Cleary, T. (2006). "The development and validation of the Self-Regulation Strategy Inventory—Self-Report." *Journal of School Psychology* **44: 307-322.**

Summary:

This article begins with an assertion that while there is interest in self-regulated learning, it is not yet clear why school psychologists should address this area in their evaluations. The article then presents research that shows a correlation between self-regulated learning and high achieving students, and then tries to show that the reverse is also true. Cleary marvels that even though research shows a strong correlation between SRL strategies and achievement, there are very few assessments available for SRL. Cleary then goes on to develop his own context-specific self-report measures of self-regulation strategies. The rest of the article articulates why the Self-Regulation Strategy Inventory—Self-Report (SRSI-SR) Cleary presents is valid for determining student's use of SRL strategies.

Theoretical Framework:

This article's theoretical framework defines self-regulated learning and uses studies from (Boekaerts et al., 2000; Butler, 1995; Weinstein, Husman, & Dierking, 2000 (Pintrich, 2003; Zimmerman & Schunk, 2001. Cleary then goes on to explain why SRL is important by highlighting several more studies that demonstrate that not only is there a strong relationship between SRL and academic achievement, but that some studies actually show that SRL processes are actually causal determinants of school success. (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002) Given that link, Cleary asserts that schools should be testing to determine the level of self-regulation in a student, even though they are generally are not. (Hutton & Dubes, 1992; Wilson & Reschly, 1996)

Reflection:

I used a modified version of the Self-Regulation Strategy Inventory that Cleary created in my project. By having the students complete the inventory at the beginning and end of the semester, I am hoping that it will help me to determine whether the training the students received during the semester caused their thinking to change toward self-regulated learning.

Cleary, T.J., & Zimmerman, B.J. (2004). Self-regulation empowerment program: A school-based program to enhance self-regulated and self-motivated cycles of student learning. *Psychology in the Schools, 41,* **537 – 550.**

Summary:

In this article, Cleary and Zimmerman present a training program they name the Self-Regulation Empowerment Program (SREP). The hope is that schools can use the techniques therein to empower students to learn self-regulation strategies and improve their learning results. The

system begins with an assessment, where trainers will assess self-regulation beliefs and study strategies. Then the trainers will teach students to use the strategies in a "cyclical, self-regulation feedback loop." If successful, the program will enable students to better be able to set goals, consider the effectiveness of their learning strategies, and to make changes to those strategies as necessary.

Theoretical Framework:

The theoretical framework begins with work demonstrating that many adolescents suffer from an inability to adapt to the transition to middle school, which leads the students to suffer from a decrease in self-esteem and could lead them to lose interest in academics. (Eccles et al., 1989; Fredericks & Eccles, 2002; Wigfield, Eccles, MacIver, Reuman, & Midgley, 1991.) Cleary and Zimmerman point out that the greater danger could actually be a disbelief in the student's own ability to do the work. They argue that a disbelief in their self-efficacy can cause them to lose motivation and can lead them to decide that the work is no longer important. (Bandura, 1997; Pajares, 1996.) Once that occurs, a host of other issues can present themselves such as "a lack of attention in class, failure to prepare for examinations, and even failure to attend school." (Zimmerman, 2002).

Cleary and Zimmerman feel that if students can be empowered with greater control of their own learning process, they will then achieve better academic results. They further posit that training in Self-Regulated Learning training is the best way to empower students, because training in processes such as goal setting, self-monitoring, and self-reflection have been shown to improve both motivation and achievement (Schunk, 1996; Wood, Bandura, & Bailey, 1990). The authors stress that while there have been other systems which are similar because they involve pinpointing problem areas, creating strategies specific for the student and then analyzing its effectiveness (Pressley, Borkowski, & Schneider, 1987;Reschly & Ysseldyke, 1995), self-regulation models are different because they are student driven. The techniques "empower students to actively engage in the problem-solving process, thereby increasing their autonomy and personal agency over their learning methods." (Schunk & Ertmer, 2000; Zimmerman, 2000).

Reflection:

This article informed my project in several ways, but the most specific was a plan that I ask the students to record their own learning plan and then consider any strategic planning errors in order to increase their metacognitive skills. Cleary and Zimmerman say that enabling students to keep track of their performance processes and outcomes is important because it helps them to "isolate the source of error, confusion, or inefficiency" (Zimmerman & Paulsen, 1995, p. 15) The article confirmed my belief that I would need journals for the students in order for them to break down their larger assignments into sections, decide on a strategy for getting the work done, and then analyze the results of their strategy afterward.

Darder, A. (2017). Pedagogy of love: Embodying our humanity. In A. Darder, R.D. Torres, & M.P. Baltodano. (Eds). *The critical pedagogy reader*. **(3rd ed.) (pp. 95-109). New York, NY: Routledge**.

Summary:
Antonia Darder examines Paulo Freire's view of a pedagogy of love. She clarifies his view of love not only in the traditional sense of caring for another, but also as what he called an "armed love - the fighting love of those convinced of the right and the duty to fight, to denounce and to announce." (Pg. 95) Freire felt that the expression and use of this fierce love was crucial, and attempting daily engagement with the societal forces that dehumanize our existence, without the power of love on our side, is "walking like lost sojourners in a vast desert with insufficient water to complete the crossing." (Pg. 95) Darder suggested that Freire believed love emerges directly out of participation in society and a democratic commitment to the transformation of a system which oppresses people.
A pedagogy of love requires teachers to know the students and be known by them in an intellectually and empathetically deep way, beyond stereotypes and superficialities. The teacher strives for a communal experience of learning and "culture of questioning" in the classroom. Freire suggests that in this type of environment students "engage in the experience of assuming themselves as social, historical, thinking, communicating, transformative, creative persons; dreamers of possible utopias, capable of being angry because of a capacity to love." (Pg. 98) Students are allowed physical self-expression in a way that reflects their bodies as extensions of their consciousness and being, necessary for real communication, rather than something that must be dominated and controlled. Freire believes that in such an environment, where students are allowed and encouraged to express themselves within the classroom, barriers that isolate and objectify students are broken down resulting in students who are more encouraged to take part in classroom life. In time, the students will also come to understand that their power to think critically and effect change their classroom environment can extend to society as a whole, ultimately resulting in a student who is a confident representative of their culture and able to take an effective role in a democratic society.

Reflection:
This essay helped me in several ways to not only rethink the traditional classroom experience, but also to enhance the goal of helping students to become self-regulated learners. Purposefully creating a culture of questioning in the classroom will encourage the students to think critically and seek to investigate beyond the surface of a subject. The ability of a student to ask themselves why they are learning a given topic, whether there are some aspects of the lesson that need greater investigation than others, or how the lesson corresponds with their experience are hallmarks of a loved student and also examples of self-motivation and metacognition strategies used by self-regulated learners.
I believe that by empowering the students to feel valued as humans, understood as unique, and fully encouraged to ask questions and express feelings, students will be naturally led to the idea that their education is something that is not the sole responsibility of the teacher, but rather a partnership in which the student plays a controlling role.

Drapeau, P. (2004). *Differentiated Instruction: Making It Work: A Practical Guide to Planning, Managing, and Implementing Differentiated Instruction to Meet the Needs of All Learners.* **New York, NY: Scholastic Teaching Resources.**

Summary:

This book is about the challenge of differentiating instruction within a diverse classroom. The author acknowledges the challenge of the teacher not having enough time to create multiple lesson plans and being able to focus on each child individually, and then goes on to present strategies that can be used to modify existing lesson plans to accommodate learners of all types. Drapeau distils differentiated instruction as "Responsive teaching and scaffolding students' learning. It may include cooperative groupings and alternative assessments." She asserts that students not only have different talent, ability, and motivation, (Pg 9,) social, cultural and language barriers play a role as well. Therefore, it does not make sense to teach the same way to every student.

Theoretical Framework:

Drapeau draws her theoretical framework from several sources. Vygotsky's theory of the Zone Proximal development (1978) informs her suggestion of when a child needs more intervention and when he or she can work more independently, as well as when they are ready to move on to new material. Drapeau explains that it is important to keep students in the zone of proximal development because that is where learning takes place. (Pg. 12.) She explains that variation in assignments and learning can occur within a zone, but it is important to define the zone because otherwise the material may not be appropriate.

Eric Jensen's work: Teaching With The Brain in Mind (1998) provides the framework for the types of challenges Drapeau suggests at various levels of the learning process. Challenge and feedback are the two critical elements that Jensen claims are vital for brain growth. He then outlines studies that tie different types of enrichment to changes in brain cells and connections between them, which Drapeau incorporates into her curriculum.

Robert Strenberg's theory of Successful Intelligence (1996) asserts that in order to be successful one must use analytical, practical and creative intelligence. He believes, and Drapeau agrees, that schools tend to focus too much on the analytical to the exclusion of the others. Drapeau further contends that when considering diversity, it is important to consider whether your learner has tendencies toward one type of thinking, and so may be easier to reach if lessons are modified to accommodate appropriately.

The last major influence on Drapeau's theoretical framework is Robert Gardener's Multiple Intelligence Theory. (1993.) Gardener identified eight different intelligences through which the scope of human potential can be identified. Drapeau claims that understanding the nature of these definitions of intelligence can help the teacher by assessing strengths, helping a student with their own metacognitive knowledge, and that it can help the teacher with their product choices. Drapeau uses the author's research together to stress the importance of creating

appropriate challenges for learners at all levels, enriching their study to encourage learning, and providing appropriate choices for learners so that they will be involved in their own education.

Reflection:
Originally, I chose this book because it had interesting ideas on evaluating students for strategic grouping. As my project changed, however, I found the most useful section to be about student choice in the curriculum. The idea of student choice goes to both the motivation and the self-reflection areas of self-regulated learning, and I have been prompted to ask students about the motivation behind their choices in their Young Author Projects and Black History Month projects. What they chose to study and why, as well as whether they were allowed to make that choice, is informative about their level of motivation and subsequent achievement.

McCoach D.B., and Siegle D. (2003). Factors that Differentiate Underachieving Gifted Students from High Achieving Gifted Students. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 47, 144-154.* *10.1177/001698620304700205*

Summary:
This article studied gifted students that were both highly achieving and underachieving and attempted to determine what the factors made the difference. It became clear that whether the student valued the work they have been given, or the outcome they would achieve, seemed to be the greatest difference between the two groups. The article recommended interventions that included goal setting and future-planning. They also recommend assessing each individual on factors measured by the SAAR-R assessment, which include "academic self-perceptions, attitudes toward school, attitudes toward teachers, motivation, and goal valuation." This assessment will enable the instructor to create a more individualized motivation plan.

Theoretical Framework:
McCoach and Siegle define underachievement as "a discrepancy between potential (or ability) and performance" (or achievement; Dowdall & Colangelo,1982; Whitmore,1980). Characteristics they have chosen to associate with underachievement include low academic self-perception, negative attitudes toward school, negative attitudes toward teachers and classes, low motivation and self-regulation, and low goal valuation, and they justify using these categories from the work of Dowdall & Colangelo, (1982), Reis & McCoach, (2000,) and Whitmore, (1980).
The authors describe academic self-concept as a description and an evaluation of one's perceived academic abilities (Byrne, 1996; Hattie,1992). They claim that academic self-concept is a very important predictor of academic achievement (Lyon,1993; Marshetal.,1995; Wigfield & Karpathian, 1991). In fact, some of the research shows as much as one third of the variance in achievement can be related directly to academic self-concept. (Lyon.)
Negative attitudes toward school are often expressed by underachievers. (Bruns,1992; Diaz, 1998; Ford,1996 ; Frankel, 1965; Mandel & Marcus, 1988; McCall, Evahn, & Kratzer, 1992; Rimm, 1995.) McCoach and Siegle separate attitudes toward school, however, from attitudes toward teachers and classes because there is not necessarily a correlation.
The authors use Zimmerman's definition of self-regulation: "self-generated thoughts, feelings, and actions which are systematically oriented toward the attainment of goals"

(Zimmerman,1994,p.ix). McCoach and Siegle warn that separating motivation from self-regulation can be difficult, but that it is sometimes the case that students have the skills necessary to self-regulate but are not inclined to do so for various reasons.

McCoach and Siegle define goal valuation as "beliefs about the importance and interest of the task" (Pintrich&DeGroot,1990). The explain that students who align with the goals of their school are more likely to engage with their studies, try harder to do them well, and achieve better results. (Pintrich&DeGroot; Wigfield, 1994).

Reflection:
This article was one of the bridges between differentiated learning and self-regulated learning for me. It was in reading this article that I began to realize how important the traits of self-regulated learning were in any strategically differentiated classroom, which prompted me to study SRL instead. The article also provided important background information for the basis of my project. I was better able to understand what traits to focus on when trying to determine whether the students had shown any improvement in their SRL tendencies.

Orelus, P. (2017). Decolonizing Schools and Our Mentality: Narratives for Pedagogical Possibilities from a Former High School Teacher and Colonized Subject. In A. Darder, R.D. Torres, & M.P. Baltodano, (Eds). *The critical pedagogy reader***. (3rd ed.) (pp. 254-265). New York, NY: Routledge.**

Summary:
In this essay Orelus examines colonial-based education systems and offers an alternative pedagogy based on a democratic and participatory form of education. Much like the "banking system" Freire denounces, the colonial-based education system Orelus describes is one where the teacher is the dominant force molding the student into what the teacher deems appropriate. Orelus points out that like colonialism, this educational model "mostly works for those who created it."(Pg. 254) Students often come out of this type of classroom with facts and figures they have been forced to memorize, but without any of the context to make it meaningful. It can seem as though the main knowledge or skill being learned is how to acquiesce to power by sitting still and doing what is told.

Orelus found that it is imperative for teachers to be aware of what they are attempting to students to become. Does the teacher want students who are self-aware risk takers, ready to interrogate information in order to put it within the context of their experience? Or does the teacher want a timid student, afraid to speak out and ask questions, yet who can regurgitate a set of fragmented bits of knowledge on a test? Once a teacher understands their role, a true teaching partnership can begin between the teacher and student. The teacher must initiate a dialogue to get to know the student well, which will enable the teacher to understand how to guide the lessons to the student's "learning styles, their cultural, linguistic, and historical repertoires, and their prior knowledge." (Pg. 258) The teacher who understands what is practical and relevant to his or her students' lives can also encourage the student to ask questions during classroom discussions, further engaging the student and making the learning more meaningful.

Reflection:
Orelusis stresses the importance of students being able to think critically and ask questions, beyond just repeating back what the teacher told them to memorize, and also advocating how important it is to get to know a student well beyond surface stereotypes. If the teacher can create a relationship with the student and partner in the student's education, then the teacher can guide the student toward understanding the relevance of the material in their own cultural context, as well as encouraging them to ask important questions.

Getting to know a student well and creating a learning partnership should lend itself well to teaching a student about self-regulated learning. When a student finds a subject relevant to their experience and situation, they are more motivated to learn about it. If they feel empowered to ask questions, they are guiding their learning and understanding what they would like to know more about. I like the method Orelusis used in his class of adjusting assignments so that the class can share and relate the lesson to their own experiences and culture, although I could see the lessons mixed with more direct questions about the class from time to time.

Raible, J, Irizarry, J (2017) Redirecting the teacher's gaze: Teacher education, youth surveillance and the school-to-prison pipeline. In A. Darder, R.D. Torres, & M.P. Baltodano, (Eds). *The critical pedagogy reader*. **(3rd ed.) (pp.461–475). New York, NY: Routledge.**

Summary:
In this article Raible and Irizarry are examining the link between the role of teacher education and the school-to-prison pipeline. They claim to have found a link between "the surveillance role played by many teachers in public schools and the over-representation of youth of color in the U.S. penal system," and site work by Foucault (1977) who observed that social control has been influenced by the model of the panopticon in schools. The panopticon is a central tower in a prison around which the other cells would be organized, allowing for constant surveillance. The authors argue that such a system allows those in power to sort students into groups of leaders and followers, socializing students to the controlling society's norms, and to control those who stray socially. Raible and Irizarry show us that this system is a remnant from ruling elites wondering what to do with freed slaves, and that the need for cheap labor along side outright hostility toward socially undesirable populations led to the need of stringent degrees of social control so that resistance could not take hold. The model was applied to Latino and immigrant populations as well, and now the black and Latino populations who account for ¼ of the U.S. population also account for 75% of the U.S. prison population.

The authors point out the irony that although often education has been championed as the liberator and equalizer for communities of color, at the same time the education system has become one of the primary methods of community control. The results varied depending on who controlled the schools, and since disengagement and suspension seems to set up an expectation of incarceration, the authors naturally advocate for teachers who can understand and engage their students. This means not only education programs that mirror the school aged population in general, but actually hiring teachers who have a vested interest in "restructuring schools so that they can become spaces where students and teachers engage in a process of liberation, as opposed to the reification of hegemony." (472) These teachers recruited from the same communities in jeopardy, must be educated and made aware of issues of diversity and hegemony

before they enter the classroom. The authors hope that through understanding poor students of color teachers will more effectively "connect with, and forge bonds of solidarity with," (472,) the students and together become true agents of change.

Reflection:

In order to empower underrepresented students and enable them to take control of their education and become self-regulated learners, I must first get to know them well and have student led discussions about their experiences and background. As Wald & Losen (2003) point out, school connectedness, or "a student's feeling part of and cared for at school," is associated with lower levels of destructive behaviors, and Raible and Irizarry feel is crucial for success in education. (473) These discussions and projects should involve other voices in the student's circle and take place many times in different ways throughout the year. Through forming a partnership with our students rather than a dictatorship, together we can show students how to become effective voices in society and our democracy rather than simply one more cog in the vast machine, ready to comply or be thrown away.

Tomlinson, C.A. (2017). *How to Differentiate Instruction in Academically Diverse Classrooms.* **Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.**

Summary:

Tomlinson is one of the most prominent authors about the subject of classroom differentiation. This book was written as a guide for teachers on how to differentiate in a classroom comprised not only of mixed abilities but varied backgrounds and student perspectives. She discusses the importance of meeting each child academically from where they are coming from, rather than imposing a one size fits all method of instruction. Tomlinson goes on to provide clear and fairly specific strategies for preparing differentiated lessons, but also for managing a differentiated classroom once the class is in action.

Theoretical Framework:

Tomlinson believes that differentiated instruction is the best and most likely way each student will obtain a high-quality education, (Pg. 14,) because proper differentiated instruction is rooted in understanding the way that individuals learn best. Further, the best learning happens when it is a bit beyond a student's independence level, but not too great or the outcome is frustration. (Souza & Tomlinson, 2011; Vygotsky, 1986; Willis, 2006.) Understanding what interests the student increases their motivation to learn a subject, (Piaget,1978; Wolfe, 2010), and Tomlinson suggests interests can be more easily understood by studying how individual brains are wired, and also by considering culture and gender. (Pg.14).

Reflection:

Besides providing more understanding on what comprises a successfully differentiated classroom, this book gave me good insight into student motivation, the first aspect of self-regulated learning

strategy. The strategy to motivate students and the decisions on how to divide students into groups often converge, and for me provided more evidence that teaching self-regulated strategy would improve academic results regardless of whether the class was differentiated. I used Tomlinson's suggestion to make the subject being studied personally meaningful by asking the students in my project to consider beforehand why they want to complete the Young Author Project they are working on. I had the students write in their journals all of the reasons that they would benefit personally from the project as a way to motivate them.

Zimmerman, B. and A. Kitsantas (2005). "Homework practices and academic achievement: The mediating role of self-efficacy and perceived responsibility beliefs." *Contemporary Educational Psychology* **30: 397-417.**

Summary:
This was a study of 179 girls from multi-ethnic mixed socio-economic status families living in a metropolitan area at a parochial school. The study showed correlations between a belief in their own academic self-efficacy and how much self-responsibility they felt that they had for their own academic outcomes. It also correlated the two academic outcomes to the student's grade point average at the end of the school term. The research revealed that their efficacy at completing nightly homework, (three hours per night average,) did correlate with their beliefs about their academic self-efficacy and their perceptions about their own responsibility for learning. There was also a positive correlation with grade point average. The study was not able to determine whether completing the homework improved self-efficacy beliefs or self-responsibility perception however, only that these traits correlated with the homework being completed more effectively and a higher grade point average.

Theoretical Framework:
The study uses Schunk & Zimmerman's (1998) definition of academic self-regulation as self-generated thoughts, feelings, strategies and behaviors designed to achieve academic goals. The authors feel that among the motivational beliefs involved with self-regulation, self-efficacy has proven to play an especially important role. (Pajares & Schunk, 2001.) They site Bandura (2001) to explain that self-efficacy is different from other self-related constructs in that it is evaluated in terms of what a student can do rather than what they will do.
Because self-efficacy is measured differently depending on the scale or domain of the research, the authors have drawn from two surveys Bandura (1989) used to measure self-efficacy across varied academic settings. Zimmerman (1994) had previously hypothesized that self-efficacy beliefs were predictive of perceived responsibility, because students who believe in their self-efficacy are more likely to acknowledge responsibility for academic outcomes. The authors drew from Intellectual Achievement Responsibility surveys created 40 years earlier by Crandal, Katkovsky, and Crandall (1965) to design their own Perceived Responsibility for Learning Scale.

Reflection:
For my project I used a modified version of the Perceived Responsibility for Learning Scale and the Self-Efficacy for Learning Form in order to determine changes between the start of the semester and the end. The training the teachers and I provide in between should cause a change in the results.