

SWITCHING COLOURS: BECOMING A CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE TEACHER EDUCATOR

B. Campbell

English Education: Language and Arts Education

University of KwaZulu Natal

Durban, South Africa

e-mail: campbell@ukzn.ac.za

ABSTRACT

This narrative inquiry self-study project explores ways to bridge the socio-cultural and cognitive gap between myself, my pre-service teacher education students and the characters and events in a Victorian novel. In the study I investigate the students' cultural capital through focus groups, conversations and classroom activities. A self-reflective journal relates how I translated what I learned about the students' beliefs, attitudes and experiences into teaching that was culturally responsive, purposeful and underpinned by constructivism. My findings were that in getting to know the students, I was able to respond to their contexts and construct knowledge jointly through purposeful pedagogy. In doing so, the chasm between myself, the students and the novel narrowed.

Keywords: constructivism, culturally responsive teaching, cultural capital, purposeful pedagogy

INTRODUCTION

I lecture pre-service teachers of English at a South African university and this article, which draws on my doctoral inquiry into my own pedagogy as an English teacher educator (Campbell 2017), explores how I sought to bridge the gap between myself, my participant students and a Victorian novel as I endeavoured to become more purposeful in my pedagogy (Samaras 2011). In my endeavors to understand the cultural capital that the students bring to the lectures, their voices and experiences were critical. My field texts (Clandinin and Connelly 2000) were my post lecture reflections and the participant students' reflections of their pedagogic experiences. What I gleaned from the students in their reflections gave me an idea as to their social and political contexts which assisted me in enacting pedagogy that included all in the group.

Many of the participants, who were all 4th year Bachelor of Education students and had selected English as one of their teaching specialisations, did not attend previously white schools in urban areas. This meant that many of the students' school experiences were influenced by the policies and practices of the apartheid government. In addition, many in the class come from disadvantaged communities wherein social ills such as poverty, crime, violence and HIV and

AIDS are prevalent (Mckenna 2010).

In their 4th year, the students are initially exposed to applied linguistics, narrative studies and various literary texts. Critical approaches to reading and research skills, as well as film study and sociolinguistic understanding are also part of the curriculum. The students are prepared for what will be encountered in the classroom and in preparation, their critical thinking skills and appreciation and of and insight into English literature is developed as is the teaching of literary texts (Campbell 2017).

LITERATURE

Conceptual stance

hooks (as cited in Darder, Baltodano and Torres 2009), recommends that students are encouraged to confront their experiences which is what I asked of my students as I sought to know them in my quest to make my teaching relevant. Thus, culturally responsive pedagogy and social constructivism are concepts important to this study. My aim was to recognize and encourage all voices in my classroom and to acknowledge that all come to lectures with different socio-cultural backgrounds (Giroux 1988). Once I had an idea as to the cultural capital that students brought to class I was able to integrate new knowledge in a way that complemented their existing socio-cultural frameworks (Adams 2006). It was my belief that students would relate better to the novel if they could link the themes of justice, equality, freedom and democracy found in the novel to their own lives. This is advocated by Giroux (1988) who is of the opinion that such understanding will liberate the students. To gain an understanding of students' backgrounds is in line with culturally responsive pedagogy. Gaye and Kirkland (2003) emphasized the need for teachers to be informed as to the cultural contexts of those who are in their classrooms and to then adapt their practice so as to accommodate all students. To be culturally responsive is not to lower expectations, but to support students by assisting them to assimilate new knowledge through their individual cultural contexts. From my reading on culturally responsive teaching, I became aware that my teaching should take cognizance of the cultures, experiences and views of the students (Campbell 2017).

It was my wish that students take responsibility for their own learning as they individually constructed knowledge. In being responsible for their own learning, they were negotiating methods of selecting, accumulating, understanding and ordering the knowledge in ways that made sense to them and their individual socio-cultural experiences (Adams 2006). Woolfolk (1993) makes the point that the social environment in which we live, cannot be separated from knowledge creation. This is in line with Vygotsky's (1962) notion that when learning happens,

there is reliance on existing knowledge and that as new knowledge is internalised, what is already known is adapted. Vygotsky (1962) also advocated that teaching should be at a level slightly higher than what is known and understood. It is thus important that the teacher firstly ascertain what the students know and understand about the topic at hand.

Constructivism, allows individuals to build their knowledge base differently as information is collected and organized in order to be understood (Adams 2006). All students will be constructing their understanding of what they are taught in relation to their own contexts and there are both personal and interpersonal components in this process. Von Glaserfeld (1995) is of the view that to engage in discussion during the process of constructing knowledge will assist students in reaching understanding. To be constructivist in the classroom is not to simply follow a simple, uncontested set of rules and knowledge is not constructed in isolation. As students learn, they interact with the world around them and with their peers and teachers. This interaction coupled with individual learning styles activates meaning-making as learning takes place (Von Glaserfeld 1995). What I tried to do in this study was to encourage all individuals in the class to participate rather than allowing some of the students to dominate discussions

To understand the cultural capital that individuals bring to the lectures and how they make sense of new knowledge in relation to what they know, requires that the lecturer take cognizance of all students in the class. Samaras (2011) referred to this as noticing and it is a simple yet effective concept through which the lecturer is able to get to know the students and their contexts through watching and listening to what is going on in the room. To notice one's students and adapt classroom practices accordingly is to become purposeful in one's practice (Samaras 2011). Samaras (2011) acknowledges that whilst it is important to have clear objectives when practicing purposeful pedagogies it must be understood that these may change in response to what is happening in the classroom. The reason for this is that teaching and learning is fluid and therefore does not follow a clear-cut linear process. Lecturers should thus be responsive to students' needs and to change what has been planned accordingly.

METHODOLOGY

Narrative self-study was the methodology adopted in this study. Self-study can be identified as "teachers and teacher educators examining their own teaching to improve their practice" and narrative inquiry is "a way of making sense of the lived experiences of teachers, learners and researchers in educational settings" (Pithouse 2011, 178). I understand this as a process of drawing directly from experience that is as it is this that informs and transforms practice as noted by Samaras (2011).

She advised that in doing so, it is important to draw on easily accessible data and I thus

used narrative to make sense of my own experiences and those of the students (Pithouse 2011) as I sought ways to assist the students to better understand the novel. In becoming relevant and purposeful in my teaching of literature to my 4th year pre-service teachers, narrative inquiry and self-study worked side by side.

I WANT TO DO MORE WITH THEM

During the second semester of 2015, I was lecturing and tutoring *Hard Times* (Dickens 1854/1973) and started the first lecture with an historical background of England during the 1800s. For the second lecture the students were seated in small groups. I asked that individuals list the issues with which they grapple in the 21st Century. After this activity, they spoke to their group members about the issues with which they battle and every group then gave feedback as to their discussions. What I highlighted after this discussion was that in spite of the novel having been written in 1854, the problems within education and the social conditions such as poverty and difficult complex relationships which Dickens raised, are the same that we face 160 years later.

This exercise was designed to encourage students to reflect on their lives and these reflections on their experiences were the start of the exploration of students' contexts in relation to new knowledge which is in line with culturally responsive pedagogy. In addition I was encouraging students to relate their experiences to those of the characters in the novel because in culturally responsive pedagogy students are able to connect with content when it is delivered in meaningful and engaging ways, thus encouraging students to connect (Villegas and Lucas 2007). Knowing something about my students' lives enabled me to make connections between the Victorian novel and the students' experiences which is a practice advocated by culturally responsive pedagogy.

In ascertaining the cultural capital that the students brought to class I gained insight into which events in the novel students would relate to and which should be emphasised as advised by Bourdieu and Passeron (1977). The 15 minute small group exercise at the start of the lecture was invaluable for me as it made me aware as to what to stress in forthcoming lectures. In addition, I gained insight into which relationships and events in the novel needed to be dealt with sensitively. I learned, amongst other things, that some of the students hail from really poor homes as did the hands¹ in *Hard Times*. A number of students complained that their parents were very controlling and a young married female student stated that she is in an arranged marriage. She related to Louisa in the novel whose father Mr Gradgrind coerced her into marrying his friend, Mr Bounderby.

The discussion at the start of the tutorial is what Dougiamas (1998) advised should be

happening in a classroom that is constructivist. Dougiamas (1998) notes that students come to class with a view of the world that has been formed by years of experience and in a classroom that is constructivist, teachers need to know of these experiences so as to build on them. The discussion also allowed me to get to know a great deal about my students outside of the classroom. Nash (2004) states that constructivists ask “what meaning lies inside of you and how can you best narrate it? Objectivists ask: what meaning lies outside of you and how can you best prove it?” I was of the view that this exercise was constructivist as I thought I was asking that the students work from the inside out but Nash persuaded me that in this exercise, I was requesting that the students examine what is inside of them as well as that which is outside.

In addition to getting to know the students during the discussions, I was encouraging them to see *Hard Times* through their views of the world. It was my hope that students would realise that their problems are not unique and have been faced by others since the beginning of time. The fictional characters of 1854 also faced with parental, educational, relationship and other problems. In using students’ experiences and opinions at the outset of the lecture, I was learning who my students are so as to better understand them and this knowledge enabled me to better facilitate their growth. My intention was to encourage students to actively gather new information which is a tenet of constructivism identified by Dougiamas (1998). I anticipated that being active in the learning would motivate the students to learn and to retain the new knowledge as explained by Lassmann (2006) who also stated that students become more motivated to learn about something as they actively engage with it and realise that they can relate the new knowledge to their existing frames of reference. Lassmann is also of the opinion that students will try harder when confronted with questions that are open-ended.

My intention was to move away from being dominant in the classroom as I encouraged student participation in our sessions. In my endeavours not to dominate the lectures and tutorials, at the beginning of one of the lectures I handed out slips of paper with only the words “I wonder ...” written on the paper. The students’ task was to imagine that they were any character from *Hard Times* and then to complete the sentence with their chosen characters wonderings. The exercise was intended to prompt students to relate to characters and events in *Hard Times* as well as to encourage them to read the novel and to engage with it as they considered what had been read. Their wonderings would mean that they had to have read the novel and that they had to go back to it and engage closely with it. So as not to catch the students unawares, I had prescribed which chapters had to be read every week. For real learning to happen, students need to actively construct their own knowledge and not to simply regurgitate what they have heard (Prawat 2001). The teachers must find the balance between recognising what is said by students whilst guiding them to understand what is being taught.

To encourage students to read the novel, I informed them that every week would begin with having to imagine some aspect of the novel. On submission of the pieces of paper, I asked that students respond to the wonderings of their peers, and I did the same. To start by discussing their wonderings, was to place the students at the centre of their learning at the outset of every session. Some of the students' thoughts are stated in the Figure 1.

<p>I wonder why Mr Gradgrind pressurised Louisa into marrying Mr Bounderby</p> <p>I wonder if Louisa was ever happy</p> <p><i>I wonder why Tom was such a rotten apple</i></p> <p>I WONDER WHY MRS GRADGRIND DID NOT PROTECT HER CHILDREN</p> <p>I wonder why Bitzer refused to help Mr Gradgrind in the end</p> <p>I wonder why we can't learn from History</p> <p>I wonder why Mr Gradgrind pushed his children so hard</p>
--

Figure 1: I wonder (Campbell 2017)

As I attempted to steer the students toward understanding the novel through engaging in activities, it came to my notice that a small group needed to be guided in their discussion and rather than beginning to teach and to dominate the discussion, I called an end to the small group discussions and opened a whole class discussion. All groups voiced their opinions and others were then encouraged to give feedback. In this example, to open up the discussion brought different perspectives to what had started out as a narrow view for some groups. This is in line with constructivism as: "... constructivist teaching assumes that students are capable of their own knowledge production as long as they are provided with meaningful experiences and guidance from an instructor or a more knowledgeable peer" (Schreiber and Valle 2013, 397).

A group of students who were always seated in the front of the class tended to dominate all sessions and I suggested that they disband and that individuals then join other groups. This was met with a resounding refusal from the group. My journal entry states that I was curious about those who dominated and those who were quiet in the tutorials. It had also come to my notice that two students only responded when asked by me to do so but that when they spoke they had interesting and valuable opinions which encouraged class discussion. I needed to find the balance between student participation and student attentiveness as on the one hand I had a group of domineering students, and on the other, individuals who were reluctant to respond and

I wanted to come up with a way in which to encourage all students to engage. In reflecting on my pedagogic practice I had identified a problem and needed to intervene. Payne (2002) states that in reflection one gathers evidence needed to change and reflexivity follows when those changes are implemented. However, when the dominant group rejected my request to disband and to merge with other groups, I had to find an alternative intervention. I was not succeeding in getting cooperation from all students and I now needed to be reflexive. I did not want to blindly intervene and reflected on how to find out more about the students so as to intervene from a position of knowledge.

I thus invited students to engage in discussion with me and I explained that I was interested in hearing about how they experienced my English lectures. I invited students who were interested to come and see me. On the 3 April 2015, I held a discussion with four students about their experiences of my English classes. In talking about tutorials and group work, one of the students said:

“Do you know how encouraging it is when the lecturer says: ‘mmmmm that is good, I like your point’. So, you [talking to me] have to motivate us to think critically. When you say ‘It is very good we get motivated that we are on the right track’. But now since we are in those straight lines sitting and cannot look left or right and some are doing their own thing so you can’t reach others to hear their point. In a group of 6 or 7 you don’t only get to hear 1 or 2 responses, you get to hear different perspectives.” (Student group discussion 3 April 2015).

The student appeared to be stressing how important it is that positive feedback is forthcoming from me. She also stated that students learn from each other and she seemed to enjoy collaborating with classmates.

In the extract below, a student expressed unhappiness that some class members dominated sessions which was confirmation of what I had noted in my own lecture reflections. In the extract that follows this student also stated that she enjoyed working in smaller groups:

“Uuuuuuh ... What I would like in lectures is ummmmmm ... sometimes we have those students who are shy and those who are not just pop up [sic] and answer. To ask these who are shy you [talking to me] can just point. I would like it if you point me [sic] and demand an answer. Using what I know about me [sic] with the knowledge that you have taught me, I will be able to give you an answer. Honestly, my answers will never be correct but it is a learning experience. That is how I feel in terms of how it should be, but sometimes when a lecturer does this some students think that they are out in a hot spot [sic]. We could also have our own groups without a lecturer to dominate those. Like we can talk together. I have groups that I go to so that is where I get to talk, so we study together as well, that it where I can talk because I am comfortable with those people.” (Student group discussion 3 April 2015).

A particular female student came to mind when I heard this. I had been acquainted with her

since her first year at university and she had never voluntarily offered her opinion during discussions. However she always had valuable insights when encouraged to respond and it was obvious to me that she was a thinker. She chose not to participate in the group discussion but made an appointment to talk with me the following day, and she allowed me to audio tape the conversation and to share her thoughts in my study. She really opened up to me and talked about her background and her insecurities. I suspect that what she had to say represents many other young people who are confused about their social, racial, cultural and sexual identities.

I have chosen to represent what she had to say through the genre of a short story because a short story generally has a strong plot, theme, character, conflict and setting. In the short story there is conflict between Angel's life and the fictional stories that she loved to read. As the protagonist in the story, she is a round character as her development is clear. The theme is clearly that of identity as Angel is questioning her identity as a young black South African who wishes she were white. She also questions her sexual identity. Angel was confused as to where she fitted into society when she was exposed to literature that was outside of her context. The confusion that she felt when exposed to the novels that she read as a young girl, highlights the complexity of teaching a novel such as *Hard Times* in a South African community.

“I WANT TO BE WHITE

I read novels about white people, I watch movies about white people and I want to be white. That is not possible so I must marry a white man as he will love me and cherish me because black relationships are not like those experienced by whites. I will never be white and I will never marry a white man. My name is Angel and I am a teacher of English who is not white, heterosexual or English speaking. I was born into a poor family in a black township outside Pietermaritzburg where I went to the local school. The only time that I was exposed to English was at school and even there the English teacher taught English through the medium of isiZulu. When I read English books in class, the teacher would ask questions in isiZulu and we replied in the same – I once responded in English and everybody laughed at me.

I was always different to the other young members of the community and isolated myself from them. I joined a library and started reading romantic novels written in English and watching English movies. I dreamed of being white, speaking English well, having a white husband and living a life of luxury. I wanted it so badly that I started to write my thoughts down and years later, realised that what I had penned were poems.

When I was in grade 10, a new English teacher Ms T came to our school and she noticed that I was always reading and that I wrote well, so she took me under her wing and mentored me. She asked that I submit a weekly book review to her and with all of this extra reading and writing, my English really improved. I passed matric and my English mark was high which motivated me to study to become an English teacher. The day of my new life dawned and I walked into the university gates with more confidence than I had had at school but this only lasted for the short walk from the gate to my first lecture. There were many Indians in my class and there were many blacks who had attended Model C schools so I withdrew and did not engage with many people because they all spoke English well. I often knew the answers but kept quiet because I felt intimidated. It was at university that I realised that I was not different because I wanted to be white

– I was different because I am a lesbian and this confused me more than I had been at school and home.

The university culture was different to that of my school – everybody spoke English, the people talked differently, walked differently, behaved differently and the teaching was different. When my lecturers asked me to talk in class, I was shy and could not find the words and the people who laughed at me were my black brothers and sisters. And then I would remember Ms T and I had the courage to take a deep breath and to believe in myself because I knew that I could do it. I wish that I had been encouraged to engage more in lectures throughout my university career but that cannot change.

I will become a teacher of English; I now believe that what I have to say is worthwhile because I proved it to myself and to others during the Hard Times lectures; I will be confident because I was given opportunities to do so in English 420; I will get to know my learners, and treat them all equally as I have been treated. I will do all of this because that is what I have learned this year in English 420. Thank you for getting to know me, to understand me and to include me in the discussions.

I read novels about white people, I watch movies about white people and I no longer want to be white. I no longer want to marry a white man because he will love me and cherish me. I know now that black relationships are the same as those experienced by whites. I will never be white and I will never marry a white man. My name is Angel and I am a teacher of English who is proud to be black, homosexual and isiZulu speaking” (Campbell 2017).

I was overcome by emotion as Angel related her tale and perhaps this is so because

“... to engage with our students as persons is to affirm our own incompleteness, our consciousness of spaces still to be explored, desires still to be tapped, possibilities still to be opened and pursued. At once it is to rediscover the value of care, to reach back to experiences of caring and being cared for as sources of an ethical idea” (Greene 2009 95).

I found what Angel had to say very telling for my classroom practice. I had never given any thought to how group work can intimidate students who are not comfortable talking to peers in a language that is not their mother tongue. After the focus group and my interaction with Angel, I resolved to get to know as much as I could about the backgrounds of individuals in my classes so as to, where possible, meet the needs of all.

In reacting to what I learned from my discussion with Angel I was purposeful and resolved to encourage all in the class to participate. When I next met with the 4th years, I distributed slips of pink, yellow and blue paper. The students were not informed as to why they had been handed the coloured slips of paper. When it was time for class participation, the students with the blue had to be the first to talk to the class. Those with yellow slips were permitted to speak after a blue slip person had ventured an opinion and those with the pink slips were allowed to speak thereafter. The students with the pink slips were furious and in their view, they were being silenced. But, after much grumbling, they agreed to cooperate.

When asked for feedback at the end of the exercise, those who had previously dominated discussions acknowledged that they had learned a lot from their peers with the blue and yellow slips and that at times they had been about to voice an opinion but in to others comments, had revised their thinking. In previous sessions they had responded to questions without giving much thought to the issues and once they had voiced these opinions, had been dominant in class. In this exercise, their input had been purposeful because other students had forced them to reconsider their initial answers to questions posed to the class. Dougiamas (1998) states that all students must have a voice in creating a democratic classroom in order to construct new ideas. This exercise in briefly suppressing those who dominated created the space for all students to be heard.

MY LEARNING

My engagement with the concept of purposeful pedagogies, generated by noticing (Samaras 2011), strengthened my classroom practice. Through my noticing, I realised the importance of relationships and interactions with students within and outside of the classroom. I learnt a lot about my students' backgrounds through these interactions. This enabled me to adapt my teaching of a Victorian novel and make it more relevant to the students and their experiences and contexts as advocated by critical pedagogy that is culturally responsive. Essentially I was "fostering relationships between students and subject, teacher and student, reader and writer, student and student, coursework and the work of the discipline and the work" (Nash 2004, 100).

By asking that students reflect on the issues in their lives and then opening a discussion around these issues in relation to the novel, I bridged the gap between the students' lives and those of the characters in a 19th Century novel. Placing the students at the centre of their learning in this way, benefitted me as well as the students because I got to know something about individuals. I learned more about the students' lives and pedagogic experiences in our discussions outside of the classroom which gave me insight into the aspects of the novel they would relate to and identify with.

When listening to the recording of a discussion group and to my private talk with Angel, the benefits of including all members of the class was reinforced. I also learnt that if challenged to participate in class discussions, many students rise to the challenge. What became clear is that when students respond to questions, they need to be affirmed. This was highlighted by the student who stated that he is encouraged by a lecturer who responds in an encouraging way. Knowing my students and their experiences better, enabled me to engage more meaningfully with them. My pedagogy was becoming more purposeful and relevant to individual experiences and contexts of my students.

The young man who, in addressing his peers in our discussion group stated that uncertainty about an answer is not an excuse for not contributing to discussions brought another issue to the fore. For some, it takes tremendous effort and courage to contribute to class discussions. One way of encouraging all in the class to contribute is to practice constructivism wherein students are making sense of information as they acquire and build it (Adams 2006). Large class and smaller group discussions must include all students. In interacting with my students what became clear is that they enjoyed working in collaboration with peers and constructing their own knowledge as they related lecture content to personal experiences.

In moving away from dominating lecture content through my white middle aged, middle class South African woman lens, I learned that the cultural differences within the classroom as well as the differences between the novel and the students became strengths as students were encouraged to think critically (Giroux 1988).

CONCLUSION

In this study, I learned that to construct knowledge jointly with students was effective as I became more aware of individuals' experiences and contexts onto which I could then build (Adams 2006). In noticing the students as individuals and through getting to know them better I was able to bridge the gap between a Victorian novel, students in the 21st Century and myself. In this process I was moving toward pedagogy that is relevant and responsive to the students' needs. Teacher educators need to work at understanding our students, thus becoming familiar with their lived experiences and socio-cultural contexts. It is through mutual trust that all parties are better able to work co-operatively and to question and comment without feeling intimidated.

NOTE

1. Hands was a term which described the Victorian factory workers in England.

REFERENCES

- Adams, P. 2006. Exploring social constructivism: theories and practicalities. *Education* 3(13): 243–257. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03004270600898893>
- Bourdieu, P. and J. Passeron. 1977. *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London: SAGE publishers.
- Campbell, B. 2017. Influences on, and possibilities for, my English pedagogy: A narrative self-study. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban.
- Clandinin, D. and F. Connelly. 2000. *Narrative inquiry. Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Darder, A., M. Baltodano and R. Torres. (Eds.). 2009. *The critical pedagogy reader*. 2nd Edition. New York: Routledge.

- Dickens, C. 1973. *Hard Times*. London: Penguin.
- Dougiamas, M. 1998. *A journey into constructivism*. <http://www.dougiamas.com/writing/constructivism.html>
- Gaye, G. and K. Kirkland. 2003. Developing cultural critical consciousness and self-reflection in pre-service education. *Theory into Practice* 42(3): 81–187.
- Giroux, H. 1988. *Teachers as intellectuals – toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. South Hadley: Bergin & Garvey Publishers.
- Greene, M. 2009. In search of a critical pedagogy. In *The critical pedagogy reader*, ed. A. Darder, M. Baltodano and E. Torres, 84–96. 2nd Edition. New York: Routledge.
- Lassmann, M. 2006. Using inductive teaching methods in the classroom. *International Journal of Learning* 13(1): 57–60.
- McKenna, S. 2010. Cracking the code of academic literacy: An ideological task. In *Beyond the university gates: Provision of extended curriculum programmes in South Africa*, ed. C. Hutchings and J. Garraway, 8–16. Cape Town: Cape Peninsula University of Technology.
- Nash, R. 2004. *Liberating scholarly writing. The power of personal narrative*. New York.
- Payne, M. 2002. Social work theories and reflective practice. In *Social work: Themes, issues and critical debates*, ed. L. Dominelli, M. Payne and R. Adams. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pithouse, K. 2011. “The future of our young children lies in our hands”: Re-envisioning teacher authority through narrative self-study. In *Memory and pedagogy*, ed. C. Mitchell, T. Strong-Wilson, K. Pithouse and S. Allnutt, 177–190. New York: Routledge.
- Prawat, R. 1992. *From individual differences to learning communities – our changing focus*, 11. http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_199204_prawat.pdf
- Samaras, A. 2011. *Self-study teacher research: Improving your practice through collaborative inquiry*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Schreiber, L. and B. Valle. 2013. Social constructivist teaching strategies in the small group classroom. *Small Group Research* 44(4): 395–411.
- Villegas, A. and T. Lucas. 2007. The culturally responsive teacher. *Educational Leadership*: 28–33.
- Von Glaserfeld, E. 1995. *Radical constructivism: A way of knowing in learning*. London: Falmer Press.
- Vygotsky, L. 1962. *Thought and language*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Woolfolk, A. 1993. *Educational psychology*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.