the themes mentioned in her written analytic reflection. I totaled the scores for each theme at the bottom of the chart. After I determined the emerging themes, I developed descriptions of the most frequently occurring ones from the initial analysis (Appendix K). The themes were: teacher’s content knowledge, classroom management, discussion moves, image selection, revisions to draft, references to course, microteaching/rehearsal, script and students. Then I refined the
themes into the seven most prominent: discussion moves, image selection, teachers’ content knowledge, student’s content knowledge, student engagement, revisions to draft and microteaching/rehearsal (Course Two only). The descriptions for the seven themes are:

1. **Discussion Moves**
   Preservice teacher mentions discussion moves that helped to enhance or limit VID discussion; further explains what it means to elicit student thinking.

2. **Image Selection**
   Preservice teacher describes process of selecting image for use with VID.

3. **Teacher’s Content Knowledge**
   Preservice teacher wants to acquire more content knowledge in order to expand on the (historical) themes of the lesson and better facilitate VID.

4. **Student Engagement**
   Pupils as active participants in VID.

5. **Student’s Content Knowledge**
   Preservice teacher explains support for and challenges to pupil’s understanding of content based on previous knowledge or inaccurate assumptions.

6. **Revisions to Draft**
   Preservice teacher identifies relationship between modifications to draft and leading the VID.

7. **Microteaching/Rehearsal**
   Preservice teacher examines the influence of microteaching/rehearsal on preparation to lead the VID.
I used the seven themes to note the relationship between emerging themes and issues related to teacher educator representations and the preservice teachers’ opportunities to approximate practice. The following example is from Rhoda², a preservice teacher in Course One, who wrote about what I categorized as Image Selection (relevant text in boldface):

Our next step was to search the internet for an image that represented citizenship, and we thought a picture showing a diverse range of students saying the pledge of allegiance would work well. However, we could not find a picture of this nature, and chose a picture of caricatures saying the pledge that were all different races, representing diversity. **This draft of our lesson did not end up reflecting what we wanted the students to learn.** We wanted the students to understand the importance of citizenship, including the rights and responsibilities of citizens, with the primary focus on voting and recycling. After we realized the image we chose did not demonstrate this and there was not a lot the students would be able to infer from the picture, we decided to change pictures…Our biggest challenge was finding an image that allowed us to generate enough substantial questions to elicit student understanding of our main objective, citizenship. **It would have been beneficial to have an idea of an image in mind prior to searching for an arbitrary image that represented citizenship.**

In Course One Rhoda modified her image after completing an initial draft and evaluating her VID following enactment. I characterized Rhoda’s reflection as related to teacher education representations and approximations of practice related to image selection.

---

² Names of all preservice teachers are pseudonyms.
In the Course Two Courtney described changing her image prior to completing the lesson plan draft. She explained the connection between anticipating student ideas and preparing to approximate instruction in the elementary field classroom (relevant text in boldface):

The biggest difficulty with planning this lesson was finding an appropriate image to use. Originally, we tried to find an image that was actually from Michigan. This restricted our search quite a bit and we found it rather difficult. The image we originally planned our lesson around was specifically from Michigan, but was not very provocative. After Cathy suggested that our image was not going to provoke enough discussion, we decided not to limit ourselves to images only from Michigan. By anticipating students’ ideas better, we should have been able to see that our original image would not have had enough to grab the students’ attention. Our new image was not from Michigan, but featured a lot of people, engaging in trade and had many details that we could count on our students to notice.

Courtney’s written reflection appears to be related to opportunities to approximate practice for image selection in Course Two. I analyzed their quotations to code examples of how the decompositions, representations and approximations of practice led to challenges and differences in preservice teachers’ learning. When I categorized the challenges and differences that emerged from the reflections, I also began to examine the challenges and differences in relation to planning, enacting and reflecting on approximating practice for VID.

To explain the preservice teachers’ reports on planning and enacting VID, I turned to Part I of the rubric (Appendices D, H). I structured the preservice teachers’ planning around image selection, learning goals and anticipating pupils’ ideas. The language of the rubric for Part I
varied between the two courses but not in substance, i.e. the planned questions and the instructional sequence were consistently supportive of the learning goals. My use of these rubrics for Part I of the VID as a teacher educator was to focus preservice teachers’ planning and enable them to approximate practice for the VID. As a researcher, I examined the preservice teachers’ scores on Part I of the VID in each course to make connections between their scores and the themes that emerged my analysis of Part II of the instructional rubric. On Part I of the rubric for Course One, my expectations were (Appendix D):

- The image is an appropriate selection for the students and the topic;
- The learning goals are clear, specific and reflect the big ideas of the lesson topic and image; the plan identifies strengths and challenges of the image;
- Planned questions to consistently support the learning goal, elicit and facilitate student thinking, take advantage of the image features and invite deep interaction with the image;
- Anticipated student responses related to students’ interests and challenges, are age-appropriate, connect to student’s prior knowledge, and include both intended and inaccurate responses; plan includes follow-up responses to pupils; and
- Assessment aligned with learning goals to interpret students’ understanding of the image and content of the lesson.

In Course Two, I graded preservice teachers’ planning for the VID using a slightly different instructional rubric (Appendix H). My expectations for preservice teachers’ planning for the VID were largely the same as the expectations for Course One, with minor variations in language to reflect the lesson planning template (Appendix G):
• The image is appropriate for supporting the learning goals for pupils and the topic;
• The learning goals are clear, specific and reflect on the big ideas of the lesson topic and image; the plan includes a description of the strengths and challenges of the image;
• The instructional sequence supports learning goals, eliciting and facilitating student thinking, takes advantage of image features and invites deep interaction with the image;
• Anticipating student ideas attends to what pupils may find interesting, challenging and possible misconceptions; anticipated responses in the sequence are age-appropriate, connect to prior knowledge and include misconceptions; instructional sequence includes discussion questions and follow-up responses to pupils.

Next, I looked at the preservice teachers’ instructional sequences and lesson plans to locate textual data in order to illustrate the relationship between my representations and opportunities to approximate practice as a teacher educator and their scores on Part I of the rubric. I used the emerging themes from both courses to identify similarities and differences in the teaching partners in each course (Appendices I, J).

To select cases as exemplars for my research study, my criteria were that the partners had to explain themes that matched in the areas directly related to representations or opportunities to practice, and each partner’s written analytic reflection had to contain detailed descriptions of planning, enacting and reflecting for VID. I planned to use the exemplars to highlight their perceptions of learning to enact VID in relationship to my teacher education practices. In Chapter Four I discuss specific analysis and evidence from the first elementary social studies methods course on teacher education practices and preservice teacher learning. In reviewing my teacher education practices on the first course, I suggest modifications for representations and approximations of practice in a second elementary social studies methods course. Chapter Five
explains how the data from the first elementary social studies methods course assisted me in modifying representations and approximations of practice for the second course.

**The Validity of the Study**

To enhance the internal generalizability of my study, I read the sources of data to corroborate, illuminate and elaborate on the answers to my research questions that would be useful for other social studies educators interested in replicating the study (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). I used data from 45 different individuals, who supplied data in writing, in DVDs and in face-to-face interactions in my courses. To corroborate data from Part II of the VID, I watched the preservice teachers’ DVDs of their teaching enactment as a teacher educator grading the assignment and then as a researcher to determine the extent to which their attributions were consistent with the evidence given in their reflections. I compared the data from Part I and Part II of the VID assignment in Course One to determine whether my instructional goals were met and to ascertain which features of my teacher education practice required modification for Course Two. I did the same for Course Two in anticipation of further study. I read widely within my data sources to create answers to my research questions described in this chapter. Additionally, I utilized preservice teachers’ rubric based scores, proficiency categories, theme categories and comparisons across both years of the study to illuminate my analysis.
Chapter 4:

Elementary Social Studies Methods Course One

In addition to deepening the understanding of my preservice teachers concerning visual inquiry, I also wanted to help them learn how to design and enact an activity to help their elementary pupils learn to “do” visual inquiry. In other words, I sought to teach them to do visual inquiry teaching. Again, using the Grossman Framework (2009) as a theoretical guide, I planned my instruction by decomposing the complex practices entailed in VID and creating representations and opportunities to approximate practice. The next section describes how I designed and enacted my instruction, or more specifically, how I represented Visual Inquiry Discussion (VID) and provided opportunities to approximate practice.

Teaching Preservice Teachers How to Do VID

In my lessons, I sought to make the work of teaching with images visible by decomposing the practice or breaking down key aspects of VID. I then designed activities to represent facets of the practice that would enable my preservice teachers to approximate the practice by receiving targeted, timely written and verbal feedback before they enacted the lesson in the field classroom. Each of the representations and opportunities to approximate practices built upon one another in increasing authenticity and culminated in my plan to approximate the VID practice in the field classroom.

First, I prepared a lesson assignment and lesson rubrics to represent the structure of VID (Appendices B, D). This representation included written details of the assignment, grading, expectations and lesson plan format. Second, I prepared PowerPoint slides to both represent the
component practices of VID and to assist the preservice teachers in preparing for their own VID by offering opportunities to approximate practice with each component of VID. The next sections discuss the pedagogy I employed to teach VID practice, including the moves I made and the opportunities I provided to approximate practice before turning to how the preservice teachers enacted the practice.

My Teaching Practice: Representing and Providing Opportunities to Approximate VID Practice

I was the instructor for one coheted group in winter 2010. In each academic year there were two cohorts of preservice teachers, with one teacher educator teaching each social studies methods course. Though I worked closely with the other instructor, I refer only to the work in my section of the course. I planned to model the VID strategy in my section of Elementary Social Studies methods and help preservice teachers prepare to enact their own inquiry with Visual Images Discussion in elementary classrooms. I selected an image from the American Revolution (described below) that my students could use in teaching this subject. Figure 4.1 shows the lesson plan I used. Column one lists the activity and column two describes what I planned. Column three is a reminder of what I needed to do before/during instruction to represent and enable the preservice teachers to rehearse or approximate VID practice.
### Figure 4.1 – VID lesson plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity/Task</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Strategy: Visual inquiry | Visual inquiry is a strategy from the Social Studies Alive materials – but is a useful strategy to use with any social studies content, can be incorporated into any social studies curriculum.  
- Boston Massacre image –  
  - Initiating question: What do you see in this image?  
  - Level 1: What do you notice about the setting of this image? What do you notice about the characters? What are they doing?  
    - Talking Statues (ask for 3-4 volunteers):  
      - Who are you? What are you doing here – what is your role? What’s going on, from your perspective?  
  - Level 2: When might this event take place? What perspectives are represented?  
  - Level 3: What message is being communicated?  
    - (Note that this picture was developed as propaganda following the Boston Massacre.) What does this image add to your understanding of the American Revolutionary period?  
- Debrief – identify steps of VID strategy  
  - Using visuals captures student interest and allows them to interact with the content  
  - Creating a script of carefully sequenced questions allows students to probe deeply into the content of an image | Be sure to ask questions at each level. Did talking statues at the end.  
May want to include question: what makes a good image? Or can return to this question in class 4.  
 decide steps of VID strategy  
- Display images on PowerPoint |
| Practice: Visual inquiry | Practice with additional images:  
- In pairs, write 3 questions, at least one for each level. Then pair off and teach to a classmate. | |
| Teaching in the field assignment | Distribute assignment; note key dates. Students can begin having conversations with mentor teacher about what unit they will be working on in March and possible images – may include photographs, maps, cartoons, etc. | This needs a wide window. |
I selected Paul Revere’s portrayal of the Boston Massacre, an image that previous teachers of this course had used to model VID.³

**Image 1. Paul Revere – The Bloody Massacre (1770)**

I selected this image because it is rich in symbolism, has been analyzed extensively and illustrates an event taught in the elementary school curriculum. While Pelham’s was the first engraving, Paul Revere’s was circulated most widely at the time. It depicts the fighting in the Boston Massacre with the title, “The Bloody Massacre” and was produced in 1770. The image shows the British organized on the right with guns, shooting the colonists, who appear to be unarmed. The line of guns draws the eye to the left of the image in which a figure is being carried by others and wounded men lay on the ground with blood pooled by their bodies. The engraving does not picture Crispus Attucks, a former enslaved African and then freed merchant.

³ Since 1999, the Elementary Social Studies methods course has been a collaboration between teacher educators. As part of the collaboration, the materials for the course including PowerPoints, readings and assignments are hosted online. New instructors for the course must apprentice with a seasoned social studies teacher educator before teaching, to experience the flow, structure and academic aims of the course.
who was killed in the Boston Massacre as all of the figures in the image are white men with the exception of the dog. Further, the dog stands on the side of the colonists slightly left of center and dogs are typically a symbol of fidelity and loyalty. The perspective of the buildings draws the eye to the building in the center of the square. The event occurred in the evening, which is represented by a moon, although the scene itself is quite bright. Colonists circulated the image in revolutionary times to evoke sympathy for the cause of revolution amongst the colonists, and many historians refer to it as a form of propaganda.

I began discussion by asking participants to identify the features they observed. I then asked them to tell me about the setting, individuals and activities portrayed. As they responded, I referenced the image alternately by pointing to it and holding up a large piece of white paper between the image and the projector to enlarge the details in the image. I asked for four volunteers to role play four figures in the image and posed three questions to these “Talking Statues”: What are you doing here? What is your role? What is going on from your perspective? After the role play, I informed the class that the engraving was designed as propaganda for the colonists. From that perspective, I asked: What does it show? and What is the message being communicated? I discussed a list of the questions in PowerPoint format as a visual representation of the structure underlying VID (Figure 4.2).
Figure 4.2: Representing VID Structure

Boston Massacre image

- Initiating question: What do you see in this image?
- Level One: What do you notice about the setting of this image? What do you notice about the characters? What are they doing?
  Level Two: (Ask for 3-4 volunteers to role play as Talking Statues.) Ask: Who are you? What are you doing here? What is your role? What is going on, from your perspective?
- Level Three: Tell preservice teachers that this picture was developed as propaganda for the Boston Massacre. Ask: What does it show? What is the message being communicated?

I continued to represent the strategy by explaining each level of questioning to make visible the VID features that had been invisible when I modeled – and explained the purpose for each level of questions – to lead elementary children to a deeper understanding of the evidence in the image and a firmer grasp of the related content.

As I taught the image and led the discussion, I did not display the procedures of VID, but tried to engage the preservice teachers in discussion by asking questions about the evidence in the image. As the VID lesson closed, I made visible and explained the VID procedure or format by showing a PowerPoint slide without the specific questions as we slowly unpacked and discussed the features of the lesson in which they had just participated (Figure 4.3).
After breaking down the pedagogical moves I used in facilitating their analysis of the Revere image, I distributed the VID assignment as a handout to further represent the VID structure in which they had just participated and discussed. I explained they would lead the same type of lesson in their field classroom (Appendix B).

Approximating Practice for VID

To help preservice teachers begin to approximate VID planning, I asked them to practice developing questions for a visual image using the levels of questioning I had made visible on the second PowerPoint to provide them with an opportunity to approximate practice by preparing leveled questions, I showed them a third PowerPoint slide (Figure 4.4) and asked them to work in small groups and create leveled questions using the images:
Figure 4.4 – PowerPoint on Image Selection

- Choose an image from those provided
- Decide what the image represents; what concepts could you teach using the image?
- In pairs develop at least three questions (one per level)
- Time permitting, teach to another classmate

I selected three images of the US civil rights movement, symbols of democracy, and ancient world history based on their rich historical context and because they represented important curricular concepts in social studies instruction:

Image 2. – Elizabeth Eckford pursued by a mob on the first day of school - Central Park High School – Little Rock, Arkansas, September 4, 1957 – Johnny Jenkins, UPI

---

4 It is important to note that while the images in the dissertation include captions and reference, the preservice teachers viewed and responded to the images without captions. Beck & McKeown (2006) refer to this as inconsiderate text (see Chapter Six for discussion).
Image 3. – Raising the Flag at Ground Zero
Thomas E. Franklin – The Record, September 11, 2001

Image 4. Egyptian Papyrus Drawing
The preservice teachers worked in pairs to develop questions for one of the images. When finished, each pair explained the image they selected and I wrote the questions for each level in PowerPoint format. As I wrote each level of question to reinforce the purpose for that level of questioning, some participants questioned the examples, which led to moving some of the questions into different categories for clarification: Level 1 - Explain details; Level 2 - Formulate ideas, make inferences; Level 3 - Consider the scene as a whole, make hypotheses, relate to big idea or concept. We finalized the leveled questions as follows (Figures 4.5-4.7):

**Figure 4.5 – PowerPoint Slide - Preservice Teachers’ Level One Questions**

Level One

- Who do you see in this picture?
- What do you see in this picture?

**Figure 4.6 – PowerPoint Slide - Preservice Teachers’ Level Two Questions**

Level Two

- Where do you think this took place?
- When do you think this took place?
- Why do you think they are doing that?
- What do you think the mood is?
- How does it make you feel?
- Why do you think the man’s pants are dusty?
Figure 4.7 – PowerPoint Slide - Preservice Teachers’ Level Three Questions

Level Three

• What do you think this picture symbolizes?
• What makes this image powerful?
• What is the significance of this picture?
• What does the American flag symbolize?
• How does this image relate to what we are studying?

After the preservice teachers developed the questions, we discussed how the example questions they created during class would be useful when they began to write their own VID lessons. Class ended with the assignment to meet with their mentor teacher to discuss the curriculum around which they would design their VID.

**Extending the Representations of VID Practice**

Knowing that most preservice teachers had an opportunity talk with their mentor teacher, I anticipated that they would need to revisit the procedures and key components now that they had actual content or actual images for planning purposes. I also wanted to stress the practice to make the relationship between visual image and content more visible. Therefore, I selected a second image of the Boston Massacre to show how a contrasting image could be useful for VID.
We quickly discussed the differences in the two images. For example, notice that the colonists are more menacing, are armed and encircling the British in this painting created almost 90 years after the event. An armed Crispus Attucks is shown being shot in the quite cramped space.

I added this picture to focus on content knowledge and to alert the participants to each of those considerations in planning, considerations that I was afraid I had emphasized enough in previous discussion. To clarify the importance of content knowledge as an aspect of preparation, we discussed historical information about the events surrounding the Boston Massacre which I had modeled in the previous week, so they would understand the importance of content in
relation to the visual image and planning for the discussion. I also explained the following PowerPoint slide (Figure 4.8):

**Figure 4.8 – PowerPoint Slide on Content Knowledge**

- Provide students with background information or sequence activity so that they are familiar with the content.
- Students will complete an assessment of your choosing to determine what they understood about the content based on the visual inquiry lesson.

Additionally, I wanted the preservice teachers to understand why a teacher might choose to plan a VID using two images and what a second image might offer in terms of instructional practice. This image I thought dramatically showed the power of contrast and comparison.

Thus, I opened this class not by modeling a full VID, but by returning to representations of the features of VID given the use of the second and very different visual portrayal of the Boston Massacre. In summary, using more than one image of the same event offered an opportunity to represent practice for preservice teachers who would need more than one image for their curriculum and for whom the rationale underlying the use of multiple images would have been invisible by modeling and discussing the representation with only one image. The next section discusses subsequent class periods in which I represented and gave preservice teachers opportunities to approximate practice.

**Further Representations and Opportunities to Approximate VID Practice**

In the fourth class, I expected participants to select an image that fit the curriculum in which they could engage children in a rich social studies discussion using evidence from their
images. I continued to discuss the components of VID in preparation for their own approximations through lesson planning. I reshowed the following slide’s contents as a structure around which to design their VID instruction (Figure 4.9). By this time, the preservice teachers had decided on a visual image and a curriculum focus with their mentor teacher and had established the dates for enacting VID teaching in the field classroom.

**Figure 4.9: PowerPoint Slide - Representing Practice by Focusing on Preparation and Planning**

So you have your topic and an image…now what?

- Research your topic
- Beyond the students’ textbook
- Begin planning your lesson. Consider:
  - What are the goals of your lesson?
  - How are you going to introduce students to the purpose of your lesson?
  - What are you going to have your students to before seeing the image? After?
    - Consider using a trade or textbook
  - How will you know if students learn what you want them to learn?

I also discussed examples of the objectives from the state curriculum that would be used in designing VID around the Revere image. I asked them to look for objectives in the state curriculum that matched their visual image. The following slide helped them focus on the important elements to consider in planning including components of the language in their lesson assignment (Figure 4.10):
Two weeks later, they turned in their draft lesson plans with their image(s), leveled questions and a student assessment in anticipation of their VID in the field classroom. The structure of the lesson plan template offered a grammar to describe the VID in preparation for teaching in the field. I gave feedback electronically using Part I of the instructional rubric to assess the lesson plans (Appendix D).

**Analysis of Preservice Teachers Doing VID**

Tables 4, 5, 6 show my analysis of Part I preservice teachers’ planning of the VID. The categories mirror those found on the instructional rubric that I used to determine challenges and differences in the preservice teachers’ approximations of practice in this study (Appendix D). I did not evaluate the preservice teachers’ student assessments, but only the fact that they included an aligned assessment as part of approximating practice for VID. The heading of the first column displays the criteria for scores: *proficient, adequate* and *inadequate*. Below the headings are the
criteria for each level of proficiency. The second column illustrates the names of the preservice teachers and their scores related to each category.

Table 4—Preservice Teachers’ Proficient Scores on Approximating Practice for VID-Part I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficient 6.5 points</th>
<th>Preservice Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The image(s) is an appropriate selection for the students and the topic. (1 point)</td>
<td>Elaine &amp; Kate; Kim &amp; Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monique &amp; Juanita; Frida &amp; Taylor;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret &amp; Laura; Larsa &amp; Audrey;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christina &amp; Clarice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The identified learning goals (objectives and anticipated student conceptions/challenges) are clear, specific, and reflect the big ideas of the lesson topic and image. The plan also reflects the affordances and challenges of the image. (1 point)</td>
<td>Elaine &amp; Kate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larsa &amp; Audrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frida &amp; Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned questions are consistently supportive of learning goals, elicit and facilitate student thinking, take advantage of image features, and invite a deep interaction with the image. (1.5 points)</td>
<td>Elaine &amp; Kate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larsa &amp; Audrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret &amp; Laura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frida &amp; Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated student responses attend to what students may find interesting and challenging in the image. Anticipated responses are age-appropriate, connect to students’ prior knowledge, and include intended responses as well as underdeveloped or inaccurate responses. Plan includes possible discussion moves and follow-up queries in response to anticipated student responses. (2 points)</td>
<td>Elaine &amp; Kate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larsa &amp; Audrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christina &amp; Clarice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson includes an assessment(s) aligned with learning goals that will allow the teacher to interpret students’ understandings about the image and content of the lesson. (1 point)</td>
<td>All preservice teachers included an assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5. –Preservice Teachers’ Adequate Scores on Approximating Practice for VID-Part I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate 4-5 points</th>
<th>Preservice Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| There are some aspects of the image that lend themselves to rich discussion, but overall this is not the case. (.85 points) | Selena & Siobhan  
Amy & Theresa  
Chloe & Michelle  
Kim & Mary  
Monique & Juanita |
| The identified learning goals are clear and specific; they generally – but not completely - reflect the big ideas of the topic and image. (.85 points) | Denise & Rhoda;  
Monique & Juanita  
Chloe & Michelle  
Christina & Clarice  
Kim & Mary  
Margaret & Laura |
| Some planned questions are generally supportive of learning goals, some facilitate student thinking, some take advantage of image features, and some invite a deep interaction with the image. (1.25 points) | Denise & Rhoda  
Chloe & Michelle |
| Some anticipated student responses attend to what students may find interesting and challenging in the image. Some anticipated responses are age-appropriate. Plan includes some intended responses as well as underdeveloped or inaccurate responses. OR, plan may not fully develop possible discussion moves and follow-up queries. (1.7 points) | Denise & Rhoda  
Christina & Clarice  
Frida & Taylor |

### Table 6. –Preservice Teachers’ Inadequate Scores on Approximating Practice for VID-Part I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Preservice Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The image is not a good selection for the students; it may be too difficult; it may not be sufficiently challenging; it may not be rich enough to support a discussion; it may not align with the topic and/or objectives. (<.85 points) | Rosemary & Judy  
Denise & Rhoda |
| There are identified learning goals but they are not clear; not sufficiently specific; and/or they do not reflect the big ideas of the topic and image. (<.85 points) | Selena & Siobhan  
Rosemary & Judy |
Few of the planned questions are supportive of learning goals, few facilitate student thinking, few take advantage of image features, and/or few invite a deep interaction with the image. (<1.25 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kim &amp; Mary</th>
<th>Rosemary &amp; Judy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selena &amp; Siobhan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are few anticipated student responses and/or they do not connect to the particular students’ prior knowledge. OR, discussion moves and follow-up queries are lacking. (<1.7 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amy &amp; Theresa</th>
<th>Kim &amp; Mary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary &amp; Judy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selena &amp; Siobhan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe &amp; Michelle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only two groups fully approximated the practices for VID by including each element of the lesson plan rubric and receiving a score of 6.5 points on the rubric: Elaine & Kate, Larsa & Audrey. My analysis revealed two problematic patterns: (1) problems with image selection and planning for leveled questioning and (2) problems in anticipating pupils’ knowledge of selected image or event and possible responses. Image selection is related to each level of proficiency on the rubric, because of the connection between the image, learning goals and student responses. Planning for leveled questions is found on the rubric in the section in which planned questions are supportive of student learning goals. Anticipating student responses is on the rubric and related to both image selection and lesson planning. The next section discusses preservice teachers’ abilities to plan for VID by using data from two of the teaching pairs. Michelle and Chloe provide examples of problems with image selection and lesson planning. Frida and Taylor are teaching partners who had difficulty anticipating students’ responses.

**Problems in Image Selection and Planning for Leveled Questions**

Michelle and Chloe were fifth-grade teaching partners at Tower Elementary School.

Michelle. Michelle was a language arts major/fine arts minor. Her experiences with children included baby sitter, camp counselor and assistant preschool teacher. She wrote: “I enjoy interactive classes more than lectures.”
Chloe. Chloe was a language arts major/integrated science minor. Her only experience working with children was in her senior year of high school when she spent 90 minutes per day in a kindergarten classroom. On a preservice teacher information sheet that I distributed to all of the preservice teachers in the first class session, she indicated that she was interested in learning to teach “history” in a way that students would remember.

Chloe and Michelle did not decide on their two images until they submitted their final lesson plan. They had not seen either of their images as problematic in the course meetings and had not brought either image to my attention in planning their lesson. Although Chloe reflected on image selection as part of her written analysis, she really speaks to a lack of consideration for the image as an integral component:

Now after doing the lesson it became apparent that it was good to have two pictures but the first picture just wasn’t as strong as the second picture. Two pictures were useful since there wasn’t as much to talk about with the first picture so it was good to also have the second one to incorporate. For the first picture I think that it was a good picture, for them to understand the setup of Jamestown. The aerial view was nice but there wasn’t a whole lot of substance of things to talk about. It was beneficial for the students to be exposed to the structure and geographical features of Jamestown but it was difficult to have an in depth conversation about it. If I were to do this lesson again I might look for a picture with more depth of things to talk about. A picture that would provide more substance.
Although image one was adequate to instruct students about the geographic layout of Jamestown, it was not a rich image source. Chloe posited that a modification she would make to
image selection would be to select two rich images to enhance discussion. Interestingly, while Michelle and Chloe wrote two versions of the initial lesson draft and was unable to offer targeted feedback on their image selection. Image two, a modern painting, was neither a primary source nor was it created in close proximity to the actual events, a factor to which Michelle and Chloe did not refer in their lesson planning and reflections. While Chloe was aware of the importance of image selection in planning, Michelle’s comments were problematic in terms of what I expected them to learn about the connection between image and discussion. I gave them the following feedback (boldface and italicized):

Chloe & Michelle’s Instructional Sequence:

- We are going to look at the first picture. Like we said before we want you to notice the physical features of this picture.
- What do you see? (Level 1)
- What is this? (Level 1) *My Comment: What does “this” refer to?*
- Where is this? (Level 2) *My Comment: See above*
- When do you think this took place? (Level 2) *My Comment: Are you asking time period? What do you want here as a response?*
- Why do you think the settlement is set up this way? (Level 3) *My Comment: Will this word come up as part of your discussion or will you need to introduce it at the beginning of the lesson?*
- Why do you think they decided to settle there? (Level 3) *My Comment: Who are “they”?*
- What do you notice about the picture that would be beneficial for the colonists? (Level 3)
- How does this relate to what we are studying? (Level 3)
- Now we will be looking at picture two.
- What do you see? (Level 1)
- Where is this? (Level 2) *My Comment: See above*
- When do you think this took place? (Level 2) *My Comment: See above*
- How does this picture make you feel? (Level 2) *My Comment: What answers are you expecting here?*
- How do you think they are feeling? (Level 2)
- What resources do you see being used? (Level 3)
- What does artist want us to know? (Level 3)
- How does this relate to what we are studying? (Level 3)
- Debrief about what was talked about. *My Comment: What questions or statements will you make in the debrief? Remember it needs to be detailed and*
lead to some analysis

- **Scripted Conclusion:** Thank you for your thoughtful participation with this activity. We saw a lot of great observations being made about why colonial settlements were built in certain ways and in specific places, and also about daily life in a colony. We’re also impressed with the effort you put into your own drawing of a colony and your discussion of what features of a colony you feel are the most important when building a new settlement. What we hope you’ll take away from this is a better picture in your mind of what a settlement looked like and what the lives of early colonists were like. These are all bits of information that will be really useful to you as you continue your Discovery 3 simulation.  

  **My Comment:** When does this happen? You need to include step by step directions for what you say and do to make this happen. Remember, you should write your lesson as if you were preparing it for someone else to teach. Would I be able to pick this up and teach it as is?

Chloe and Michelle’s initial draft lesson plan didn’t include expected student responses or follow-up questions that are listed in the proficiency level of Part I of the instructional rubric. Michelle and Chloe prepared their lesson plan with limited considerations for student learning goals despite the emphasis on student goals as a prominent feature in the format of the lesson template, Part I of the instructional rubric and in our class discussions. Michelle then responded to my feedback:

> When I reflect on planning the lesson, I see the word “revision” flashing before me in huge letters! The first draft of our lesson was a cursory overview of what we wanted to do, and I think that at that point, we only had a vague idea of the big picture of what we wanted to accomplish. Going back and refining our lesson plan in great detail was so helpful because it forced us to define exactly what we wanted to accomplish with the lesson. It also forced us to outline every step we would take in order to meet our objectives.

While my targeted feedback enabled the preservice teachers to approximate practice and was crucial for VID planning, I had wondered what was missing from my representations and
opportunities to approximate instructional practices that had not alerted Michelle and Chloe to this aspect of planning prior to my targeted feedback. I surmised that they knew they would receive enough comments upon which to build a lesson, which they had not initially drafted, or perhaps my initial representations and opportunities to approximate practice were too opaque.

**Failure to Anticipate Children’s Background Knowledge and Responses**

Taylor and Frida selected their image and prepared a lesson with follow-up questions and anticipated student responses and content knowledge. However, they did not successfully approximate practice because they did not know what to expect from children due to their limited experience working in classrooms. Their first exposure to teaching upper-level students in grades 3-5 occurred during their field placements in the same semester as Course One.

**Taylor.** Taylor was a junior social studies major/math minor. She was placed in a fourth grade classroom with Frida at Eagle Elementary. On her preservice teacher information sheet she described her experiences working as a camp counselor, babysitter and math tutor. She wrote, “Loves being around children.” She also wrote, “I really like to be able to try things out so learning in the classroom and being able to give lessons on my own is a huge way that helps me learn. Just getting experience teaching children.”

**Frida.** Frida was a math major/fine arts minor. She worked as a babysitter/nanny and in a fine arts program with preschool children. Frida indicated that she had been working as a substitute teacher since 2008. She wrote, that she was interested in “How to make social studies/history fun and engaging” for students.

Originally, they planned to focus on the relationships between Native Americans and the British in Michigan during the 1700s since their curriculum focus was Michigan history. After creating the lesson, they were concerned about children’s prior knowledge of the American
Revolution, the British and the Native Americans. Instead, Taylor and Frida decided to focus on the Henry Ford plant in Dearborn as an important event in Michigan history, because they thought that pupils would have prior knowledge and interest that would facilitate their enactment of VID. Taylor and Frida selected a panel from a mural in the Rivera Court of the Detroit Institute of Arts painted by Diego Rivera,

Image 8. Detroit Industry (1932) – Diego Rivera

As a teacher educator I was concerned that Taylor and Frida were expecting their students to handle quite a bit of content information and engage in discussion when the students had never been exposed to this type of discussion in the classroom. My feedback on their draft lesson plan was intended to alerting them to issues related to the age appropriateness of their questions and pupils’ prior knowledge:

Frida & Taylor’s Instructional Sequence

Anticipated Student Conceptions or Challenges to Understanding:

1. Students have no prior knowledge of the automotive industry, especially related to Henry Ford.
We will have to explain to them who Henry Ford was, why he was important, and what was his significance to the automotive industry in Michigan. We will also have to discuss with them the importance of the automotive industry and how it changed transportation as well as the lives of many Americans.

2. Students do not know how to participate in or act during a discussion.
   - We would model a mini discussion for them so that they could see what our expectations of them are and how they should act during the discussion.

   My comment: Wow! Those are significant challenges. Each challenge could be a lesson of its own. Will you have enough time for this? Do you have a plan for conveying this information? Should it be part of your scripted introduction?

   **Scripted Introduction:**
   
   We’re going to show you an image on the screen and as social studies students we are going to investigate it together. We are going to ask you questions, do your best to answer them. This is going to help enrich your knowledge of Michigan’s history. We may ask you to look closely at some details in the image. Please be good listeners and raise your hand if you have something to contribute.

   My comments: The “we” statements are contradictory. Maybe you want to use language to invite them to investigate the image with you. Suggestion: “We would like you to investigate this image with us.” Or look at the image with us?

   **Instructional Sequence:**
   
   1. Introduce the lesson and let students know what they can expect.
   2. Project the image. Ask the following questions:
      a. What do you see in this image?
      b. Who do you see in this image?
         My comment: Include possible expected answers to your questions (See instructional sequence handout)
   - use “magic paper” to highlight details in the image (specifically the sections of the image that are hard to see in order to make them bigger and more clarified)
   3. Ask questions to draw students’ attention to the details in the image.
      a. Where do you think this image takes place?
         **My comment: These men are?**
      b. When do you think this took place?
         **My comment: How does this fit your objectives? Maybe: What are they doing?**
      c. What mood do you think is portrayed in this image?
         **My comment: Kind of sophisticated question. What do you expect they will say?**
      d. Do you think there is separation occurring in this image? Why or why not?
         **My comment: What do you mean by this question?**
   4. Ask questions to enable students to generate ideas or make inferences based on the evidence in the image.
      a. What do you think this picture symbolizes?
      b. What makes this image powerful?
My comment: *Do they think it’s powerful? Maybe you want to ask: “Do you think this image is powerful? Why?”*

c. What is the significance of this image?
   
   My comment: *Kid-friendly language: “What do you think this image means?”*

5. Ask questions to enable students to make connections to the concept under study.
   
a. What does this image add to our study of the time period and our study of Michigan?

6. Wrap up the discussion. Summarize the main points that came out of the discussion and comments that arose out of the image. Link the discussion to what came before and what will follow.

7. Administer the assessment of student learning.
   
   My comment: *Will they share their responses with the whole group or in pairs or will you just collect them?*

   Have the students do a free write on the following question:
   
   What was it like to be an automotive worker on the assembly line or in a typical Ford factory? Provide evidence from the image to support your decision/stance.

My comment: *Great free write. It should be really interesting to see what they come up with.*

**Scripted Conclusion:**

Henry Ford and the automotive industry revolutionized the way of life for Americans and forever changed Michigan’s economy. People of all races and socio-economic status worked together on Ford’s assembly line at the River Rouge Plant in Detroit to make quality automobiles that would be shipped around the world.

My comment: *Don’t forget to include your image I was using my memory of the mural! I’m not sure which panel you will use.*

Taylor referred to the influence of my comments to on her initial lesson plan draft to help approximate practice for the VID in the written analytic reflection of her teaching. I suggested and pointed out elements of the plan that they needed to address prior to working with pupils in the field. She perceived planning and revising the lesson plan draft as related to her successful enactment of the VID because my comments were considerations that she and Frida had not planned for. Taylor and Frida’s draft asked higher level questions that they had not prepared the pupils to answer in other parts of the planned discussion. From my reading of their plan, as a teacher educator, it appears that they did not consider how pupils might think about the
questions, and so they planned to ask the types of questions that a teacher might ask of adult learners, my targeted feedback on their lesson plans offered Taylor additional insight on preparing to enact a VID:

What really challenged us in creating this lesson was making the language kid friendly. We ended up having to go back into our lesson to change all of the questions we had intended to ask them so that they would make more sense to the students. We realized that we had been using too advanced vocabulary and wording for the level our students were at. We also had to modify the types of questions that we were asking so that we had questions ranging from Tier 1 to Tier 3 as well as list more responses we thought the students might come up with.

The opportunity for Frida and Taylor to design instruction for the VID by preparing an initial draft and revising the draft as a way to prepare for the actual teaching enactment appeared to influence their teaching by helping them to focus on the type of detail required to plan and enact a VID. This teacher education practice enabled me to intervene with Frida and Taylor before they worked with pupils in the field classroom.

**Successfully Analyzing Their Practice and Identifying Content Knowledge as an Instructional Problem**

While most of them fell in the *adequate* category in their ability to approximate practices in preparation to enact VID in the field classroom, on Part I of the instructional rubric, twenty preservice teachers fell into the *proficient* category or Part II of the instructional rubric (Table 11). The rubric for Part II of the VID included preservice teachers’ analysis in categories related to planning and teaching the VID lesson, analyzing five student assessments, analyzing video clips from their own DVD of the teaching enactment, and the attachment of all materials to the original submission (Appendix D). For this study I only report on the category of preservice
teachers’ analysis of the planning and teaching of the lesson focused on anticipating, eliciting and facilitating student thinking and suggesting modifications for the lesson based on their analysis. Based on this category, one pair of teaching partners fell into the adequate category, meaning their evidence and justification for their claims was weak, even though they wrote their reflections individually. This group (Denise & Rhoda) did not submit a DVD of their teaching enactment due to technical difficulties. Two other preservice teachers, who were not teaching partners fell into the inadequate category: Rosemary and Monique. Monique’s written analytic reflection was submitted after the deadline and often focused on personal failings while the other was not reflective about the VID enactment (the pair to which this novice teacher belonged did not successfully plan for or execute a VID, although the other partner did describe the difficulties in analytic reflection). The following chart shows the preservice teachers’ scores on Part II of the VID (Table 7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the</td>
<td>Analysis of the planning and teaching of the lesson focuses specifically on</td>
<td>Analysis of the planning and teaching of the lesson generally – but not</td>
<td>Analysis of the planning and teaching of the lesson does not explicitly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning and</td>
<td>anticipating, eliciting and facilitating student thinking and includes</td>
<td>completely – on anticipating, eliciting and facilitating student</td>
<td>focus on anticipating, eliciting and facilitating student thinking, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching of the</td>
<td>suggested modifications for the lesson based on this analysis. (5 points)</td>
<td>thinking, OR includes suggested modifications for the lesson based only</td>
<td>includes suggested modifications for the lesson based only partially on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lesson focuses</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.25 points)</td>
<td>this analysis. (≤4.25 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty preservice</td>
<td>Twenty preservice teachers</td>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>Rosemary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rhoda</td>
<td>Judy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. – Preservice Teachers’ Scores on Part II - VID
While Michelle, Chloe, Taylor and Frida often fell into the adequate category on Part I of the instructional rubric, each fell into the proficient category in Part II. I return to each of them to examine the relationship between their earlier difficulties with planning and content knowledge and their reports of enactment of VID in the field classroom. Comparing their initial lesson planning to their reports of teaching and learning with pupils I gained insight into my teacher education practices and their learning to plan, enact and reflect on practice for the VID.

Michelle initially reflected on major limitations in her ability to understand and use the components of the VID. Her initial limitations and targeted feedback from me led her to reflect on the utility of scripting instruction and more closely design the type of instruction she would need to enact in the field classroom. In her written reflective analysis, Michelle perceived the scripted lesson plan as a way to access student thinking on multiple levels:

Writing out every procedure and every question helped to give us a feel not only for the length of the lesson, but made it possible for us to prepare questions with a specific goal in mind rather than thinking them up on the spot with only a general idea of what we wanted to accomplish with them. Including anticipated student responses helped us to define what exactly we expected the students to get out of our questions, and put us in the students’ shoes since we were essentially answering our own questions and could then judge whether or not they were a good fit for the pictures we were using….The act of scripting our introduction and conclusion helped not only for reminding us what we wanted to say to the students, but it also helped to guide our composition of questions. Since we had the introduction and conclusion drafted before we set down our instructional sequence, we were able to
work backwards from what we wanted the students to learn, to drafting ways for
them to learn it.

While, Michelle did not initially focus on the connection between the learning goal and working
backward from the goal to plan the assessment and instructional activities in planning for the VID
in Part I of the assignment, she was able to reflect on the utility of planning in Part II of the
assignment, on her written analytic reflection. For Michelle, the process of scripting her plan for
the teaching enactment was useful because including features like anticipated challenges and
follow-up questions provided a structure that she perceived as helpful; this is useful for teacher
educators in assisting preservice teachers in planning and preparing to enact instruction.

Michelle had not been able to use her own content knowledge to clear up student
misconceptions. When preservice teachers’ prior knowledge and that of the students was limited
and it was difficult to discuss the content of the visual image and to address student
misconceptions. However, Michelle recognized this as she reported on her limited content
knowledge and identified her textbook as a source of information that she didn’t utilize, although I
represented this practice in class during discussion:

If I were to teach this lesson again, the first thing I would do is to research the
colony of Jamestown much more thoroughly. I know now that the 5th grade
Social Studies textbook is a good source of basic information on the history of
Jamestown. In planning the lesson, I failed to find resources that mention that
Jamestown was built on a marsh that was riddled with mosquitoes that made
farming challenging and living very difficult. That would have been valuable to
include in our information, since just by looking at the picture, no one (including
myself) came to the conclusion that Jamestown was so marshy. Secondly, I
would certainly rehearse my script before giving the lesson. There were times—
especially as I was explaining the directions for the assessment—when I found
myself stumbling over my words, which probably wouldn’t have happened had I
practiced what I was going to say beforehand.

Michelle’s comments speak to the prominent difficulties in preservice teachers’ designing
instruction for the VID. Namely, there was a strong relationship between content knowledge,
image selection and the ability to enact the VID. While I emphasized each of these aspects in
representations of practice, they managed to escape notice by Michelle. Additionally, Michelle
mentions her regret for not practicing the VID before enacting instruction in the elementary field
classroom.

Lack of content knowledge may have contributed to Chloe’s inability to respond to
students as well. Chloe’s portrayal of responding to students represents the concerns of
preservice teachers who planned for their students to respond in specific ways and were confused
as to how to proceed with facilitating an engaging discussion when students respond as exactly
as expected, I would argue due to an the limited details in the first image and insufficient initial
lesson planning. In her written reflective analysis Chloe described difficulties with finding
instances in which she furthered student thinking during the teaching enactment:

When it comes to facilitating the students thinking I didn’t really respond to the
students responses when they gave them about the picture. I just nodded my head
and said yes. I think that I could have talked more when they gave an answer but I
was worried that I would take away from what another student would want to say.
So, instead of me directly answering I could have asked the students what they
thought about their fellow students answer and if they had anything to add to that.
Like when a student responded with the water could be used for boats I could have asked what kinds of boats and what did those boats do and why were they important. Then other students could answer also. If I were to do it again I would have expanded more on what the students had to say instead of just going on to the next student.

My expectations for preservice teachers’ initial planning for the VID included not only expected responses but follow-up questions; such as, “What makes you say that?” or “Where do you see that?” as well as some of the techniques Chloe alluded to in her written reflection. So Chloe’s difficulties in the discussion show a clear link between limited planning and classroom enactment of practices for the VID. While Chloe was able to reflect successfully on this limitation, as a teacher educator, it would have been better for the children in Chloe’s class if she had been able to better design instruction and thereby further comprehension of the content before she enacted instruction in the classroom.

Similarly, Frida reflected on her lack of content knowledge related to broader themes in the curriculum and multiple interpretations of her image. While Frida and Taylor had utilized a strong image and prepared leveled questions, in retrospect Frida regretted her lack of knowledge related to both the art history and the history of the automotive industry, while she didn’t want to bring too many interpretations into the VID, she did want to offer more in the way of content knowledge:

I have studied this painting previously in art classes, although I don't remember all the information I learned. I want to say I would like to brush up on this history before I teach this lesson again, but at the same time I feel knowing too much about the various interpretations of the painting can hurt me in guiding student
learning. I do think, however, better preparation on the topic of the Ford Motor Company and the implications it had on Michigan's economy will allow me to elicit such comments on the topic from the students and get them to tie the ideas into their social studies unit in a more round-about way. I think the one aspect the lesson was really lacking, which was actually part of the objectives, is tying this into Michigan's economy. We were barely able to touch on it, and very few of the students had comments for us. With some more prior knowledge on my part, I may have been able to rephrase the questions more appropriately for them to make connections.

Frida acknowledged that the discussion of the content and context related to their visual image was limited. Frida reflected on her limited acquisition of the content necessary to further student thinking about Michigan, economics and the automotive industry which influenced her teaching enactment.

In contrast, although Taylor uses the word content knowledge in the following quotation, she appeared to be describing misconceptions about students for her grade level in her written analytic reflection. Awareness of children’s prior knowledge of content is a different issue than teacher’s knowledge of content. Whereas, teachers can and should strengthen their own content knowledge prior to enacting the VID, understanding children’s prior knowledge requires teachers to utilize instructional practices like interviewing or brainstorming prior to determine what children know about the content:

If I had to teach this lesson again, I would definitely make a few modifications. The first thing I would work on is improving my content knowledge as much as I could. I would do a lot more research to prepare for the lesson so that I could
better explain questions my students have and be better prepared to explain ideas
the students may not comprehend. I wasn’t anticipating my students
misinterpreting the words “powerful” and “symbolized” and I wish I had prepared
to discuss these concepts with them.

While Taylor perceived children’s misconceptions as a limit to her own content knowledge, she
was describing limitations in her understanding of what children know in grade four. Taylor
attributed her difficulty to her own content knowledge but I perceive it as a limitation in knowledge
of children’s learning trajectory. This represents a failure in my targeted feedback to help Taylor
approximate practice for the VID. Although I commented on limitations in children’s prior
knowledge it did not translate into a change in Taylor’s instructional practices related to using the
words powerful and symbolize in her teaching enactment.

**Discussion and Implications**

As my analysis indicates there was some “good news” and “not so good news” in how
well the preservice teachers learned the VID practice. First, they all were able to simulate the
procedures of VID. That is they all selected an image, tied the image to the curriculum, had
questions to lead the discussions, and then used their plans to teach children in a classroom.
Further, almost all were able to reflect on the ways they did the VID, effectively identifying
features of the practice and some of their limitations.

However my analysis also revealed that most of the preservice teachers had significant
problems in selecting images, constructing leveled questions, anticipating pupil’s questions and
misconceptions, and limitations in their own content knowledge. This data showed me that my
instructional design and enactment has its own limitations, limitations caused, in part, by my
underestimating the time needed to acquire this practice and my preservice teachers’ content
knowledge. I had assumed that my representations and the opportunities I provided my students to approximate practice would effectively prepare preservice teachers launch the VID in elementary field classrooms. I planned to represent the practices for enacting a VID and help preservice teachers work towards authenticity by offering opportunities to develop the skills necessary to enact a VID lesson in the field classroom with children. The data indicates that I had not adequately prepared the preservice teachers to enact a VID in elementary field classrooms. In what areas did I have room to alter my instruction?

**Representing Practice**

I considered that my representations of practice for the VID strategy would help the preservice teachers understand the aims and format of the strategy specifically related to image selection, lesson planning and content knowledge. I did not consider that my representations lacked information about the implications of failing to recreate each step of the VID model. Such implications could have included why it would be necessary for preservice teachers to follow each step of the lesson planning template in order to assist in pupil’s examination of evidence in the image and comprehension of content.

When the preservice teachers initially brought their images to class, I regretted my lack of formal instruction on image selection. I had not formalized the notion that preservice teachers must be taught to select the type of image around which they could design instruction and that I could represent this practice in the methods courses (Berry, Schmeid & Schrock, 2008; Kress & van Leuwen, 1996). Some of my representations, such as image selection and content knowledge, remained opaque even when I began to provide them with opportunities to approximate practice for VID. Despite the preservice teachers’ limited reports related to image selection, their analyses in Part II suggest that image selection is related to preservice teachers’
abilities to engage in the type of VID that would further their elementary pupils’ comprehension of content and allow for rich discussion.

I also could have emphasized the crucial role of the acquisition of teacher knowledge on the PowerPoint, lesson assignment and rubrics. As a teacher educator, I failed to address their ability to comprehend the influence of content knowledge when helping them to plan for VID. While it may seem intuitive that a teacher should be aware of the importance of content knowledge, the marginalization of social studies in schools and teacher education has led to its de-emphasis in terms of teacher preparation; at most, beginning teachers receive one semester of instruction in social studies, which in some cases, is integrated with language arts. In summary, I needed to provide additional representations and opportunities to approximate practice in the course to ensure that the participants possessed adequate content knowledge prepare prior to enacting VID in the field classroom.

Opportunities to Approximate Practice

Beyond the lesson planning, actual enactment proved problematic because the participants perceived missed opportunities to enrich the discussion and further pupil’s thinking around an image. In their other methods courses they used techniques from Beck & McKeown (2006) to lead discussions, but for some reason they did not transfer these strategies to my social studies discussion. I believe that the structured nature of the grammar for the VID on the lesson planning template and rubric led them away from cross-curricular learning in the teacher education program. I could have included experiences in the elementary social studies methods course for preservice teachers to practice responding to elementary pupils as additional opportunities to approximate practice related to eliciting student thinking about a visual image. In summary, it would benefit teacher educators across disciplines to reinforce strategies, i.e.
those for discussion in multiple courses, and highlight the commonalities for preservice teachers who are unable to recognize the similarities in representations of practice. Thus, Chapter 5 describes how I modified my decompositions, representations and approximations of practice to improve teaching and learning with visual images in the second elementary social studies methods course.
Chapter 5:

Elementary Social Studies Methods Course Two

I saw my first attempt at teaching VID as a mixed success, as a teacher educator with the chance to teach this practice again to preservice teachers, I was very interested in improving my method of teaching VID. In Chapter 4, I show how the preservice teachers in my first elementary social studies methods course were able to approximate the planning procedures of VID and use them to varying degree with pupils after my instruction. Chapter 4 also lists the issues to effectively identify and select robust images to use with pupils, design leveled questions that anticipated pupil’s pre-instructional understanding and construct effective responses to pupil’s questions. Thus, I modified my instructional practice by adding documents and materials focused more on specific components of VID design, such as image selection, and provided modified opportunities for preservice teachers to practice before enacting instruction in the field classroom.

In Chapter 5, I again use Grossman’s Framework as the basis of my instruction and modifications and representative quotes from the preservice teachers’ written reflections and examples to modify my instructional practices. Chapter 5 ends with suggestions about the changes needed to improve preservice teachers’ learning to teach with visual images in social studies and the related teacher education practices.
Teaching Preservice Teachers How to Do VID: Modifications in Decompositions, Representations and Approximations of Practice for VID

The Grossman framework (2011) identifies decompositions of practice as helping preservice teachers understand complex instructional practices by teaching them the component parts. She describes how teacher educators have to follow decompositions with approximations or opportunities to practice so that preservice teachers can begin to simulate practice. To decompose practice I modified the course syllabus, PowerPoints VID assignments and rubrics to reflect considerations related to what I learned about representations and opportunities to approximate practice in the first course. As in the first course, I moved between representations and opportunities to approximate practice in an iterative cycle during the course. To represent practice, I again modeled the VID for preservice teachers using Paul Revere’s 1770 engraving of the Boston Massacre and led a discussion of the image using the evidence to ask a series of leveled questions (see Chapter 4). Following my initial representation, I added two content-based slides to refresh (or teach) the preservice teachers about the historical details of the events surrounding the Boston Massacre. Thus, I was attempting to add a move that brought into the lesson needed background knowledge to address the concerns about content knowledge and to demonstrate to the preservice teachers ways in which I was planning for differences in pre-instructional background knowledge.

Unlike Course One, I then displayed the Champney lithograph (see Chapter 4) right after I provided the preservice teachers with background knowledge on the Boston Massacre rather than waiting for the following week as I did in the first course. I added the picture to create a contrast that sharpened the students’ ability to see different ways to represent the Boston
Massacre. This also would provide an opportunity to represent the issue of image selection and the value of using two images. To further represent the instructional practices for the VID, as I had in the first elementary social studies methods course, following the modeling we discussed the structure for the VID that was invisible when I modeled the VID using the Revere and Champney images (Figure 5.1):

**Figure 5.1 PowerPoint Slide – Format for Visual Inquiry**

**Visual Inquiry**

1. Arrange your classroom so projected images will be large and clear.
2. Use a few powerful images to represent a lesson’s key concepts.
3. Ask carefully sequenced questions that lead to discovery.
   - Always begin with: What do you see in this image?
   - Level 1: Explain the details
   - Level 2: Formulate ideas, make inferences
   - Level 3: Consider the scene as a whole; make hypotheses about what is happening, why, and how it relates to a larger concept or big idea.

I asked if they remembered the questions during VID modeling. Next, I handed out the modified VID assignment including a greater weighting of their grade and the inclusion of microteaching prior to enactment (Appendix F). I showed the following slide overview of the structured opportunities for the modified assignment (Figure 5.2). I reminded them to speak with their mentor teacher concerning the specific curriculum focuses and objectives to be covered while enacting VID in the field classroom.
Figure 5.2 – PowerPoint Slide – Visual Inquiry Assignment

1. With MT, select an image (1-2) to align with social studies in your classroom
2. Co-plan the lesson in pairs – begin in class on February 11; complete outside of class
3. Rehearse the lesson in class on February 18
5. Write an individual lesson reflection – due 3/25

The preservice teachers also had to develop their own leveled questions using an image that I provided. Unlike course one, where I showed three images and allowed the preservice teachers to select one, I only showed one image, because it had been the most productive relative to the number of questions generated in course one. I designed the following slide to help them approximate VID practice with questioning around an image (Figure 5.3):

Figure 5.3 – PowerPoint Slide – Practicing Visual Inquiry

Practicing the Visual Inquiry

- Decide what the image represents; what concepts could you teach using the image?
- In pairs develop at least six questions (two per level)
  - Level 1: Explain the details
  - Level 2: Formulate ideas, make inferences
  - Level 3: Consider the scene as a whole; make hypotheses about what is happening, why, and how it relates to a larger concept or big idea.
- Time permitting, teach to another classmate
Participants self-selected and worked in pairs to develop examples of leveled questions for the following image:


The groups shared their questions and I entered the responses into three slides as examples of leveled questions (Figure 5.4; Figure 5.5; Figure 5.6):

**Figure 5.4 – PowerPoint Slide 1**

Level 1:
- Who do you see in this picture?
- What do you notice about the background?
- What do you notice about the men’s clothes?
- What are the colors in the picture?
As the pairs read their sample questions, I realized that they had a greater degree of prior knowledge of this image and its context than would the pupils in their classrooms, but I was not sure that they would realize their pupils’ lack of content knowledge. I gave feedback on how using an image that may have been unknown to elementary pupils would require them to think about how to develop questions that a pupil could answer.

Due to difficulties (see Chapter 4, Analysis of Preservice Teachers Doing VID) with my image selection in Course One, I modified the representations and opportunities to include more information about what to look for when selecting an image for VID. The following slide explains the selection of an image focusing on the key features of image selection that were
problematic in course one. I wanted the preservice teachers to focus on the characteristics of a rich image prior to selecting a final image (Figure 5.7).

**Figure 5.7 – PowerPoint for Selecting a VID Image**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selecting an Image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Related to the curriculum content you want to teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Created by a painter or photographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clear enough to recognize the details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not overly complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tells a story before you know the story</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To make visible the specific features of a rich image, I suggested that they make sure that the image selected included details or features that would interest children and have enough detail to promote rich discussion. I indicated to them that a useful visual image tells a story before you actually know the story; the image invites the viewer to learn more about the story.

In my discussion I emphasized the connection between image and curriculum to further pupil’s comprehension of content through the visual image I suggested that an image created by a painter or photographer rather than an illustration would ensure a better quality level and accuracy. Additionally, the image had to be clear enough for the children to identify its features. I cautioned them that the most useful images image invite a viewer to learn more about the story. To approximate image selection following my representations of practice related to image features, I showed the following images and led a discussion on the strengths and weaknesses of each:
In our discussion, preservice teachers could begin to approximate practice for the VID in anticipation of selecting their own images by identifying the problems with the first image in which symbols were superimposed on the American flag and did not tell a complete story. Additionally, this image is a composite of other web-based images, which I encouraged preservice teachers to avoid when planning their VID. I discouraged them from creating their own image using such composited images from the internet and encouraged them to use a photograph, painting or illustration that was created for the purposes of conveying information about an historical event, time period or social science concept from their curriculum.
In the second image preservice teachers were able to further approximate practice by identifying the interest of people as a detail in the image and the movement of the figures. The second image tells a story visually that children would be eager to analyze using evidence from the image. I continued to represent image selection by pointing out that while it might be somewhat difficult to see what all of the figures were doing, this could be useful for furthering instruction on the setting of the Woolworth counter sit-ins and helping to explain why there would be so many people crowded around. The preservice teachers expressed sentiments that the image would spark curiosity and emotion. I selected these two images to provide preservice teachers with opportunities to approximate practice with image selection because of the work of Berry,
Schmeid & Schrock (2008), who found that students retained and recalled the content in images that spark curiosity, tell a story and evoke an emotional response, which I used to help preservice teachers identify powerful images as part of the VID strategy. Following our discussion of the first two images, I initiated a conversation about when content or topics might need to be represented by two images to make visible how and why they might want to select two images in planning their VID. I reminded the preservice teachers of the earlier examples of the Paul Revere and Champney images and included the topic of mining, for example, when you have to describe the exterior of the mine as well as the activities of miners, two images would be more useful than one to convey a sense of the work of mining for students.

Image 12. – Mining A

![Image 12. – Mining A](http://www.miningartifacts.org)

Image 13. – Mining B

![Image 13. – Mining B](http://www.miningartifacts.org)

Source: [http://www.miningartifacts.org](http://www.miningartifacts.org)
Further Representations and Opportunities to Approximate Practice for VID

After the preservice teachers had spoken with their mentor teachers and brought sample images to class, I emphasized the importance of their own content knowledge in preparing for VID (Sanchez, 2010). I offered suggestions related to ascertaining students’ prior knowledge of the subject and improving content knowledge by reading an adult-level book on the subject and/or children’s nonfiction text selections. Due to the broad range of curriculum in the upper-elementary classroom, it would be impossible to plan opportunities for preservice teachers to gain specific content knowledge within my elementary social studies methods courses, but I needed to make them aware that they were responsible for thoroughly researching the content prior to enactment, due to their difficulties with content knowledge in Course One.

I added anecdotal examples from Course One to offer instances in which preservice teachers enacted the VID in the field classroom and to show how their limited content knowledge prohibited them from answering students’ questions about the image and its context to assist in their approximations of practice. I showed the following slide from the first course as I described the difficulties with limited content knowledge during enactment of the VID in the elementary field classroom (Figure 5.8)
Figure 5.8 – PowerPoint Slide: Content Knowledge for VID

Visual Inquiry
So you have your topic and an image…now what?

Research your topic
– Beyond the students’ textbook
– Begin planning your lesson. Consider:
  – What are the goals of your lesson?
  – How are you going to introduce students to the purpose of your lesson?
  – What are you going to have your students to before seeing the image? After?
    Consider using a trade or textbook
  – How will you know if students learn what you want them to learn?

I continued representing practice by emphasizing the aspect of analyzing the evidence in the image throughout the inquiry with visual images discussion to make preservice teachers aware that they were assisting their students in engaging in historical thinking; I wanted to make them understand this factor in leading a successful VID to make visible a feature of the planning that may have been invisible as I represented the practice by modeling or in our discussions (Figure 5.9):
I used each of these representations with preservice teachers to make visible the elements of a successful inquiry with visual images lesson. I chose to place additional emphasis on image selection and content knowledge to highlight the importance of those factors as preservice teachers prepared to plan their own VID lesson due to difficulties with those instructional practices in Course One. In the next step, preservice teachers began to approximate practice by developing lesson plans in preparation to enact VID in the field classroom.

**Additional Opportunities to Approximate Practice for VID**

In Course Two, I added an opportunity to practice the VID in the university classroom prior to enacting instruction in the field to offer an additional approximation of practice. I anticipated that this would enable them to practice their discussion moves in a formal setting.
rather than practicing on “real” children (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Colby, 2009; Grossman et al., 2009; Kallenbach & Gall, 1969; Lampert, 2010; VanderKloet & Chugh, 2012).

I provided written feedback on the lesson plan drafts to help them approximate practice in the field classroom. Upon completing their lesson plan drafts, I asked them to come to the third session prepared to teach the lesson to their peers. Although I describe this practice in the course materials as microteaching, it was more than one small segment of instruction; thus I add the word, “rehearsal”, to “microteaching” (Grossman et al., 2009; Kallenbach & Gall, 1969; Lampert, 2010; VanderKloet & Chugh, 2012). Grossman et al. (2009) use “rehearse” in conjunction with opportunities to approximate practice, and argue for additional study/research on aspects of microteaching that might be useful in pedagogies of teacher education. In traditional definitions of microteaching, preservice teachers practice shortened segments of instruction which they videotape and review multiple times, but in my course the preservice teachers rehearsed the teaching of their entire VID lesson with their peers without videotape. I asked the preservice teachers to rehearse the entire lesson, to be sure that they practiced all of their discussion moves in the university classroom first. To reinforce the directions for engaging in the microteaching/rehearsal we discussed the steps as shown in the following PowerPoint slide (Figure 5.10):
Participants imagined they were children at the grade level of the VID lesson they were watching and I told them to ask questions they thought such children might ask to help approximate the practices they would enact later in the field classroom. I asked for sincere feedback so that their peers could improve their instructional practices. I placed the preservice teachers in groups with a variety of lesson topics. Before preservice teachers began their lesson we discussed the directions for the microteaching/rehearsal feedback using a slide, so that each participant would be prepared to offer specific feedback (Figure 5.11):
Figure 5.11 – PowerPoint Slide: Microteaching Feedback

- **Introducing the lesson**: How did they engage students in the discussion? How did they help the students to understand the way they should discuss?
- **Leveled questions**: How do the questions asked ensure that they use evidence in the image to support their inferences?
- **Closing the lesson**: Does the lesson have a coherent closure? What questions will ensure that students connect the discussion of the image to the unit of study?
- **Assessment**: does the assessment seem appropriate for the lesson?

Following microteaching/rehearsal in the university classroom, each preservice completed a written feedback sheet and also shared the feedback verbally in their small group to help their peers prepare for enactment in the field classroom (Appendix E). Following the microteaching/rehearsal I required each preservice teacher to write about their experiences with the rehearsal and how it helped them to think about enacting VID (Appendix E).

**Analysis of Preservice Teachers Doing VID**

To prepare preservice teachers to enact the VID lesson in the field classroom, I included opportunities to approximate practice by developing a draft lesson with their teaching partner(s) as in course one. I gave written feedback on the drafts. Next, they rehearsed and altered their lesson plan based on my comments and feedback from the rehearsal before enacting the lesson in the field classroom. Unlike the first course, where only two groups of preservice teachers fell in the *proficient* category following lesson planning, in this course seven out of nine groups fell in
the proficient category on Part I of the VID (Appendix H). Tables 8, 9, 10 show their abilities to
develop lesson plans for VID:

Table 8. – Preservice Teachers Proficient Scores’ on Planning for VID-
Part I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Preservice Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The image(s) is appropriate for supporting the learning goals for the students and the topic. (2 points)</td>
<td>Karen &amp; Connie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paula, Joan &amp; Lillian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leah &amp; Anne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courtney &amp; Hilary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morgan, Blake &amp; Nicole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irma &amp; Ava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The identified learning goals are clear, specific, and reflect the big ideas of the lesson topic and image. The plan also reflects the affordances and challenges of the image. (2 point)</td>
<td>Karen &amp; Connie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paula, Joan &amp; Lillian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leah &amp; Anne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courtney &amp; Hilary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morgan, Blake &amp; Nicole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irma &amp; Ava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maggie, Louisa &amp; Beverly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional sequence is consistently supportive of learning goals, eliciting and facilitate student thinking, takes advantage of image features, and invites a deep interaction with the image. (2 points)</td>
<td>Karen &amp; Connie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paula, Joan &amp; Lillian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leah &amp; Anne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courtney &amp; Hilary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morgan, Blake &amp; Nicole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irma &amp; Ava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topanga &amp; Lisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipating student ideas attend to what students may find interesting and challenging in the image as well as anticipated misconceptions. Anticipated responses in the instructional sequence are age-appropriate, connect to students’ prior knowledge, and include intended responses as well as underdeveloped or inaccurate responses. Instructional sequence includes discussion questions and follow-up responses to anticipated student responses. (2 points)</td>
<td>Karen &amp; Connie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paula, Joan &amp; Lillian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leah &amp; Anne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courtney &amp; Hilary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morgan, Blake &amp; Nicole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irma &amp; Ava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topanga &amp; Lisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson includes a written assessment(s) aligned with learning goals that will allow the teacher to interpret students’ understandings about the image and content of the lesson. (1.5 point)</td>
<td>All preservice teachers included an assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9. – Preservice Teachers Adequate Scores’ on Planning for VID-Part I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Preservice Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are some aspects of the image that lend themselves to rich discussion, but overall this is not the case. (1.5 point)</td>
<td>Topanga &amp; Lisa Maggie, Louisa &amp; Beverly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The identified learning goals are clear and specific; they generally – but not completely - reflect the big ideas of the topic and image. (1.5 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some planned questions are generally supportive of learning goals, some facilitate student thinking, some take advantage of image features, and some invite a deep interaction with the image. (1.5 points)</td>
<td>Maggie, Louisa &amp; Beverly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some anticipated student responses attend to what students may find interesting and challenging in the image. Some anticipated responses are age-appropriate. Plan includes some intended responses as well as underdeveloped or inaccurate responses. OR, plan may not fully develop follow-up responses to anticipated student responses. OR plan may not anticipate student conceptions. (1.5 points)</td>
<td>Maggie, Louisa &amp; Beverly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maggie, Louisa & Beverly, fell into several adequate categories because the image selected was non-negotiable in terms of the mentor teacher and restricted their development of questions to elicit thinking due to its lack of detail. Similarly, Topanga & Lisa used an image selected from a literature book that was suggested by their mentor teacher. The images from the book were unclear and it was difficult for the viewer to discern the details in the image.
Table 10. – Preservice Teachers Inadequate Scores’ on Planning for VID-Part I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Preservice Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The image is not a good selection for the students; it may be too difficult; it may not be sufficiently challenging; it may not be rich enough to support a discussion; it may not align with the topic and/or objectives. (&lt;1.5 points)</td>
<td>Grace &amp; Adele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are identified learning goals but they are not clear; not sufficiently specific; and/or they do not reflect the big ideas of the topic and image. (&lt;1.5 points)</td>
<td>Grace &amp; Adele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few of the planned questions are supportive of learning goals, few facilitate student thinking, few take advantage of image features, and/or few invite a deep interaction with the image. (&lt;1.5 points)</td>
<td>Grace &amp; Adele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are few anticipated student responses and/or they do not connect to the particular students’ prior knowledge. OR follow-up responses to anticipated student responses are lacking. (&lt;1.5 points)</td>
<td>Grace &amp; Adele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson does not include an assessment(s) aligned with learning goals that will allow the teacher to interpret students’ understandings about the image and content of the lesson. (&lt;1.5 point)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only group in the inadequate category was hindered by the choices they made within the curriculum. They taught in a grade level where the curriculum focus was geography, which includes options for image selection related to the Five Themes of Geography (1984). Despite my cautioning this group and the feedback they received during microteaching/rehearsal, they developed a lesson around two non-engaging geographic landscape images. Therefore, their planned questioning was not designed to help pupils have deep interaction with the images.
The next section discusses preservice teachers’ abilities to plan for VID based on data from two groups: Ava and Irma and Connie and Karen. Using their lesson plans, image selections and written analytic reflections, I describe how they planned for, enacted and reflected on teaching a VID lesson in upper-elementary field classrooms.

**Successful Image Selection and Planning Questions for VID**

As mentioned, I was concerned with preservice teachers’ planning related to image selection due to difficulties with image selection in course one. Karen and Connie described an awareness of the image as a prominent component of VID discussion, and the difficulties they identified were related to choosing from images related to the regional geographic curriculum focus rather than their inability to recognize the type of image that would be useful in planning the VID.

**Connie.** Connie was a Mathematics Major/Science minor placed fourth-grade at Sunshine Elementary School with Karen. Her experiences included nannying, tutoring, youth group leader and Spanish teacher in a local language tutoring program for third-grade students.

**Karen.** Karen was a Language Arts Major/Mathematics minor placed in a fourth-grade class at Sunshine Elementary School with Connie. Karen wrote that she had five years’ experience babysitting and nannying and volunteering in a kindergarten class.

Initially, the limited image choices for the fourth-grade curriculum were problematic as Connie indicated in her analytic reflection:

The initial planning of the visual inquiry lesson began with finding images associated with the fourth grade social studies curriculum. This proved to be challenging because students were currently studying the regions of the United States and my teaching partner and I were struggling to find thought provoking
images associated with maps and landforms. Even after deciding to select two images of Detroit (past and present) which would allow students to discuss similarities, differences, and changes regions go through, we still struggled to find appropriate photographs. We wanted students to independently recognize that the pictures were taken of the same location, but few photographs allowed for this discovery. However, after extensive searching we found two appropriate, detailed images that aligned with our goals, allowing lesson planning from then on to run fairly smoothly.

Both Karen and Connie recognized limitations with their images as they began to design instruction for VID, yet they took advantage of teacher education representations and opportunities to approximate practice in selecting two rich images to portray regional change over time:

http://www.shorpy.com
Imagining that their students would have difficulty determining that the images were the same location, they prepared multiple follow-up questions and responses to scaffold students’ understanding of the images in their lesson planning. Karen’s written analytic reflection stated:

Prior to the lesson, I also did not think that students would readily conclude that the photos were of Detroit and that significant scaffolding may be necessary. In my planning, I noted multiple follow-up and probing questions that would help the students to see not only that the pictures are of the same place, but also that they are of Detroit. Upon looking at the curriculum and the instruction that the students received prior to my lesson, I anticipated that much of the students’ ideas about regions were regarding landforms and geographic location, therefore the material regarding regions covered in my lesson would be new to them. My lesson questioned students about the changes that a region undergoes over time and who or what may be responsible for those changes. Because this is not a
concept the students have ever been asked to think about I was unsure what sort of answers I might receive.

The richness of the image and their expectations of student content knowledge led both to report few difficulties in developing questions related to the image. They did not perceive any limitations in developing their students’ knowledge using evidence from the image and found this image engaging for VID planning. As a teacher educator viewing their rich image and abundance of leveled questions I perceived Connie and Karen as well-started. Below is a section of their lesson plan to illustrate their planning and my comment (boldface and italicized) to facilitate approximation of practice:

**Figure 5.13 - Connie and Karen’s Instructional Sequence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Steps Describing What the Teacher and Students Will Do (include all questions that you will ask students as well as anticipated responses)</th>
<th>Notes and Reminders (including management considerations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>Recently in social studies we have been studying the regions of the United States. Today we are going to act like detectives and closely examine two photographs as if we are looking at them through a magnifying glass. We will discuss the differences you notice between the two images and how the differences could have developed.</td>
<td>Students may begin to call out answers. Ask prompting questions for students to notice small details about picture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>Project image 1: What are some things you see in the image? * People * Trolleys * Cars * Statue * Buildings * Signs</td>
<td>Prompting may be necessary to keep conversation going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>What do you specifically notice about the people (use magic paper trick)? * Old clothes. What makes you think they’re old? Long dresses and big hats.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soldiers.</strong> How can you tell they’re soldiers? Uniforms and weapons. What do you think they are doing in this picture? Patrolling the streets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Captains.</strong> What makes you think they’re captains? Their hats and uniforms. What do you think their role is? Managing the soldiers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*My comment: You added useful and discussion-building follow-ups for your questions in each section. Good work!*  
What do you notice about the modes of transportation?  
- Old cars. How do you know they’re old? Big, made from Ford’s assembly line (model T).  
- Trolleys. How do you know they’re trolleys? Have you seen these before?  
- Train tracks  
Let’s look really closely at some of the signs. What do they say? (Use magic paper trick)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based off the signs we read what city do you think this photograph was taken in? What region?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - Detroit. What do you see in the picture that lets you know? Detroit Opera House or Detroit creamery sign.  
- Midwest  
From what we noticed about this image, the old clothing and transportation, what do you think the time period is?  |
| - (Ss)A long time ago. (T)This photograph was actually taken in the early 1900’s, specifically 1917, which was about 100 years ago.  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduce image 2: What are some things you see in this image?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - Statues  
- Traffic lights  
- Buildings  
- Flags  
- People  
- Cars  
Prompt students to notice details not just the obvious  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using the images you see, what time period would you guess this photograph was taken in?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - Present day. What in the photograph makes you think this? The cars, building, and people. What specifically about these objects? Bigger buildings with glass, cars that are seen today, etc…  
Make sure document camera allows two images to be projected at the same time |
**Where would you guess this photograph was taken in?**

- A city. What makes you think it’s a city? Big buildings, traffic lights, etc. Do you see any similarities between this photograph and the previous one? (May have to put up both images). The statue! Hmm…If the statue is in both images what city do you think this photograph was taken in? Detroit.

**10 min**

Now that we know these photographs were taken of the same place, but about 100 years apart we are going to compare and contrast the two photos. Recently you turned in your compare and contrast essays so I know that you are all experts at noticing similarities and differences. In a minute I am going to pass out a sheet for each of you to take your notes on. I want you to fill in the sheet individually, but afterwards there will be a chance to share your ideas with the rest of the class.

- Pass out activity to each student
- Allow about 7 minutes to work

**Keep both images on document camera.**
- Some students may take longer than others to finish.
- Make sure to make photocopies prior to lesson.

**5 min**

What differences do you now notice between the two images? What similarities do you notice?

- Differences: cars, clothing, traffic lights, buildings, etc…
- Similarities: Statue, same place, people walking, etc…

What could have played a role in bringing about these changes? How so?

- People. What do people do to cause changes?
- Advanced machinery and technology. How do these things cause changes? What specific changes could machinery and technology have made in our two photographs?

**This is not an area students have studied. Be prepared to give an example to prompt their thinking.**

**2 min**

Wow. You were all really able to look at these images like detectives and notice small, important details about each picture. We figured out that both these photographs were taken in Detroit which is part of the Midwest region. In the coming weeks we are going to be looking at the _____ region so as we are learning keep in mind the ways cities in this region may change overtime and how these changes may occur.
Unlike Connie and Karen, who received only one comment on their initial instructional sequence for VID, the next pair represent preservice teachers who reached proficiency following additional opportunities to approximate practice with microteaching/rehearsal.

**Limited Initial Image Selection and Planning Questions for VID**

**Ava.** Ava was a Social Studies major/Language Arts minor placed in a third-grade class at Ivy Elementary School with Irma. Ava’s experience included camp counselor, babysitter and school volunteer for ESL students. Ava wrote: “Just really want to learn how to teach social studies effectively and in a fun way!”

**Irma.** Irma was a Science major/Mathematics minor placed in a third-grade class with Ava. Her experience included babysitter and swim instructor. Irma did not write anything about supporting her learning in the course.

Irma and Ava focused on Michigan history and Native Americans because their students were familiar with the story of The Three Fires tribes working together. Their next curriculum focus was the fur trade, so they searched for an image related to this topic. Irma reported that she and Ava engaged in limited planning and image selection at the outset of the assignment. Preservice teachers who designed lessons from the third-grade curriculum around the fur trade in Michigan Studies typically had a limited selection from which to choose. I was concerned about the follow-up questions for the pupil’s expected responses in their lesson plan. In a section from Irma and Ava’s instructional sequence prior to microteaching, my comments are in boldface and italicized (Figure 5.14):
### Figure 5.14 - Irma and Ava’s Instructional Sequence Prior to Microteaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Steps Describing What the Teacher and Students Will Do (include all questions that you will ask students as well as anticipated responses)</th>
<th>Notes and Reminders (including management considerations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ~2 min | **Introduction:**  
Hello 3rd Graders! Today we will do a Social Studies activity that’s going to require you to think like a historian! Let’s pretend that we are historians and have been asked by a local Michigan historical museum to study this image and report back to them what it was about. We will have to work, starting with simple questions, to solve the puzzle. As we ask you more and more questions you will have to work to put the puzzle pieces together and describe what this image is showing us. This picture will tie into your study of the history of the early peoples of Michigan. Ok! Here is the image… | Some students may complain and resist this activity. We will remind them how important this activity will be in learning about Michigan history. We will also make this meaningful to their lives by stating that this happened where they live. |
| ~5 min | **Level 1 Questions:**  
Who do you see in this image?  
  - Native American’s (Ojibwa’s)  
  - Settlers (French)  
What do you see in this image?  
  - Trees  
  - Canoe  
  - Furs/something the Native American’s are holding  
  - Water | Students may not give the answers stated.  
- If they say Native Americans, we can build on their knowledge by asking what tribe specifically? |
| ~5 min | **Level 2 Questions:**  
What do you think they’re doing in the picture?  
  - Holding something in their hands  
  - The Native Americans and settlers are getting ready to meet  
  - They are about to trade fur with each other | Students will be unwilling to participate if they don’t think they know the exact answers. We will remind them that any answer is a good answer! We simply want to know how they… |
Where do you think the men on the boat came from?
- Trading with another group of people
- Their own land/home

*My comment: Follow-up could be: “What in the picture lets you know that they are about to trade?”*

Where do you think the other men came from?
- Hunting
- Their land/home

−5 min  Level 3 Questions:

Why are these two groups meeting?
- They are meeting to trade their goods
- The settlers want the Native American’s fur and the Native Americans want beads and pots from the settlers.
- They need resources the others have
- To fight
- To talk
- To steal each others land

*My comment: Follow-up: “What would make you think they want to steal each other’s land?”*

Why is what they are doing important?
- They need the fur to survive
- They are making friends
- They are claiming territory

−2 Closing:

Wow! We really unpacked this picture. I think we, as a class, did a great job putting together the pieces of what this picture means. The museum will be so happy with our work! We learned today that the early French settlers and Native Americans in Michigan worked together to trade resources that the other did not have. The Native Americans provided fur, while the settlers provided other useful objects that the Native Americans could not make in their environment. Now we’re going to do a fun activity! Each of you will pretend you are either a part of the Ojibwa tribe or the French Settlers. Then you will write a “grocery list” of what you want from the other group! The purpose of this is we want to know what you want from the other group! You will share all your great ideas.

Students may give a variety of answers. We will steer them in the proper direction by asking more questions relating to specific answers.

Students may whine that they have to do a writing assignment. We will explain to them that we are really interested in what they learned and this will help us! Giving a purpose for their writing may persuade them to become more interested.
While their draft included leveled questions and anticipated student responses, Irma and Ava did not add follow-up questions to help students explain their thinking. Had I assessed Irma and Ava’s initial lesson plan at this point, they would have received less proficient scores. In comparison to Karen and Connie, Irma and Ava needed additional teacher educator support to approximate practice for VID in the form of microteaching/rehearsal.

Preservice Teachers’ Planning after Microteaching/Rehearsal

Preservice teachers perceived the microteaching/rehearsal aspect of the course as influential for refining image selection, practicing questioning techniques, rehearsing teaching moves and enacting VID in the field classroom. Even for preservice teachers who started their planning with strong images, microteaching/rehearsal alerted them to instances in which they needed to modify their instructional plan prior to enactment. Connie and Karen offered examples of the types of realizations that surfaced during rehearsals. In each of their rehearsal reflections, they wrote about their peers’ suggestions to modify the introduction to hide the fact that their images were of the same location but a century apart. Connie wrote about improving her own content knowledge and modifying her plan for the questioning students:

In preparations for actually giving the lesson, I plan on reading background information about how Detroit has changed since the 1900’s. I would also like to read up on the role technology and machinery play in these changes. Lastly, I will be sure to reexamine the questions I am asking and develop concrete prompting questions I can use if students are hesitant to answer.

Content knowledge was an issue that preservice teachers struggled with in the first elementary social studies methods course that I taught. In addition to adding a PowerPoint slide on content knowledge, the microteaching/rehearsal demonstrated the type of knowledge preservice teachers
needed to enact the VID in the field classroom. While I could tell the preservice teachers to thoroughly research the content, the fact that they perceived their own limitations in this area was very powerful. They expressed a commitment to find out more for themselves to engage in a more successful VID with their students in the field classroom.

In addition to adding a slide on content knowledge, the microteaching/rehearsal demonstrated the type of knowledge preservice teachers needed to enact VID in the field classroom. While I could tell the preservice teachers to thoroughly research the content, the fact that they perceived their own limitations in this area was powerful. They expressed a commitment to find out more for themselves to engage in successful VID in the field classroom. However, some components remained opaque for Irma and Ava until they engaged in microteaching/rehearsal. The next section describes the influence of microteaching/rehearsal on Irma and Ava’s planning to enact VID.

While Karen and Connie were able to take advantage of some of the initial representations and opportunities to approximate practice in planning to enact their VID, the microteaching/rehearsal really benefitted preservice teachers who needed additional opportunities to rehearse in preparation to enact the VID. Despite representations and opportunities to approximate practice related to enacting the VID in class sessions, some of the components remained opaque for Irma and Ava until they engaged in the microteaching/rehearsal which helped them improve their plan for enacting the VID. The next section describes the influence of microteaching/rehearsal on Irma and Ava’s planning to enact the VID.

Preservice teachers had an opportunity to engage in microteaching following the creation of their first written lesson plan and prior to the teaching enactment to support lesson planning. Each preservice teacher wrote a reflection on the utility of the microteaching experience. Irma
explained how the microteaching/rehearsal led to the selection of a new image based on her ability to engage in a rich discussion during the microteaching instructional rehearsal with her peers:

Prior to the microteaching we did in class the two of us thoroughly completed our lesson plan on the early people of Michigan and the fur trade. Our image focused on a scene in which the Native Americans were trading with the European settlers. After microteaching, though, I was disappointed in the lesson and especially the image we had chosen (it was fuzzy and hard to see). The first thing Ava and I did afterwards was find a new image to use. This image was in color and very clearly depicted trading between the two groups (much more appropriate for third grade!). In addition to our original questions my partner and I added quite a few new questions that would probe deeper into what the students were thinking. Based on what our peers told us we needed to ask more questions that would eventually lead to learning.
While they thought they had completed their lesson and were pleased with the outcome, the microteaching/rehearsal added another layer to the process that caused all of the preservice teachers to enhance their lesson in some way, whether it was changing the image completely, like Irma and Ava, or adding additional questions and activities. Like Irma, Ava wrote about the process in her written analytic reflection: Pleased with their lessons, participants discovered that microteaching/rehearsal added another layer to the process that caused all of them to enhance their lessons, whether changing the image, or adding questions and activities. In her analytic reflection, Ava wrote:

> We decided on surrounding our lesson around trade between the Native American’s and French settlers centered in Michigan. We chose a picture that depicted the Native Americans and settlers and started to plan our lesson. After receiving feedback from our group and Cathy in class, we realized it may be smarter to find a new image so that more discussion could take place since that was where our lesson was lacking. Our original image didn’t clearly depict the concept of trading and was therefore harder to stimulate discussion behind it. We found a new image that beautifully conveyed trade between the settlers and Native Americans.

The microteaching/rehearsal helped Irma and Ava identify the limitations of their image prior to enacting the lesson with children in the classroom. The feedback from peers in a face to face interaction had great impact on their planning and preparation for the VID. The interactions and practice during the microteaching/rehearsal episode enabled Irma, Ava and all of the preservice teachers with opportunities to modify their lesson, realize alternative image options and add additional features to enhance the discussion to better plan instruction for the field classroom. The interactions and practice during the microteaching/rehearsal episode gave everyone more
opportunities to modify their lessons, select alternative image options and add features to enhance rich discussion. Below is a section from Irma and Ava’s lesson plan following the microteaching/rehearsal, in bold and italicized are their modifications to the instructional sequence (Figure 5.15):

**Figure 5.15 - Irma and Ava’s Instructional Sequence after Microteaching/Rehearsal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Steps Describing What the Teacher and Students Will Do (include all questions that you will ask students as well as anticipated responses)</th>
<th>Notes and Reminders (including management considerations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~2 min</td>
<td>Introduction: Hello 3rd Graders! Today we will do a Social Studies activity that’s going to require you to think like a historian! Let’s pretend that we are historians and have been asked by the [local] historical museum to study this image and report back to them what it was about. We will have to work, starting with simple questions, to solve the puzzle. As we ask you more and more questions you will have to work to put the puzzle pieces together and describe what this image is showing us. This picture will tie into your study of the history of the early peoples of Michigan. Ok! Here is the image…</td>
<td>Some students may complain and resist this activity. We will remind them how important this activity will be in learning about Michigan history. We will also make this meaningful to their lives by stating that this happened where they live.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ~5 min | Level 1 Questions: Who do you see in this image?  
- Native American’s (Ojibwa’s)  
- Settlers (French)  
*What are the differences between these groups of people?*  
- Their dress → fabric versus clothing  
- Long hair versus short hair  
- Skin color  
What do you see in this image?  
- Furs  
- Guns  
- Stacks of fur  
- Pots/Pans  
- Stuff in shelves | Students may not give the answers stated.  
- If they say Native Americans, we can build on their knowledge by asking what tribe specifically? |
- People in background

**Where do you think they are? Who’s behind the counter?**
- Settlers Store/Cabin

---

**~5 min**

**Level 2 Questions:**

What do you think they’re doing in the picture?
- Holding something in their hands
- They are about to trade fur and weapons
- with each other
- Inspecting each others products

Why are they trading?
Where do you think each of the groups came from?
- Trading with another group of people
- Their own land/home

Why do you think these men came from here?
Where do you think the other men came from?
- Hunting
- Their land/home

---

**Students will be unwilling to participate if they don’t think they know the exact answers. We will remind them that any answer is a good answer! We simply want to know how they perceive this image.**

---

**~5 min**

**Level 3 Questions:**

Why are these two groups meeting?
- They are meeting to trade their goods
- The settlers want the Native American’s fur and the Native Americans want beads and pots from the settlers.
- They need resources the others have
- To talk
- To steal each others land

Why is what they are doing important?
- They need the fur to survive
- They are making friends
- They are claiming territory

Why do you think the settlers want fur and the Native Americans want weapons?
- Native Americans don’t have the materials to make weapons and vice versa

Check out their facial expressions…What do you think they are thinking?
- Seem curious about the products
- Want to make sure they aren’t getting “cheated”

How do you think they feel about each other?
- Happy they are getting new goods
- Glad they have someone to trade with

What are other reasons you may be thinking?

---

**Students may give a variety of answers. We will steer them in the proper direction by asking more questions relating to specific answers.**
### Closing:
Wow! We really unpacked this picture. I think we, as a class, did a great job putting together the pieces of what this picture means. The museum will be so happy with our work! We learned today that the early French settlers and Native Americans in Michigan worked together to trade resources that the other did not have. The Native Americans provided fur, while the settlers provided other useful objects that the Native Americans could not make in their environment. Now we’re going to do a fun activity! Each of you will pretend you are either a part of the Ojibwa tribe or the French Settlers. Then you will write a “grocery list” of what you want from the other group! The purpose of this is we want to know what you want from the other group! You will share all your great ideas.

### Students may whine that they have to do a writing assignment.
We will explain to them that we are really interested in what they learned and this will help us! Giving a purpose for their writing may persuade them to become more interested. We will divide the tables up ahead of time so that not all of the kids choose the same “character” to act as.

---

I was pleased to observe that my modifications to my teacher education practices alerted the preservice teachers to the importance of selecting a strong image/s. Microteaching/rehearsal helped Irma and Ava modify their plan prior to enactment. In her rehearsal reflection Ava wrote:

The feedback from you was really helpful. We’re going to modify our questions because we knew we needed to ‘dig a little bit deeper’. This will definitely enhance the discussion and keep the students more engaged. We will need to ask a lot more ‘why’ questions and ask how they are inferring certain things from the picture.

Another thing we need to add to our lesson is how we will break up the class ahead of time for our assessment. We will have half the class act as settlers and half the class act as Native Americans. The introduction to our lesson also needed to be changed slightly. We wanted to make the lesson more meaningful to them so we
will explicitly state why it’s important to study pictures like this. Also, we will be helping out a [local] historical museum.

In her rehearsal reflection and in her analytic reflection about how changing the image helped them modify the lesson and prepared her for the teaching enactment in the field classroom, Irma wrote:

I was not worried about giving my visual inquiry to my classmates last week, but as I pulled out my lesson plan I quickly realized that I was not as prepared as I should have been. While my lesson plan was thoroughly completed, I had not practiced and had left a few areas lacking that I figured I would improvise on the day of. The introduction to the lesson went well but after that I was surprised by the number of spots in the lesson that needed improvements….Using the great feedback from microteaching, my partner and I made a lot of modifications to our lesson. Actually, we started by changing our image to one that was much more clear and appropriate for the third graders. From there we tailored all of our questions to the new image. In addition to our original questions my partner and I added quite a few new questions that would probe deeper into what the students were thinking. Based on what our peers told us we needed to ask more questions that would eventually lead to learning. We did little to change the introduction and learning goals because they were still fitting for our new image. I’m glad these modifications were made; I think the lesson will go much more smoothly in class because of them.

The additional opportunities to approximate practice for the VID heightened their awareness of the level of preparedness they would need to lead a social studies discussion with children in the elementary classroom. Despite specific instruction in class and discussion on selecting rich images and preparing for an active discussion, most participants benefitted from microteaching/rehearsal.
Successfully Analyzing Practice and Identifying Student Knowledge as an Instructional Problem

While each of the preservice teachers was required to analyze the VID lessons in Part II of the VID, it allowed them to frame their personal understanding of what they needed to do to further pupil’s learning and their own teaching expertise for future enactments. Based on proficiency standards related to the first category, planning and teaching the VID, twenty of the twenty-one participants (one student fell in the inadequate category for both segments of the assignment) successfully analyzed planning and teaching VID focused specifically on attending to the learners (anticipating student ideas and making the content accessible to all) and included suggested modifications for the lesson based on their analysis (Table 11):

Table 11. – Preservice Teachers’ Proficient Scores on Part II - VID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the planning and teaching of the lesson focuses specifically on attending to the learners (anticipating student ideas and making the content accessible to all students) and includes suggested modifications for the lesson based on this analysis. (8 points)</td>
<td>Analysis of the planning and teaching of the lesson focuses generally – but not completely – on attending to the learners OR includes suggested modifications for the lesson based only partially on this analysis. (7.5 points)</td>
<td>Analysis of the planning and teaching of the lesson does not explicitly focus on attending to the learners and/or does not include suggested modifications for the lesson based on this analysis. (&lt;7.5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty preservice teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grace
The majority of preservice teachers Course Two did not cite issues with planning and enactment related to content knowledge or image selection unlike course one. Many of the issues related to designing instruction were addressed during the class sessions or in microteaching/rehearsal prior to enactment. In their reflections many described their ability to probe student thinking using evidence from the image, the image’s role in discussion and references to modifications from the initial lesson plan draft based on my feedback and peer feedback.

**Approximating Practice for VID**

In reflecting on the VID, Irma conjectured that the open-ended nature of the discussion encouraged participation and thinking from the children in her field classroom. She perceived the connection between accepting all observations from children and children’s willingness to respond to questions. She identified the process of noting the details in the image as a good way to initiate VID, because the children could move from low levels of observing before being asked to give more complex interpretations of the visual image:

> **Overall, I was thrilled with my visual inquiry lesson!** I have to admit, I was skeptical of the assignment and how the lesson would go over with the third grade class I [teach] in, but it went very well. The students were enthusiastic and willing to participate which was surprising as they are typically chatty and uninterested in whole class lessons such as this. I could tell that most of the students understood the point of the visual inquiry and were interested in how they could build on their own thinking. I am glad to have had this experience; it made me realize how much students’ answers can be pushed to bring forth higher level answers….Unlike previous assignments[my teaching partner] and I have given the class this
assignment was well received; the students were enthusiastic about completing the assessment and sharing their ideas.

Irma compared the unengaged, disinterested and talkative children to the engaged interested and focused children during VID. Irma made the connection between the VID and pupils’ ability to engage in higher levels of thinking when pushed to do so by the questioning in the VID lesson, which enabled them to complete the assessment that followed the discussion. Ava gave a similar observation in her written reflection on VID enactment, referring to her planned introduction as a support in enacting instructional practices:

I was really impressed with how well our lesson turned out, mostly from how the students reacted to it. Aside from a few management issues, the class was engaged throughout the lesson. I believe our introduction of the played a huge role in the active participation and excitement that the class showed. Our introduction conveyed how it was so important for them to help us piece together this puzzle so that we could tell the museum what it was about! I think giving them something authentic to work from really motivated them to get involved with the lesson. They were more excited to participate because it meant something real to them. I also believe this was a great way to begin this unit on the first settlers in Michigan because it got them truly thinking what the picture could be about without having much prior knowledge. They had to use exactly what was in the picture to form their thoughts. Overall the visual inquiry lesson went over really well in the 3rd grade classroom. This was the beginning of the “Early Settlers in Michigan” unit so the children only knew limited information about the topic. They briefly learned about the tribes in Michigan but not much about their settlement and how they
interacted with other groups of people. Most of their social studies lessons do not deal with analyzing pictures, so I believe this was a new and exciting activity for them! It also got them to truly think outside the box when coming up with responses.

Ava’s description emphasized the notion that children don’t need an abundance of prior knowledge to engage in a VID but the teacher can use the evidence from the image to engage the children in the content, if the teacher is well versed in the content herself. Irma and Ava prepared and rehearsed before they entered the classroom and focused on student learning.

While Irma and Ava reflected on enacting a successful VID, due to teacher education interventions, Connie and Karen wrote individual analytic reflections of their planning and teaching. I considered them well-started in terms of content knowledge and image selection. Unfortunately, they were somewhat displeased with their delivery of instruction for different reasons. My concern as a teacher educator related to student learning; in attempting to move preservice teachers to well-started beginners, I did not want them to focus only on their teaching performance. Karen expressed concern with her teaching performance in relation to children’s learning:

If I were to teach this lesson again, I would better anticipate students’ ideas. I very much underestimated the capacities of the students in relation to the levels of their thinking and observing. I planned for the students to be much more challenged by the lesson than they actually were when it came to the higher level thinking questions. The students discovered that the two pictures were of Detroit rather easily, so I may choose two images that were more unfamiliar to them. The students were also able to discuss the reasons for changes to a region without much
difficulty, so I may decide to increase the difficulty of the assessment by asking them to write an extended response about the effects of people or technology on a region. Beyond these minor modifications, I believe that this was a successful lesson. Whenever students are engaged and enjoy the activity at hand, I consider it a major success.

Karen’s reflection goes to the core of my objective, i.e. preservice teachers should know the image, content and discussion moves sufficiently in order to focus on the learners. The difficulties with a rich image may be that preservice teachers perceive it as sufficient to carry the ensuing discussion. Connie, who was interested in accessing pupils’ thinking around the image, was unsure that she had did as much as possible ensure that the pupils could identify all of the facets of their rich image. Connie wrote:

Now that the lesson enactment is finished, analyzing the process has given me a fresh perspective in regards to modifications I would make. First, while I am lesson planning I will make more of a conscious effort to elicit students thinking. One way of doing this is to ensure that I prepare multiple follow up questions for possible student responses. There were a few times during the lesson where students made comments and I failed to follow through with their thinking. When I reviewed the video, these instances of non-follow-through left me wishing I had found out more. Second, if I were to enact this lesson again I would be sure to make a photocopy of the first image for every student. There was so much detail in the signs and the people’s clothes that remained unseen due to the limits of technology [document camera]. If students had their own individual copy of the image they would have all had the opportunity to notice the sign that said ‘Detroit
Creamery’, meaning they would have had the capability to witness first-hand and without scaffolding that the image was taken in Detroit. Overall the visual inquiry was an extremely positive experience for me and the students. Although there were aspects of the lesson I would change given the opportunity, these ‘problems’ offered insightful learning opportunities.

Like Karen, Connie thought that her inquiry into children’s thinking could have been enhanced with additional questioning. It is important to note that like Frida and Taylor in course one, Connie and Karen’s reported planned modifications may have related to their inexperience with children’s capabilities at the fourth-grade level.

**Discussion and Implications**

I found that including support and scaffolding related to representations and opportunities to approximate practice was a useful inclusion of teacher education practices for preservice teachers preparing to enact VIDs in the field classroom. My slides on image selection helped to focus the preservice teachers’ attention the crucial role of the image in the successful analysis of evidence in VID discussion. Anecdotes about limited content knowledge focused attention on this important aspect of VID planning. Microteaching/rehearsal allowed greater approximations of practice, but also revealed some crucial difficulties arising from weaker image selection, lesson planning and content knowledge prior to enactment in the field classroom.

To prepare preservice teachers in VID for elementary social studies depends on representing and offering more opportunities to approximate practices related to image selection, content knowledge and lesson planning. I found that in both of my courses preservice teachers used the Internet (primarily Google) to research and select images. In my future planning for these courses I would require preservice teachers to access images from websites that include
sourcing and contextualization information with each image as a way to further enhance preservice teachers’ content knowledge. The Midwestern University in which the School of Education is housed has its own online links to sourced and contextualized images as part of the library database. Another reliable source is the Smithsonian Institution (http://americanart.si.edu). I would also require participants to cite the image source and context as part of the assignment, to reinforce disciplinary practices related to historical inquiry.

Even though many participants reflected on the relationship between their image/s and their ability to enact VID, my concern is that preservice teachers need to hold the image in balance with content knowledge and discussion strategies and don’t neglect careful preparation in selecting rich images. An image cannot substitute for careful planning and sequenced questioning. Most preservice teachers in course two reported on plans to enhance their own content knowledge of their selected image/s prior to enactment, rather than expressing regret for their lack of content knowledge.

Preservice teachers were required to nominate a five-minute segment of instruction as part of their written reflection assignment, yet it would be useful to have them talk about and perhaps annotate some observations so that each individual learns from another. Including video examples of teachers leading social studies discussion or asking volunteers to enact their lesson in a rehearsal in front of the class might have allowed participants to resolve some enactment issues prior to enactment in the field classroom. Additionally, instructors across the learning units and the methods courses need to design instruction without using a common lesson plan. I was encouraged by the fact that preservice teachers applied their instructional practices from other learning units and courses to my VID enactment.
The next chapter explains my overall findings for the study in relation to teacher education practices and preservice teachers leaning to enact a VID lesson in the Elementary Social Studies Methods Courses. I return briefly to the literature to relate how the findings add to extant literature. I identify limitations of the study and conclude the chapter with avenues for future research related to VID in social studies teacher education.
Chapter 6: 

Findings and Implications for VID in the Elementary Social Studies Methods Course

The previous chapters described my teacher education practices based on the Grossman Framework. The preservice teachers in my two social studies methods classes were exposed to decompositions and representations and were given opportunities to approximate the practice of enacting an Inquiry with Visual Images (VID) discussion in both the classroom and in the field. Chapter Six discusses the contributions of my research to the literature on preservice teacher education and the use of visual images in elementary social studies instruction. This chapter reviews the answers to the two research questions asked in Chapter One and concludes with suggestions for future research.

Despite the fact that scholars in multiple disciplines encourage the use of visual images for teaching social studies, there is limited scholarship on teaching the use of visual images in elementary social studies (Bousted & Ozturk; Britsch, 2010; Brugar, 2012; Levstik & Tyson, 2008). Thus, I posed these research questions:

• How did one teacher educator decompose, represent and provide opportunities for preservice teachers to approximate practice in learning to use VID to teach elementary social studies?

• How did preservice teachers take up the VID practice during two elementary social studies methods courses? What challenges did they face? Were there any differences in the ways preservice teachers planned for and reflected on VID?
The following section summarizes my findings related to the research questions and gives examples of my teacher education practices and preservice teachers’ considerations for learning in the two elementary social studies methods courses I taught.

**The Practice of Teacher Education**

In summarizing two years of work with preservice elementary teachers, I identify three critical factors that contribute to my use of the Grossman Framework in helping preservice teachers approximate practice for the VID: (1) the importance of increasingly sophisticated opportunities to approximate practice, (2) including microteaching/rehearsal in the teacher education classroom, and (3) the role of identifying detailed features of the VID strategy as a precursor to developing representations and opportunities to approximate practice for elementary social studies preservice teachers. Each of these factors contributed to my understanding of teaching the VID and each offers insights into my plans for future iterations of elementary social studies methods courses.

**Opportunities to Approximate Practice**

Implementing a range of successively more complex practices with increasing authenticity in the university classroom allowed the preservice teachers to encounter and test their responses with their peers. Successive approximations are best utilized in the teacher education setting so that preservice teachers enter the field classroom with a set of beginning competencies rather than learning strategies at the expense of their pupils. As I moved the preservice teachers through a series of increasingly more complex tasks I was able to identify areas where I needed to add additional representations and more opportunities to approximate practice in preparation for their most authentic approximation in the field classroom with pupils.
Additionally, I included targeted feedback at multiple levels to highlight the importance of various components of practice for VID, such as image selection, follow-up questions to pupils’ responses and anticipating pupils’ misconceptions. The targeted feedback served to help focus attention on features of VID that remained invisible to the preservice teachers. As a teacher educator reviewing their lesson assignments, I learned what more I needed to provide in terms of support.

**Microteaching/Rehearsal**

Microteaching/rehearsal opportunities in the university classroom to approximate practice revealed preservice teachers’ issues with image selection, content knowledge and planning discussions. In the microteaching/rehearsal preservice teachers experienced the limitations of an image for leading discussion when they practiced their VID with a group of peers. For example, they were asked to answer questions from their peers that may have highlighted the selection of disengaging images. When microteaching/rehearsal also revealed a preservice teacher’s own lack of content knowledge about an image, it often led them to read and conduct more research before teaching the VID to elementary pupils. The microteaching/rehearsal sometimes identified problems with instructional sequencing and asking follow-up questions to further pupils’ discussion. If the preservice teachers prepared an instructional sequence that did not include the types of questions that prompted discussion, it became clear when they practiced the lesson with a group of their peers.

Including a practice session in which the preservice teachers taught the VID to their peers added an additional layer of authenticity, helping to focus their instruction before the teaching enactment in the field classroom. This teacher education practice helped to make visible aspects of the VID that remained opaque for preservice teachers after planning and
representations in the course and helped them modify their instructional practices prior to working with pupils.

**Decompositions of Practice**

A teacher educator needs to analyze the components of an instructional practice in relation to what may appear obvious to the teacher educator, but about which the preservice teachers may have little or no knowledge. This seems obvious, but aspects of practice that are intuitive for experienced teachers are not so for preservice teachers. In order to decompose practice for the VID, I had to understand each feature and represent it properly. While I initially decomposed the features of VID and planned representations and approximations, I also added more representations and opportunities to approximate practice when the preservice teachers needed them.

I had to learn that some features of the VID remained opaque for preservice teachers. Although I considered that I had made them visible, I had to understand when and how to modify my instructional practices. While the Grossman Framework identifies the features of practice in professional education to help beginners learn to enact complex practice, it is at the discretion of the teacher educator to determine the features to represent, how to represent them and what kinds of opportunities require approximation.

**Learning to Use VID**

I also identify three more important factors in learning to teach with images: (1) acquiring sufficient content knowledge, (2) selecting rich images, and (3) developing a teacher’s capacity to critique his/her enactment of VID. Preservice teachers’ initially faced some challenges in planning for VID, largely due to their unfamiliarity with both teaching social studies and leading a social studies discussion with visual images. While preservice teachers faced some challenges,
these challenges focused their attention on key characteristics of VID and alerted them to the modifications they would need to make to their instructional practices.

**Sufficient Content Knowledge**

The preservice teachers who were most successful realized that images do not speak for themselves, but that effective instruction requires the acquisition of sufficient content knowledge to “wrap around” the image. For example, Karen described her plans to conduct additional research on her image in preparation for the teaching enactment in the field classroom so that she could engage in a rich discussion with her pupils.

I suggest that the definition of “enough” content knowledge is when a preservice teacher has acquired sufficient understanding of context to explain both how or why an image is created as well as the context regarding the event portrayed. One preservice teacher, Connie, emphasized the importance of studying both the history underlying the images of Detroit a century ago she selected and the technological advances that changed the city’s transportation, manufacturing and communication. Preservice teachers like Connie recognized that acquiring depth of knowledge about the context of both the image and the event equipped them to answer most of their pupils’ questions and to keep discussion lively. They were not content with entering the field classroom with limited knowledge; they wanted to be fully prepared to answer pupils’ questions on multiple levels. The notion that preservice teachers became aware of the importance of content knowledge in teaching rather than being told by the teacher educator is an important lesson.

**Image Selection**

Selecting rich images initially was somewhat incomprehensible. In stressing the leveling of questions and the importance of engaging the pupils in analysis and discussion, I discovered
that many preservice teachers did not understand the actual process of selecting images. It took practice to become conscious of the elements that define an effective image and to become purposeful in making selections. For example, Chloe did not recognize the limitations of her image until she began to lead the VID in the field classroom with elementary pupils. Similarly, Irma and Ava encountered difficulties in finding appropriate images for an early assignment.

Once image selection became an identified element in VID, however, they persevered in searching for the most suitable images; they also learned not to fear discarding them in favor of selecting others to encourage discussion in the field classroom. Preservice teachers required practice in making the image an integral component of their practice. When preservice teachers recognized the importance of a rich image, they also learned to use that image in conjunction with careful lesson planning in order to facilitate an engaging VID in the field classroom with pupils.

**Critiquing Practice**

Self-critique was not as difficult for the preservice teachers as image selection and content knowledge. I found that after decomposing and representing the VID, most of the preservice teachers were able to analyze their mistakes and modify their instruction. In short, they appeared to be capable of metacognitively critiquing their practice and suggesting thoughtful modifications. For example, Taylor reported on the importance of identifying students’ misconceptions related to content knowledge and on how she modified her own content knowledge by undertaking more research in preparation for enacting the VID. Karen explained how awareness of students’ misconceptions could have enhanced her leveled questions and added to a more engaged discussion with pupils.
Using guiding questions on an instructional rubric, my preservice teachers were able to identify their limitations with image selection, content knowledge, leading discussions and anticipating their pupils’ misconceptions about content. I concluded that an individual’s ability to acknowledge problems in teaching enactment is the first step in learning to alter instructional practices. The aspect of metacognition is not addressed in the Grossman Framework, but it appeared to focus preservice teachers’ instructional practice for VID.

Implications for Teacher Education

This study demonstrated how one teacher educator used representations, decompositions and approximations of practice with visual images in elementary social studies. This data adds to the scholarship on equipping beginning teachers with visual texts for instruction, lesson development and planning and supporting teachers’ acquisition of content knowledge for teaching. My study contributes to the existing social studies teacher education literature by describing the pedagogical practices of one teacher educator across multiple years of teaching visual inquiry discussion to elementary social studies preservice teachers using the Grossman Framework (Boerst et al., 2011; Colby, 2009; Grossman et al., 2009; Grossman, 2011; Palincsar, Kucan et al., 2011; Davis, Kenyon & Hug, 2011; Sullivan et al., 2009).

Although I found very few studies on teacher educators’ instruction for using visual images in elementary social studies methods courses, many studies comment on the growing inclusion of multimodal texts, such as visual images, in new curriculum models. Best practices recommend that teacher educators should equip novice teachers to use such texts as part of their instruction (National Governors’ Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010). Given the marginalization of social studies in the elementary curriculum, elementary social studies teacher educators can help beginning teachers by offering multiple
entry points for social studies instruction throughout the school day (Au, 2009; Brugar, 2012). For example, social studies informational and visual texts can be used to teach literacy skills and practices. My study supports and offers ideas for including visual texts in elementary social studies teacher education (Barton & Levstik, 2008; Brugar, 2012; VanSledright, 2002).

In supporting practices across disciplines in teacher education, instruction of teaching with visual images does not have to be the independent endeavor of social studies teacher educators. Literacy teacher educators have reported success with visual texts in the elementary classroom that should be the source of collaboration among teacher educators (Britsch, 2010; Rowsell et al., 2012; Seglem & Witte, 2009). Visual image interpretation, selection and communication strategies can be found in multiple university departments. Teacher educators could collaborate with faculty in anthropology, art, art history, history, information sciences, museum studies, etc., to help focus preservice teachers’ attention on considerations of teaching with visual images with support from the liberal arts.

Visual images are influential in scaffolding student comprehension of written text by illuminating the content and providing opportunities to examine historical, political and social contexts through meaningful discussions (Bousted and Ozturk, 2004; Britsch, 2010; Levstik & Tyson, 2008; Parker, 2010; Seixas, 2004; Wilen, 2010). In other studies of visual images for social studies instruction, researchers conclude that they have a powerful impact on comprehension of content, yet rarely do these studies offer specific strategies for including visual images in elementary social studies (Berry, Schmeid & Schrock, 2006; Bousted & Ozturk, 2004; Brugar, 2012). My study includes specific strategies for elementary social studies teacher educators related to visual images in social studies.
Much of the research on instructional practices in social studies is conducted with practicing teachers at the secondary level or with an emphasis on student thinking (Brugar, 2012; Levstik & Barton, 2006; Levesque, 2008; Seixas, 2004). This suggests the need for more research to help elementary social studies teacher educators foster effective pedagogical practices with preservice teachers. My findings suggest that elementary social studies preservice teachers benefit from decompositions, representations and approximations of practice related to the acquisition of content knowledge, image selection, and the ability to critique their enactment of VID (Grossman, 2011; Grossman et al., 2009; Shulman, 1986).

Limitations

I selected preservice teachers of elementary social studies because of my accessibility to their written assignments and DVDs of teaching enactment as their methods course instructor. This data was analyzed both for teacher education and research purposes.

In teaching Course One for the first time, I note that some of the learning difficulties encountered by my preservice teachers were related to my instructional delivery. Other influences beyond my control or knowledge, such as other teacher education courses, field settings, or peer interactions may have also contributed to planning and critiquing the VID.

Future Research

I reviewed the preservice teachers’ DVDs of teaching enactment as part of grading the course. Future research could examine the preservice teachers’ own nominated episodes of teaching, so that teacher educators can represent practice by concentrating on these personal episodes. I used examples of teaching produced by “Inside Teaching” (http://insideteaching.org) and Annenberg Learner (http://learner.org) for examples of good teaching strategies. Many of my preservice teachers found these videos unrealistic, because the work of teaching, preparation
and classroom management was not apparent in the same ways as the “real” preservice teachers’ DVDs that illustrated the struggles with specific areas of instructional practice.

**Discussion Moves**

In terms of the preservice teachers’ perceptions of ineffectiveness in leading classroom discussion, it would be helpful for teacher educators to study the discussion strategies and practices that increase opportunities to approximate practice in enacting commonly occurring forms of classroom discussion across content areas. A teacher educator can teach high leverage practices such as ending classroom discussion, focusing pupils on completing their thoughts and responding to classmates, and refocusing discussion. Studying these types of tools for teacher education would be informative across multiple disciplines (Boerst et al., 2011; Grossman, 2011).

**Captions**

The captions and source citations for the images used in my dissertation research were not used with elementary pupils in the field classroom. This omission would seem to contradict best practices both for literacy and history, where the caption is crucial in helping the viewer to interpret the visual text (Beck & McKeown, 2006; Levesque, 2008; Sanchez, 2008; Seixas, 1998; Wineburg, 2001). I chose not to emphasize captions and citations, because I considered VID as an introduction to a more in-depth study of content related to the curriculum as supported by my study of art history education models and VID protocols (Bower & Lobdell, 2005; Housen, 2001; Yenawine, 2003). I suggest that future research on the teacher education level in social studies should study the use of more representations and opportunities to approximate practice with contextualizing and sourcing visual images as a way for teachers to utilize captions and enhance historical thinking (Barton & Levstik, 2008; VanSledright, 2002).
Controversial Images

I did not address all of the historical, political and social issues surrounding visual images in my two courses (McKean, 2004; Moreau, 2003; Zimmerman, 2002). One preservice teacher wrote about changing one of her images of slavery, because she deemed it controversial and “opinion based.” I do not know how many preservice teachers avoided images with content that surrounded issues that they chose to neglect. In both courses I instructed preservice teachers about leading discussions of controversial issues, a common aspect of social studies education (Parker, 2010; Wilen, 2004). Based on my observations, it may be useful to introduce the issue of controversial topics related to images and leading discussion when preservice teachers learn about image selection and the use of a rich image, to familiarize them with conducting such discussions.

VID Beyond the Methods Course

While the data suggests that the preservice teachers learned the model for enacting a VID, the instructional setting, i.e. the university classroom, pupils and peers also affect how beginning teachers implement practices (Kennedy, 1987; Theriot & Tice, 2009). Inferring that they learned the model for enacting VID in my courses, I also recognize other influences including instructional setting, peers and mentors, on the use of VID in a “real” classroom. I would be interested in information on the sustained implementation of VID by teachers including how and why they continue to use the strategies, modifications or additions made to accommodate their continued use of VID in the elementary classroom.
APPENDIX A: Paul Revere Image

Boston Massacre image –
- Initiating question: What do you see in this image?
- Level 1: What do you notice about the setting of this image? What do you notice about the characters? What are they doing?
  Level 2: (Talking Statues – ask for 3-4 volunteers) Who are you? What are you doing here – what is your role? What is going on, from your perspective?
- Level 3: Note that this picture was developed as propaganda for the Boston Massacre. What does it show? What is the message being communicated?

Source: University of Michigan Elementary Social Studies Planning Group
APPENDIX B: Elementary Social Studies Methods Course One – Visual Inquiry Assignment

Visual Inquiry Lesson

(25% of course grade)

For this lesson, you will teach using the “visual inquiry” strategy. You begin by selecting 1-2 powerful images that represent the key concept(s) under study. As you teach, you will spend a good deal of time asking questions and facilitating discussion to allow students to visually “read” each image and draw conclusions about the key concept(s). Please work with your practicum partner to co-plan and co-teach the lesson (Part I). Your analysis of the lesson (Part II) will be completed individually.

Part I: Co-plan the lesson (draft due XXX; final due XXX)

- In a conversation with your CT, decide on the concept(s) you will focus on. Select 1-2 images (e.g., photographs, paintings, maps, cartoons, illustrations) that will engage students and elicit discussion about the concept(s). (Note: This lesson should be coherent with the curriculum that is in place in your classroom – that is, the selected concepts should come from the current unit of study). Bring the image(s) to class on Feb. 10 to begin planning.
- **Thoroughly research** your topic using books, articles, and/or websites that go above and beyond the material in students’ textbooks.
- Develop your lesson plan (see attached lesson plan format and rubric). Pay particular attention to the wording and sequence of the questions you will ask to enable students to deeply study the images. You want to make sure you are planning to **elicit and facilitate student thinking**.
- If you will be teaching your lesson before XXX submit your lesson plan to your instructor at least three days before you teach. Your instructor may ask you to make revisions before you teach. You should also submit your lesson to your CT and field instructor before you teach.

Co-teach the lesson (Complete no later than XXX)

- Ask your CT (and field instructor, if possible) to observe your teaching. You may want to provide them with a focus for observation – for example, your use of questioning to elicit and facilitate student thinking.
- Before you teach: Make sure the classroom is arranged so that projected images will be large and clear, so all students can see the images. Make sure you have the equipment you need (i.e., projector, screen, image on transparency or computer). Make any copies of handouts that you need.
- Set up video equipment and videotape the entire lesson.
Part II: Analysis of the lesson (Due XXX)

- Your analysis should be based on your observations the day of teaching, feedback from observers, and your viewing of the videotape. Please include as attachments samples of five student assessments, any written feedback you received from an observer (either from your CT or field instructor), and the video tape of your entire lesson on a CD. Reflect and comment on the following elements in a 5-7 page (double-spaced/regular margins and font) paper:
  a. Planning and modifying the lesson
  b. Teaching the lesson, including feedback from CT and, if applicable, field instructor and your reaction to that feedback. Focus in particular on how you elicited or facilitated student thinking during the lesson.
  c. Choose five student assessments, which display a range of abilities. Analyze the student work and make conclusions about their learning/understanding, using evidence to illustrate. Make sure to focus on your lesson objectives. Attach copies of the five students’ work (with names removed). If possible, please make pdf copies of the student work and submit with your written analysis on Ctools.
  d. A description and analysis of two five-minute video clips (include specific times for the clips).** One clip should demonstrate how you elicited or facilitated student thinking during the lesson. The second clip can be your choice: either something in the lesson that you were particularly proud of or something you would like to work more on in the future. Include why you chose both of the clips and an analysis of what you learned by viewing the clips that you might not have noticed during the lesson.
  e. Modifications you would make if you taught the lesson again, including: (1) What aspects of your teaching would you work on before teaching this again (e.g., your content knowledge, anticipating, eliciting or facilitating student thinking, explaining directions, addressing student misconceptions or misunderstandings); and (2) What you might do differently during the enactment of the lesson.

**Please turn in a CD to your instructor with a video of your entire lesson.
APPENDIX C: Elementary Social Studies Methods Course One –Lesson Planning Template

Your Names:

Length of lesson:

Date(s) of lesson:

Title of lesson:

Grade and subject (if applicable):

Context of Lesson: Briefly explain how the lesson aligns with what came before and what comes after

Overview: Provide a short (2-3 sentence) description of lesson

Objectives: Specify unit objectives that this lesson meets. Use the format: “Students will…” Be sure to ground your objectives in state standards and cite which standards you use (place standards in parentheses behind each objective).

Anticipated student conceptions or challenges to understanding: Explain the challenges you anticipate students might face in accomplishing the lesson objectives AND how you plan to address these.

Materials/ Sources: Use bullet points to identify the resources that the teacher and students will use in the lesson. Attach all relevant materials including the image(s) and any handouts.

Assessment: Explain how you will assess student understanding during and after instruction. You must include some sort of written assessment (for example, an exit ticket) that aligns with your lesson objectives and the instructional sequence.

Scripted Introduction: Write what you will say to the students as an introduction to the lesson. Be sure to include the importance of the lesson, what it is that you want the students to learn, and how this lesson links to what has come before and what will follow it.

Instructional Sequence: List the steps in teaching this lesson including ways you intend to introduce and close the lessons and details of student and teacher actions. Script out all questions you plan to ask students and the anticipated student responses. These steps should be appropriately detailed so that a substitute teacher could teach the lesson. Provide an approximate time frame for each step. Please attach your anticipating student thinking and discussion moves handout.

1.

2.

Etc.

Scripted Conclusion: Write what you will say to the students to conclude the lesson. Be sure to include the lesson’s “take away” or main objective and how today’s lesson links to tomorrow’s and thereafter.

Attach all images and handouts.
### APPENDIX D: Elementary Social Studies Methods Course One- Rubric for VID Assignment

#### Visual Inquiry, Lesson Plan, Part I

**Rubric and Scoring Guide (12 points)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The image(s) is an appropriate <strong>selection</strong> for the students and the topic. <em>(1 point)</em></td>
<td>There are some aspects of the image that lend themselves to rich discussion, but overall this is not the case. <em>(.85 points)</em></td>
<td>The image is not a good selection for the students; it may be too difficult; it may not be sufficiently challenging; it may not be rich enough to support a discussion; it may not align with the topic and/or objectives. <em>(&lt;.85 points)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The identified <strong>learning goals</strong> (objectives and anticipated student conceptions/challenges) are clear, specific, and reflect the big ideas of the lesson topic and image. The plan also reflects the affordances and challenges of the image. <em>(1 point)</em></td>
<td>The identified learning goals are clear and specific; they generally – but not completely - reflect the big ideas of the topic and image. <em>(.85 points)</em></td>
<td>There are identified learning goals but they are not clear; not sufficiently specific; and/or they do not reflect the big ideas of the topic and image. <em>(&lt;.85 points)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned questions are consistently <strong>supportive of learning goals, elicit and facilitate</strong> student thinking, take advantage of image features, and invite a deep interaction with the image. <em>(1.5 points)</em></td>
<td>Some planned questions are generally supportive of learning goals, some facilitate student thinking, some take advantage of image features, and some invite a deep interaction with the image. <em>(1.25 points)</em></td>
<td>Few of the planned questions are supportive of learning goals, few facilitate student thinking, few take advantage of image features, and/or few invite a deep interaction with the image. <em>(&lt;1.25 points)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anticipated student responses</strong> attend to what students may find interesting and challenging in the image. Anticipated responses are age-appropriate, connect to students’ prior knowledge, and include intended responses as well as underdeveloped or inaccurate responses. Plan includes possible discussion moves and follow-up queries in response to anticipated student responses. (2 points)</td>
<td>Some anticipated student responses attend to what students may find interesting and challenging in the image. Some anticipated responses are age-appropriate. Plan includes some intended responses as well as underdeveloped or inaccurate responses. OR, plan may not fully develop possible discussion moves and follow-up queries. (1.7 points)</td>
<td>There are few anticipated student responses and/or they do not connect to the particular students’ prior knowledge. OR, discussion moves and follow-up queries are lacking. (&lt;1.7 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson includes an assessment(s) aligned with learning goals that will allow the teacher to interpret students’ understandings about the image and content of the lesson. (1 point)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson does not include an assessment(s) aligned with learning goals that will allow the teacher to interpret students’ understandings about the image and content of the lesson. (&lt;1 point)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: /6.5

See next page for scoring guide
## Scoring Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Plan Elements</th>
<th>Possible points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title, grade &amp; subject, date of lesson, length of lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context of lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated student conceptions or challenges to understandings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials (including all images and handouts attached)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripted introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional sequence including question script and anticipated student responses</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripted conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>/5.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These elements are included in the rubric on page 1.

**Grand Total: /12 points**

**Instructor comments:**
# Visual Inquiry, Lesson Analysis, Part II

## Rubric (12 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis of the planning and teaching of the lesson</strong></td>
<td>Analysis of the planning and teaching of the lesson focuses specifically on <strong>anticipating, eliciting and facilitating</strong> student thinking and includes suggested modifications for the lesson based on this analysis. <em>(5 points)</em></td>
<td>Analysis of the planning and teaching of the lesson focuses generally – but not completely – on anticipating, eliciting and facilitating student thinking, OR includes suggested modifications for the lesson based only partially on this analysis. <em>(4.25 points)</em></td>
<td>Analysis of the planning and teaching of the lesson does not explicitly focus on anticipating, eliciting and facilitating student thinking, and/or does not include suggested modifications for the lesson based on this analysis. <em>(&lt;4.25 points)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis of five student assessments</strong></td>
<td>Analysis of five student assessments focuses on the alignment of the assessment to learning goals, <strong>interpretation</strong> of student thinking, and the presentation of specific evidence to warrant claims. <em>(3 points)</em></td>
<td>Analysis of five student assessments focuses generally – but not completely – on the alignment of the assessment to learning goals and interpretation of student thinking. <em>(2.5 points)</em></td>
<td>Analysis of five student assessments does not explicitly focus on the alignment of the assessment to learning goals, and/or interpretation of student thinking. OR, analysis does not include the presentation of specific evidence to warrant claims. <em>(&lt;2.5 points)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis of the video clips</strong></td>
<td>Analysis of the video clips includes a detailed description of <strong>eliciting and facilitating</strong> student thinking and the presentation of specific evidence to warrant claims. Analysis also includes justification of why the clips were chosen. <em>(3 points)</em></td>
<td>Analysis of the video clips includes a description of eliciting and facilitating student thinking that may not be sufficiently detailed, OR evidence to warrant claims is partially missing. <em>(2.5 points)</em></td>
<td>Analysis of the video clips is missing a detailed description of eliciting and facilitating student thinking, OR evidence to warrant claims is missing. OR, analysis does not include justification of why the clips were chosen. <em>(&lt;2.5 points)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All attachments</strong></td>
<td>All attachments (five student assessments, video on CD &amp; written evaluation from CT and FI if applicable) are included. <em>(1 point)</em></td>
<td>Some attachments are missing. <em>(&lt;1 point)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** /12 points  
**Instructor Comments:**
APPENDIX E: Elementary Social Studies Methods Course Two - Reflection on Rehearsal

Visual Inquiry Lesson Feedback-from peers

Please comment on the effectiveness of the following:

- How the intern introduced the lesson:

- The image the intern used and how the leveled questions were used to engage students in the image:

- How the intern closed the lesson (if applicable):

- The lesson assessment (if applicable):

Additional comments:

Journal entry Assignment

Reflect on the following in your journal:

- The enactment of the lesson, including adjustments and modifications you made while teaching the lesson.

- Student (peer) response/learning. Describe (to the extent that you can):
  - Their learning/understanding during the lesson (make sure to focus on your lesson objectives)

- Feedback from your peers (and instructor, if applicable), including your reactions to that feedback

- Modifying the lesson:
  - Given feedback from yourself, your instructor, and your peers how will you modify this lesson?
  - What aspects of your teaching would you work on before teaching this to elementary students (e.g., content knowledge, facilitating discussion, explaining directions, etc.)?
APPENDIX F: Elementary Social Studies Methods Course Two - Visual Inquiry Discussion Assignment

**Visual Inquiry Lesson**

(40% of course grade)

For this lesson, you will teach using the “visual inquiry” strategy. You begin by selecting 1-2 powerful images that represent the key concept(s) under study. As you teach, you will spend a good deal of time asking questions and facilitating discussion to allow students to visually “read” each image and draw conclusions about the key concept(s). Please work with your practicum partner to co-plan and co-teach the lesson (Part I). Your analysis of the lesson (Part II) will be completed individually.

**Part I: Co-plan the lesson** (draft due XXX final due XXX)

- In a conversation with your mentor, decide on the concept(s) you will focus on. Select 1-2 images (e.g., photographs, paintings, maps, cartoons, illustrations) that will engage students and elicit discussion about the concept(s). (Note: This lesson should be coherent with the curriculum that is in place in your classroom – that is, the selected concepts should come from the current unit of study). Bring the image(s) to class on Feb. 11 to begin planning.
- **Thoroughly research** your topic using books, articles, and/or websites that go above and beyond the material in students’ textbooks.
- Develop your lesson plan (see attached lesson plan format and rubric). Pay particular attention to the wording and sequence of the questions you will ask to enable students to deeply study the images. You want to make sure you are planning to elicit and facilitate student thinking.
- Prepare a draft of the lesson by February 18th. You will teach the lesson to your classmates in 431 on February 18th (micro-teaching).
- If you will be teaching your lesson in the field before February 18, submit your lesson plan to your instructor at least three days before you teach. Your instructor may ask you to make revisions before you teach. You should also submit your lesson to your mentor and field instructor before you teach.

**Co-teach the lesson** (Complete no later than XXX)

- Ask your mentor (and field instructor, if possible) to observe your teaching. You may want to provide them with a focus for observation – for example, your use of questioning to elicit and facilitate student thinking.
- Before you teach: Make sure the classroom is arranged so that projected images will be large and clear, so all students can see the images. Make sure you have the equipment you need (i.e., projector, screen, image on transparency or computer). Make any copies of handouts that you need.
- Set up video equipment and videotape the entire lesson.
**Part II: Analysis of the lesson** (Due XXX)

- Your analysis should be based on your observations the day of teaching, feedback from observers, and your viewing of the videotape. Please include as attachments samples of five student assessments, any written feedback you received from an observer (either from your mentor or field instructor), and the videotape of your entire lesson on a DVD. Reflect and comment on the following elements in a 5-7 page (double-spaced/regular margins and font) paper:
  
  f. Planning and modifying the lesson
  
  g. Teaching the lesson, including feedback from mentor and, if applicable, field instructor and your reaction to that feedback. Focus in particular on how you elicited or facilitated student thinking during the lesson.
  
  h. Choose five student assessments, which display a range of abilities. Analyze the student work and make conclusions about their learning/understanding, using evidence to illustrate. Make sure to focus on your lesson objectives. Attach copies of the five students’ work (with names removed). Please scan and make jpg copies of the student work and submit with your written analysis on Ctools.
  
  i. A description and analysis of two five-minute video clips (include specific times for the clips)** One clip should demonstrate how you elicited or facilitated student thinking during the lesson. The second clip can be your choice: either something in the lesson that you were particularly proud of or something you would like to work more on in the future. Include why you chose both of the clips and an analysis of what you learned by viewing the clips that you might not have noticed during the lesson.
  
  j. Modifications you would make if you taught the lesson again, including: (1) What aspects of your teaching would you work on before teaching this again (e.g., your content knowledge, anticipating, eliciting or facilitating student thinking, explaining directions, addressing student misconceptions or misunderstandings); and (2) What you might do differently during the enactment of the lesson.

**Please turn in a DVD to your instructor with a video of your entire lesson.
APPENDIX G: Elementary Social Studies Methods Course Two – Lesson Planning Template

| Your name(s): |  |
| Grade level and school: |  |
| Title of lesson/activity: |  |
| Teaching date(s) and time(s): |  |
| Estimated time for lesson/activity: |  |

### Overview and Context

| Overview: |  |
| Context of lesson: |  |
| Sources/materials: |  |

### Attending to the Learners

| Anticipating student ideas: |  |
| Making the content accessible to all students: |  |

### Learning Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Goals/Objectives</th>
<th>Connection to GLCEs</th>
<th>Connection to Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Assessment</th>
<th>Learning-Goals Connection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attach all images and handouts.

INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING TEMPLATE (Annotated)

Overview and Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Connection to Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>Provide a short description (2-3 sentences) of the visual inquiry lesson.</td>
<td>C7: Building a Coherent Sequence of Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context of lesson</td>
<td>Describe how the lesson connects to other things that the students are learning about in the classroom</td>
<td><em>How does the lesson connect to the other lessons within the unit, across units, and to longer-term goals?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources and Materials</td>
<td>List the image(s) that you are using for the lesson. Include any other materials that you will use for the lesson.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attending to the Learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Connection to Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anticipating student ideas</td>
<td>Explain what you think will be students’ prior knowledge about the topics or themes presented in the read aloud. Also describe what you think will be likely misconceptions or difficulties that students will have with the topics or themes. Explain how you plan to address likely misconceptions.</td>
<td>C2. Attending to Students’ Ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>How does the lesson attend to students’ experience, knowledge, and capabilities? (Specifically, are there any student ideas that might come up during the lesson that the teachers should be prepared for?)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Learning Goals/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Connection to Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning goals</td>
<td>List the learning goal(s) you have for your students. Use measurable behaviors that can be linked to the assessments.</td>
<td>C1: Attending to Learning Goals &lt;br&gt; <em>How do the activities and assessments align with the learning goals?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to MI GLCEs</td>
<td>State the Michigan GLCE(s) that you address in your lesson. Include the reference number for the GLCE as well as the GLCE itself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assessment(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Connection to Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of assessment</td>
<td>Name the type(s) of assessment you will use to assess student learning (e.g., worksheet, exit slip, teacher observation, whole class discussion). If possible, try to create an assessment that allows you to make claims about individual student learning.</td>
<td>C5: Making the Content Accessible to All &lt;br&gt; <em>How does the lesson ensure that all students will be able to engage productively? How does the lesson attend to and capitalize on differences among students?</em> (Specifically, do the assessments enable every student to demonstrate his/her understanding and/or skills?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning-goals connection</td>
<td>State the learning goal(s) that the assessment targets.</td>
<td>C1: Attending to Learning Goals &lt;br&gt; <em>How do the activities and assessments align with the learning goals?</em> (Specifically, do the assessments measure students’ progress toward the learning goals?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Instructional Sequence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Connection to Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Plan for the introduction       | **Script out** how you will launch the lesson, including what you will do to help students see the importance of the lesson and how this lesson links to what has come before and what will follow it (if applicable). Also have a way to find out what students know or do not know about the topic. | C2. Attending to Students’ Ideas  
*How does the lesson attend to students’ experience, knowledge, and capabilities?* |
| Instructional sequence          | **Detail the specific steps of the lesson. Include all the questions you plan to ask during the lesson as well as anticipated student responses.**                                                                 | C3. Attending to the Content  
*How does the lesson help students zero in on the intended content and maintain the integrity of the discipline or domain?* |
| Plan for the closing            | **Script out** how you will conclude the lesson, including helping students see the lesson’s “take away” or main objective and connecting today’s lesson to tomorrow’s (if applicable).                                   | C4. Promoting Students’ Sense-Making  
*How does the lesson guide students to reason about and develop an understanding of the intended content (including concepts, practices, and skills)?* |
| Notes and Reminders (including management considerations) | Describe how you will manage students during instruction (e.g., how you will handle materials, transitions, possible behavioral issues). Include other reminders to yourself. | C6: Attending to Classroom Management and Norms  
*How does the lesson address classroom management and support the development of classroom norms?* |
APPENDIX H: Elementary Social Studies Methods Course Two –Rubric for VID Assignment

Visual Inquiry, Lesson Plan, Part I
Rubric and Scoring Guide (19 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The image(s) is appropriate for supporting the learning goals for the</td>
<td>The image is not a good selection for the students; it may be too difficult;</td>
<td>The image is not a good selection for the students; it may be too difficult; it may not be sufficiently challenging; it may not be rich enough to support a discussion; it may not align with the topic and/or objectives. (&lt;1.5 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students and the topic. (2 points)</td>
<td>There are some aspects of the image that lend themselves to rich discussion, but overall this is not the case. (1.5 point)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The identified learning goals are clear, specific, and reflect the</td>
<td>The identified learning goals are clear and specific; they generally – but not completely - reflect the big ideas of the topic and image. (1.5 points)</td>
<td>There are identified learning goals but they are not clear; not sufficiently specific; and/or they do not reflect the big ideas of the topic and image. (&lt;1.5 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning goals topic and image. The plan also reflects the affordances</td>
<td>Some planned questions are generally supportive of learning goals, some facilitate student thinking, some take advantage of image features, and some invite a deep interaction with the image. (1.5 points)</td>
<td>Few of the planned questions are supportive of learning goals, few facilitate student thinking, few take advantage of image features, and/or few invite a deep interaction with the image. (&lt;1.5 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and challenges of the image. (2 point)</td>
<td>Some planned questions are generally supportive of learning goals, some facilitate student thinking, some take advantage of image features, and some invite a deep interaction with the image. (1.5 points)</td>
<td>Few of the planned questions are supportive of learning goals, few facilitate student thinking, few take advantage of image features, and/or few invite a deep interaction with the image. (&lt;1.5 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional sequence is consistently supportive of learning goals,</td>
<td>Some planned questions are generally supportive of learning goals, some facilitate student thinking, some take advantage of image features, and some invite a deep interaction with the image. (1.5 points)</td>
<td>Few of the planned questions are supportive of learning goals, few facilitate student thinking, few take advantage of image features, and/or few invite a deep interaction with the image. (&lt;1.5 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eliciting and facilitate student thinking, takes advantage of image</td>
<td>Some planned questions are generally supportive of learning goals, some facilitate student thinking, some take advantage of image features, and some invite a deep interaction with the image. (1.5 points)</td>
<td>Few of the planned questions are supportive of learning goals, few facilitate student thinking, few take advantage of image features, and/or few invite a deep interaction with the image. (&lt;1.5 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>features, and invites a deep interaction with the image. (2 points)</td>
<td>Some planned questions are generally supportive of learning goals, some facilitate student thinking, some take advantage of image features, and some invite a deep interaction with the image. (1.5 points)</td>
<td>Few of the planned questions are supportive of learning goals, few facilitate student thinking, few take advantage of image features, and/or few invite a deep interaction with the image. (&lt;1.5 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anticipating student ideas</strong> attend to what students may find interesting and challenging in the image as well as anticipated misconceptions. Anticipated responses in the instructional sequence are age-appropriate, connect to students’ prior knowledge, and include intended responses as well as underdeveloped or inaccurate responses. Instructional sequence includes discussion questions and follow-up responses to anticipated student responses. <em>(2 points)</em></td>
<td>Some anticipated student responses attend to what students may find interesting and challenging in the image. Some anticipated responses are age-appropriate. Plan includes some intended responses as well as underdeveloped or inaccurate responses. OR, plan may not fully develop follow-up responses to anticipated student responses. OR plan may not anticipate student conceptions. <em>(1.5 points)</em></td>
<td>There are few anticipated student responses and/or they do not connect to the particular students’ prior knowledge. OR follow-up responses to anticipated student responses are lacking. <em>(&lt;1.5 points)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lesson includes a written assessment(s) aligned with learning goals that will allow the teacher to interpret students’ understandings about the image and content of the lesson. *(1.5 point)*** | **Lesson does not include an assessment(s) aligned with learning goals that will allow the teacher to interpret students’ understandings about the image and content of the lesson. *(<1.5 point)*** |

**Total:** /9.5
### Scoring Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Plan Elements</th>
<th>Possible points</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name, title, grade, date of lesson, length of lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources/materials (including all images and handouts attached)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated student ideas</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning goals/objectives</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripted introduction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional sequence including question script and anticipated student responses</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripted closing</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: /9.5

*These elements are included in the rubric on page 1 and will not be re-scored.

**Grand Total:** /19 points

**Instructor comments:**
### Visual Inquiry, Lesson Analysis, Part II

**Rubric (20 points)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the planning and teaching of the lesson focuses specifically on <strong>attending to the learners</strong> (anticipating student ideas and making the content accessible to all students) and includes suggested modifications for the lesson based on this analysis. <em>8 points</em></td>
<td>Analysis of the planning and teaching of the lesson focuses generally – but not completely – on attending to the learners OR includes suggested modifications for the lesson based only partially on this analysis. <em>7.5 points</em></td>
<td>Analysis of the planning and teaching of the lesson does not explicitly focus on attending to the learners and/or does not include suggested modifications for the lesson based on this analysis. <em>&lt;7.5 points</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of five student <strong>assessments</strong> focuses on the alignment of the assessment to learning goals, attending to the learners, and the presentation of specific evidence to warrant claims. <em>5 points</em></td>
<td>Analysis of five student assessments focuses generally – but not completely – on the alignment of the assessment to learning goals and attending to the learners. <em>4.5 points</em></td>
<td>Analysis of five student assessments does not explicitly focus on the alignment of the assessment to learning goals, and/or attending to the learners OR analysis does not include the presentation of specific evidence to warrant claims. <em>&lt;4.5 points</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the video clips includes a detailed description of the alignment of the assessment to learning goals, attending to the learners, and the presentation of specific evidence to warrant claims. Analysis also includes justification of why the clips were chosen. <em>5 points</em></td>
<td>Analysis of the video clips includes a description of eliciting and facilitating student thinking that may not be sufficiently detailed, OR evidence to warrant claims is partially missing. <em>4.5 points</em></td>
<td>Analysis of the video clips is missing a detailed description of eliciting and facilitating student thinking, OR evidence to warrant claims is missing. OR, analysis does not include justification of why the clips were chosen. <em>&lt;4.5 points</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All attachments (five student assessments, video on CD/DVD &amp; written evaluation from mentor and Field Instructor if applicable) are included. <em>(2 point)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some attachments are missing. <em>(&lt;2 point)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total :  
/20 points

Instructor Comments:
Appendix I: Elementary Social Studies Methods Course One - Themes Frequency Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PST</th>
<th>Partner cooperation</th>
<th>Partner comparison</th>
<th>Teachers Content Knowledge</th>
<th>Student Content Knowledge</th>
<th>Tie-in to class activity</th>
<th>Reference to changes made from draft</th>
<th>Discussion moves</th>
<th>Script</th>
<th>Collecting Answers *(unique to CI)</th>
<th>Validating student responses</th>
<th>Needed to rehearse</th>
<th>Image Selection</th>
<th>internet</th>
<th>Student abilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhoda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frida</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juanita</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selena</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarice</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siobhan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix J: Elementary Social Studies Methods Course Two – Themes Frequency Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PST</th>
<th>Partner cooperation</th>
<th>Partner Comparison</th>
<th>Teachers Content Knowledge</th>
<th>Student Content Knowledge</th>
<th>Rehearsal</th>
<th>Tie-in to class activity</th>
<th>Reference to changes made from draft</th>
<th>References Discussion moves</th>
<th>Script</th>
<th>Mgmt Specifics **Unique to C2</th>
<th>Needed to rehearse</th>
<th>Image Selection</th>
<th>Student abilities</th>
<th>Internet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cold call*/scaffold</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>probe</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>probe</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topanga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>scaffold</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>probe</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adele</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>probe</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cc*/probe</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>probe</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>issue</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>probe</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ava</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>probe</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>probe</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>scaffold</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillian</td>
<td>cnflt</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>scaffold</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Probe/scaffold</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irma</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>probe</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>probe</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6**</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K: Explanation of Themes - Elementary Social Studies Methods Courses

Teacher’s Content Knowledge

- Preservice teachers had researched the image and the context and had enough knowledge to lead the VID.
- Preservice teachers wished they had more content knowledge, regretted lack of research
- The utility of the script in preparing to lead the VID

Classroom Management

- Mentor teacher complimented preservice teachers classroom management strategies
- Preservice teachers alluded to classroom management difficulties
- Described their Classroom management plan
- Described their classroom management plan as explicit
- Field instructor

Discussion Moves

- Used this terminology to discuss their techniques in leading the VID: Cold Calls/Popsicle Sticks/turn and talk
- Explained the relationship between their learning goals and the VID
- Described how they modified their lesson during the VID
- Relationship between inexperience and ineffective moves.
- Used the words probed/probing to describe their strategies for accessing student thinking
- Explained their use of questioning
- Identified their abilities to refocus the discussion/Emphasizing key points with students
- Preservice teachers explained how they scaffolded student thinking during the VID
- Preservice teachers described clearing up student misconceptions
- Used the term summary to explain the conclusion of the VID discussion

Image Selection

- Preservice teachers explained the historical perspective of the image and its relationship to the learning goals
- Described the image in relationship to how they used the image during the discussion (Image-Discussion Connection)
- The process they used to select their images
Revisions to Draft

- Modifications to the initial draft and how that influenced the VID
- Preservice teachers explained their content research and its utility for leading the VID

References to Course

- Preservice Teachers reference strategies modeled in the course (talking statues, magic paper)

Microteaching/Rehearsal

- Its influence on preparing them to lead the VID in the field classroom

Students

- The role of student comprehension on successful enactment of the VID.
- Student engagement in the lesson
- Student participation in the lesson
- Student background knowledge and how it helped/hindered the VID discussion.
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