International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education 2016, Volume 28, Number 3, 347-360
http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/ ISSN 1812-9129

What Happens When the Apprentice is the Master in a Cognitive Apprenticeship? The Experiences of Graduate Students Participating in Coursework and Fieldwork

Bridget Kiger Lee
The Ohio State University

Kathryn Dawson and
Stephanie Cawthon
The University of Texas at Austin

The University of Texas at Austin Master of Fine Arts (MFA) program offers a cognitive apprenticeship for graduate students in drama-based pedagogy (DBP) through Drama for Schools (DFS), a professional development program for K-12 educators. This article presents findings from an exploratory case study investigation of graduate students' experiences in the cognitive apprenticeship in the practice of drama-based pedagogy in K-12 public school classrooms. Findings indicate that when graduate students simultaneously participated in fieldwork (as "masters") and related coursework (as "apprentices"), they developed a personal understanding of how theory was realized and confounded within real world contexts. Implications for university faculty members and teaching artist educators are included.

In his keynote address to the Association for Theatre in Higher Education (ATHE), Richard Schechner asserted that MFA programs need to be restructured "by combining practical experience with research and fieldwork" in order to provide a well-rounded graduate education in theatre (1992, p. 3). Additionally, graduate teacher education programs have cited similar needs. Linda Darling-Hammond, an expert in teacher education reform, includes in her key features of successful education programs, "extended clinical experiences (at least 30 weeks) which are carefully chosen to support the ideas and practices presented in simultaneous, closely interwoven course work" (Darling-Hammond, et al, 2000). However, for graduate students, making connections between practical and theoretical work can feel daunting and liminal at best (Austin, 2002; Pallas, 2001; Zeichner, 2010).

In preparing graduate student teaching artists, the University of Texas at Austin Master of Fine Arts (MFA) in Drama and Theatre for Youth and Communities (DTYC) attempts to respond to this by focusing on the theoretical foundations and contemporary critical issues in drama and education for youth and communities in both classroom and fieldwork experiences. Each MFA graduate student cohort comes with diverse experiences and aspirations. Due to the nature of the MFA as a practice-oriented degree, most students identify themselves as practitioners who teach or "do" theatre and have less experience in the underlying theories of education and drama. Upon graduation, faculty members hope graduate students will also identify as reflective scholars and practitioners (Dawson & Kellin, 2014; Schön, 1983) within the context of drama and education. But how might faculty respond to and support this type of development?

In their first year of study, DTYC graduate students often struggle with understanding the theoretical underpinnings of drama-based pedagogy (DBP). Relatively dense readings in critical pedagogy (Freire, 2002) and socio-cultural learning theory (Vygotsky, 1978) in first year graduate courses are used to interrupt and challenge preconceived ideas about education. Austere experiences of these texts typically result in two perspectives on theory and its application to classroom practice: 1) for those students with experience in the classroom, theory is far removed from practical understanding or 2) for those students with little experience in the classroom, theory easily applies to all situations. This categorization oversimplifies the students' responses; however, these are common findings in graduate education (Austin, 2002; Pallas, 2001; Zeichner, 2010). In order to provide an *in situ* experience of the theoretical readings, it seems that students may need extended time in an authentic context to appropriately consider and reflect on the diverse theoretical entry points offered in their reading assignments.

With this article, we consider how a practice-based MFA program can better prepare graduate students to be critical, reflective artists and scholars through fieldwork experiences. Research questions that guide this study include the following: What does the cognitive apprenticeship process look like for the graduate student teaching artists in Drama for Schools? How do the theories from university coursework and their practice in the school classroom support or contradict one another? To address these questions, we use a content analysis of communication, lesson plans, and transcribed interviews to explore the development of five graduate students pursuing an MFA learning drama-based pedagogy and practice through coursework at the University and their *in situ* experiences using drama-based pedagogy in the public school setting.

Drama for Schools as a Cognitive Apprenticeship

Within a traditional apprenticeship, the master models the desired behaviors while apprentices observe the behavior, for example, as in carpentry. During this process, however, apprentices may misinterpret the observed behavior, for example, misunderstanding the intention motivating the behavior. For graduate students, the desired behavior may be an implicit process; therefore, a cognitive apprenticeship that focuses more on the thinking skills and heuristics is useful for apprentices (Belcher, 1994; Collins, Brown & Hollum, 1991; Loving & Foster, 2000; Stewart & Lagowski, 2003). In a cognitive apprenticeship, the master uses modeling, coaching, and fading to train the apprentice for expert problem solving within a specific context (Austin, 2009; Collins et al., 1991; Hockly, 2000).

Although none of these phases is exclusive or isolated from the other, the cognitive apprenticeship framework suggests that the master guides an apprentice through each of these phases. In the modeling phase, the master demonstrates the targeted behavior while deliberately discussing the metacognitive processes and cultural practices for the apprentice. This allows the apprentice to build a conceptual model of the task. In the coaching phase, the apprentice attempts the targeted behavior or task and the master provides specific, diagnostic feedback for improvement. As the apprentice gains confidence and understanding of the task, the master is able to direct the apprentice to attend to previously overlooked or more implicit aspects of the task. Finally, in the fading phase, the apprentice gains more autonomy, and the master slowly removes support for the apprentice (Collins et al., 1991).

Drama for Schools (DFS) is a professional development program that uses drama-based pedagogical strategies to shift the learning culture in the K-12 school classroom (Cawthon & Dawson, 2009; Lee, Cawthon & Dawson, 2013). Broadly, DBP uses active and dramatic approaches to engage students in aesthetic, affective, and academic learning through dialogic meaning-making in all areas of the curriculum (Lee, Patall, Cawthon, Steingut, 2015). As a socio-cultural practice, DBP invites learners to co-construct knowledge with a focus on the process of meaning-making, provides authentic and meaningful learning contexts for the students to deepen their understanding of a curricular topic, and provides ways for teachers to scaffold the learning through careful consideration of each student's development (Cawthon & Dawson, 2009; Lee et al., 2013). Using a critical pedagogical framework (Freire, 2002), DBP intends to shift the learning environment to better support student complex cultural identities and experiences. In sum, a DBP pedagogical approach offers a way for teachers and learners to learn side-by-side while incorporating multiple perspectives and experiences.

In particular, multiple meta-analytic research studies have shown that DBP has a significant positive impact on a constellation of academic-related outcomes (Conrad, 1992; Conrad & Asher, 2000; Kardash & Wright 1986; Lee et al., 2015; Podlozny, 2000). This is further supported through qualitative studies that have suggested that DBP practices support students in making their knowledge and perspectives visible and available as they learn to comprehend and write about complex texts (Cushman, 2011; Edmiston, 2003; Heath & Wolf, 2005 Wagner, 1998). Recent research suggests that using DBP with literary and informational texts both challenge and support students as they examine details in their own and others' texts (Gallas & Smagorinsky, 2002; Kidd, 2011), infer and evaluate possible meanings (Edmiston & McKibben, 2011; Smagorinsky & Coppock, 1995), and synthesize perspectives (Crumpler, 2006; O'Neill, 1995).

Given this research, DBP is a viable pedagogical approach for teaching artists and classroom teachers to use in the K-12 curriculum (Cawthon & Dawson, 2009; Lee et al., 2013; Lee et al., 2015). Many graduate students in this program want to deepen their understanding of DBP in the classroom for future practice as teaching artists. As part of their MFA course of study, the graduate students have the simultaneous opportunity to learn about DBP in coursework and to practice DBP in the DFS program. A faculty member takes on the role of a "master" trainer within coursework and supports graduate students as "apprentice" trainers. Then, in turn, graduate students take on the role of a "master" trainer to K-12 teachers in the DFS program. In this way, graduate students start as apprentices but are given increasing training responsibilities over the arc of a year. Eventually, K-12 teachers are practicing DBP in their classrooms beyond the professional development sequence. For further explanation, see Table 1.

As evidenced in interactions with graduate students, this cognitive apprenticeship seems to challenge students to take on the complicated dual role of an "apprentice" graduate student in a college classroom and quickly asks them to take on the role of a 'master' teaching artist trainer in a public school classroom. In the college classroom, faculty members intentionally make explicit their thought processes to facilitate the graduate student learning that they will need and use in the K-12 classroom with the teachers. When trying out DBP as a "master" in the K-12 school classroom, graduate students confirm, create, reject, or revise learning theories from coursework.

Drama for Schools as Praxis

Theory informs practice and practice, in turn, points out blank spots in theory (Bernstein, 1983). Praxis puts theory and practice in dialogic conversation

Table 1
Timeline for Faculty, Graduate Students & K-12 Teachers as Apprentice and Master

Timeline Academic Year	Faculty Responsibility	Graduate Student Responsibility	K-12 Teacher Responsibility
August	Modeling in coursework	Observing in coursework	
September	Modeling in coursework	Observing in coursework	
October	Modeling in training/Coaching in coursework	Observing in training/Practice DBP in coursework	Observing in training
November	Coaching in coursework/training	Modeling DBP in Training/coursework/ K-12 classrooms	Practice DBP in training
December	Fading in coursework/training	Modeling DBP in coursework/training Coaching in K-12 classrooms	Practice DBP in training/ K-12 classrooms
January-March		Coaching in training/K-12 classrooms	Practice in training/ K-12 classrooms
April-May		Fading in training/K-12 classrooms	Practice in K-12 classrooms
Following academic year			Practice in K-12 classrooms

(Gadotti, 1996; Lindeman, 1944) to support critical consciousness (Kincheloe, 2008). At first graduate students allow theory to direct their behavior in the classroom in an almost rudimentary way. For example, they invite multiple student perspectives when asking a question rather than taking one "right" answer; however, novice teachers may not sense how to guide the dialogue in a classroom of 30 or more students. This experience shapes the way graduate students read and respond to the theory as well as how they practice in the future (Elliot, 2007). Through the reiterative cycle of action-reflection-action students develop a more complex conceptual understanding of the multiple systems of power shaping the educational process in US schools (Kincheloe, 2008) and their own multi-faceted identity construction within it (Grady, 2000).

This ongoing cycle of discovery and becoming is a potentially discomforting process (Freire, 2002). When we learn anything new, this process can be exhausting and feel unstable (Moreno & Mayer, 1999; Paas, Renkel & Sweller, 2004; Sweller, 1988). Therefore, the cognitive apprenticeship attempts to scaffold the learning through coursework and just-in-time learning in the classroom as well as extensive university faculty support. With this intention, the university faculty members hope that the graduate students do not feel paralyzed by the process but rather engaged in the process.

When graduate student teaching artists collaborate with teachers, the graduate students try out their new knowledge of educational learning theory and practice while the school teachers try out their new knowledge of DBP theory and practice (Lee, 2013). Consequently, graduate students no longer have a list of "what works" strategies to use in the classroom, but rather they have a situated learning context for when a specific strategy was (un)successful with a specific group of students in a specific school environment. Thus, this type of fieldwork experience embodies the idea of praxis to the extent that both theory and practice are put into conversation with one another.

This study describes an exploratory investigation of graduate students' experiences in a cognitive apprenticeship. Research questions that guide this analysis include: What does the cognitive apprenticeship process look like for the graduate student teaching artists in DFS? How do the theories from coursework and their practice in the school classroom support or contradict one another?

Methods

Study Context

This exploratory qualitative content analysis (Creswell, 1998) was conducted during the 2008-09 academic year within the context of Drama for Schools (DFS) developed from research and practice conducted by multiple faculty members at the University and K-12

Table 2
Monthly Cycle of Teaching Artist/Teacher Residency

Timeline Academic Year	Activity in K-12 partnering district
Before the residency	Teachers identified curriculum for drama-based strategy. Teaching artists encouraged teachers to choose a topic from an upcoming unit or lesson.
Day one of the residency	Teaching artists and faculty facilitated an after-school training (2-3 hours). During the last 45 minutes of training, Teaching artists and teachers co-created a lesson plan.
Day two of the residency	In the teacher's classroom, teaching artists facilitated the lesson plan by modeling, coaching, and eventually observing teachers using strategies in the classroom.
After residency	Teachers provided feedback on strengths and weaknesses of lesson. Lessons were rewritten and modified for future use.

teachers. The IRB 2007-09-0146 at the University of Texas approved this research as it is described here. The DFS team included five graduate students and two faculty members from the Department of Theatre and Dance and one faculty member from the College of Education. The team facilitated eight in-school residencies at one high school in a medium-sized southern town over the course of the school year. The in-school residency consisted of afterschool training sessions led by university faculty members and graduate student teaching artists for the high school teachers. Then the teaching artist remained in residence at the school the following day with the high school teachers (see Table 2).

During the training, faculty members helped facilitate DBP strategies as well as checked in with teaching artists to offer support and/or guidance. After the residency, teachers and teaching artists made every attempt to do an initial evaluation immediately following the lesson. However, many times this evaluation occurred through email over the following week. This entire cycle (training, lesson planning, classroom teaching, evaluation) repeated eight times throughout the course of the academic year on a monthly basis. This structure intended to provide an embedded, reiterative process for teachers to learn and use new DBP strategies across multiple lessons and contexts. At the same time, this structure provided an opportunity for graduate students to model DBP lessons and move through coaching and finally fading by the end of the eighth residency.

Sample Population. All graduate students participating in DFS consented to be involved with this research, thus providing a nuanced understanding of the graduate students' experiences, albeit from a small sample of participants (Bunce & Johnson, 2006; Crouch & McKenzie, 2006). Four of the graduate students were enrolled in the MFA in Drama and Theatre for Youth, and one graduate student was enrolled in the MA in Performance as Public Practice, a sister program in the Department of Theatre and Dance. Their experience with DBP ranged from very little to multiple years' in classrooms working as a teaching artist.

Data sources. We used three qualitative sources that focused solely on the graduate students' interpretations of their experience in the complex learning context as masters and apprentices. In an effort to mark significant moments or shifts throughout the process, we analyzed multiple data sources for thematic content of the cognitive apprenticeship model framework (Creswell, 1998): graduate student individual development plans, written reflections, and a transcribed focus group meeting.

1. *Individual Development Plan:* Before DFS work began in the school, each teaching artist completed an Individual Development Plan consisting of a self-assessment of individual strengths and weaknesses in relation to implementing the *DFS* program. (Glenn & Jordan-Davis, Appendix.)
2. *Personal Reflections:* Throughout the academic year, teaching artists wrote monthly emails to the researchers with reflections after each residency cycle. Teaching artists wrote an average of seven reflections each, although the range included one to eight reflections per teaching artist.
3. *Focus Group:* The researchers, which included two university faculty members, conducted, recorded, and transcribed an hour long focus group meeting with all the teaching artists at the conclusion of the year. Questions were preplanned and included:

- What is the DFS program?
- What is drama-based pedagogy?
- How have you shifted in your thinking over a year in this program?
- Speak to this program's role as part of your development in the MFA program at the University.

Data analyses. Two researchers read and coded the data to generate more parsimonious and meaningful findings (Langley, 1999). Using the cognitive apprenticeship framework as a guide, the coders reviewed the dataset for occurrences of the three phases of an apprenticeship: modeling, coaching, and fading. While analyzing the data for the apprenticeship phases, two more thematic ideas presented themselves: *understanding of teaching* and *moments of theoretically contradictory action* (Table 3). The coding process thus combined both a thematic content analysis and a grounded theory approach (Strauss & Corbin 1990).

The researchers compared their coding and discussed areas of agreement and disagreement (Langley, 1999). All codes were counted and then divided by the number of disagreements, which resulted in an 87% agreement in coding the data. To increase trustworthiness for this study, researchers collected data from participants over the course of an entire academic year, collected data from multiple sources and methods, and conducted member checking with participants after data was coded by emailing questions and a draft of the manuscript to the graduate students to review.

Results and Discussion

In this section, we use the cognitive apprenticeship framework to consider: What does the cognitive apprenticeship process look like for the graduate student teaching artists in DFS? Next we consider: How do the theories from coursework and their practice in the school classroom support or contradict one another? To this end, we have included a small sample of the most salient, succinct quotes from the coded data and then offer an interpretation of that data.

Modeling

At the beginning of the DFS residency in the school, graduate student teaching artists *modeled* DBP strategies in the teachers' classrooms. When appropriate and relevant, they shared their thought processes with the teacher. In the modeling phase, graduate students seemed to have a self-perceived positive and confident presence in the classroom. Modeling comments included the following:

Table 3
A Priori Coding Descriptions

Code	Description of Code
Teaching artist role: modeling	Graduate students as masters model strategies and/or cognitive processes for teachers. (e.g., teaching artists facilitate a DBI strategy with students while educator observes.)
Teaching artist role: coaching	Graduate students co-facilitate strategies with and/or provide feedback for teachers. (e.g., teaching artists give instructions for DBI strategy to the students, and then the educator facilitates the strategy with the students.)
Teaching artist role: fading	Graduate students observe teachers using strategies. (e.g., teaching artists discuss and plan a lesson plan with an educator but the educator facilitates all the dbi strategies with the students.)
Theoretically supported action	Graduate students apply theories (i.e., socio-constructivism, critical pedagogy) that have been studied in coursework to their practice in the field. (e.g., teaching artists are able to develop and ask open-ended questions to students.)
Theoretically contradictory action	Graduate students make choices in their practice that counter theories that have been studied in their coursework. (e.g., teaching artists ask leading or closed questions.)
Understanding of teaching	Graduate students' understanding of the skills needed to be an effective teacher. (e.g., teaching artists see the artistry and complexity of creating and implementing a lesson plan.)

> I think I did a good job steering us back on track.
>
> I was clear about the movement needing to be silent, and the students respected that for the most part.
>
> I am proud of myself that I did not get frustrated [leading the strategy].
>
> I had no trouble getting them to participate in the [the strategy].

Sometimes the graduate student teaching artists modeled strategies even after they encouraged the teacher to lead a strategy:

> I said as I passed to [the teacher] that she was welcome to take over as leader if she wanted, but I ended up doing all of [the strategy].

The evidence supports that the teacher was not prepared to lead the strategy because she was uncomfortable, she hadn't planned on leading a strategy, or she thought the teaching artist was supposed to model the strategies. It could also be that the graduate student was not able to sense a teacher's readiness to participate and therefore was unable to adequately scaffold the teacher's learning.

Throughout the modeling phase, the graduate students focused on themselves and their practices (either positively or negatively) rather than the teacher and her practice. In DFS, the faculty members assumed that modeling of strategies was mainly for the benefit of the teachers; however, this phase is equally if not more important for the graduate students. While modeling strategies for teachers, the graduate students focused on their own ability to facilitate the DBP strategies rather than on the teacher's ability to understand the strategy. The DFS faculty had envisioned this phase as a time when the teachers are becoming familiar with the strategies, but also as a time that graduate students closely attend to a teacher's needs and comfort level. However, this focus on the teacher may be an unrealistic expectation for graduate students. Graduate students need to feel efficacious in their facilitation of DBP strategies *before* they can focus on training the teachers. The DFS residency is the first time that most of the graduate students are asked to facilitate DBP strategies with the intention of training another person to lead the strategies.

This shift in orientation may challenge graduate students' thorough emerging understanding of the complexity of the strategy. No longer could a graduate student depend solely on their intuition or on their perceptions of how colleagues facilitated an activity. They needed to explicitly understand and explain the strategy to the new "apprentice," the teacher. They need to understand a strategy in multiple ways, for example: a) Why would I use this strategy? b) How difficult is this strategy to implement? c) How much space do I need to implement this strategy? d) How much do I need to tell the teacher about the strategy so that the teacher is able to use the strategy but not be overwhelmed by the idiosyncrasies of the strategy? Although these types of questions arise in course discussions with the faculty members, a teaching artist may not have thought through each of these questions as applied to the specific situation and may model the strategy with limited consideration for the teacher or students.

Many graduate students had difficulty determining when the modeling portion of the graduate student/teacher partnership was complete. They encouraged teachers to lead strategies but may have lacked the skills to scaffold the teacher's learning. The fluidity of these roles as master and apprentice as well as the phases of modeling, coaching, and fading invited a welcomed confusion. Within the context of college courses, the graduate students are considered apprentices to the pedagogy and practice of drama-based pedagogy. Within the context of the teacher's classroom, the graduate students play the role of master to this pedagogy and practice. But how does a graduate student read and respond to a teacher's needs while acknowledging his/her own? The complexity of this delicate balance was most evident in the coaching phase of the DFS training cycle.

Coaching

As the graduate student teaching artists and teachers agreed to move into the *coaching* phase of the DFS residency, graduate students co-facilitated strategies with, and provided feedback for, teachers. During this phase, the graduate students shifted their focus and made more comments on the teacher's struggle or success to use the strategy. Coaching comments that reflect effective collaboration included the following:

> I told her my objective wasn't to change her [but it was to] incorporate the things she is already doing in her classroom. I told her I was here for her.
>
> Especially the last period was a little victory for both [the teacher] and me: she saw how good she was at leading activities, and I was able to come up with lots of little [strategies].
>
> It was not polished or pretty, but we did it. The lesson was truly co-taught because I was

> explaining the [strategy] to the class, and I would get stuck, so [the teacher] would jump in.
>
> It's interesting to plan with all of my teachers because if they don't agree with one of my ideas, they are very vocal about it.
>
> I just did a lot of listening and I think that was very key.

However, moving between a differentiation of modeling and coaching was difficult for some graduate students. Comments that seem to reflect a struggle during coaching included the following:

> I'm not sure whether it's my position to help her become a better disciplinarian, or if I'm just realizing that my style would be completely different.
>
> So I started jumping in and reassuring students, encouraging them to try it. Then my hand off to [the teacher] was awkward, and she went on to explain, but it was clunky. As time went on, I started talking more and it became more and more awkward to pass off to [the teacher].
>
> During the planning session [the teacher] was impossible.
>
> I am still trying to figure out how best to support her and how to interpret her responses to our planning together, but I'm getting closer!

During the coaching phase, it may be that teachers feel vulnerable and/or scared to take risks in front of their students and the graduate students. Facilitating DBP in a secondary classroom is very different from the usual classroom practices. Just having students stand in a circle can be an undertaking in a 30-person chemistry class that usually solves problems on worksheets sitting at their desks.

Graduate students may feel a need to intervene and just do it themselves. They understand how to lead the strategies but may still have difficulty coaching another person to lead the strategies. Their inability to coach a teacher may be rooted in their rudimentary understanding of the strategy. Furthermore, facilitating a DBP strategy can be challenging. The graduate student not only needs to understand the strategy: they also need to adapt to another person's teaching style, classroom management techniques, and comfort level with classroom control.

Among other contributing factors, the power dynamic between a graduate student and a classroom teacher may be difficult to negotiate. By mid-year, the graduate student has a great deal of DBP experience but limited content knowledge, while a teacher has little DBP experience and a great deal of content knowledge. They need to agree on what takes priority during a lesson: should we focus on the teacher learning the strategy so she can use it when the graduate students is not present, or should we focus on the student learning the curriculum content without regard for the DBP strategy? We would hope that there can be a balance, but it may be that in this real world context that the teacher and teaching artist necessarily prioritize one or the other.

In this phase, graduate students critically engage with the strategies and the teachers through a process of negotiating their identity as master and apprentice. They begin to identify and understand how they want to lead strategies, but it seems they are not quite able to execute their desires in a fluid way. In the coaching phase, graduate students are no longer 'trying out' their ideas but are starting to take on these ideas as their own. This identity negotiation and knowledge construction and/or ownership seem even more evident in the observing phase of the residency cycle.

Fading/Observing

In the final phase of the DFS residency, that is, the "fading" phase, the graduate students observed the teachers using the DBP strategies in their classrooms. Graduate student teaching artists moved toward a differentiation of their roles as masters and as apprentices. Comments where the graduate students served as masters focused on the teachers' development during the fading included these:

> I encouraged/forced [the teacher] to lead the Constellations exercise, and (probably to her dismay), she did a great job.
>
> It worked well, and I truly got to just sit back and observe [the teachers] facilitate. They did a great job!
>
> This class was the most fun, mostly because [the teacher] really took the reins on the class activity.
>
> She is excited about this work and allows it the time and space that it needs!
>
> I was most proud that [the teacher] talked with me, got the idea, then really did the rest herself.

Comments where graduate students struggled with their role during fading included:

> [The teacher] ended up, in a way, both leading the discussion and giving a lecture, while the students barely paid attention.
>
> I didn't want to step on her toes so I waited until she called on me to step in. I wonder if she wanted me to step in a bit quicker.
>
> I agreed that this [strategy] would be great but I wasn't sure how to structure the lesson— I decided to observe her teach one lesson.

During the fading phase, graduate students attempted to give teachers autonomy and complete control of their classrooms. If facilitating the strategy was not going well, then the graduate student had the option to support the teacher in the instruction or to allow the teacher to move through as best he or she could and unpack the issue afterwards. In their nascent roles as masters, many of the graduate students struggled with how to embed coaching into this final step of the residency process. Once again, it may be unclear to the graduate students how to continue to move between coaching and fading. When a graduate student observes a teacher making an egregious mistake in setting up a strategy—for example, forgetting to tell students to stand in a circle—it may seem appropriate to step in so that the strategy does not fail. The teacher then has the possibility of experiencing success with DBP rather than being derailed at the beginning.

However, what role does the graduate student play when the teacher is following the basics of facilitating a DBP strategy but lacks an artistic finesse of an experienced teaching artist? A graduate student may jump in to model more effective facilitation, but this may directly affect a teacher's efficacy and confidence for trying out these new strategies in the future. Is the graduate students' role to make sure that the instruction is of the highest quality for students? Or is their role to let a classroom teacher struggle through a difficult moment and reflect on it afterwards? Which would benefit the classroom teachers and best support their ongoing move towards site-embedded practice of the new instructional approach? Answers to these questions need to be made quickly in experiential education situations. In this phase, it may be that teaching artists struggle *because* they identify more as masters: they have an understanding of the complexity of their role and decision-making process.

Activating Theory through Praxis

Throughout the DFS residency, graduate students make choices that may align with or contradict the theories studied in coursework (i.e., critical theory, constructivism), but more important is their intentional act when working with teachers and students. In this data, the graduate students discuss choices in the teacher's classroom where the graduate students supported or contradicted the application of theory in practice. Table 4 offers sample comments that reflect and/or contradict the two main theories of interest: critical pedagogy and constructivism.

Most interesting were moments when graduate students integrated multiple theoretical constructs and recognized that it could be a contradictory experience. For example, what do you do when you share power with the students and then the students make racist comments? Their experience in the fieldwork classroom informed their understanding of DBP by enhancing their abilities to recognize multiple theoretical constructs and integrate theory into novel contexts even when the experience contradicted their understanding.

Table 4
Application of Critical Pedagogy and Constructivism

Theory	Supporting Comment	Contradictory Comment
Critical Pedagogy	*I think I went from thinking it was, when I first started working in the program, thinking it was led more by the [teaching artist] and now I'm realizing or at least I feel like it is more led by the teacher.* (B)	*It was pretty chaotic, and it required a lot of me controlling the debaters.* (M)
Constructivism	*NO ONE was the expert, and that really got the students interested in the dialogue.* (T)	*[The teachers] had great conversations about definitions while the students watched. I really want to work on changing the habits of the teachers to ask their STUDENTS for answers to their questions, rather than falling back into "too comfortable" grown-up conversations. I am not sure how to encourage that quite yet.* (T)

As graduate students struggled through the phases of the cognitive apprenticeship, they co-constructed a more complex idea of work in the community and in the classroom. When working with actual teachers and students, graduate students encounter a complicated, more difficult process. Although many of the phases of the cognitive apprenticeship are fraught with problematic collaboration and frustration, these moments may in fact be desirable difficulties. By struggling, the graduate students were no longer accepting their preconceived notions of classrooms and were attending to how theory may indeed inform their practice. The graduate students shifted in their understanding of teaching began to develop a reflective-synthetic knowledge of education that engages experience, purpose, and multiple forms of knowing (Kincheloe, 2008).

Understanding of Teaching

Throughout the residency, graduate students shifted their understanding of the skills needed to be an effective teacher. The data captured this shift by comparing how graduate students described their skills in the Individual Development Plan and how graduate students discussed teaching during the final focus group at the end of the year.

Over the year, the graduate students shifted from practical, non-specific language to more theoretically supported, domain-specific language. By offering an intentional way to try out the theories, this process allowed them to claim and complicate their use and understanding of theoretical discourse (Grady, 2002). Theory moved from a disconnected abstraction existing purely on paper to a complicated, embodied understanding situated in lived experiences. For example, "time for collaboration/planning with teachers" is a practical way to think about meeting teachers' needs; however, "the importance of learning communities" offers a more in depth understanding of the ongoing and systemic nature of professional development and reflects a socio-constructivist view of learning (Table 5).

When considering how graduate students connected with others, initially graduate students commented that they wanted to "relate to students" in the classroom. But by the end of the year, they broadened this idea to include the systemic nature of schools by commenting "[the school] is very political, and it's very economically based, and how do you work within those constraints?" This complicated view of power within education reflects more of a critical pedagogical perspective and developing notion of praxis. Although relating to students is of utmost importance, a teaching artist needs to understand the complex system in which students, teachers, and administrators work in order to facilitate a shift in the learning culture in the classroom.

The final focus group captured a shift in understanding of teaching through statements made by the graduate students. Comments that reflected an understanding in teaching include the following:

> [It] doesn't mean the teacher is not effective right now. So that we're not going in and saying you're not effective and so we're giving you tools that are going to make you effective.

> I had two teachers this year that would get so frustrated with themselves because they couldn't remember the name of the activity. But they remembered how to do the activity and what the activity was and I was like 'Time out. Let's celebrate that. Call it 'Purple Flower!' You know what you're doing!'"

> I think being aware of our limitations and the limitations of the work are important to the quality. And if we feel like the students aren't ready or are acting immature, that we don't compromise the work.

Compared to the modeling phase of the residency, by the end of the year, the graduate students seemed to have a richer understanding of the theoretical foundation that is taught through coursework. For example, one graduate student stated, "It doesn't mean the teacher is not effective right now." He not only acknowledges the teacher's ability to co-construct meaning but also he scaffolds the teacher's learning to meet her needs. Another graduate student commented, "It's not the name [of the strategy] that's important, it's what you do." This reflects a critical perspective for working toward change in the classroom. Rather than focusing on the teacher regurgitating the "right" answer, the graduate student looks for a deeper understanding of what is learned. In sum, all the graduate students struggled through this *in situ* learning experience but they each used those challenges as learning moments for deeper understanding of the theory and practice of DBP, and some took the first step towards critical consciousness.

Implications of Findings for Training Teachers and Teaching Artists

Working in the community is not an easy task, but it is necessary to better prepare graduate students to be critical, reflective artists and scholars (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Schechner, 1992). By using a cognitive apprenticeship framework, the researchers

Table 5
Identified List of Skills of an Effective Teaching artist

Self-identified growth areas	Fall 2008 Development Plan	Spring 2009 Focus Group
Understanding DBI Strategies	• *creativity with strategies* • *ease of brainstorming* • *lesson planning on the spot* • *breadth of techniques*	• *learning what strategies will be effective* • *teaching people that there is no one right answer*
School context	• *ability to relate to students* • *ability to adapt to different personalities*	• *connect with educational climate* • *[the school] is very political and its very economically based and how do you work within those constraints*
Creativity	• *readiness to try something new* • *think outside the box*	• *artistry in teaching* • *artistry in crafting a lesson* • *artistry in the way that you talk to your students*
Collaboration	• *time for collaboration/planning time with teachers*	• *the importance of learning communities*

charted the progress of graduate students through this complicated and valuable fieldwork experience in conjunction with related coursework. Although graduate students are both "apprentices" (in coursework) and "masters" (in fieldwork), they were able to move between the two identities— though challenging at times— as the theoretical constructs supported their practice. In various contexts, apprenticeships need to include a "master" who is willing to scaffold support and offer explicit guidance when necessary for apprentices.

Specifically, the researchers noted that the graduate students especially needed the modeling phase to gain confidence and understanding of the DBP strategies for themselves. Although coursework seems an ideal place to practice modeling, the modeling for K-12 teachers and in classrooms helped solidify their understanding of DBP in practice. During the coaching phase, the graduate students had difficulty knowing when to prioritize the teacher's learning or the students' learning. The graduate students struggled when they identified more as masters because they understood the complexity of learning and facilitating DBP strategies.

Implications Beyond a K-12 Classroom Context

Educators of graduate students and teaching artists may want to reconsider ways to support an extensive, cognitive apprenticeship that allows for an ongoing dialogue between the practice and theory of a specific domain. When facilitating a cognitive apprenticeship, educators need to engage students in rigorous reflection about the relationship between particular thoughts and actions as they confront lived experiences in a variety of forms. They can provide time to discuss solutions collaboratively and model coping behaviors for problematic situations while recognizing that some of the theoretical assumptions that drive beliefs about teaching may contradict their experiences in fieldwork. Contradictions between theory and practice, then, become just as generative as supportive connections (Pinar & Grumet, 1988; Van Manen, 1999). These inconsistencies are sites for dialogue about holes in theories or unexplainable experiences. In the same way, this can be an opportunity to deepen understanding of theory and practice rather than set up dichotomies that value one or the other. In sum, educators and graduate students need to remove any guise that theories translate easily into practice and/or that all practice fits neatly into theories.

Limitations and Future Directions

Even though it seems that fieldwork experiences are an invaluable part of an MFA graduate program, we acknowledge that there are many other possible interpretations and likely contributors to the graduate student's growth. Since the DFS residency took place over the course of nine months, time plays a role in shaping their understanding of theory and practice. This does not undermine the usefulness of DFS fieldwork but rather may be an integral part of reaching a deeper understanding of how theory and practice inform one another. It is also important to note that the DFS

program often falls short of the larger goals of critical pedagogy. Faculty encourages the analysis of conflicting forces that shape education, normative assumptions, and systems of power, but these are not privileged in the program model.

Because graduate students were simultaneously enrolled in coursework and participating in the DFS program, we cannot solely attribute the shifts to the DFS program. The research suggests that DFS plays a role in shaping the graduate student's understanding of how to be a teaching artist, but further research is needed to understand the various perspectives involved in DFS. How might graduate students who do not work with the DFS program have a different and/or less complicated view of the theories from coursework? How do the teachers perceive the graduate students as part of the larger DFS program? How do the faculty members shift their understanding of DBP through their experiences in the K-12 classroom with graduate students? Many people affect the development of teachers, teaching artists, and faculty members; therefore, we will continue to pursue questions that tease out these relationships and the dialogic nature of practice and theory.

References

Austin, A. E. (2009). Cognitive apprenticeship theory and its implications for doctoral education: A case example from a doctoral program in higher and adult education. *International Journal for Academic Development, 14*(3), 173-183

Austin, A. E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(1), 94-122.

Belcher, D. (1994). The apprenticeship approach to advanced academic literacy: Graduate students and their mentors. *English for Specific Purposes, 13*(1), 23-34.

Bernstein, R. (1983). *Beyond objectivism and relativism: Science, hermeneutics, and praxis*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field Methods*, *18*(1), 59-82.

Cawthon, S., & Dawson, K. (2009). Drama for schools: Impact of a drama-based professional development program on teacher self-efficacy and authentic instruction. *Youth Theatre Journal, 23*(2), 144-161.

Collins, A., Brown, J. S., & Hollum, A. (1991). Cognitive apprenticeship: Making thinking visible. *American Educator, 6*, 38-46.

Conrad, F. (1992). *The arts in education and a meta-analysis* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.

Conrad, F., & Asher, J. W. (2000). Self-concept and self-esteem through drama: A meta-analysis. *Youth Theatre Journal, 14*, 78-84.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Crouch, M., & McKenzie, H. (2006). The logic of small samples in interview-based qualitative research. *Social Science Information, 45*(4), 483-499.

Crumpler, T. (2006) Educational drama as response to literature: Possibilities for young learners. In J. Jasinski Schneider, T. Crumpler, & T. Rogers (Eds.), *Process drama and multiple literacies: Addressing social, cultural, and ethical issues*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Cushman, C. (2011). *Re-imagining reading instruction for English Language Learners: A performance ethnography of collaborative play, inquiry, and drama with Shakespeare in a third grade classroom*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.

Darling-Hammond, L., Macdonald, M. B., Snyder, J., Whitford, B. L., Ruscoe, G., & Fickel, L. (2000). *Studies of excellence in teacher education: Preparation at the graduate level*. Washington, DC: AACTE Publications.

Dawson, K., & Kellin, D. (2014). *The reflexive teaching artist: Collected wisdom from the drama/theatre field.* Bristol, UK: Intellect Books.

Edmiston, B. (2003) What's my position? Role, frame and positioning when using process drama. *Research in Drama Education*, *8*(2), 221-230.

Edmiston, B., & McKibben, A. (2011). Shakespeare, rehearsal approaches, and dramatic inquiry: Literacy education for life. *English in Education, 45*(1), 91-106.

Elliott, J. (2007). *Reflection where the action is: The selected works of John Elliott.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Freire, P. (2002). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York NY: The Continuum International Publishing Group.

Gadotti, M. (1996). *Pedagogy of praxis. A dialectical philosophy of education.* New York, NY: SUNY Press.

Gallas, K., & Smagorinsky, P. (2002). Approaching texts in school. *The Reading Teacher, 56*, 1, 54-61.

Glenn, J., & Jordan-Davis, J. TASC. Power of three: Critical components of coaching. management coaching curriculum.

Grady, S. (2000). *Drama and diversity*: *A pluralistic perspective for educational drama*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Heath, S. B., & Wolf, S. (2005). Dramatic learning in the primary school. London, UK: Creative Partnerships.

Hockly, N. (2000). Modelling and 'cognitive apprenticeship' in teacher education. *ELT Journal*, *54*(2), 118-125.

Kardash, C. A. M., & Wright, L. (1986). Does creative drama benefit elementary school students: A meta-analysis. *Youth Theatre Journal, 1*, 11-18.

Kidd, D. (2011). The mantle of Macbeth: *English in Education, 45*(1), 72-85.

Kincheloe, J. (2008). *Critical pedagogy primer* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Lang.

Langley, A. (1999). Strategies for theorizing from process data. *The Academy of Management Review, 24*(4), 691-710.

Lee, B. (2013). The process of developing a partnership between teaching artists and teachers. *Teaching Artist Journal, 11*(2), 26-34.

Lee, B., Cawthon, S., & Dawson, K. (2013). Teacher self-efficacy for teaching and pedagogical conceptual change in a drama-based professional development program. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 30*, 84-98.

Lee, B., Patall, E., Cawthon, S., & Steingut, R. (2015). Meta-analysis of the effects of drama-based pedagogy on K-16 student outcomes since 1985. *Review of Educational Research, 85*(1), 3-49. doi: 10.3102/0034654314540477.

Lindeman, E. C. (1944). New needs of adult education. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, *231*, 115-122.

Loving, C., & Foster, A. (2000). The religion-in-the-science-classroom issue: Seeking graduate student conceptual change. *Science Education, 84*(4), 445-468.

Moreno, R., & Mayer, R. (1999). Cognitive principles of multimedia learning: The role of modality and contiguity. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*(2), 358–368.

O'Neill, C. (1995). *Drama worlds: A framework for process drama*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Paas, F., Renkel, A., & Sweller, J. (2004). Cognitive load theory: Instructional implications of the interaction between information structures and cognitive architecture. *Instructional Science, 32*, 1-8.

Pallas, A. M. (2001). Preparing education doctoral students for epistemological diversity. *Educational Researcher, 30*(5), 6-11.

Pinar, W., & Grumet, M. (1988). Socratic *casura* and the theory-practice relationship. In W. Pinar (Ed), *Contemporary curriculum discourses*. Scottsdale, AZ. Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Podlozny, A. (2000). Strengthening verbal skills through the use of classroom drama: A clear link. *Journal of Aesthetic Education, 34*(3/4), 239-275.

Schechner, R. (1992). A new paradigm for theatre in the academy. *TDR: The Drama Review, 36*(4), 7-11.

Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Smagorinsky, P., & Coppock, J. (1995). Reading through the lines: An exploration of drama as a response to literature. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 11*(4), 369-391.

Stewart, K. K., & Lagowski, J. J. (2003). Cognitive apprenticeship theory and graduate chemistry education. *Journal of Chemistry Education, 80*(12), 1362-1366.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded Theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science, 12*(2), 257–285.

Van Manen, M. (1999). The practice of practice. In M. Lange, J. Olson, H. Hanson, & W. Bunder (Eds.), *Changing schools/Changing practices: Perspectives on educational reform and teacher professionalism*. Luvain, BE: Garaut.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman (Eds.), Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wagner, B. J. (1998). *Educational drama and language arts: What research shows*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Drama.

Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education. *Teacher Education, 61*, 89-99.

BRIDGET KIGER LEE is a post-doctoral researcher at The Ohio State University, 333 Arps Hall, 1945 N. High St., Columbus, OH, 43210-1172; e-mail: lee.6237@osu.edu. She holds a Ph.D. in Educational Psychology and an M.F.A. in Drama and Theatre for Youth from The University of Texas at Austin. Her research interests include the effects of drama-based pedagogy on various academic-related outcomes, the processes by which teachers shift pedagogical practices and the effects on student outcomes, and the development and application of research on arts integration pedagogies for use in educational policy.

KATHRYN DAWSON is an assistant professor in theatre and Director of Drama for Schools at The University of Texas at Austin, 300 E, 23rd St, D3900m Austin, TX 78712-0383; email: kathryndawson@austin.utexas.edu. She holds an M.F.A. in Drama and Theatre for Youth from The University of Texas at Austin. Her research interests include drama-based pedagogy, arts integration, museum theatre and teaching artist pedagogy and practice.

STEPHANIE CAWTHON is an associate professor of educational psychology at The University of Texas at Austin, 1 University Station, D5800, Austin, TX 78712-0383; e-mail: Stephanie.cawthon@mail.utexas.edu. She holds a Ph.D. in educational psychology from University of Wisconsin-Madison. Her research interests include issues of equity and access to education.

Appendix

Consider these questions in relation to your position within Drama for Schools.

I. Self-Assessment

Greatest Strengths:

1.
2.
3.

Development Areas:

1.
2.
3.

II. Competence (knowledge, skill and/or behavior)

The one development area that I commit to working with for the semester is/are:
Because: (why this competence, why now)

III. Development Plan

To support my continuous improvement with this knowledge, skill and/or behavior, I plan to incorporate the following practices into my work:

1.
2.
3.

I have chosen these specific methods toward improvement because:
Some challenges I am concerned about are:
I hope to address the challenges by:
Katie and Bridget can assist me in this area by:

IV. Improved Performance

I will know I have been successful as a Teaching Artist when:
My success will affect my colleagues by:
My success will affect my *DFS* program by:

Adapted from: Management Coaching Curriculum developed by Janis Glenn and Jackie Jordan-Davis