

Copyright

by

Charles David Fuhrken

2006

The Dissertation Committee for Charles David Fuhrken Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

**PRESERVICE TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF PREPARATION
AND PRACTICES FOR TEACHING READING/LANGUAGE ARTS:
THREE CASE STUDIES**

Committee:

Nancy L. Roser, Supervisor

Randy Bomer

Beth Maloch

Miriam Martinez

Diane L. Schallert

**PRESERVICE TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF PREPARATION
AND PRACTICES FOR TEACHING READING/LANGUAGE ARTS:
THREE CASE STUDIES**

by

Charles David Fuhrken, B.A.; M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Austin
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

December 2006

Acknowledgements

Thanks above all to Nancy, for having the patience to say things again and again until the ideas took hold in me and for tireless reading, rereading, and editing. As is your way, you were willing continually to go beyond what can reasonably be expected of a dissertation chair.

Thanks to my committee members who contributed to the study by being and providing resources, and who checked in with impeccable timing to say “keep writing.”

Thanks to my family, who from near and far, hoped and prayed this degree, and especially this study, into reality. Thanks for supporting my five years of abandonment.

Thanks to so many friends who collectively form a remarkable second family. Thanks to John Jones for not letting me grumble. Thanks to Kemp and Nancy Gregory for letting me grumble endlessly. Thanks to Tish Denny who continually supported this endeavor. Thanks to so many more, especially Martha Scarborough, Stephanie Sartain Herrera, Kathleen McDonnold, Norma Carr, Carol Bedard, Chris and John Powell, Tammy Campbell, Delise Becker, Jenny Hartman, Gena Gourley, Darrel Baker, and Peter Conforti.

Thanks to the members of the expert panel who graciously contributed to this study. And, of course, thanks to the preservice teachers who so willingly invited me into their lives and offered their time when their schedules had so little of it. I wish you long and fruitful careers in this great profession.

**PRESERVICE TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF PREPARATION
AND PRACTICES FOR TEACHING READING/LANGUAGE ARTS:
THREE CASE STUDIES**

Publication No. _____

Charles David Fuhrken, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2006

Supervisor: Nancy L. Roser

This interpretive case study is an investigation of a sample of three preservice teachers' perceptions of their preparation and practices in learning to teach reading/language arts. The portrayals describe the professional experiences that the participants reported as valuable sources of knowledge in informing their learning to teach in elementary schools. The portrayals also present the knowledge and sources that the three preservice teachers reported drawing upon when asked to view video-clips of other teachers' demonstrations of reading/language arts teaching; the preservice teachers' descriptions and interpretations were compared with those of experienced teachers who reported on the same video-clips in order to further contextualize the preservice teachers' burgeoning understandings about reading/language arts teaching.

Interview data were collected during the semester in which the preservice teacher participants were concurrently completing a course in language arts methods and their

student-teacher practica. Data analysis was ongoing and inductive (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), and recurring themes and patterns were used to build representations that most exemplified the preservice teachers' experiences.

The findings in this study suggest that the preservice teachers draw from multiple sources of knowledge, which include: course readings, assignments, and discussions; fieldwork observations and teaching experiences; and professor and peer relationship experiences that fostered collaboration and idea sharing. Additional findings suggest that preservice teachers have ready facility with a particular lexicon and notice, label, define, and analyze features of instruction in exact or similar ways to experts. The three preservice teachers also differed from experts in marked ways, including the emphasis given to some features of instruction over others, and the nature and depth of elaboration used to describe and analyze features.

The implications of this study and suggestions for future research relate to the potential for preservice teachers to draw from multiple sources in their teacher education program, the potential for more and varied fieldwork experiences to influence preservice teachers' practices, and the potential for participating in communities of learners in order to impact practices and develop toward expertise, among other implications.

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES	XI
LIST OF FIGURES	XII
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	2
DESIGN OF THE STUDY	3
<i>Purpose</i>	3
<i>Rationale</i>	4
<i>Research Questions</i>	6
PROCEDURES	7
<i>Sample Selection</i>	7
<i>The Researcher</i>	8
<i>Data Collection</i>	9
<i>Data Analysis</i>	10
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	11
OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS	11
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	13
TEACHERS AS REVEALERS OF THEIR KNOWING	13
<i>Toward Valuing Teachers as Informants of Their Learning</i>	13
EVIDENCE ABOUT TEACHERS AS INFORMANTS	14
EFFECTS OF REVEALING AS INFORMANTS	15
METHODS FOR REVEALING.....	16
THE USE OF INTERVIEWS IN PRESERVICE TEACHER STUDIES	18
LANGUAGE AS THE VEHICLE FOR REVEALING	20
<i>Teacher Expert Knowledge</i>	21
TOWARD A MODEL OF EXPERTISE	21
TOWARD BECOMING EXPERTS	25
TOWARD NARROWING THE GAP BETWEEN NOVICE AND EXPERT	28
TOWARD THE FUTURE OF STUDYING EXPERTS.....	29
TOWARD BECOMING EXPERTS IN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.....	30
<i>Drawing on Learning from Case-based Instruction in Preservice Teacher Education</i>	33
THE NEED FOR CASES	33
CASE-BASED LEARNING DEFINED	34
THEORIES THAT UNDERGIRD CASE-BASED LEARNING.....	34
PROGRESSION OF CASE RESOURCES AND EFFECTIVENESS	36
STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF USING CASES IN TEACHER EDUCATION	38
CASE-BASED LEARNING AND THIS STUDY	40
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY.....	41
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	41
RATIONALE FOR RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	42
CONTEXT	44
<i>The University</i>	44
<i>The College of Education</i>	44
<i>The Teacher Education Program</i>	45
<i>The Participants</i>	47
<i>The Researcher</i>	49
INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT AND DATA COLLECTION	51
<i>Instrument Development</i>	51
SELECTING VIDEO-CLIPS OF DEMONSTRATIONS OF TEACHING	52
CODING THE CONTENT OF THE VIDEO-CLIPS WITH EXPERTS.....	55
TOWARD DEVELOPING INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS	58

RATIONALE FOR INTERVIEWING	58
DEVELOPMENT OF INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS	58
PROCEDURES	60
<i>Data Collection</i>	61
TOWARD CAPTURING PRESERVICE TEACHERS' USEFUL EXPERIENCES	61
TOWARD ACCESSING PRESERVICE TEACHERS' UNDERSTANDINGS AND WAYS OF KNOWING	62
TOWARD INVESTIGATING PRESERVICE TEACHER'S SOURCES OF KNOWLEDGE WHILE TEACHING	63
ADDITIONAL DATA SOURCES	64
<i>Data Analysis</i>	65
INTRODUCTORY INTERVIEWS	65
VIDEO-CLIP INTERVIEWS	66
OBSERVATIONS OF TEACHING INTERVIEWS	66
FIELDNOTES AND ARTIFACTS	66
ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES	67
<i>Researcher Perspective and Limitations</i>	69
CHAPTER IV: CASE STUDIES	72
KAREN	73
<i>Early Experiences in Becoming a Teacher of Literacy</i>	74
IMMERSION IN THE CULTURE OF SCHOOL	74
EARLY READING MEMORIES	76
EARLY WRITING MEMORIES	76
INTEREST IN LANGUAGE	77
<i>Sources of Knowing Throughout Her Preservice Teacher Education</i>	78
EDUCATION COURSE EXPERIENCES AND READINGS	78
FIELDWORK EXPERIENCES	80
PROFESSORS	81
COOPERATING TEACHER	81
PEERS	82
SUPERVISING TEACHER	83
<i>Developing Notions about Teaching Reading/Language Arts</i>	84
BECOMING A THEORIST	84
TOWARD SHARPENING HER PRACTICE	87
THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER	90
<i>Summary of Karen's Sources and Knowing</i>	92
GLORIA	93
<i>Early Experiences in Becoming a Teacher of Literacy</i>	94
THE CONSUMMATE CAREGIVER	94
BECOMING A READER	95
BECOMING A WRITER	96
<i>Sources of Knowing Throughout Her Preservice Teacher Education</i>	97
PRIOR WORK EXPERIENCES	98
UNIVERSITY COURSEWORK EXPERIENCES	98
RELATIONSHIPS WITH PROFESSORS AND COHORT	99
EXPERIENCES WITH HER COOPERATING TEACHER	100
THE MERITS OF FIELDWORK	102
SUPERVISING TEACHER	103
<i>Developing Notions about Teaching Reading/Language Arts</i>	105
DEVELOPING A THEORY-DRIVEN PRACTICE	105
DISPLAYS OF CONTENT KNOWLEDGE	107
THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER	110
<i>Summary of Gloria's Sources and Knowing</i>	112
LANA	113
<i>Early Experiences in Becoming a Teacher of Literacy</i>	114
BECOMING A LIFELONG READER	114
EARLY ROLES AS TEACHER	115
SOCIAL WORK ROOTS	117
<i>Sources of Knowing Throughout Her Preservice Teacher Education</i>	118

BENEFICIAL EDUCATION COURSE CONTENT AND ASSIGNMENTS	118
HELPFUL FIELDWORK EXPERIENCES	120
RELATIONSHIPS WITH COHORT AND PROFESSORS.....	123
COOPERATING TEACHER.....	124
<i>Developing Notions about Teaching Reading/Language Arts</i>	<i>127</i>
CONTENT KNOWLEDGE	127
SHAPING A PHILOSOPHY	130
DEVELOPING HER PRACTICE.....	132
THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER	135
<i>Summary of LANA'S Sources and Knowing</i>	<i>137</i>
PRESERVICE TEACHERS' AND EXPERT PANEL'S DESCRIPTIONS/INTERPRETATIONS OF VIDEO-CLIPS	138
<i>Similarities in Identification of Features</i>	<i>139</i>
<i>Similarities in Analysis</i>	<i>142</i>
<i>Differences in Weighing the Importance of Features</i>	<i>144</i>
<i>Differences in Emphasis Attributable to Orientation.....</i>	<i>146</i>
<i>Differences in How Notions Were Elaborated.....</i>	<i>149</i>
<i>Differences in the Depth of Analysis and Elaboration.....</i>	<i>150</i>
<i>Differences in Knowledge Sources.....</i>	<i>152</i>
CHAPTER V: FINDINGS, LIMITATIONS, DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS.....	155
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	156
<i>Sources of Knowledge.....</i>	<i>156</i>
EARLY EXPERIENCES.....	156
EDUCATION COURSE EXPERIENCES.....	158
FIELDWORK EXPERIENCES	159
INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS	162
UNDERUTILIZED SOURCE.....	163
<i>Preservice Teachers' and Expert Panel's Descriptions/Interpretations of Video-clips</i>	<i>164</i>
SUMMARY OF SIMILARITIES.....	164
SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES.....	166
LIMITATIONS.....	169
DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS.....	171
<i>The Potential for Multiple Sources in Teacher Education Program.</i>	<i>172</i>
<i>The Potential for Preservice Opportunities to Access and Inspect Assumptions.....</i>	<i>173</i>
<i>The Potential for More Variety in Preservice Fieldwork Opportunities.....</i>	<i>175</i>
<i>The Potential for Professional Development Opportunities to Fund New Sources.</i>	<i>178</i>
<i>The Potential for Participating in a Community of Learners.</i>	<i>180</i>
A FINAL WORD	183
APPENDICES	184
APPENDIX A VOLUNTEER PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE	185
APPENDIX B CLIP 1 TRANSCRIPT	187
APPENDIX C CLIP 2 TRANSCRIPT.....	195
APPENDIX D CLIP 3 TRANSCRIPT.....	201
APPENDIX E PART ONE OF INTRODUCTORY INTERVIEW	206
APPENDIX F PART-TWO OF INTRODUCTORY INTERVIEW (BEING-A-PRESERVICE-TEACHER INTERVIEW).....	207
APPENDIX G CLASSROOM DEMONSTRATION VIEWING INTERVIEW	208
APPENDIX H PRESERVICE TEACHER'S TEACHING INTERVIEW	210
APPENDIX I SUMMARY OF INTRODUCTORY INTERVIEW ANALYSIS.....	211
APPENDIX J EXAMPLE OF VIDEO-CLIP ANALYSIS.....	212
APPENDIX K SUMMARY OF DEBRIEFING INTERVIEW AFTER OBSERVATION OF TEACHING	213
APPENDIX L.....	214
SAMPLE OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN EXPERT PANEL AND THREE CASES IN IDENTIFICATION OF FEATURES OF VIDEO-CLIPS.....	214
REFERENCES	217

VITA 234

List of Tables

Table 3.1: Preservice Teachers' Biographical Information	49
--	----

List of Figures

Figure 3.2: Data Collection Plan.....	65
Figure 4.1: Differences in Depth of Elaboration	151

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

While the quality of the preparation of teachers has always been a concern of teacher educators, there is little doubt that the concern has grown into a current national issue (e.g., “Education Schools,” *The New York Times*, July 31, 2005). Both policy and rhetoric contend that teacher quality makes a significant difference in student achievement, and the term “teacher quality” is being used by politicians, policymakers, and researchers to emphasize teachers’ critical influence on how, what, and how much students learn (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005, p. 38).

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 (www.ed.gov/nclb) mandated that all schoolchildren must be taught by highly qualified teachers who receive high-quality professional development. The ensuing rush to define what makes for a highly qualified teacher placed the spotlight on teacher education programs. Barr, Watts-Taffe, and Yokota (2000) argued that the critical issues surrounding the preparation of teachers for the classroom have been heightened as a result of media attention and political debates.

In contentious times, public blame-casting often leads to negative stances, quick diagnoses, and unrealistic schedules for “fix-ups.” Criticism notwithstanding, teacher educators and researchers have been recently at work to ask what’s right about preservice teacher education and how will this knowledge enlighten reform (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Hoffman & Roller, 2001). For example, one initiative aimed toward investigating what makes for quality teacher preparation in the area of reading instruction is the International Reading Association’s formation in 1999 of the National Commission on Excellence in Elementary Teacher Preparation for Reading Instruction. The Commission was charged with the task of developing and executing a program of research to identify

the qualities of effective teacher preparation programs in reading. The Commission took on this task by developing and implementing three phases of study: a survey of current practices in teacher education programs across the United States; an investigation of the features of excellent reading teacher preparation programs; and an examination of the effects of preparation on the transition into teaching and on teaching practices through the first years of teaching. Similar to earlier surveys of national practice (e.g., Austin & Morrison, 1961; Morrison & Austin, 1977), the Commission identified features of excellent elementary teacher preparation programs in reading instruction (Hoffman et al., 2005).

Yet, many questions, worthy of future research, remain about how to recognize improvements in teacher education. Barr, Watts-Taffe, and Yokota (2000) identified particular issues, including the nature of preservice teachers' experiences, the nature and content of their practical experiences, and the ways in which they come to learn what it means to teach. Anders, Hoffman, and Duffy (2000) noted the promise of recent research that turns attention to how teachers learn, as well as how teacher educators promote that learning.

Statement of the Problem

Cochran-Smith and Zeichner (2005), co-chairs of AERA's Panel on Research and Teacher Education, lamented that the university-based researchers' perspectives tend to dominate inquiry in teacher education. Cochran-Smith and Zeichner argued that a need exists for research that probes the perspectives, questions, and voices of prospective teachers. Although some research into the impact of teacher preparation coursework and fieldwork has helped to uncover how beliefs and attitudes of teacher candidates affect their learning outcomes (e.g., Knowles, 1992; Zeichner & Gore, 1990), there is a need for

additional research that examines the specific influences of coursework and fieldwork on such outcomes as teachers' practices and knowledge growth.

Perhaps preservice teachers themselves can provide insights into the features of programs that seem immediately of value. Guilfoyle (1996) pointed toward the need for learning how neophyte teachers work through contradictory information they receive from multiple sources—coursework, fieldwork, and on-the-job experiences. One part of the answer, quite simply, might be to ask them. Even journalism methods have pointed toward the potential richness of response when preservice teachers serve as informants. For example, when *The New York Times* reporter Anemona Hartocollis asked Lehman College education students to talk about their best and worst experiences in a particular class as well as in their education program, these teachers were able to articulate their perceptions about what they have gained from their experiences in a teacher education program, what was left wanting, and what sources they drew upon to get answers to persisting questions (“Education Schools,” *The New York Times*, July 31, 2005).

Research aimed toward refining the content and practices of teacher education programs necessitates the inclusion of the participants' voices and perceptions.

Design of the Study

PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to investigate a sample of three preservice teachers' perceptions of their preparation and practices in learning to teach reading/language arts. The study used case methodology to build coherent representations of the preservice teachers' professional experiences they reported as useful in informing their learning to teach in elementary classrooms. The cases also describe the content of the remarks that three preservice teachers made and the sources of knowing that they reported drawing

upon when asked to view video-clips of classroom demonstrations of reading/language arts teaching, as well as how their remarks and sources compared with those of experienced teachers. Additionally, the cases detail the preservice teachers' reflections on their own practices and the sources of knowledge that they reported drawing upon when teaching reading/language arts. The study aims to contribute to the growing body of research that informs the design and implementation of more effective teacher education programs.

RATIONALE

This study is fueled by the notion that teachers are highly capable of discussing their conceptions about their practice, as well as the sources that feed their knowledge and action. Kaplan (2001) lamented that although researchers and teacher educators debate what abilities, skills, competencies, and stances need to be emphasized in a teacher education program, they do not often ask the students themselves to identify what they think is important to learn to become effective teachers. Butt (1984), Flanders (1983), and Olson (1984) argued that it is important to access the experiences that significantly influence what a teacher does or does not do, and the experiences that are used in decision-making. Structured conversations and interviews have been found to be effective means for tapping into what people know and think (Butt, 1984; Sparks-Langer, Simmons, Pasch, Colton, & Starko, 1990; Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1984). Therefore, this study will rely on the preservice teachers as primary informants on their learning.

Teacher expert knowledge is the second area that informs this study. Much of the research on expert knowledge sets up contrasts between experts and novices (e.g., Berliner, 1986; Borko, Bellamy, & Sanders, 1992). Such research typically identifies one or more of four characteristics that distinguishes experts from novices—knowledge base, knowledge organization, problem solving, and metacognitive skill. Yet, Carter (1990),

Clift (1989), and Munby and Russell (1994) warned that there is a risk that the distinctions drawn between experts and novices will become categorical and thereby minimize the complexity of what the expert appears to do with little effort. It is also possible that strict categories of “knowing” may fail to capture the complexities of what novice learners are working to understand.

Other researchers (Hammerness et al., 2005) have suggested that many studies describing what beginning teachers can and cannot do were conducted at a time when most teacher educational programs were less well organized and focused. If teacher educators draw only from this research, there is the possibility of underestimating the potential of new teachers. Those who have examined the kinds of teacher education that support teacher learning suggest that under the right circumstances and with particular kinds of learning experiences, new teachers can develop a more expert practice even as beginning practitioners (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Hammerness, Darling-Hammond, & Shulman 2002; Zeichner, 2002). With stronger, more purposeful preparation, new teachers might demonstrate more accomplished practice earlier than previously thought.

The third area that this study draws from is case-based learning. Cases (exemplars of practice with supporting documentation) are now widely used in teacher education in an effort to enrich the learning that comes from observation of classrooms; the practice is founded in the notion that learners benefit from discussions when they share common experiences (Stephens, Leavell, Fabris, Buford, & Hill, 1999).

A number of strengths have been offered for the inclusion of media-rich cases, as opposed to print forms, when learners encounter cases. Media-rich cases provide vicarious experiences with actual classroom settings, allowing preservice teachers and their instructors to analyze and reflect on the same teaching act from multiple perspectives and frameworks (Putnam & Borko, 2000; Spiro, Coulson, Feltovich, &

Anderson, 1988). Media-rich cases also allow for nonlinear and multiple viewings as well as for a richer set of materials to be considered (e.g., from teachers' journals, to students' notebooks, to students' work, to interviews between teachers and students), allowing users to consider multiple perspectives on an event simultaneously (Feltovich, Spiro, & Couson, 1997; Spiro et al., 1988). Much of the research on case-based learning in teacher education has focused on the use of cases in the company of others. That is, case-based learning is typically described as an instructional strategy introduced by teacher educators that includes viewing and discussing, as well as other class assignments in which students' perspectives are invited. Much less attention has been focused on the nature of preservice teachers' responses to viewing videocases when they are asked to do so independent of others' views. To prompt and concretize preservice teachers' perceptions of their preparation and practice for teaching reading/language arts, this study includes a simulation of case-based learning, a design that also permits the collection and comparison of the perceptions of more experienced teachers to the same cases.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

To describe preservice teachers' knowledge of teaching reading/language arts, I addressed the following questions in this study:

- 1) What do three preservice teachers report as useful experiences (e.g., models, readings, topics, etc.) in preparing them to teach reading/language arts?
- 2) What aspects of instruction do these three preservice teachers comment on when they watch video-clips of classroom demonstrations of reading/language arts teaching, and how do their remarks compare with those of experienced teachers' views about the same video-clips?

- 3) What sources of knowledge do these three preservice teachers report drawing upon when they observe video-clips of classroom demonstrations of reading/language arts teaching, and how do their ways of knowing compare with those reported by experienced teachers?
- 4) What sources of knowing do these three preservice teachers report drawing upon when they reflect on their own classroom experiences teaching reading/language arts during their student-teaching semester?

Procedures

To build three interpretive case studies (e.g., Merriam, 1988; Stake, 1995; Yin, 1994) of preservice teachers' perceptions of the value, content, and usefulness of their learning (specifically in the area of reading/language arts), as well as the sources they described as informing their practice, I carried out the procedures that follow.

SAMPLE SELECTION

Five participants were selected from two sections of a Language Arts Methods course, the last course in the participants' teacher preparation program at a large southwestern university. The sample was purposeful and one of convenience (Patton, 1990) in that I had been invited by the instructors teaching these sections of the Language Arts Methods course to investigate the students' understandings.

While all students in the sections of the fall 2005 course were told about the study and invited to participate, I attempted to select five students that had maximum variability (Patton, 1990) in terms of such demographics as gender, age, and ethnicity, as well as in terms of the grade level of their student-teaching assignment and previous teaching experiences. Data were collected for five participants, with the expectation that three

cases would comprise the final written report and that including two additional participants allowed for the possibility of attrition.

THE RESEARCHER

I am a 36-year-old Caucasian male who began my graduate program in 2001 with research interests in studying literacy learning in elementary classrooms. A few years into the program, I developed new interests while I served as a teaching assistant in one section of the Language Arts Methods course for preservice teachers. I observed the preservice teachers in tutoring, responded to their posted reading responses, answered their questions about teaching, taught specific content, and graded exams and papers. I also listened to their stories informally, those they told before and after class about their successes and struggles as they engaged in fieldwork and looked forward to making the transition from preservice to inservice teachers. My eavesdropping on what they were revealing about their personal and professional lives provided the seed of this study.

During the semester in which this study took place, however, I was not a teaching assistant. Those volunteers who participated in this study did not know me as a teaching assistant, but as a researcher only. Although I made visits to the sections of the methods course from which the participants were selected, I did so for observational purposes only, making notes of course content and student participation patterns. I did not in any way contribute to the grading or evaluation of student work, nor were the preservice teachers who volunteered and participated in this study ever identified to the course instructors.

DATA COLLECTION

As the researcher, I relied heavily on interviewing in order to access three preservice teachers' perceptions of their preparation and practice for teaching reading/language arts.

In the first week of the study, I conducted a two-part introductory interview with each participant. On two separate occasions, each participant provided me with background information (e.g., experiences in grade school, college experiences) and with information about being a teacher education student (e.g., perceived strengths of the program).

During the next three weeks of the data collection phase of the study, participants met individually with me to view video-clip demonstrations of classroom teaching of reading/language arts (e.g., journal writing; readers' workshop). These clips served as stimuli to prompt preservice teachers to reveal on their knowledge of teaching reading/language arts and their ways of knowing. I then interviewed the participant immediately following each viewing. Each interviewee was asked to participate in three viewing sessions. Experienced teachers, referred to as the expert panel, also viewed these same demonstrations and those data were used for comparison with the responses and sources of the preservice teachers in this study.

During these last two weeks of data collecting, I observed the preservice teachers' teaching on two occasions and conducted follow-up interviews to investigate their practice of teaching reading/language arts and their knowledge sources.

Field notes were taken throughout the semester when I visited the Language Arts Methods course sections that the participants attended. Relevant artifacts—such as online responses to text readings or in-class journal writing—were repeatedly requested

but were infrequently delivered by the preservice teacher participants, and therefore did not serve as a significant data source.

DATA ANALYSIS

The nature of this research study asked me to step inside to seek the stories that revealed the ways in which the participants were interacting with the settings, and to dig deep into those stories—looking for how they supported one another and how they stood apart—in order to put them together in a way that provides a fuller picture of the phenomenon.

Data analysis was on-going (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and involved coding and recoding categories (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) from the participants' talk in the various kinds of interviews. Analyses from the background interviews as well as analyses from field notes prompted lines of inquiry in the interviews conducted in the later phases of data collection.

After thorough examination across all sources of data, I began to consider each participant's data set on an individual basis. Because case studies “use prose and literary techniques to describe, elicit images, and analyze situations” and “present documentation of events, quotes, samples, and artifacts” (Wilson, 1979, p. 448), I worked to pull out those data bytes that exemplified the essence of each participant. I produced full-length summaries by pulling out the most relevant information from the aggregated data, those from which we can “learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research” (Patton, 1990, p. 169). The final written report features the three cases that are the most interesting knowers and allows for a compelling, vicarious experience on the part of the reader (Merriam, 1998). In addition, my findings across cases were used to derive study implications and to suggest future research.

Significance of the Study

In their final semester of teacher preparation study, the full responsibility of a classroom is gradually handed over to the students, and the imminent transition from university teacher education student to certified classroom teacher is upon them. This juncture is an important point for asking preservice teachers to report on the experiences—both positive and negative, helpful and not so helpful, eye-opening and mundane—that have influenced them to be the teachers they are and the teachers they aim to become. It seems that teacher education programs need to hear about preservice teachers' experiences and knowledge sources from those who are in the throes of the experience.

The insights gained from this study can assist teacher educators in the development of more effective programs by describing the kinds of experiences that the preservice teachers' reported as important to their learning about and practice in teaching reading/language arts, as well as the ways in which the preservice teachers perceived those experiences as feeding their understandings.

Further, some research (Cox et al., 1998; Elbaz, 1981; Schon, 1983) suggests that when preservice teachers are asked to reveal on their knowledge and experiences, the act of doing so is beneficial. That is, the act of reflecting on one's practice and the effort to articulate elements of one's practice benefit the preservice teachers as well.

Operational Definitions

A list of terms and definitions that are important to this study is included below. Ordered alphabetically, these terms are defined in specific ways that may aid in clarifying how they are used in this particular study.

Cooperating teachers: Certified classroom teachers who have invited preservice teachers to spend a specified amount of time participating in the teaching of their classes.

Coursework/Programs: Specific university-based classes, often arranged in a particular sequence, that are designed to provide exposure to preservice teachers to specific curricular and pedagogical content. (See also Methods course, below.)

Fieldwork or field-based assignments: Assignments in which preservice teachers are allowed and encouraged to implement the teaching practices they have learned through their coursework.

Methods course: A course in a particular content area designed to introduce specific strategies to preservice teachers.

Preservice teachers: Undergraduate university students who have been admitted to the teacher education program and are enrolled in teacher education classes, as well as assigned to internships and student-teaching.

Supervising teacher: University faculty or staff in the College of Education assigned to observe and support the preservice teachers' practice during the student-teaching semester.

Teacher educators: University faculty in the College of Education who are currently teaching preservice teachers.

CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The primary focus of this study is to build three cases of preservice teachers' perceptions of their preparation and practices for teaching reading/language arts. This review of literature discusses three critical areas that support this study. To begin, I examine the research that has positioned preservice teachers as informants of their own learning, explore the reasons why asking preservice teachers to serve as informants can benefit their learning, and identify the methods that have been used to enable teachers to reveal on their own knowledge. Then I define teacher expert knowledge and discuss research that has contributed to our understanding of and support of novice teachers' progression toward becoming expert teachers. To end this section, I explore case-based learning and the ways in which cases have been incorporated into teacher education coursework, as well as the effects that case-based learning has had on preservice teachers' learning.

Teachers as Revealers of Their Knowing

This study is fueled by the notion that teachers are highly capable of discussing their conceptions about teaching and learning and their practice, as well as the sources that feed that knowledge and action.

TOWARD VALUING TEACHERS AS INFORMANTS OF THEIR LEARNING.

Although researchers and teacher educators debate what abilities, skills, competencies, and stances need to be emphasized in a teacher education program, they do not often ask the students themselves to identify what they think is important to learn to become effective teachers (Kaplan, 2001). Olson (1984) said that we need to watch

teachers teach and, like historians, we need also to consult them as we speculate on what their actions mean within the frameworks which give their actions meaning; we need to talk to teachers in order to understand them; to test our ideas about them against our own.

Kaplan (2001) advocates consulting preservice teachers about their learning at all stages of their teacher education program, because doing so accomplishes two things: (1) It encourages them to become reflective about all aspects of their development as teachers, and (2) it helps develop autonomy as they continue to become more responsible for their own learning. Flanders (1983) and Butt (1984) acknowledged that only in gaining information directly from the person is there the possibility for accessing what significantly influences what a teacher does or does not do, and determining how those thoughts came to be, are understood, and are used in decision-making. Through examining the transformational quality of experiences in one's personal and professional lives can we apprehend a teacher's formation or development in an educative as well as a training sense.

Butt (1984) noted that educational scholarship had suffered because, up until his time of writing in the 1980s, educational inquiry was seldom based on "classroom reality" (p. 96). That is, there was a "minimal dialogue between teachers (as they perceive their professional lives) and scholars of education—not only because of the nature of the relationship of outsiders to insiders, but also because of the lack of an approach to inquiry that effectively grasped and represented what one might call the teacher's voice [*emphasis his*]" (p. 96). It is through listening to the teacher's voice that we might learn the most about preservice teachers' preparation and practices.

EVIDENCE ABOUT TEACHERS AS INFORMANTS. Despite such advocacy for turning to the voices of those enrolled in teacher education programs, some dissention in the field exists. For instance, Calderhead (1989) claimed that student teachers' reflective

talk is superficial and that they lack a language for talking about teaching and are reluctant to criticize themselves. Such an assessment suggests that preservice teachers as informants hold limitations in terms of what they are able to contribute to the ongoing conversation about teacher education reform. But Ellwein, Graue, and Comfort (1990) found that preservice teachers' talk was not as shortsighted as Calderhead suggested. In their study, Ellwein, Graue, and Comfort solicited oral descriptions of, and explanations for, successful and unsuccessful episodes of lessons delivered as part of student teachers' field experience. Participants (n=47) were interviewed once in which they described their assessments of one successful and one unsuccessful lesson delivered in their student-teaching semester. The researchers found the participants to be effective informants of their practice. Specifically, the participants' talk revealed that they held multidimensional conceptions of instruction and were able to attribute successful and unsuccessful lessons to a number of elements (e.g., poor planning).

EFFECTS OF REVEALING AS INFORMANTS. Research suggests that when preservice teachers are asked to reveal on their knowledge and experiences, the act of doing so is beneficial beyond simply the researcher's interests. That is, the act of reflecting on one's practice and the effort to articulate elements of one's practice have benefits for the preservice teachers as well. Elbaz (1981; see also Connelly & Clandinin, 1990) pursued the elaboration of the stories of her teacher informant in order to investigate what past and present experiences significantly influenced current thought and action. Specifically, by using interviews to get her participant—Sarah—to talk about her work—that of being a high school English teacher, Elbaz sought to attain an understanding of Sarah's knowledge from her own point of view. In doing so, Elbaz reported that the teacher, as an informant, was able to develop her knowledge through reflection and talk, by “giving form to [her] knowledge” (p. 170).

Huber and Mandl (1984) noted that when teachers are interviewed following a classroom observation and asked to discuss the performance, the teachers are revealing the subjective meaning of the context of the action, rather than disclosing the actual, objective reasons of the action. Furthermore, the fast succession of imperative decision-making makes it hard for the teacher to register all the effects of his or her actions, which can have implications for teachers' abilities to learn from their experiences. Thus, the researchers argued that the main goal of teacher training is to enhance the practitioner's ability to learn from experience. They explained that asking preservice teachers to recall and relate their actions (e.g., construct explanations and rationales) has distinct possibilities for improving future actions.

Schon (1983), in *The Reflective Practitioner*, says that the challenge for understanding and improving professional practice is to make articulate what is inarticulately embodied in action itself. Practice itself, Schon asserted, is knowledgeable. More is done in our practice than we can say. For Schon, to educate the professional is to engage him or her in making the tacit articulate and to subject that to criticism. We need a critical reflection of the meaning of one's actions in their context.

Thus, asking preservice teachers to reveal their conceptions of teaching and learning and their sources of knowing means not only that they will provide information that the researcher finds important, but that the act of talking about their practice can be beneficial to them and should be a worthy aim of teacher education programs.

METHODS FOR REVEALING. Butt (1984) said that simply observing an event or phenomenon is not sufficient because one needs to go further to understand the relationship among the events that came before that informed this particular event, as well as the events soon to follow and the implications on other events to happen further in the future. Meaning, motive, beliefs, and intentions, thus, need to be pursued by both

researcher and teacher. This process permits the researcher to have access to the teacher's thoughts and actions, as well as to unexamined or habitual aspects of the teacher's life.

While researchers have drawn on several methodologies in order to gain such access, some methodologies are less useful or are too narrow to be used alone in the development of cases of preservice teachers' experiences. The use of questionnaires and surveys, for one, is less useful in my study. Weinstein (1989) used questionnaires to tap into preservice teachers' perceptions about learning, and Kaplan (2001) used survey methods to draw out preservice teachers' motivations for learning. Their instruments, though, allowed for broader evaluative findings than the kind of knowing that I am seeking. In fact, Weinstein stated that one of the limitations of the study was that while a larger sample was possible than might have been the case with other research methods, such as interviewing, the responses were often ambiguous and required coders to make inferences that could have been misunderstandings or distortions. Thus, questionnaires and surveys are not instruments that are useful for my in-depth inquiry into preservice teachers' notions about teaching reading/language arts.

Examination of documents/artifacts is another method. Borko, Lalik, and Tomchin (1987) examined the journal entries of 26 elementary student teachers in order to uncover their conceptions of teaching. The researchers found that stronger and weaker student teachers wrote similarly about successful lessons, instructional practices, classroom management, and student involvement. Additionally, Staton (1988), Roe and Stallman (1994), Bean and Zulich (1989), and Garmon (2001) have looked at the writing of student teachers in *dialogue journals* (private written conversations with the teacher over an extended time) and found that the journals facilitate student learning of course materials and prompt self-reflection and self-understanding. Such findings indicate that

the writings of student teachers in journal formats could be, if available, sources of data for my study, but these data alone are not sufficient for drawing portraits of the preservice teachers.

THE USE OF INTERVIEWS IN PRESERVICE TEACHER STUDIES. A more effective research method than broad surveying or examinations of teacher writing is person-to-person interviewing, and I argue that interviewing is a clearly supportable way of tapping into what people know and think. Tabachnick and Zeichner (1984) sought out the teacher perspectives (e.g., purposes, goals, conceptions of students and curriculum) of preservice elementary teachers during their final semester of student-teaching. The researchers interviewed the thirteen participants five times and observed teaching at least three times. In reporting their findings, the authors profiled four of the participants, detailing their responses to eighteen “dilemmas of teaching” (p. 32), which included knowledge and curriculum, teacher-pupil relationships, the teacher’s role, and issues related to student diversity.

In another study, Sparks-Langer, Simmons, Pasch, Colton, and Starko (1990) interviewed preservice teachers (n=24) at a certain point during their student-teaching semester and asked them to identify a successful teaching event, their reasons for seeing it as successful, and the conditions that influenced the outcome. At a later point, similar interviews were conducted, this time eliciting information about a less successful teaching event. Evidence showed that the participants were able to draw from theoretical principles presented in course topics and discussions to illuminate their practice and their descriptions of teaching events. Yet, the researchers also found that students were concerned with the more technical aspects of their teaching, which aligned with Fuller’s (1969) theory about beginning teachers’ concern with survival and managing the elements of teaching early on in their experiences. The researchers fault some of their

interview questions (e.g., what are other issues or concerns you found yourself thinking about?) as not adequately eliciting critical perspectives, such as moral and social interpretations.

Dooley (1998) held four interviews with one preservice teacher, Steve, during the field component of a Language Arts Methods course. All interviews occurred after the researcher's observations of his teaching. The researcher sought to uncover the influence of his beliefs and assumptions about teaching and learning on his instructional practice, and therefore the preservice teacher was asked to construct and reconstruct metaphors about teaching and learning in those interviews to help uncover the difficulties he was experiencing in his classroom. Through interviews, the teacher educator/researcher and preservice teacher examined the roots of his metaphors as originating from prior beliefs, theory, practice, and other sources.

Grossman et al. (2000) used interviews, and interviews following observations of teaching, in a longitudinal study of ten beginning teachers from their last year of preservice education into their first two years of inservice teaching. At least five interviews per year with each participant were conducted as well as five observations of teaching per year. The school culture, climate, and curriculum mandates greatly impacted the teachers' developing understandings and practices in their first year. Pedagogical tools developed during their preservice teacher education were more evident in the teachers' second year of inservice teaching.

Boyd, Boll, Brawner, and Villaume (1998) used interviews along with other data sources such as journal entries and questionnaires to study preservice teachers' journeys toward becoming reflective professionals within the context of a reading/language arts methods course and field experience. The findings suggest that questioning as a way of learning, constructing a coherent philosophy, and commitment to ongoing inquiry were

struggles that promoted reflective professional behavior. Preservice teachers reported benefiting from the experience of being placed in inservice teachers' classrooms in which the language and literacy practices that were exhibited were explored in the university classroom as well. The data indicated that the preservice teachers still needed and valued the university culture to provide the time to explore their questions and the opportunity to try out solutions in the field, and that simultaneously conducting the university class and the field experience was key.

Such studies support interviewing as an effective methodological means for allowing preservice teachers to reveal their perceptions of their preparation and practices for teaching reading/language arts.

LANGUAGE AS THE VEHICLE FOR REVEALING. At the core of this study is the belief that through language, individuals enact and present themselves and their knowledge to each other (Goffman, 1959). Because humans rely on language to interpret and navigate the world and construct themselves inside the world, language both shapes people and is shaped by them. Cazden (1988) stated that language is social practice that bridges the cognitive with the social and the individual with the cultural. Language in this study, then, is the *means* through which the preservice teachers reveal their knowledge, their perspectives, and their interpretations of their preparation and practices in teaching reading/language. Because language is not completely transparent and even when presumed that a speaker's words more or less directly reflect his or her thoughts on a subject (Schiffrin, 1994), it becomes incumbent upon the interviewer/researcher to attempt to uncover the speaker's meaning systems and the embedded perspectives concerning context, knowledge and practice upon which those meaning systems rely (Olsen, 2006).

In sum, a study that seeks to report preservice teachers' perceptions about their preparation and practices for teaching reading/language arts must place a premium on interviewing those who are in the dynamic, continuous, and situated acts of learning to teach. The studies reviewed here value person-to-person interviews and illustrate how observations of preservice teachers' teaching can serve as important data sources as well. These studies' methods informed my efforts to construct a research design that would best fuel my pursuit to build cases of preservice teachers' learning to teach reading/language arts.

TEACHER EXPERT KNOWLEDGE

Munby, Russell, and Martin (2001) have pointed out that the body of research called novice-expert has several rubrics, including craft knowledge (Grimmett & MacKinnon, 1992), professional knowledge (Bromme & Tillema, 1995), pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1986), and knowledge-in-action (Schon, 1983). Much of the research in this body has attempted to take on the "murky contexts" (Munby, Russell, & Martin, 2001, p. 889) in order to tease out the contents of expert knowledge in general enough terms so that they are open to assessment and yet are not so general that meaning is lost.

TOWARD A MODEL OF EXPERTISE. The development of expertise is frequently described in terms of a five-stage model developed by Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1986) and adapted by Berliner (1986). The stages are novice, advanced beginner, competent, proficient, and expert. In the first stage, the novice is learning practical knowledge (e.g., what constitutes higher-order questions) and context-free rules (e.g., praise students for original thinking). The behavior of a novice is usually rational, relatively inflexible, and tends to conform to whatever rules and procedures they were told to follow. The novice

is gaining experience and values real-world experiences over verbal information. Student teachers and first-year teachers are usually considered novices (Berliner, 1986).

In the advanced beginner stage, experience melds with verbal information. Practical knowledge [and case knowledge, (i.e., ideas about what to do in a particular teaching situation), a part of practical knowledge], is built up during this second stage. Conditional and strategic knowledge is also built up in this stage, as the advanced beginners learn when to ignore or break rules, for example, because certain contexts merit a certain action to be taken. Many second- and third-year teachers are thought to operate within this stage.

The third stage, competent stage, is marked by an ability to have rational goals, choose sensible means for meeting goals, and make sensible instructional and curricular decisions (e.g., when to stay with a topic and when to move on). Because those at this stage tend to feel more control over the events around them and more freedom to follow their own plans, they feel more responsibility for outcomes. Still, these teachers are not yet very fast, fluid, or flexible in their behavior; this occurs in the fourth stage.

In the proficient stage, those with over five years of teaching and who are able to reach this stage, teachers become more intuitive and have a holistic way of viewing the situations they encounter. Experience allows them to see similarities among events that novices will fail to notice. These patterns of recognition allow those in the proficient stage to predict more precisely how classroom events will transpire. Nonetheless, in the proficient stage, the teacher is still likely to be analytic and deliberate in deciding what to do.

In the last stage, the expert stage that only a few teachers reach, teachers are not analytical and deliberate about responses because their grasps are highly intuitive and marked by fluid performance. Schon (1983) called this knowledge-in-action, and the

expert acts virtually effortlessly without consciously choosing what to attend to and what to do.

This five-stage model, however, has been criticized because little explanation is offered about how a learner advances in the stages (Berliner, 2001). Furthermore, stage theories that have guided teacher education decisions in the past have been interpreted in a linear fashion, suggesting that development is fairly fixed, hierarchical, and sequential (Richardson & Placier, 2001). Such criticism has led expert-novice researchers to attempt to uncover the conditions that foster expert development. Ericsson and Charness (1997), for instance, propose that the acquisition of expertise results from deliberate practice, through great effort, and through the motivation to improve performance. Hammerness, Darling-Hammond, and Shulman (2002) attribute teachers' abilities to reach high levels of competence to metacognitive elements, such as critiquing their practice, and they suggest that these skills can be developed in teacher education in order to help teachers reach these levels of competence more quickly.

Other researchers have emphasized the need to make explicit in expert teachers' performances what has been tacit and implicit; otherwise, little will be known about the advancement through the stages toward expertise. But Carter (1990) and Leinhardt (1990) have noted the great difficulty in making concrete that which is, often for the experts themselves, difficult to articulate. Because expert practitioners often suffer the lack of ability to express the basis for their expertise and skill, novices are left somewhat in the dark even when they are working alongside one another. Schon (1983) says that often "we cannot say what it is we know" (p. 49). Schon contends that because our knowing is implicit and tacit and in the patterns of our action, knowing is *in* our action. McIntyre and Hagger (1993) concur, stating that because teachers' expertise is so embedded in their practice, it is not necessarily readily articulated, and teachers' talk

about their practice fails to capture the complexities and subtleties of their practice. Schon's (1983) work on reflective thinking suggests that practitioners' learning and development are enhanced when they are taught to reflect on their practice, because only when one's practice is open to critical reflection can transformation occur. Such a view fits with the position taken by Ericsson and Charness (1994) that experts develop as a result of restructuring their performance and acquiring new methods and skills.

Still others have focused on why so few teachers reach the advanced level of expertise. One explanation has been that growth toward expertise is hindered by working in isolation, which is so often the case in teaching. Glaser (1997) proposed an alternate theory to the five-stage model that has only three stages—externally supported, transitional, and self-regulatory. In the externally supported stage, novices are presented with structured environments by experts who help the novices acquire an initial set of skills. In the transitional stage, scaffolding is decreased, and self-monitoring and self-regulation techniques are learned. Glaser's first two stages were influenced by Vygotskian (1978) psychology and the concepts of social learning and communities of practice. In the last stage, the self-regulatory stage, the developing expert has more control of his or her own learning environments, practicing and getting feedback as needed. Glaser's model might allow for more interaction between experts and novices and thereby work to eliminate some of the isolationism involved in teaching—especially since isolationism has been used to explain why many teachers fail to reach the later stages of expertise. Berliner (1986), however, criticized Glaser's theory because it focuses on changing agency during learning and therefore might be more appropriate to learning in an area where one performs as an individual (e.g., ice skating) rather than other kinds of learning where social constraints on behavior are stronger, as in learning to teach. Nonetheless, Berliner says that even though studying teaching has variables that

can be hard to discriminate, there are identifiable behaviors and modes of thinking that teachers acquire progressively over an extended period of time. By focusing on these, we can expand our understanding of what makes experts stand apart from novices. Hamachek (1999) suggests that there is no well-defined standard that all experts meet and that non-experts do not meet, but that experts reflect a “family resemblance” (p. 190) and that these central tendencies are worthy of note. These are explored in the next section.

TOWARD BECOMING EXPERTS. Much of the research on expert knowledge sets up contrasts between novices and experts (e.g., Berliner, 1986; Borko, Bellamy, & Sanders, 1992). These studies draw from the “expert approach” in cognitive psychology (e.g., Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1993) that focused on teachers’ thinking processes, structures or schemata of knowledge, and problem solving. Berliner and his colleagues (e.g., Berliner, 1994; Carter, Sabers, Cushing, Pinnegar, & Berliner, 1987; Carter, Cushing, Sabers, Stein, & Berliner, 1988; Clarridge & Berliner, 1991; Sabers, Cushing, & Berliner, 1991) have identified many propositions about expert and novice teachers:

Expert teachers often develop automaticity and routinization for the repetitive operations that are needed to accomplish their goals.

Expert teachers are more sensitive to the task demands and social situation when solving pedagogical problems.

Expert teachers represent problems in qualitatively different ways than do novices.

Expert teachers have fast and accurate pattern recognition capabilities, while novices cannot always make sense of what they experience.

Expert teachers perceive meaningful patterns in the domain in which they are experienced.

Expert teachers, although they may begin to solve problems slower, bring richer and more personal sources of information to bear on the problems they face.

Other research about experts and novices typically identifies one or more of four characteristics that distinguishes experts from novices. These are explored in the following sections.

KNOWLEDGE BASE. The extensiveness of an expert's knowledge is often noted as a fundamental difference between experts and novices. In teaching, certainly teachers need considerable knowledge in order to answer a wide range of questions that arise from the problems that students confront. But effective teachers possess much more than extensive content knowledge. Shulman (1986) suggested the term *pedagogical content knowledge* to describe the skills and strategies that the master of a domain draws on to help develop neophytes. Without pedagogical knowledge, experts would suffer from what Nathan, Koedinger, and Alibali (2001) called the *expert blind spot*, the notion that experts are often blind to the fact that much of their domain knowledge has moved from conscious to unconscious and is therefore easily skipped over in instruction. Therefore, differences in depths of knowledge about one's subject matter might separate novices from experts, but many other conditions abound, such as the organization of knowledge, problem-solving ability, and metacognitive ability.

ORGANIZATION OF KNOWLEDGE. More than rich knowledge sources, experts' knowledge seems to be highly organized. Experts' knowledge is connected and organized around important ideas in their disciplines, rather than being long lists of disconnected facts. Ericcson and Charness (1997) claim that experts, through spending years learning the material they teach, have efficiently organized the knowledge they

access, doing so easily if not automatically. Bransford, Brown, and Cocking (1999) concur, finding that it is the organization of knowledge that helps experts know when, why, and how aspects of their vast repertoire of knowledge and skills are relevant in a given situation. Weinert, Schrader, and Helmke's (1990) claim that underlying pedagogical knowledge acts as schema in order to reduce the teacher's cognitive load, making teaching more efficient and less effortful. The organization of knowledge also influences other processing skills. As noted earlier, Berliner (1986) emphasized how extraordinarily fast and accurate an expert's pattern recognition capabilities are. Because sense is made almost instantaneously, experts are afforded opportunities to determine where difficulties might occur. Novices are not as good at recognizing such patterns, and even when they do so, little inferences about the situation are made.

PROBLEM SOLVING. Their approaches to problem solving further separate novices and experts. Sternberg and Horvath (1995) said that the knowledge brought to bear in problem solving is a critical distinction. Experts were found to be more insightful and to devise more creative solutions because they were able to selectively encode, combine, and compare information. Berliner (1986) noted that experts are apt to take more time in studying a problem before acting, and that novices' problem-solving ability is limited by their narrow perception of events. In de Groot's (1965) now-classic study of expertise in chess, he found that experts start problem solving at a different, higher place than novices, meaning that experts notice features of problems and situations that escape the attention of novices.

METACOGNITIVE SKILL. Metacognitive abilities have been found to be more pronounced in experts. Leinhardt and Greeno (1986) and Housner and Griffey (1985) found, in experts, skill in planning and using time sensibly. Leinhardt and Greeno noted that expert teachers often have elaborated time tables sketched out in their minds, such as

ideas about how long it will take students to obtain certain skills and then be ready to move on to other content. Housner and Griffey found that expert teachers often anticipated derailments and were more flexible and better able to generate contingency plans quickly. Furthermore, Erickson (1986), focusing on how teachers observe and make sense of what happens in their classrooms, found that expert teachers note specific details in relation to others and attended most to situations and events that called for some decision and action; novice teachers, on the other hand, focused mostly on keeping order, and fine details of subject matter instruction took second place. Such findings corroborate those of Fuller (1969) who said that novice teachers are preoccupied with matters of self (e.g., one's ability to control the room) before they are able to deal simultaneously with curriculum, teaching strategies, and assessing student learning.

TOWARD NARROWING THE GAP BETWEEN NOVICE AND EXPERT. Beyond merely identifying the ways in which experts and novices differ, some research leads to assertions about how the gap between novice and expert might be narrowed. For example, Berliner (1994), in addition to those propositions previously discussed, makes special note of one more proposition that has been well-supported in studies of teaching: Expertise is specific to a domain, and to particular contexts in domains, and is developed over hundreds and thousands of hours. An expert pedagogue will have had extensive classroom experience: at least 15,000 hours in classrooms as students, perhaps 1,000 hours as a student teacher or classroom aide, and a minimum of 7,000 hours in classrooms as a teacher. However, studies of expertise in other areas, such as in sports (e.g., Starkes, Deakin, Allard, Hodges, & Hayes, 1996), suggest that good coaching is a more important variable in development of expertise than is practice. Such a finding has implications for learning to teach, since often teachers get no practice after student-teaching and often complete their jobs without much coaching or mentoring. Berliner

posited that perhaps teachers could move through the stages toward expertise more quickly if a strong coaching element and deliberate practice were offered.

Bereiter and Scardamalia (1993) seem to concur, suggesting that the scientific community could serve as a model in that the scientific community is an example of a working environment that requires its experts (i.e., researchers) to engage in progressive problem-solving in a continuous effort to build deeper understanding of one's domain. In Bereiter and Scardamalia's conception, the classroom would function as a knowledge-building community, and since members of a knowledge-building community share their knowledge and support one another in knowledge construction, a collective knowledge base is built. In order to produce experts, schools need a supportive, progressive, knowledge-building discourse. More recent research by Joyce and Showers (2002) noted that skilled coaching in peer support groups allowed teachers to explore, develop, strengthen, and refine teaching skills together. This collegial nature of the process appears to stimulate reflection and greater skill development.

TOWARD THE FUTURE OF STUDYING EXPERTS. The continually growing body of research on novices and experts has advanced several cautions. Carter (1990), Clift (1989), and Munby and Russell (1994) warn that there is a risk that the distinctions that are drawn between experts and novices will become categorical and thereby minimize the complexity of what experts appear to do with little effort. Kagan (1990) says that generalizing from a few can become a problem if certain characteristics of experts' thinking become criteria from judging the effectiveness of teachers. Additionally, Leinhardt (1993) reiterates criticism noted earlier that identifying experts' behavior does not actually help much in knowing how someone advances to the expert level. And copying expertise can lead to "an inappropriate conservatism and a lack of innovation" (p. 44).

But other researchers suggest that many studies describing what beginning teachers can and cannot do were conducted at a time when most teacher educational programs were fairly weak interventions (Hammerness et al., 2005). There is danger, then, in underestimating the potential of new teachers. Recent studies that examined the kinds of teacher education that support teacher learning suggest that, under the right circumstances and with particular kinds of learning experiences, new teachers can develop a more expert practice even as beginning practitioners (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Hammerness, Darling-Hammond, & Shulman, 2002; Zeichner, 2002). With stronger, more purposeful preparation, research suggests that new teachers can demonstrate more accomplished practice earlier than previously thought.

TOWARD BECOMING EXPERTS IN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS. Berliner (1986) pointed out that there are many reasons to study experts, one being that they sometimes provide exemplary performance from which we can learn. Experts can, more than most teachers, provide us with the cases—the richly detailed descriptions of instructional events—that should form a part of a teacher education program. Shulman (1986) argued that beginning teachers need such cases to develop their understanding of pedagogy. Grossman (1995) identified the growing interest in the practices of experienced teachers when she explained:

While teachers can acquire knowledge from a wide variety of sources, they also create new knowledge within the crucible of the classroom. Because teaching has lacked a method for capturing and recording such knowledge, both researchers and practitioners have turned their attention to documenting the wisdom of practice of experienced teachers. (p. 22)

Beyond the “wisdom of practice” of experienced teachers is the call for the wisdom of practice of contemporary teacher education programs that have been identified as highly effective. In fact, one of the tasks assigned to the National Commission on

Excellence in Elementary Teacher Preparation for Reading Instruction was to identify the common characteristics of excellent reading teacher preparation programs (Hoffman & Roller, 2001). The Commission identified eight areas:

content (teacher educators provide a comprehensive curriculum to build a knowledge base of prospective teachers),

apprenticeships (teacher educators allow opportunities to see models of effective teaching and student learning),

visions (teacher educators center their program around a vision of literacy, quality teaching, and quality teacher education),

resources and mission (teacher education programs draw upon multiple resources [intellectual, financial, and professional] to support the mission of quality teacher preparation),

personalized teaching (teacher educators value diversity and are prepared to offer their students with responsive teaching and an adapted curriculum),

autonomy (teacher educators are active in adapting and negotiating with their institutions so that students receive the best preparation possible),

community (teacher educators work to create active learning communities that include faculty, students, and mentor teachers), and

assessment (teacher educators continually assess their students, their

program, their graduates, and themselves to guide instructional decision-making and program development).

Other research efforts have focused on how teacher education programs are making differences in classrooms; specifically, teachers who are certified and receive training in subject-matter and pedagogy are more successful in terms of obtaining student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Hoffman & Pearson, 2000), and teachers who received more training in methods and pedagogy drew upon their preservice teaching experiences more and in varied ways during their first three years of teaching (Maloch et al., 2003).

Such incurring and compelling evidence underscores the need to examine teachers' abilities to learn in and from practice, whether novice or expert. Berliner's (1986) five-stage model seems too restrictive a way for conceptualizing the novice-to-expert continuum, mostly because it suggests that novices develop along the same path toward expertise, regardless of their intervening experiences. The research on qualities and characteristics of experts helps to inform teacher educators about the instructional practices and experiences that aid in a novice teacher's development; however, extant literature on the subject has emphasized how experts are different from novices rather than searching for the ways that they are alike and then building on those observations to further narrow the gap. Thus, this study seeks an inquiry into what novices and experts report about their knowledge and sources when given the opportunity to discuss their practice as a result of being prompted to view others' teaching. This study seeks to advance the notion that novices' and experts' conceptions of teaching and learning have the potential to inform teacher education practices and quite possibly contribute to the acceleration of the novice teacher becoming an expert one.

DRAWING ON LEARNING FROM CASE-BASED INSTRUCTION IN PRESERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION

The use of videotaped segments of classroom demonstrations that were incorporated into this study of preservice teachers' preparation and practices for teaching language arts is supported by the evidence drawn from case-based theory and research.

THE NEED FOR CASES. Traditionally teacher education programs provide preservice teachers with a number of opportunities to observe K-12 classrooms before they begin their student-teaching assignment. These observations can benefit the budding teachers, but the preservice teachers' ability to critically analyze what they have seen has been questioned. That is, often the preservice teachers go into the field alone and then report back what they have seen for whole-class discussions. The evidence that is utilized in the discussions is limited to the preservice teacher's description and perspective of the experience (Stephens, Leavell, Fabris, Buford, & Hill, 1999). In an effort to enrich the learning that can happen from observation of classrooms, and operating with the notion that learners benefit from discussions when they share common experiences, teacher educators now use cases as an instructional practice in teacher training.

In 1986, both the Carnegie Commission and the Holmes Group advocated the use of a case-based approach in an effort to improve teacher education, and the use of case studies or case analysis began to appear more prominently in teacher education courses. Case-based learning had previously been successfully used in several professional schools, such as medicine, law, and business, with goals related to self-directed learning, content knowledge, and problem solving (Christensen, Garvin, & Sweet, 1991; Savery & Duffy, 2001).

CASE-BASED LEARNING DEFINED. In teacher education, a case is usually defined as a problem-based account of a dilemma faced in a classroom situation (Shulman, 1992). Case-based instruction has been defined as an active-learning pedagogy designed for problem analysis and problem-solving in which a variety of viewpoints are shared and potential outcomes are formulated (Cranston-Gingrass, Raines, Paul, Epanchin, & Roselli, 1996). Because students are engaged in learning through analysis and guided discussions of context-rich problem sets (Merseth, 1996), they have an opportunity to apply theoretical principles of pedagogy to real-life cases (Harrington, 1995). Group case analyses provide a unique opportunity to collectively examine classroom dilemmas and unfamiliar situations seldom available to students during isolated, individualized student observation and/or student-teaching experiences.

THEORIES THAT UNDERGIRD CASE-BASED LEARNING. Case-based learning is informed by situation cognition theory, cognitive flexibility, and generative knowledge theory. Situation cognition argues that knowledge is situated and therefore cannot be separated from the context, activity, or culture in which it is developed and used (Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989). Greeno, Smith, & Moore (1993) suggested that if we learn knowledge in situations that are similar to the places in which that knowledge will be used, we are more likely to transfer the knowledge into practice. While field-based experiences are valuable to preservice teachers, these experiences, often completed alone, are limited to an individual teacher's insights and abilities to draw connections between theory and practice. Case-based learning, instead, presents authentic activities in university classrooms (Putnam & Borko, 2000), thereby allowing learners to act as constructors of their own knowledge (Harrington, 1995) in a context which is similar to the context in which they would apply that knowledge (Savery & Duffy, 2001).

Cognitive flexibility theory is defined as the ability to represent knowledge from different conceptual and case perspectives and to tailor that knowledge to the needs of problem-solving situations encountered later (Spiro, Feltovich, Jacobson, & Coulson, 1992). That is, the way that students are taught has a significant influence on the type of cognitive structures they create and store, ultimately affecting how flexible they will be when using that knowledge later. Cognitive flexibility mandates a flexible teaching environment and flexible instructional methods. Instruction must avoid oversimplification, must provide multiple representations, and must cover content material in different ways and at different times (Boling, 2003). Only then do students learn to use many different perspectives in order to learn the complexity of the material presented (Spiro et al., 1992). Hypermedia forms of case-based learning allow for such flexibility by providing the user with multiple representations of classroom teaching that can be quickly accessed, visited, and revisited (Stephens, Leavell, Fabris, Buford, & Hill, 1999).

Case-based learning is also informed by the theory of generative knowledge. According to generative knowledge theory, a learner does not automatically make connections between knowledge that is dispensed to them and the situations where that knowledge can be used (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1985). But when learners generate that knowledge themselves, more and better connections are made (Risko, McAllister, Peter, & Bigenho, 1994). In case-based learning, preservice teachers view classroom situations and then generate their own analyses about what is happening. Students are encouraged and expected to think both critically and creatively and to function at a metacognitive level (i.e., monitor their own understanding) (Savery & Duffy, 2001). Peer groups and the course instructor aid in the analyses by offering alternative ideas and challenging others' thinking.

PROGRESSION OF CASE RESOURCES AND EFFECTIVENESS. Over the past two decades, the medium of cases presented in teacher education classrooms has developed from print forms, and advanced to include hypermedia. Anecdotal stories were used early on (Silverman & Welty, 1992). In this type, a situation is described by providing the perspectives of the key personnel—classroom teacher, support staff, and administration, for example—in a certain teaching dilemma, and preservice teachers then discuss what actions should be taken. Each case often fosters multiple viewpoints that are batted around by the peers and instructor. Another type of case is drawn from the stories that expert teachers tell about their experiences. These texts tell about literacy classrooms from many angles, and because presenting dilemmas is not always the authors' intent in these texts, preservice teachers develop their own topics for discussion, debating the ideas presented by the authors (Baker & Wedman, 2000). But anecdotal stories and text-based case studies have been criticized because of their inability to capture and communicate the reality of the nuances and immediacy of actual classroom settings (Smith & Diaz, 2002).

In recent years, the move from the textual format of cases to the use of video and multimedia has grown in popularity. Video and multimedia enable the viewer to observe gestures, environments, sounds, and emotional states that are so important when considering the dynamic interactions between and among the people in classrooms (Bransford, Sherwood, Hasselbring, Kinzer, & Williams, 1990). Such new formats allow for anchor cases (Cognition and Technology Group of Vanderbilt, 1990) which involve sustained, repeated explorations of classroom situations that allow preservice teachers a window into real-life problems that teachers encounter and the kinds of decisions that are made. The cases become a common anchor for teacher educators and preservice teachers to construct knowledge through discussions about theory, research, and practice (Teale,

Leu, Labbo, & Kinzer, 2002). Multimedia formats often provide access to key materials from a particular classroom (e.g., running record sessions and lesson plans) and videotaped interviews with teachers, students, and parents, as well as the technology to engage in online discussions in forums and links to related sites (e.g., experts in the field) (<http://ctell.uconn.edu>; Teale et al., 2002).

In one study that utilized such context-rich anchors, Risko, Yount, and McAllister (1992) found that preservice teachers in classrooms that used multimedia cases asked more questions and more higher level questions than those in similar methods courses that did not engage in multimedia cases. Furthermore, students who were exposed to multimedia cases began to use multiple sources of data and developed more comprehensive views of teaching issues—such as assuming multiple roles as they questioned case content, elaborated on others’ comments, and made connections between course readings and case content. In making decisions about the case dilemmas, preservice teachers referred to situational and student factors and showed flexibility in their thinking about the procedures they read about in their university course. In a later study, Kinzer and Risko (1998) added that students and instructors retained more vivid recollection of the video content.

Ferdig et al. (2004), in describing the “lessons learned” from using a multimedia format, indicated that what the preservice teachers viewed in the accompanying clips of teaching was different from the kind of instruction they received when they were in elementary schools. The content, then, challenged the teachers’ prior assumptions about teaching and learning. Furthermore, the clips allowed the preservice teachers to see that the kind of literacy instruction that was being discussed in their university courses was occurring in classrooms, even if they themselves had never experienced this kind of instruction when they were students. The authors say that more research about how to

best provide scaffolding for learners is needed so that the connections between theory and practice become common practice in communities of learning. The researchers also posit that creating support systems would be helpful for teacher educators who are new to the impact that technology can have on teaching and learning.

Baker and Wedman (2000) produced their own hypermedia program for use in their year-long study of preservice teachers' analysis of first-graders' writing development. They found a reciprocal relationship developed—that the case study in the university course influenced their student-teaching experiences and that their student-teaching experiences influenced what they brought to the case study in the university course. The researchers also found that preservice teachers were proficient in their abilities to reflect on children's literacy skills during their field-based assignments when addressing areas of literacy abilities and instructional practices that matched the cases discussed in their university course. When the preservice teachers were presented with dilemmas that deviated from cases presented in the course, they were less able to be reflective or to suggest instructional practices. As a result, the authors suggested that future research is needed in order to increase understanding about effective uses of case-based learning, such as when the instructor should step in to clarify misconceptions, what kinds of scaffolding are needed, and whether case-based learning that focuses on children rather than teachers develops different types of reflective habits in preservice teachers.

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF USING CASES IN TEACHER EDUCATION. A number of strengths for the inclusion of media-rich cases in preservice teacher education have been offered. One is that rather than assigning preservice teachers to visit particular classroom settings and to note their observations for a later discussion with a peer group, cases provide vicarious experiences with those settings, allowing the preservice teachers and the instructor to analyze and reflect on the same teaching act (Putnam & Borko,

2000). As a result, preservice teachers get to explore the richness and complexity of authentic pedagogical problems from multiple perspectives and frameworks (Spiro, Coulson, Feltovich, & Anderson, 1988). Another advantage is that the teacher educator has more control over the situations and issues that the preservice teachers encounter and therefore can prepare in advance for discussions and activities that should be built upon the cases viewed (Sykes & Bird, 1992). Still another advantage is that, depending on the type of media presented, cases allow for nonlinear and multiple viewings as well as for a richer set of materials to be considered (e.g., from teachers' journals, to students' notebooks, to students' work, to interviews between teacher and student). These data allow users to consider multiple perspectives on an event simultaneously (Feltovich, Spiro, & Coulson, 1997; Spiro et al., 1988).

Despite such advocacy, there is still much to be learned about the effectiveness of cases as instructional tools. Merseth (1996) says that there exists an "imbalance between promise and empirical data" (p. 738), because there are many claims about the usefulness of cases but that research which specifically addresses cases lags far behind. Putnam and Borko (2000) ask for research into the differences between what is learned from case methods versus other instructional approaches and materials. These researchers posit that there are times when limiting the complexity of a setting is desirable in order to teach particular concepts or strategies, while there are other times when complex case materials aid in teacher reflection and problem-solving. Spiro (reported in Shulman, 1992) cautions that instructors who use single case examples might afford that single representation to reign unchallenged, and Shulman (1992) warns against using so few cases that students come to understand case content as a prescription rather than a set of possibilities. Hughes, Packard, and Pearson (2000) call for longitudinal studies and point out that most studies have sought to uncover the benefits to users who work with cases

collaboratively toward a course goal versus determining other possible uses of cases and potential benefits.

CASE-BASED LEARNING AND THIS STUDY. Much of the research on case-based learning in teacher education has focused on the use of cases in the company of others. That is, case-based learning, as reviewed here, is typically described as an instructional strategy by teacher educators, specifically, case viewing that is followed by group discussions or other class assignments in which students' perspectives are offered and batted around. Much less attention has been focused on the nature of preservice teachers' responses to viewing videocases when they are asked to do so independent of others' views. In my study, I have elected to do one-on-one viewings and interviews in order to develop a more individual portrait of a learner. The videotaped clips I've assembled will provide preservice teachers with concrete classroom demonstrations of teaching upon which to register their learning and sources of knowledge.

These three areas—teachers as informants of their learning, teacher expert knowledge, and case-based learning—support this study of preservice teachers' perceptions of their preparation and practice for teaching reading/language arts.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

In this section, I describe the methodology for this study of preservice teachers' reflections on their preparation and practices for teaching reading/language arts. The section has five major parts. Following a restatement of the research questions, the first section explains why the selected methodology of qualitative case study is a good fit for this research project. The second section describes the context of the study as well as the participants, the researcher, and the sampling plan. The third section extensively details the development of instruments and data collection plan. The fourth section discusses data analysis procedures. The final section concerns the researcher perspective and the limitations of the study.

Research Questions

To present three cases of preservice teachers' knowledge of teaching reading/language arts, I seek to address these research questions in this study:

- 1) What do three preservice teachers report as useful experiences (e.g., models, readings, topics, etc.) in preparing them to teach reading/language arts?
- 2) What aspects of instruction do these three preservice teachers comment on when they watch video-clips of classroom demonstrations of reading/language arts teaching, and how do their remarks compare with those of experienced teachers' views about the same video-clips?
- 3) What sources of knowledge do these three preservice teachers report drawing upon when they observe video-clips of classroom demonstrations of

reading/language arts teaching, and how do their ways of knowing compare with those reported by experienced teachers?

- 4) What sources of knowing do these three preservice teachers report drawing upon when they reflect on their own classroom experiences teaching reading/language arts during their student-teaching semester?

Rationale for Research Methodology

In conceptualizing all aspects of the study's design—from the research questions, to data sources, to data interpretation, to presentation of findings—I focused on qualitative research practices to inform my decisions. Sherman and Webb (1988) identify qualitative research as concerned with how individuals construct their realities as they interact with their social worlds, as well as how they make sense of their experiences. Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest that holistic, contextually situated inquiry is best suited for uncovering individuals' constructed realities. Patton (1985) explains that qualitative research is about understanding the nature of the setting—"what it means for participants to be in the setting, what their lives are like, what's going on for them, what their meanings are, what the world looks like in that particular setting" (p. 1). In these ways, qualitative research allows for a deep understanding of people in certain contexts and therefore makes sense for constructing profiles that represent the participants' experiences that have informed their conceptions about the teaching of reading/language arts—those experiences that have, among other things, shaped, broadened, challenged, and changed their thinking. Unlocking these ways of knowing can be supported within a qualitative framework and in an "exploratory, personally interactive manner" (Merriam, 1988, p. 17).

Within the qualitative model, I have chosen the interpretive case study strategy to frame and guide the study. Although it has been defined in a number of ways, a case is essentially a “specific, a complex, functioning thing” (Stake, 1995, p. 2), a single entity or unit around which there are boundaries (Merriam, 1998; Smith, 1978), such as an individual or a group of individuals. Case study research is about developing an in-depth understanding of the case that is selected. Thus, as Stake (1995) says, the “real business of case study is particularization, not generalization. Investigators take a particular case and come to know it well, not primarily as to how it is different from others but what it is, what it does” (p. 8). Bromley (1986) writes that case studies, by definition, “get as close to the subject of interest as they possibly can, partly by means of direct observation in natural settings, partly by their access to subjective factors (thoughts, feelings, and desires)” (p. 23). Yin (1994) echoes this notion of intimacy when he defined case study as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (p. 13).

In selecting case study for this proposed study, I carefully considered Merriam’s (1998) perspective on the design:

The case study offers a means for investigating complex social units consisting of multiple variables of potential importance in understanding the phenomenon. Anchored in real-life situations, the case study results in a rich and holistic account of a phenomenon. It offers insights and illuminates meanings that expand its readers’ experiences. These insights can be construed as tentative hypotheses that help structure future research; hence, case study plays an important role in advancing a field’s knowledge base. (p. 41)

As Stake (1995) explained, case study research begins because there is a research question, “a puzzlement, a need for general understanding” (p. 3), and that by studying a particular case, we might gain some insight into the question. It is the particularistic nature of case study that invites the researcher to examine a specific instance in order to

highlight a general problem. It is the descriptive nature of case study that allows the researcher to illustrate the intricacies of a situation, showing the ways in which many factors contribute to it. And it is the heuristic quality of case study that affords the researcher opportunity to evaluate, analyze, summarize, and conclude (Merriam, 1998). These qualities of case study methodology allow for the kind of investigation that can lead to data-rich portraits of preservice teachers' perceptions of their preparation, practices, and funds of knowing in support of their teaching reading/language arts.

Context

This study took place within the teacher preparation program at a large southwestern university. The university, the College of Education, and the teacher education program are discussed in turn.

THE UNIVERSITY

The institution in which this study takes place is a large, state-supported university in a southwestern city. Total enrollment (undergraduate and graduate) is approximately 51,000, of which about 40,000 students are undergraduates. Students select from over 170 fields of study within approximately 100 majors. The university has 11 colleges and schools, one of which is the College of Education.

THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Total enrollment (undergraduate and graduate) in the College of Education is approximately 3,500 students, of which about 2,000 students are undergraduates. Approximately 1,300 are in teacher preparation programs.

There are five departments within the College of Education: Curriculum and Instruction; Educational Administration; Educational Psychology; Kinesiology and Health Education; and Special Education.

The College offers two certification degrees, one of which is a Bachelor of Science degree with a focus on learning to become a teacher. One program of study within this major is designated as an Early Childhood Through Grade 4 Generalist. Thus, future elementary teachers involved in this study are part of the Curriculum and Instruction Department, and are enrolled in a program of study intended to prepare them for teacher certification in Early Childhood Through Grade Four. This program is 130 semester hours, a substantial amount of which is centered on content learning, learning theory, and teaching practice. Other coursework includes a substantial writing component, courses in a second language, courses in math, science, culture, kinesiology, and a minor chosen by the student.

THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

To enter the teacher education program, candidates must apply or transfer to the College of Education and must have completed at least 45 semester hours of coursework with a minimum university grade point average of 2.0. Students who are enrolled in a program that leads to teacher certification must apply for and be accepted into the professional development sequence in order to take their final 36 hours of coursework.

To be accepted into the professional development sequence, students must meet the following eligibility criteria: completion of specific prerequisite courses, such as courses covering the foundations of mathematics and learner differences, as well as six hours in applied learning and development, such as courses covering literacy acquisition and learning influences; completion of at least 72 semester hours of coursework before submitting an application; and attainment of a 2.5 university-grade-point average at the time of application.

In the three semesters devoted to professional development, students may continue to complete coursework on campus, but a significant portion of each week is

spent in area schools. As part of their professional development, students are assigned in groups of approximately 25 to cohorts under the guidance of a university supervisor. In these groups or cohorts, students experience the last three semesters of coursework and field-based assignments together.

The first and second semesters of the professional development sequence are called Internship Semesters. In the first of the final three semesters of undergraduate education, or Internship I, students complete twelve semester hours of professional development coursework. That coursework includes methodologies of reading, in addition to classroom management, child development, and others. Students also spend between twelve and fourteen hours per week in elementary schools, or the equivalent of one-and-a-half days per week in the classrooms. In this first semester, students are assigned to pre-kindergarten and kindergarten classrooms. Expectations include that the interns: observe the teacher and students; take notes about classroom instruction, procedures, and management; and take over small groups teaching to practice teaching particular instructional strategies.

In the second semester, Internship II, twelve semester hours of professional development coursework is completed on campus. That coursework typically includes a course in reading difficulties, as well as school organization and others. In addition, about sixteen hours per week, or the equivalent of two full days per week, are spent in first- through fifth-grade classrooms. Interns typically begin the semester by observing the classroom teacher and taking notes. Additionally, interns write their own lesson plans and teach those lessons in small group situations or to the entire class.

In the third semester, called the Practicum (or student-teaching) Semester, students are assigned to a particular classroom in an area elementary school every weekday, typically from 7:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. In addition, the students enroll in their

final class, a methods course in language arts. During this semester, each student is assigned to work alongside a particular classroom teacher (called a cooperating teacher). Across the semester, interns take on additional subjects each week until they assume full responsibility for teaching all subjects, all day, every day.

THE PARTICIPANTS

I queried the instructors of two sections of Language Arts Methods to allow me to invite the preservice teachers enrolled in their classes to participate in my study. With their approval, I planned a day in which I was given the last ten minutes of a class session to introduce myself to the preservice teachers and tell them about my study. I related that I was interested in the professional experiences of preservice teachers who are in their last semester of their teacher education program. I described how I was interested in hearing about their experiences—honest, first-hand depictions of their successes and struggles, what they have enjoyed and those experiences that were not so enjoyable—in order to develop a deep understanding of what it takes to be a preservice teacher. I pointed out that studies like mine have the potential for shaping the experiences of those preservice teachers who are following them in their university’s teacher education program as well as the experiences of preservice teachers elsewhere. I addressed the level of involvement that my study required of the participants, specifically that there would be approximately six hours of interviews and at least two observations of their teaching. I ended by assuring the preservice teachers that their participation was entirely voluntary, that my study was entirely separate from their coursework, and that all data would be kept confidential and that the participants would remain anonymous in all oral and written reports about the study.

While all students enrolled in these two sections of the course were told about the study and were invited to participate, I went into this study intending to purposefully

select (Patton, 1990) only five students from those who volunteered. I wanted to select five students with the expectation that three cases would comprise the final written report and that selecting two additional students would account for the possibility of attrition.

In planning this study, I intended for the sample to be selected based on the maximum variability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) of demographics, such as gender, age, and ethnicity, as well as grade-level placement in the student-teaching assignment and previous experience with children. However, the demographics of the students enrolled in those two sections of the Language Arts Methods course were relatively similar. For instance, there were no male students, only one student was older than age 25, and the majority of the students were Caucasian.

In terms of the robustness of the sample pool, I expected, perhaps naively, that I would have many more volunteer participants than the number of students I could pursue interviewing. However, when I introduced my study to the two sections of the Language Arts Methods class and distributed the information sheet (see Appendix A) for the students to fill out to indicate their interest in the study, only eight students completed and returned the form. Many more students approached me to say that they were interested in my study but that they could not spare the time required to complete the study. Several students mentioned that they were already participating in a study of preservice teachers and technology that was being conducted by another doctoral student at the university. Further, of those eight students who initially expressed interest, two students requested to bow out when I contacted them by email to schedule a first interview and one student requested to bow out after the third interview, all citing hectic schedules. Therefore, I pursued interviewing all of the remaining preservice teachers who were interested in contributing to my study. All five of them completed the interview series. Brief descriptions of the participants are provided in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Preservice Teachers' Biographical Information

Pseudonyms	Ethnicity	Age	Student-teaching placement
Karen	White	22	1 st grade bilingual
Gloria	Mexican-American	21	Pre-kindergarten
Lana	White	22	2 nd grade
Suzanne	White	22	Kindergarten
Jennifer	White	21	2 nd grade

These volunteers were completing their final semester in the professional development sequence and were enrolled in the final Language Arts Methods course. This course was taught in the fall semester of 2005. Students in this course were concurrently enrolled in their Practicum Semester in area elementary schools.

THE RESEARCHER

When I began my graduate studies, I had particular interests that I knew I wanted to pursue. The first semester into my studies, I researched children's writing at grades two, three, and four. Then I became curious about a friend's voluntary, after-school book club that she began at her son's school, and I became a participant in that club. As a result of taking courses and interacting with peers and faculty, I began to develop new wonderings. I was invited by a faculty member and peer to help learn about first-graders' transitions from picture books to easy-to-read chapter books. At about the same time, I began participating in the teaching of a section of Language Arts Methods and continued for a total of three semesters—the fall of 2003, the fall of 2004, and the spring of 2005. My degree of participation varied in those three semesters. In the first semester, I provided feedback to in-class journal entries; in the second semester, I provided written feedback to student writing, while also making presentations about a children's author

and illustrator; in the third semester, I responded to online journal entries weekly, made short presentations, and taught a class session about teaching poetry to young students.

My experiences in those semesters of helping with the teaching of preservice teachers acquainted me with much more than the content and management of the course. I shared in the professional lives of three groups of students who had reached a particular point in their development as teachers—it is a culminating point as well as a transitory point. Those three semesters helped me determine that the preservice teachers who are at this juncture would be the most informing about their experiences. But I came to this conclusion not just because I participated in the teaching of this course across semesters; I was also informed by my eavesdropping, listening in on conversations that preservice teachers had when they arrived a few minutes early to class. I also listened during breaks and after class as they talked about their experiences in the field—what was going well, what was frustrating, what was expected, and what was not. They were preservice teachers approaching the end of their education program, and I was a doctoral student approaching the end of my coursework and facing the planning of my dissertation. So, even though I was still developing and pursuing a number of research interests in literacy, I found myself in the midst of a new wondering as I continued to observe, interact with, and sometimes (casually) counsel these preservice teachers.

Although I had years before been a classroom teacher, I had missed out on the experiences they were sharing. As an undergraduate, I didn't formally complete a teacher education program, but instead completed a degree in English, and took education courses as electives. I lucked into a teaching position after graduation, being hired under an emergency certification plan granted by the state, and I floundered in the classroom for a short time before ending my teaching at that school. Sadly, I contributed to the statistic that reports our profession loses a significant number of teachers in their first

three years of service (e.g., Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). Thus, I was an outsider to the preservice teachers' preparation with an interest in becoming an insider—perhaps wondering in quiet moments if I would still be teaching had I not been so ill-prepared.

As the researcher of this study, I assumed the role of researcher only, discontinuing my participation in the teaching of any sections of the Language Arts Methods course in which the volunteers were enrolled. In fact, I sought out sections of the Language Arts Methods course with instructors that I had not taught alongside from which to draw my participants. The participants were informed that I was an observer only and that I had no involvement in the course nor did I assist the instructor in any way, such as grading or evaluating student work. In fact, the instructors of the Methods course sections were never made aware of particular student's participation at any point. When I did visit the sections of the classes at various times throughout the semester, I sat in the back of the room, recording notes about my observations of the course content, student involvement, and other such matters. I used those observations to inform my interview questions, drawing on them to derive new interview questions and ask appropriate prompts. In such ways, I continually looked for the ways in which my observations of the preservice teachers in their university coursework and fieldwork settings could inform my conversations and enhance my understandings of the preservice teacher's professional lives.

Instrument Development and Data Collection

INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT

Two types of instruments were developed for the purposes of data collection: an instructional video viewing assessment and interview protocols.

In this section, I first discuss the process I used for selecting, annotating, and producing a content code description for the three videotaped clips of reading/language arts classroom teaching that were used in this study. Then I provide a rationale for relying on interviewing as a major data collection technique and I describe each of the interview protocols that were developed for use in data collection.

SELECTING VIDEO-CLIPS OF DEMONSTRATIONS OF TEACHING. Taking cues from case-based learning, I used video-clips to provide concrete examples of classroom teaching from which the respondents in this study could speak.

SELECTION OF VIDEOTAPED CLIPS. My process for selecting three clips took many paths, but my final decisions were made based on the clips' portrayal of demonstrations revealing the teacher's broad understanding of reading/language arts instructional strategies or innovations, clarity of instructional foci, variety of demonstrations among the three chosen clips, and quality of video production.

To begin the selection process, I borrowed a teacher educator's collection of instructional videotapes that she draws from in her teaching of undergraduate reading/language arts courses. I viewed approximately 30 instructional videos produced by WGBH Educational Programming, the Center for the Study of Reading, Stenhouse Publishers, and others, all of which demonstrated some aspect of the teaching and learning of reading and writing. Essentially, these videos were designed for the showcasing of a particular aspect of language instruction, including emergent reading, interactive writing, developing reading-writing relationships, etc., so that the intended audience—budding educators—could view demonstrations of reading/language arts teaching. The tapes I viewed seemed technically excellent in terms of production aspects—varying camera angles, adequate lighting, clear sound transmission, and “natural” projections of teachers and students working together.

I immersed myself in the videos, watching each more than once and taking fieldnotes as though I were actually present in the classrooms featured on the videotapes. As I did, I began developing criteria for determining which classroom demonstrations might serve this study (i.e., elicit a range of teachers' identification and descriptions of events, as well as interpretations of the teaching). I chose a timeframe of from five to seven minutes of footage for each clip, to accommodate viewers' intensity of interest and ability to revisit. Further, I searched for footage that: (a) featured some aspect of teaching reading/language arts that would be readily identifiable to the viewer; (b) presented continuity of instruction rather than a patchwork of editing; and (c) was free of heavily interpretive commentary or omniscient voice-over.

In addition to these considerations that I used in evaluating the videotapes, I no doubt was influenced by my own theoretical understandings of reading/language arts instruction. My readings in graduate school, my observations and participation in classrooms, and my conversations with other teaching professionals certainly have shaped my literacy lens and my allegiance to social constructivist aims, such as that literacy learning is a social process in which learners inherit, appropriate, and transform the language of others (Bakhtin, 1981; Gee, 1991), and that literacy learning takes place most effectively in classrooms where collaboration is encouraged and each individual's contributions are honored (Moll, 1990). Intentionally, and perhaps at times unconsciously, I looked for classroom performances that held such beliefs at the core. Certainly, too, because my intention was for the preservice teachers to reveal on their knowing and because I held knowledge of the content of their education program, I selected teaching moments that would be familiar and serve to foster conversations rather than silence the respondents.

Using these both practical and theoretical criteria to narrow the sample of tapes, I made final decisions about the selection of three clips by striving for the most diversity. These clips represents two different grade levels—kindergarten and first-grade. They offer three different reading/language arts activities—journal writing, instruction within a small reading group (guided reading), and the management of a portion of a readers’ workshop. The clips offered some geographic variety as well: two classrooms in Texas (Houston and Austin), and another in Boston, Massachusetts. One teacher is male and two are female. These and other qualities of the selected videotaped clips are described in more detail below.

DESCRIPTION OF CLIP 1. The video from clip 1 centers on a Houston kindergarten teacher and a group of emergent readers and writers engaged in using what they understand about written language in an authentic form—a journal. It was produced in 2003 by WGBH Educational Programming in association with the Annenberg Foundation. Titled “Writer’s Journal,” this tape is a part of a professional development series called *Teaching Reading, K-2: A Library of Classroom Practices*. The series is described as a “video library that features teachers introducing students to reading through a variety of methodologies, and shows teachers and students engaged in effective reading practices” (www.learning.org, Retrieved on July 28, 2005). The teacher, John Sinnett, has over twenty years of teaching experience. From the total 27-minute video, I selected a clip that lasts 6 minutes, 48 seconds. (See Appendix B for a summary and complete transcript of this clip.)

DESCRIPTION OF CLIP 2. Clip 2 shows a Boston teacher working with a small group of first-grade students to develop an awareness of the comprehension strategies they are using as they read texts at their instructional level. The video from which clip 2 was selected was produced by WGBH in 2003. It is titled “Assessment-Driven

Instruction” and is part of a series called *Teaching Reading, K-2: A Library of Classroom Practices*. In the clip, the teacher works to develop the comprehension strategies of a small group reading leveled texts (i.e., books matched to the students’ instructional reading levels). The entire film of Ms. Perez’s classroom lasts approximately 27 minutes; I selected a clip that lasts 5 minutes, 57 seconds. (See Appendix C for a summary and complete transcript of this clip.)

DESCRIPTION OF CLIP 3. The featured teacher in clip 3 is supporting her Austin first-graders in their beginning forays into the components of a readers’ workshop (self-selection of books; reading with others; preparing scripts for readers’ theater). The video from which clip 3 was taken was produced by WGBH in 2003. It is titled “Students Making Choices,” and is a part of a series called *Teaching Reading, K-2: A Library of Classroom Practices*. Of the 27 minutes highlighting Ms. Pursley’s classroom, I selected a clip that lasts 5 minutes, 48 seconds, and spotlights the students reading independently, in pairs, or in small groups. (See Appendix D for a summary and complete transcript of this clip.)

These three video-clips of classroom demonstrations were used to elicit the participants’ observations, understandings, thoughts, opinions, and rationales for reading/language arts teaching, as well as the sources they draw upon to explain their perspectives.

CODING THE CONTENT OF THE VIDEO-CLIPS WITH EXPERTS. To have a basis for ascertaining the breadth and depth of preservice teachers’ responses to the video-clips (i.e., their perceptions and sources of knowledge), I collected the responses and knowledge sources offered by a panel of experienced teachers.

From the nominations of professors within the College of Education, teachers within the local district, and fellow graduate students, I identified four teachers whose

names were suggested by at least two of my sources. Using the same procedures as I used with the preservice teachers (described in the data collection section below), the experienced teachers were interviewed individually and were asked to respond to the same set of questions and probes about the clips.

The experienced teachers' responses were used to form a code book, that is, a cataloging system for inventorying the range of the experienced teachers' responses and sources. I transcribed the experienced teachers' dialogues, and then using constant-comparison methodology (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), I identified both broad and specific categories for the features of instruction they revealed while watching the clips.

To determine the feasibility of cataloging expert teacher knowledge, I first tested the procedures with one experienced teacher from my panel.

With each of the three video-clips, I followed the interview protocol that I had developed. Doing so helped me to refine some of the probes for each of the main questions. For instance, the first question I asked, "Tell me about what was happening," often elicited a good amount of response that addressed the second question on the protocol, "Tell me about the teacher." Therefore, I added more probes for this question, such as "What do you think the teacher was aiming to accomplish, and how successful do you think this teacher was in the clip you viewed," so that respondents might add more substantive and supported comments in addition to descriptive ones.

While conducting the pilot interview, I both taped and took notes, listening for ways to refine the interview questions as well as for the level of response that the questions were garnering. From a transcription of the interview, I coded the experienced teacher's responses and inspected her talk for categories that could describe segments of talk. For example, the experienced teacher described one video segment as a teacher "modeling" the whole process, the writing and the thinking. Without a break in the talk,

she explained that the video teacher was “sitting right there on the floor, in there with them.” I began developing tentative categories based on the experienced teacher’s talk, such as, “described/labeled a teacher purpose,” and “offered definition/support for a judgment.”

These first steps in building a categorization system seemed to confirm that it would be possible to document across experienced teachers, developing and modifying categories as they failed to confirm the range of experienced teachers’ responses. That is, the interview questions seemed to allow the collection and coding of experienced teachers’ knowing, as well as a way to collect and compare their understandings and knowledge sources with preservice teachers’ observations and explanations. The experienced teacher with whom I piloted the questions made comments about what she observed, told stories of how her own experiences compared with what she saw in the classroom footage, reflected on how her experiences were supported by various knowledge sources, and made inferences about how and why the featured teachers made the decisions that are evident in the clips.

Piloting of the clips and interview protocol confirmed that eliciting the responses of experienced teachers to these video-clips would provide the expert knowing that allowed for the preservice teachers’ interpretations to be compared and interpreted. Thus, I collected and analyzed the responses of a panel of four experienced teachers. Once data from the combined set of experienced teachers’ responses were coded and categorized, I used them to compare student teachers’ responses and explanations. I used the term “expert panel” to describe their collective knowing; that term is used throughout to refer to the combined thinking of these four experienced teachers who served as respondents to the three video-clips.

TOWARD DEVELOPING INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS. Interviews of the undergraduate preservice teachers served as the principal data source in this study; therefore, the development of interview protocols was a critical concern in planning data collection procedures.

RATIONALE FOR INTERVIEWING. Interviewing has been heralded as a reliable method for collecting relevant data in studies like this one (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Merriam, 1998; Patton, 1990). Dexter (1970) defined interviews as “conversation[s] with a purpose” (p. 136), and Patton (1990) explained that the interviewer is seeking to find out what is “in and on someone’s mind” (p. 278). Interviews are particularly important in this study because I was attempting to uncover what is not directly observable. As Merriam (1998) maintained, “we cannot observe feelings, thoughts, and intentions. We cannot observe behaviors that took place at some previous point in time ... The purpose of interviewing, then, is to allow us to enter into the other person’s perspective” (p. 196).

DEVELOPMENT OF INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS. The purpose of each of the study’s interview forms was to engage the participants in a conversation in which they could reveal what they know. The various types of interviews that were used in this study were the two-part introductory interview, the video-clips interviews, and the interviews following observations of the preservice teachers’ teaching.

TWO-PART INTRODUCTORY INTERVIEW PROTOCOL. In developing the introductory interview protocols, I kept in mind that the main intent of the interviews was to enter into the personal and professional lives of the participants. That is, these interviews were intended to provide a base-level understanding of the participants’ experiences that inform the perspectives they revealed throughout the data collection process. The first part of the interview sought a general understanding of each participant’s personal and schooling background. Open-ended questions about family

life, school life, and college life were asked. (See Appendix E for the complete interview protocol.) The second part of the interview focused more specifically on eliciting their opinions about particularly useful aspects of the teacher education program, as well as the utility of other teaching experiences they had had. (See Appendix F for the complete interview protocol.)

VIDEO-CLIP INTERVIEW PROTOCOL. In developing the video-clip interview protocol, I focused on the aims of this investigation: (a) accessing participants' thoughts and opinions about the content of the instruction in each clip; and (b) accessing the sources of knowledge that informed the participants as well as the experiences that helped shaped the participants' thoughts and opinions. Toward that end, I shaped open-ended questions about the classroom demonstration (e.g., "Tell me about the teacher"), as well as questions about the participants' sources of knowledge (e.g., "What learning experiences have you had that helped you to know what that teacher was doing?") (See Appendix G for the complete interview protocol.)

OBSERVATION-OF-TEACHING INTERVIEW PROTOCOL. In developing the protocol for the interviews that followed the researcher's observation of the participants' teaching, I kept in mind that the aim was to access the preservice teachers' preparation for a lesson, reflections on its effects, and sources that were used during the planning and delivery. Open-ended questions about the planning of the lesson included "Tell me how you decided to teach that lesson." Questions about the delivery of the lesson included "Tell me how you feel about what just happened." To access sources of knowledge, many of the interview questions included prompts like "How do you know?" and "What helped you decide?" and "What makes you say that?" (See Appendix H for the complete interview protocol.)

All of the protocols described above remained flexible enough for the researcher to pursue ideas and notions that related to the research questions in this study and that were raised by an interviewee during the course of an interview, thereby maximizing what could be gained from a participant's perspective.

PROCEDURES. All interviews were conducted person-to-person (as opposed to in a group). Since I was formulating cases, the data collection process needed to provide a comfortable and safe environment in which participants could speak freely from professional and personal perspectives. I traveled to schools where the participants were teaching. Doing so helped enable each participant to complete all parts of the study without posing great interruptions to their daily schedules. Interviews were conducted before or after school or during adequately lengthy break times during the school day. The researcher offered weekends as a possibility as well, and one interviewee chose to meet on Saturdays for all interviews except those that required observations of her teaching.

All interviews were audiotaped and transcribed verbatim. My decision to audiotape all interviews was one attempt to bolster the integrity of the analysis phase of my research. That is, while some investigators believe that a written, verbatim record of data is not always necessary (e.g., Stake, 1995), the exact wording of participants' responses was integral to this study—too critical to rely on the researcher's memory or summative notes (Weiss, 1994).

In this study, it was important for the interviews to sustain a casual, personal, conversational feel. Therefore, all interviews were semi-structured but open-ended (Merriam, 1998) in the sense that I planned ahead and operated from a protocol. The exact wording of the questions and the sequence in which the questions were asked changed because I needed to allow the participants' responses to guide the interview

(Weiss, 1994). As another way to ensure the conversational tone of the interview, I chose not to videotape the interviews nor take notes during the interviews. Instead, summative notes were written in the researcher's journal immediately following each interview; these notes included my impressions of the interview, new ideas that were introduced by the participant that needed some type of follow-up, and any new thoughts that I had that informed future data collection and analysis proceedings.

DATA COLLECTION

TOWARD CAPTURING PRESERVICE TEACHERS' USEFUL EXPERIENCES. To address question 1, that is, to understand what background, readings, demonstrations, coursework, and other sources of knowing were perceived as useful to the preservice teacher, I conducted two interviews with each participant. Those were the first data collected and therefore, the interviews were conducted during the first week of the study's data collection. These introductory interviews were intended to help me enter into the personal and professional lives of the participants. In the first part of the interview, I sought to gain background information about each interviewee, asking open-ended questions about family life, school life, and college life. The second part of the interview focused more specifically on eliciting information about helpful aspects of the teacher education program, as well as other teaching experiences that had influenced the participant.

All interviews were audiotaped and transcribed. These data were supplemented by the summative notes that I recorded following the interviews. For the second part of the interviews about the preservice teachers' experiences in their teacher education program, I invited the interviewees to bring in samples of their professional work completed in previous education courses (e.g., a lesson plan or an inquiry project). Although I intended for concrete products to spark conversations more specifically about

past experiences in the teacher education program and perhaps serve as an additional data source, the preservice teachers did not arrive at the second part of the interview with such documents. For the remainder of the study, I invited the participants to bring along relevant documents, but rarely did they do so.

TOWARD ACCESSING PRESERVICE TEACHERS' UNDERSTANDINGS AND WAYS OF KNOWING. To address questions 2 and 3, which sought to access the preservice teachers' understandings about reading/language arts instruction and the sources that feed that knowledge as elicited by viewing videotaped classroom demonstrations, and which also sought to compare their understandings and sources of knowing with those of experienced teachers, I conducted a series of interviews in which participants watched several video-clips in my presence, commented freely on what they saw, and then answered open-ended interview questions.

Each study participant watched a clip on a small portable DVD screen in a quiet area and participated in an interview immediately following that viewing. While watching a clip, the participant was invited to talk freely about what he or she was noticing. To capture these thoughts, I took notes as well as audiotaped the comments. The participants were also invited to take notes to serve as reminders of thoughts that could be shared during the interview. During the interview that followed the viewing, each participant was provided with a transcript of the clip and was allowed to request to view a certain section of the clip again if the memory demand of responding to one viewing of the clip was too much. In only one instance did a respondent look through the printed transcript; however, I often initiated reviewing the clip based on a respondent's lack of clarity about a specific incident. The interview protocol was used flexibly, and I used my notes to inform appropriate probes that were specific to each interviewee's

remarks. Each participant completed three video-clip viewings and interviewing sessions.

TOWARD INVESTIGATING PRESERVICE TEACHER'S SOURCES OF KNOWLEDGE WHILE TEACHING. To address question 4, which seeks to determine the sources of knowledge that preservice teachers draw upon when engaged in the teaching reading/language arts, I made two observations of each preservice participant's teaching. Because the last semester of the professional development sequence is the point at which the participants engage in their student-teaching experience, it was important for me to observe them teaching reading/language arts lessons to further tap their understandings and knowledge sources as they reflected on their practice. Each observation of teaching was followed by an interview in which the participant reflected on the teaching that I had observed. The interviews were open-ended and sought information about the preservice teacher's decisions to teach a particular subject/topic and to use a particular strategy, as well as the sources that informed the teacher's decisions and assessment of that particular lesson.

Observations of teaching were scheduled such that the observation and follow-up interview happened within the same day (e.g., observation from 10:00-11:00 a.m. and follow-up interview from 12:15-12:45 p.m.). Only on one occasion did the follow-up interview take place a day later.

The preservice teachers' classroom teaching was not recorded by audiotape or videotape, in keeping with the terms for which I was granted permission by the university to complete this study. However, on a number of occasions, the preservice teacher chose to videotape the lesson for use in completing a course assignment or for portfolio-building purposes. The researcher took fieldnotes during the observations to derive

specific and appropriate probes for the follow-up interviews. As was the case with all other interviews, these interviews were audiotaped.

ADDITIONAL DATA SOURCES. Fieldnotes taken during visits to the sections of the Language Arts Methods course and artifacts written by the preservice teachers in their Language Arts Methods course are two additional sources of data that supplemented the data obtained through the many interviews described above.

I observed several class sessions of each participant's language arts class, taking fieldnotes (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995), specifically noting the range of involvement on the part of the participants. For example, the content of a participant's contributions in a small-group discussion or a whole class situation were recorded with fieldnotes.

Immediately after each university class session I observed, I expanded the shorthand notes and added additional commentary about my observations. Specific notes about how these observations affected future data collection and analysis procedures were transferred to a reflexive journal I was keeping.

Although I repeatedly requested access to artifacts, the preservice teachers rarely presented them. A few writing samples were provided and I used both the content of these samples and the contexts in which they were written to inform questions in interviews and to confirm experiences that had been previously shared in interviews.

These additional data sources of fieldnotes and artifacts were used to confirm information gained from the other types of interviews included in this study.

Figure 3.2 shows the major components of the data collection.

Figure 3.2: Data Collection Plan

Time Frame	Type of Interview/Activity
Prior to Preservice Teacher Interviews	Collected and coded experienced teacher data of video-clips Observations of Language Arts course
First Week	Two-Part Background Interviews
Second Week	Clip 1 Interviews
Third Week	Clip 2 Interviews Observations of Preservice Teachers' Teaching and Follow-up Interviews
Fourth Week	Clip 3 Interviews Observations of Preservice Teachers' Teaching and Follow-up Interviews

DATA ANALYSIS

Data were analyzed inductively (Merriam, 1998). That is, preconceived established frameworks were shed in favor of allowing the data to shape the analysis. Data analysis was ongoing during the data collection. In order to begin to make sense of the data arrays, I asked, “What’s seems to be going on here?” and “What’s the story?” (Chiseri-Strater & Sunstein, 1997, p. 290). In this section, I first describe how data were used reciprocally with each data source type—introductory interviews, video-clip interviews, observations of teaching interviews, and fieldnotes/artifacts. Then I describe the analysis procedures in further detail.

INTRODUCTORY INTERVIEWS. Data from the introductory interviews, the earliest data to be collected in this study, were transcribed. I read and coded the data for each participant’s responses and then looked across data sets for common themes as well as uniqueness of response. These data were used to inform the data collection phases, specifically the video-clip interviews and teaching observation interviews, allowing me to follow up on aspects of the data in a way that were specific to a particular participant. That is, the intent of the introductory interviews was to prompt the students’

backgrounds, stances, readiness, anxieties, eagerness, and areas of perceived strengths and weakness. Such information was pulled together to begin building cases. These early data fed deep understandings of each participant's strengths, awareness, positions, perceptions, and questions.

VIDEO-CLIP INTERVIEWS. The transcribed data from the video-clip interviews were coded and categorized for each participant. Then data was analyzed across cases using constant comparison analysis (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) to determine the categories that collectively the undergraduate preservice teachers seemed astute at observing (e.g., teacher's purpose), as well as those that arose less frequently (e.g., teacher's assessment of student learning). These data were further analyzed against the code book of experienced teachers' responses to make and support statements about similarities of and differences between experienced and inexperienced teachers' responses.

OBSERVATIONS OF TEACHING INTERVIEWS. I transcribed the debriefing interviews that I conducted with each participant following an observation of a taught lesson. The data for each transcription were coded, and these data informed me about interview questions and probes for future observations and interviews.

Once all observations and interviews were completed for a particular participant, data were analyzed across the two teaching episodes. These data were compared against categories that emerged in the series of video-clip interviews. Data across cases were then analyzed to determine commonalities in sources of knowledge employed when engaged in the teaching of reading/language arts.

FIELDNOTES AND ARTIFACTS. Fieldnotes and artifacts collected from the observations of the Language Arts Methods course or contributed by the participants during the interviews were read and coded to identify topics that repeatedly emerged. These data were used to inform other data collection phases, specifically the video-

prompted interviews and observation of teaching/follow-up interviews. As mentioned previously, written artifacts were rarely offered and collected, and therefore were used mostly to confirm other data rather than to supply new data.

ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES. I was aided in the analysis process by the creation of Microsoft Word tables. Specifically, I took all transcribed data from interviews and divided it into statements so that these statements could be read and reread in order to unitize, categorize, and develop themes (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). As new data were introduced, these data were compared to previously coded data to look for additional evidence of existing categories and themes and/or the emergence of new categories and themes.

After transcribing the data for the introductory interviews and separating that data into statements for analysis, I coded the data and began to look for similarities in emerging categories. I developed categories and themes based on the main topics of my interview questions, such as “Recalled Memories of Learning to Read” and “Perceived Strengths as a Teacher.” I then pulled all related statements by theme and began to construct summaries of the experiences that related to those categories. (See Appendix I for an example of one participant’s summary.)

For the second phase of coding and analysis, I coded the data from the preservice teachers’ interviews following the viewing of three video-clips. Again, these data were separated into statements, and the statements were coded for emerging categories and themes. Some of the main topics of my interview questions also fed the development of categories, such as “Identification of Teacher’s Purpose” and “Positioning of Students.” After the data were categorized and analyzed for each preservice teacher, I then began placing that data against the collective knowing gained from the expert panel’s responses. The code book for the expert panel was essentially an informal outline of responses, so I

used Microsoft Word tables to place the expert panel’s data statements on the left side of the page and fill in similarities and differences in responses for each preservice teacher on the right side (See Appendix J for an example.) Those data were then compared across all cases to develop categories of similarities, such as “Identification of Instructional Features,” and categories of differences, such as “Differences in Emphasis Attributable to Orientation.” Because this process was used for analyzing responses to each video-clip, I then looked across cases and across responses to video-clips to determine the most representative examples for each theme, and these examples were used in the explanations of my findings.

For the next phrase of coding and analysis, I coded the data from the preservice teachers’ interviews following my observations of their teaching. I again divided the data into statements, and the statements were coded for emerging categories and themes. I wrote summaries of the interviews using this coded data as well as the descriptions that were found in my fieldnotes. (See Appendix K for an example.)

Through these phases of data analysis, my developing portrait of each participant was being adjusted, confirmed, and reconstructed. To work toward developing my findings for each case and across the cases, I attempted to assemble the broader categories, and I did so by arranging and rearranging themes and supporting data statements in graphic displays. By doing so, I tested my hypotheses across the interviews, and my developing constructions of each participant became stronger or weaker, confirmed or countered, adjusted and refined. I then arrived at three umbrella groups that I wanted to use to organize my findings: Early Experiences and Potential Influences; Sources of Knowing Throughout Preservice Teacher Education; and Developing Notions about Teaching Reading/Language Arts. Because case studies “use prose and literary techniques to describe, elicit images, and analyze situations” and

“present documentation of events, quotes, samples, and artifacts” (Wilson, 1979, p. 448), I used the information in the graphic displays to pinpoint the most representative examples of the preservice teachers’ reported sources and knowledge.

Over time, as more participants’ data were considered, I continued to ferret the ways in which a participant’s experiences connected to those of others, as well as the ways in which the experiences stood apart. Full-length summaries were produced by identifying the most relevant information from the aggregated data. Then I chose three of the five cases that I deemed, from reviewing the summaries, as the most “information rich,” those from which we can “learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research” (Patton, 1990, p. 169). This final written report features the three cases that allowed for the most interesting, relevant, related, and detailed descriptions of preservice teacher learning, with the additional aim of producing a compelling, vicarious experience on the part of the reader (Merriam, 1998). In addition, I present my findings across cases based on my collection of hypotheses that became larger in quantity and stronger in assertion, and these findings are from which the implications of this study and suggestions for future research were derived.

RESEARCHER PERSPECTIVE AND LIMITATIONS

In studies like the one I conducted, the researcher gathers information about a problem with the intent of analyzing, interpreting, or theorizing about the phenomenon (Merriam, 1998). A distinctive characteristic of this type of research is the emphasis on interpretation. The researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis, and, being human, brings qualities and perspectives to the research that can be viewed both negatively and positively. In the negative vein, qualitative research has long been criticized because of the risk of researcher bias in all designs (Yin, 1994). Therefore, the researcher must be cognizant of the possible effects of bias, and the integrity of the

research depends on adhering to thorough and thoughtful data collection and analysis procedures (Merriam, 1998). The researcher is not neutral because previously held notions about the very subject of the research—in this case teacher education, preservice teachers, and experienced teachers—influence all aspects of the research process (see LeCompte & Preissle, 1993).

Nevertheless, the researcher cannot possibly begin to understand a phenomenon deeply without watching and listening, considering and reflecting, probing and questioning (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Chiseri-Strater & Sunstein, 1997). From a positive perspective, the researcher can be “responsive to the context” and “adapt techniques to the circumstances” (Guba & Lincoln, 1981, cited in Merriam, 1998, p. 7). Stake (1995) celebrates these characteristics of the research because they should not be “seen as a failing needing to be eliminated but as an essential element of understanding” (p. 45). Indeed, the ability to “deliberate inside the scene of action” (Erickson, 1986, p. 157) and to step into the phenomenon as intimately as possible is of utmost importance in a study like this one.

It becomes incumbent upon the researcher, then, to insure that the qualitative research design contains rigor and that the researcher’s procedures provide a true, clear, and consistent picture of what the data that are collected represents. Lincoln and Guba (1985) explained that the researcher must attend to trustworthiness criteria that includes credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. In this study, credibility of findings was established through engagement with the participants, triangulation of multiple sources, and member checks and debriefings. For example, I employed member checks while in the process of collecting data as well as during data analysis. Often I went to interviews with chunks of transcribed interview data, presented my interpretations of specific remarks, and asked for clarification or elaboration. In addition,

once I completed the writing of the individual cases, I sent each participant her own case via email and asked for response. I heard back from two of the three cases, and each asked for minor corrections of specific details, which I made. Transferability was handled by ensuring that the final written report contains “rich, thick descriptive data” (Merriam, 1998, p. 38) and that the context of the study was emphasized. I strove to heed Guba and Lincoln’s (1981, cited in Merriam, 1998) warning that case studies can “oversimplify or exaggerate a situation, leading the reader to erroneous conclusions about the actual state of affairs” (p. 377). Dependability and confirmability are accomplished through the researcher’s attention to documentation throughout all phases of collection, analysis, and reporting. As an aid, I kept a reflexive journal in order to capture my ongoing decision-making. Furthermore, throughout the process of data collection and analysis, I met with my dissertation chairperson regularly to review my progress and discuss next steps. Those work sessions included discussing category codes and themes, reading and analyzing summaries, and finding representative examples for the building of cases.

Conscientiously, I admit that my own construction of reality is introduced into the research situation, which no doubt interacted with the participants’ constructions or interpretations of the phenomenon being studied (Merriam, 1998), and this is thoughtfully acknowledged as a limitation of the study. Further limitations are described in the last chapter of this report.

CHAPTER IV: CASE STUDIES

In this section, I portray three preservice teachers—Karen, Gloria, and Lana—in a bid to capture their knowledge and sources that they reported drawing from and applying to their own practices as well as to their perspectives on others’ teaching. I conducted interviews about their backgrounds and their preservice teacher education experiences to understand how their experiences have pointed to and fed their participation in a teacher education program. In addition, I conducted interviews that included viewing video-clips of teaching demonstrations intended to capture how they described and interpreted features of reading/language arts instruction and how they applied their knowing. I also conducted interviews following my observations of two teaching instances in order to prompt reflections on their own teaching and reveal their sources of knowing that influenced and informed their practices.

Although many themes emerged singularly and multitudinously, I explored, described, and analyzed representative critical incidents to make visible the story of someone becoming a teacher of reading/language arts. Each case is structured in three sections. The first section, “Early Experiences in Becoming a Teacher of Literacy,” reports the preservice teachers’ early experiences, and reveals the sources they talked about that yielded potential influences on their paths to becoming literacy teacher. The second section, “Sources of Knowing Throughout Her Preservice Teacher Education,” offers the sources of knowing that the preservice teachers reported drawing from as they were participating in their preservice education program. The third section, “Developing Notions about Teaching Reading/Language Arts,” displays what the preservice teachers reported knowing about the teaching of reading/language arts, including their content

knowledge, their theoretical understandings, their conceptions of their practice, and their views of student learning and the role of the teacher. Each section is completed by a summary of the preservice teacher's "Sources and Knowing."

This section that features the three cases is followed by a discussion of how the preservice teachers' descriptions and interpretations of three video-clips of others' teaching of reading/language arts compared with those offered by an expert panel. I first discuss the similarities that were found, such as that the preservice teachers shared a particular lexicon and noticed, identified, defined, and analyzed many features of instruction in exact or similar ways. I then address several differences between the preservice teachers and the expert panel, such as the emphasis given to certain topics over others and the nature and depth of elaboration.

Karen

Karen is all business. That was certainly what I thought the first time I met her for an interview outside the library at the university. As we talked, I tried to wrestle myself out of that impression. I conjectured that maybe she was tired from teaching first graders all day and then attending a class at the university before being able to sit down with me. I also wondered if her assiduous teacher professional demeanor had something to do with the fact that I was connected with the university, even though she had been told in great detail that our meetings together had no bearing on her scores in her coursework. I also assumed she might be a little nervous since we were strangers talking about some of the details of her life, and perhaps I was projecting a little of my own nervousness.

Whatever the case, nearly fifteen minutes into the first interview, I realized that I needed to relax my persona as the intent interviewer, if perhaps that was how I was being

read by her, and instead work to establish rapport. That endeavor proved easy. Once I lowered the clipboard, moving away from a strict adherence to my interview protocol, our talk gave way to a spirited conversation, and I found that Karen and I shared a few things in common. Both of us were children of divorce, raised in small towns, and had become rather accomplished pianists (if we said so ourselves!). She and I shared how we both felt supported by our families, perhaps as the result of being the youngest child. I walked away from that more-than-an-hour talk realizing that Karen was not just all business, although she still struck me as cautious and careful when speaking. Although I had no way of knowing at the time, over the course of several weeks of interviews, I would come to know Karen as thoughtful rather than cautious and reflective rather than impulsive. Indeed, Karen impressed me as being articulate, fair, and wise about her profession beyond her 22 years, someone who was committed to working hard and getting all she could from her preservice teacher education.

EARLY EXPERIENCES IN BECOMING A TEACHER OF LITERACY

Even though she is a child of a teacher, Karen doesn't recall planning to be teacher while growing up. Karen enjoyed taking ballet and learning the piano rather than getting together with her friends to play school. But various early experiences at home and in school created vivid memories of schooling, reading, writing, and language that would work together to direct Karen to the doors of the university's College of Education.

IMMERSION IN THE CULTURE OF SCHOOL. Karen told me that education was a highly valued commodity in her family. Karen's mother was a teacher through Karen's early childhood and until she was in the third grade. Karen recalled that was the year her mother became a university education professor. In our first interview, Karen described the emphasis on school in her life: "We talk a lot about school in my family. It was

understood [by her older brother and sister and her that] school was very important,” she said, and Karen was “good at doing school.” Across our conversations, I came to realize how much of an ever-present theme schooling was in her life. She later revealed that along with having a teacher for a parent, nearly every social and civic event revolved around school in the small town where she was raised.

Because Karen was aware of teaching as a role and career throughout her life, she possibly became sensitized to teaching models as sources that she drew upon later. For example, Karen reported that she has come to believe that children learn best “by watching and then doing.” When I asked her to identify her source for this notion, she did not cite her university coursework or fieldwork but rather what she learned at home as a child: “I grew up with the idea that you make your own things happen. My mom was a real hands-on, 1970s, experience type of teacher.” Karen contrasted her mother’s philosophy with the ways of her grandmother—a woman who expected Karen and her sister to simply watch dutifully to learn sewing, cooking, and other skills. Karen’s mother was different. Karen explained: “You watched a little and did a little. Then you watched and did a little more.” Thus, Karen reported that she continues to adhere to a way of teaching and learning that she observed early and firsthand, one that she claims to draw on in her own teaching practice.

Moreover, Karen attested to the strength of her mother’s career and experiences as influences in her own life as someone learning to teach. She testified to the benefit of lots of discussions with her mother throughout her teacher education, sharing ideas and swapping stories. Karen related an example that although her mother’s stories of teaching kindergarten are from the early 1970s, she found those stories to be important even though she didn’t get to live them with her mother.

In these ways, Karen cited her mother as a teaching role model, as someone who espoused the belief that learning happens when there is space made for trying, and as someone to reflect with throughout her preservice teacher education.

EARLY READING MEMORIES. Although Karen does not remember reading before she entered school, she does remember being engaged with books at home. As a student in a private kindergarten, Karen began learning to read with “mostly phonics-based, leveled readers” that were part of a Christian curriculum. Karen remembers conventionally reading these “little books.” Further, because textbooks were purchased by families (rather than provided or rented), she recalls being able to carry them home and read them to her entire family. Karen also felt great pride in bringing home new sets of readers, somehow intuiting that getting a new set of books meant that she was progressing as a reader. That early experience of reading was so positive and sustaining that she went in search of her beginning readers when she began her teacher education program, believing that she would find ways to use those materials as a resource. Karen explained, “My siblings would say that it was the [kindergarten readers/curriculum] that taught us how to read.” She reasoned the same curriculum would benefit other youngsters she would be assigned to teach in her fieldwork. Although she testified to enjoying reading to her family and improving as a reader, her talk on this subject was descriptive rather than detailed, and she didn’t offer particular titles or vignettes from her early memories of reading.

EARLY WRITING MEMORIES. Karen also had positive experiences with writing early in her education. She moved to a public school for first grade and recalled her teacher and that year fondly: “We read a lot. We wrote a lot. We had fun.” Karen traced her roots as a writer to that first-grade year in which she flourished. She has held on to and carefully protected a story she wrote that year for a writing contest sponsored

by the local Livestock and Rodeo Show. “It was about a cowboy, appropriately enough,” she chuckled. Karen was awarded a prize ribbon for that story. She credited her teacher for making her feel like a writer and for giving her the six-year-old courage to put her writing forward for other readers.

That early confidence in writing was nurtured and supported throughout her schooling, so much so that Karen thought she might decide to be a journalism major in college. In her first year, she wandered into the office of the university’s newspaper where she was put to work almost immediately. “It was really grueling,” she said of the pace and the expectations placed upon the student writers who volunteered. Although Karen liked the people and knew she could write reasonably well, there were “lots of midnight deadlines” and “a really fast turnaround” that made her realize that her commitment to the newspaper would eventually affect her grades. She crossed off journalism from her list of possible majors, but she “still knew [she] wanted to do something with writing.” That interest would creep back into her life once she declared education as her major in her sophomore year.

INTEREST IN LANGUAGE. In high school, Karen consulted her mother when she was faced with decision of learning a second language—a high-school graduation requirement and a prerequisite for college admissions. Karen’s mother encouraged her to take Spanish, and Karen completed two years of courses in the language that she reported learning with great joy and ease.

In college, Karen again found an opportunity to pursue learning Spanish, enrolling for six credit hours in her freshman year. Her interest in Spanish even led her to enroll in a course in Spanish literature. As a result, she reported feeling fairly confident about her ability to read, write, and speak Spanish after this course series. When she decided that she wanted to pursue education as a major, she initially applied through the

bilingual program admission process. However, she fell just below the required score on the entrance exam. Undeterred, Karen launched her pursuit of an education major through the general program, trusting that she could continue to improve her knowledge of Spanish as well as pursue her interest in bilingual education.

Taken as a whole, Karen reported being steeped in the culture of teaching early in her life. She learned to value education in her home; she sensed and stored good teaching models at home and in school; and she recalled specific memories connected to reading, writing, and language throughout her life as a confident learner. These experiences pointed Karen to the doors of the university's College of Education and provided her with deep wellsprings that she could draw from as she pursued her preservice teacher education.

SOURCES OF KNOWING THROUGHOUT HER PRESERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION

Karen acquired influential sources of knowing when she entered and participated in the preservice teacher education program. In this section, I first address those sources that Karen reported drawing on significantly—education course experiences and readings, fieldwork experiences, professors, and cooperating teacher—and then I address those sources that appeared underutilized—peers and supervising teacher.

EDUCATION COURSE EXPERIENCES AND READINGS. Although I didn't learn the underlying reasons, Karen told me that she determined early on in her program that she wanted to find a job teaching in a "multicultural classroom setting—a diverse school" and be assigned specifically to teach Spanish to elementary students. Even with such clarity of goals, Karen felt trepidations about "bridging the cultural barrier." Because she is Caucasian and a non-native speaker, Karen felt like a cultural outsider in the schools in which she was assigned to observe and teach. She admitted that she will need to "prove herself" in her field, which I interpreted to mean that her knowledge about language and

culture would be tested in her daily life as a bilingual educator. Yet, specific courses and textbook readings seemed to have played a part in reassuring Karen that she can reach her students. She credited *White Teacher*, by Vivian Paley (1989), as one source for her convictions: “I cannot change who I am and neither can these kids.” Further, a university course titled Sociocultural Differences in Education exposed her to additional readings and discussions that helped her understand what her students need from her. From such specifically cited texts as *Ain’t No Makin’ It* (MacLeod, 1987), and exposure to Luis Moll’s (1992) funds of knowledge, Karen claimed to derive notions that “teachers need to take an inventory of what kids bring to the classroom.” Speaking metaphorically, she described her courses as helping her to “turn the mirror around, off the teacher and onto the students.” Karen elaborated her insight: “It made [me] wonder about what the kids brought and had to offer instead of focusing always on what the teacher was planning and saying.”

In addition to building Karen’s confidence as a bilingual practitioner, specific course content appeared to arm Karen with confidence about instructional approaches.

She frequently cited Reading Difficulties as a course that encouraged her to work toward melding theory and practice: “The Reading Difficulties course provided an ideal setting because you were able to be a teacher to a student while also still in the position of being a student yourself—one learning to be a teacher.” Karen described that course as giving her the opportunity to learn strategies for teaching reading to the university classroom and then apply them when tutoring a student one-on-one, planning lessons specifically for the child based on the preservice teacher’s ongoing monitoring. She said the experience made an impact on her practice because her university instructor kept tying what was happening in each particular case and the content of the course overall to what her peers and she would be doing in their own classrooms as teachers.

As two additional examples, Karen cited Calkins' *The Art of Teaching Reading* (2000), and *The Art of Teaching Writing* (1994), as texts that affected how she thought about her practice. One bit of take-away knowing from those texts, she reported, was that teachers should assure that students are off on reading and writing endeavors before attending to more mundane classroom tasks such as taking attendance or collecting book money. Karen, then, reported learning that literacy is always the priority in the classroom.

Thus, Karen reported education course experiences and readings as strengthening and shaping her desire to serve in diverse schools as a bilingual educator. She valued and learned from hands-on experiences with students that immediately put to work her understandings of teaching and learning. And she valued and learned from specific readings that she cited as helpful in informing how she enacts and reflects on her own practice.

FIELDWORK EXPERIENCES. In addition to her university coursework, Karen attributed experiences across multiple sites as contributing to her knowing. Across three semesters of observing and teaching in the field, she worked in kindergarten, second-, and fifth-grade classrooms, concluding—without intending to be reductionistic—that the importance of doing fieldwork in multiple sites is that “you just get to see how things are with different schools and different settings and different teachers.”

Karen showed appreciation for the connectivity between her university coursework and fieldwork. That is, she frequently referred to how her Reading Difficulties course was designed to introduce reading strategies to the preservice teachers, send them into the field to apply them, and then return to the university classroom to reflect on the effect. Interestingly, that practice might be distilled as “learning a little and then doing a little”—a philosophy that she was presented with early in her life. Karen

clearly perceived that her observations in the field and teaching in the field were beneficial since she remarked that she saw different schools, settings, and teachers, and she “could use maybe a few more [fieldwork experiences].”

PROFESSORS. Overall, Karen felt that she had strong relationships with her university instructors. Karen stated, “All of my classes that I’ve had [in the professional development sequence] have been good. I got to know the professors.” She elaborated, “If I had to get a recommendation from somebody, I would feel comfortable going to any one of my professors.”

Karen indicated that the relationships built with professors during a semester can often extend past the end of that semester. She provided a specific example: “Our Reading Methods professor still emails us with things about going to book fairs and seeing different things. There was a lot of relationship-building in the academic sense, which I think is a really good reflection on the College of Education. I saw it happening across all of these classes [in the teacher education program].” Thus, Karen viewed an established relationship with her university instructor as not just limited to the semester in which she was enrolled in a particular course, but as having the potential to enrich her experience throughout her participation in the program and possibly beyond.

COOPERATING TEACHER. Karen seemed to value teaching in the first-grade bilingual classroom in which she was completing her student-teaching semester. In fact, she credited her cooperating teacher frequently as informing whatever notions of teaching and learning she was discussing in our interviews. For instance, I observed a lesson in which Karen taught children to make English words plural, using an easel and chart paper to model how singular words (written on the left side of the page) were made into the plural form by adding an –s (written on the right side of the page). Karen modeled with nouns that were familiar to the students, used the words in sentences, and asked students

to show their understandings by selecting objects around the room and announcing and spelling their plural forms, all before allowing students to go off and work independently in their journals. In my interview with her following that lesson, Karen reported that her instructional techniques emanated from her cooperating teacher, who seemed to have taught Karen to contextualize new and familiar vocabulary, engage the group in oral language responses, and monitor for understanding before allowing students to work independently. Karen added that her cooperating teacher has taught her the importance of eliciting purposeful language in multiple contexts and through speaking, listening, reading, and writing.

Thus, during her student-teaching semester, Karen first borrowed from and mirrored her cooperating teacher's instructional strategies as the groundwork for internalizing and reflecting on her practice in collaboration with her cooperating teacher as the semester progressed.

PEERS. Although Karen reported that she established relationships with her professors often, she never mentioned a specific instance of peer influence on her learning. She was part of a cohort of students who moved through their professional courses and fieldwork as a group. Even so, Karen didn't mention that she leaned on her peers in any way, such as to work collaboratively on assignments, share ideas, or even vent concerns. When I observed the Language Arts Methods class in which she was enrolled during her student-teaching semester, Karen and her peers were friendly to each other but did not seem to use opportunities within the class structure (such as breaks during the three-hour course) to collaborate or share their experiences. Although the relationships with peers might have been stronger and more helpful earlier in her program when Karen's coursework constituted more of the demands of her day, the absence of

references to her colleagues made me wonder if consulting with fellow students was an underutilized source of knowing for these peers participating in similar experiences.

SUPERVISING TEACHER. Although she often talked about how her cooperating teacher served as a model and supported her learning, Karen mentioned her involvement with her university supervising teacher only once across our conversations. Karen's supervising teacher and I were invited to observe a lesson that involved students composing a "morning message," a routine that the class begins with each day. In our debrief interview, Karen admitted, "I wish I would have done something more exciting, something more hands-on. But I was being observed. You never know how something's going to go." Although Karen didn't specifically mention the criteria on which the lesson was judged, she perceived a need to "play it safe" by inviting her supervising teacher to view the morning routine, possibly because it *was* routine and she could anticipate her students' participation. She seemed to view her supervising teacher as someone whose main purpose was to evaluate her practice rather than to scaffold or challenge it, as her cooperating teacher had done. As a result, Karen did not credit her supervising teacher as an additional source for assisting in the development of her practice.

At one point in our interviews, Karen constructed a metaphor that she felt described her perception of her own responsibility in the enterprise of becoming a teacher. She said, "You are commanding your own voyage into the classroom, and you are skilled enough to decide and make a judgment about what you've learned." Always appearing content to be "responsible for [her] own learning," Karen's culminating evaluation of her preservice teacher education is marked by the attributions of credit to varying sources of knowing as well as the crediting of her own ability to make sense of those sources in ways that can inform and affect her teaching.

DEVELOPING NOTIONS ABOUT TEACHING READING/LANGUAGE ARTS

Across our seven interviews together, Karen took several opportunities to support her notions about the teaching and learning of reading/language arts with theoretical perspectives and her knowledge of content. She often fluidly announced, defined, and articulated her understandings, applying them to her learning, her observations of others' teaching, and her reflections on her own practice. However, like other beginners, Karen appeared to be continuing to find ways to transfer those voiced theories and understandings into the demands of the classroom.

BECOMING A THEORIST. Karen's theoretical knowledge about the teaching of reading/language arts became more transparent when I asked her to review and describe the contents of specifically selected videotapes of teaching demonstrations in reading/language arts. Karen had ready facility with a teacher lexicon, continually naming, labeling, and/or defining instructional theories and practices. For instance, after viewing a clip in which a kindergarten classroom was engaged in journal writing, she defined the teacher's roles as "modeling the task," "facilitating the process," and "conferring with students to assess their understandings." She reported that the teacher's goal was to "get the students to produce some form of writing, to work at becoming independent writers."

In our second session of viewing a clip, which featured a first-grade classroom engaged in a readers' workshop, Karen reported recognizing such features of a workshop as "selecting a 'just right' book," "picking a partner," "finding a place to read," and "conferring with the teacher," among others. She speculated that the teacher was working with one particular child on onset and rime to build "a fundamental ... skill that maybe [the student] didn't have yet" while the teacher also "monitored the progress of the other students working independently or in groups."

When asked to reveal her sources of knowing, Karen traced her knowledge of the content of instruction to her reading of *The Art of Teaching Reading* (2000) and *The Art of Teaching Writing* (1994) by Lucy Calkins, as well as to her fieldwork experience connected to her course in Reading Methods in which she observed a fifth-grade class engaged in a readers' workshop.

Additionally, although I didn't directly ask Karen to judge the practice of the teaching demonstrations on the videotapes, she found some opportunities to wonder aloud about some of the teachers' instructional decisions. For instance, while Karen was generally complimentary of the kindergarten teacher's use of his own writing as the instructional medium and was impressed with the students' engagement with the task, she wondered if the teacher was so focused on the structure of the lesson and the process of writing that the content of the texts that the student writers were producing was ignored. And when she and I viewed the clip of the small guided-reading group in the first-grade classroom, Karen noted that the instruction seemed well-planned but narrow in scope. As she watched the teacher specifically work on strategies, she wondered if the teacher would ever "guide the students through the study of character" rather than simply "guiding them through the words." Such critiques illustrated Karen's concern with students' meaning making rather than the procedures of the tasks placed in front of the students.

In these instances, Karen gave me hints of theory, often showing that more than simply identifying components of a workshop approach to teaching and learning reading/language arts, she understood the principles that undergird the practice. Her sources of knowing—from both education course experiences and readings, and her work in schools—have enabled her to discuss teachers' individual attention to students' needs, to address student engagement and connection with texts, and to take concern for other

matters that attend to the broader conceptions of teaching reading/language arts rather than existing on a basic level of procedural understandings.

Across several interviews, Karen also revealed many of her philosophies related to student learning. As one example, she expressed her viewpoint that students should be allowed to “take responsibility for their own learning.” Karen believes that she lived that philosophy as a student herself, viewing her participation in the preservice teacher education program as “commanding her own voyage into the classroom” and taking “responsibility for making decisions about what [she] was learning.” Not surprisingly, Karen found opportunities in our interviews to discuss the importance of creating opportunities for student-selected reading and writing. When viewing the clip of the second-grade classroom engaged in a readers’ workshop, Karen appeared to have a dawning moment when she began railing against a program called Accelerated Reader that her younger cousins were participating in. Karen explained that her understanding of the program was that students were required to read books only from assigned, designated reading levels, rather than having the opportunity to browse books, ask their peers for recommendations, or select books about subjects of interest. Karen was dismayed that a practice would purposefully limit students’ ability to freely choose their texts, and lauded the classroom in the video-clip that showed students choosing to “read around the room, rehearse for reader’s theater...and pick books that they like.” Karen credited her Reading Methods and Reading Difficulties courses for espousing the notion of “having this gigantic classroom library so that students have choice.” Karen reported that she learned from her coursework and fieldwork that classrooms don’t simply just need lots of books; classrooms need lots of books so that students can make decisions about their reading and “participate in their own learning, think about their own learning.” Karen beamed as she reflected on the teacher’s intent in the readers’ workshop

classroom: “The teacher was operating with the knowledge that learning is a participatory activity. [That teacher] knows that her students need to be able to think and interact with other students and to have choice. They choose independently and can report back about their progress.”

In these ways, Karen showed herself as a burgeoning theorist who carefully and purposefully pulls from her varied sources of knowing to recognize and articulate the philosophies, intents, and meanings that inform others’ teaching practices.

TOWARD SHARPENING HER PRACTICE. Across our interviews, Karen revealed her practice as being in the continual process of developing. Sometimes she showed evidence of wrestling theory into practice, struggling to make sense of what she perceived as incongruent philosophical stances. Sometimes she showed evidence of aligning theory with practice, supporting her descriptions of what she was enacting in her practice in the field with the theoretical principles that she had learned well in the university classroom and the field. Sometimes she showed that her theoretical understandings had not yet worked themselves into her practice and that perhaps she was lacking sufficient opportunities to reflect deeply on her practice.

Karen’s efforts to wrestle theory into practice was especially evident when she came to an interview conflicted about a conversation she had had with her cooperating teacher. On this particular day, Karen’s 25-year veteran cooperating teacher shared her philosophy that bilingual students need to “get writing immediately because it is a skill that students can learn quickly.” Karen agreed with the notion of having students learn English by writing, but she was somewhat dismayed to discover that by “get writing,” the cooperating teacher meant writing by copying. Karen explained the primary source of her conflict: “It’s not really what I’ve been taught.” Furthermore, she cited her concurrent experience of taking the course Language Arts Methods in which the

professor “is providing a comprehensive look at what a language arts teacher can and should be.” Her conflict resulted because she expected to find evidence in the field of the broader conception of oral language and writing instruction that she was being exposed to in her university coursework. That is, she had come to understand that children had a great deal to say and that one way to honor that is to let them write what they think, and yet in the field, she was seeing those definitions narrowing and becoming more prescriptive. Karen’s conflict was the result of her perceived collision of theory.

This experience, though, empowered Karen to find opportunities to use her student-teaching classroom to try out some of her developing theories about effecting reading/language arts instruction. For instance, her mounting knowledge of the writing workshop caused her to consider how this structure “would look” and work in her bilingual classroom. As a result, Karen introduced her students to Author’s Chair, a feature of a writing workshop in which young writers read their work to peers, because she believed it to provide for purposeful listening and speaking, such as turn-taking and responding to the content of carefully crafted texts. Thus, her perception of the collision of philosophies between aspects of her field-placement classroom and her university coursework spurred her to inspect more closely and experiment with developing notions about effective reading/language arts instruction.

In addition, Karen seemed to understand that sound decisions about planning and delivering instruction in a bilingual classroom demand consideration of both knowledge about language and knowledge about children’s acquisition of language. When she described to me her decisions for teaching the two lessons I observed, Karen articulated her instructional decisions by explaining them in the context of advancing students’ skill levels. As she reflected on her lesson about the basics of making English words plural, Karen explained, “This is a technique in ESL. I chose to do it because ... the language

structure is different in Spanish than in English.” When I asked if the students were familiar with all the words on the chart in addition to the words that the students provided at her invitation, she explained that she tries to “slip in” new vocabulary: “They might not have ever written ‘pencil’ in English, but they know that word. I say, ‘Sharpen your pencil’ constantly.” In this teaching instance, Karen seized an opportunity to help students transfer their listening vocabulary to their reading and writing vocabularies, illustrating how her practice was being shaped by her theoretical understandings.

In other instances, however, Karen still appeared to be juggling her understandings of how language works, what children can do, and what children need, searching for a balance of focusing on advancing the skills that her learners need while also assisting their development as independent writers. When I sat down with Karen to discuss her morning practice of completing the sentence starters “Today is... Tomorrow is... Yesterday was... Words I know are...,” she rushed to defend the routine. Perhaps she was inferring that I might notice the difference between the self-selected writing that she described as valuing versus the patterned writing that made up this lesson. Karen explained her decisions for the writing practice in this way: “It’s hard for [the students] to always be faced with not knowing what’s going on. They’re going to master this. They’re going to feel successful. It’s 8:30 in the morning, it doesn’t take up a lot of time, and they need some confidence.” She then explained that the students move from this confidence-building, whole-group instruction to independent practice in the form of the more demanding activity of self-selected writing, leaning on their ever-growing word wall as they need or choose to do—an activity that seemed more in keeping with the comprehensive view of language arts instruction that she reported ascribing to.

In addition, Karen’s reflection on her practice with me indicated that on at least one occasion, Karen reported not transferring her theoretical knowledge to her classroom

practice. When she talked about her intentions for the lesson on making English words plural, Karen admonished herself when she realized that she had not sufficiently used both languages to support the students' learning. Because she had elected to videotape that lesson, we were able to watch and talk together about her teaching. While we were watching, Karen suddenly raised her voice, declaring "I just realized something, just now." She then explained to me that a bilingual specialist with the district had just consulted with her and the cooperating teacher about "connecting everything more to the students' first language." She recognized the specialist's advice as guarding against *subtractive bilingualism*, a notion that Karen reported learning in her coursework readings as "getting rid of one language to advance another instead of using the students' first language as a resource." She seemed to realize that a different approach that leaned on the students' first language could have enhanced the students' understanding of making English words plural, recognizing that she should have talked about the plurality of Spanish first: "I didn't do that. I knew that and I've done that since [the bilingual specialist] made a point of mentioning it, and I don't know why I didn't here."

Karen, then, appeared to be in the process of sharpening her practice by questioning the established practices of her cooperating teacher, finding opportunities to insert more of her theoretical and content knowledge gained from her university coursework into her practice, and finding opportunities and knowledgeable others with whom to critique and reflect on her practice. As Karen moves from her position of preservice to inservice, she will likely have to seek out similar opportunities in order to continue to grow her practice.

THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER. Explicit in her discussions of how students learn best was her view of the role of the classroom teacher. Karen has held fast to the notion that "good teaching is good modeling." Certainly she reported witnessing good

demonstrations of teaching throughout her life as both student and teacher, and perhaps as a result, modeling is a quality that Karen, across our seven interviews, chose to address in her own teaching as well as in the teaching of others, often taking the initiative to draw comparisons. For instance, when discussing the kindergarten class and the teacher who used the writing of his own story as an instructional medium, Karen identified modeling in his practice and shared how modeling can look different in her room “for the purpose of English [language acquisition].” She indicated that she never simply narrated a process, as the teacher was able to do as a result of his students’ facility with English. Instead, she described how she used an easel and chart paper for demonstrating skills to be acquired because “the purpose is for them to see the print and hear the print.”

Modeling, however, is not a term that Karen loosely attributed without reservation. Her definition of modeling appeared not only to be related to giving students access to a task but demonstrating the thinking that students should employ as they engage in the tasks that are designed to develop their independence as readers and writers. She said, “I think sometimes teachers think they’re modeling but they’re just talking. I’m always thinking about my modeling and what it looks like and how effective it is”—yet again conveying her desire to improve her practice through reflection. In the clip showing a small-group guided reading session, Karen was careful to say that the teacher was guiding more than modeling because the students already seemed to know the reading strategies that the teacher wanted them to use: “[The teacher] is talking about strategies and asking questions to get the students to say what they know about those strategies and how they are using them, rather than modeling anything.” And in the clip featuring a second-grade classroom engaged in a reader’s workshop, Karen described the teacher as “monitoring” and “facilitating” rather than modeling.

Karen's attentiveness to modeling in her own practice might mean that with more experience, she might look to more varied sources than were evident in my two observations of her teaching. Specifically, she might be apt to draw from her mother's philosophy of learning by doing; from her increasing theoretical and practical knowledge of and expectations for her students as developing language learners; and from her ever-broadening conception of language arts instruction. True, too, is that Karen's inclination to reflect on her practice works to ensure that modeling might continue to evolve as a strength in her teaching.

SUMMARY OF KAREN'S SOURCES AND KNOWING

Karen holds clear notions of how early experiences of observing teaching professionals and valuing literacy and schooling directed her to preservice teacher education. Those memories are sustaining ones that have influenced her present teaching experiences in ways that are both philosophical (attributing "learning by doing" to her mother) and practical (hunting for books from her own school learning). Karen cites many sources of knowing, clearly attributing and applying what she has learned from course experiences, reading, and field observations and teaching, and demonstrating how that knowing informs her as a practicing educator. She values opportunities to try out what is learning and believes that she is responsible for her own learning as a preservice teacher—and, it can be presumed, responsible for her own learning as an inservice teacher. Karen also appears to be a highly astute theory-builder in her field. As a budding professional, she values, pays attention to, and internalizes theories that she actively looks to observe and enact in the field. When Karen encountered dissonance, she worked to make sense of her understandings, inspecting and experimenting with her conceptions of effecting reading/language arts instruction. As a result, she seems to have emerged as a capable and willing reflector on her own and others' practice. Her

theoretical understandings will likely continue to serve her practice as she willingly works to cultivate and unite the two.

GLORIA

Gloria took a seat beside me on a concrete bench that sits in front of the elementary school where she was a student teacher. It was just before noon, as she unwrapped her sandwich and asked me, “So, what would you like to know?” This was our first meeting, but there was something about Gloria’s presence and energy that made her seem familiar to me.

I began, perhaps a little awkwardly, with “What’s going on with you?,” buying some time as I set up the audio recorder and located my interview protocol. Without hesitation, Gloria said, “I’m burned out.” I looked at my first interview question—a request for her to begin telling me her schooling and literacy story from birth—and decided instead to accept her invitation to tell me the story that was on her mind that day. “You’re burned out?” I repeated, with a mixture of both surprise and interest. Soon Gloria was sharing with me the details of her daily schedule, seamlessly weaving together how her roles as live-in nanny, university student, and student teacher were pressing on her. She immediately struck me as someone who has few secrets, and who was willing to reveal her teaching life to me.

Toward the end of our first hour-long interview, Gloria told me that she had a paper due in her Language Arts Methods class and that she would probably have to turn it in late. Hours later, as I was transcribing the interview, I had feelings of guilt when I came to that part of our talk. It dawned on me that she could be using her time to work on her assignments rather than volunteering for my study. When I asked by email if she felt that participating in my study would be more taxing than beneficial to her, she did not

accept my invitation to bow out. Instead, we agreed that her studies must come first, and that our interviews should be worked in when she had pockets of time. That was a fortunate moment for me, because over the course of our interviews, I came to know Gloria as a charming preservice teacher, with boundless enthusiasm and creativity—all of which appeared a good match for her interest in the early childhood education program she sought out at the university.

EARLY EXPERIENCES IN BECOMING A TEACHER OF LITERACY

Possibly as a result of Gloria's mother's occupation as a childcare worker, Gloria learned early on about caring for others, so that when Gloria entered college, she, too, took a job teaching young children in a childcare center. It is also possible that Gloria was influenced to pursue helping children to become more literate as a result of positive experiences she had as a child learning to read and write in school. These significant experiences are discussed in the sections that follow.

THE CONSUMMATE CAREGIVER. Gloria's mother began caring for children in her home when Gloria was a young girl. Having children around all the time increased Gloria's "interest in caring for and entertaining them." Gloria's mother repeatedly told her while she was growing up that she was "always nurturing," a role that Gloria took very seriously, especially when her younger sister was born prematurely. She recalled how her sister, who had a weakened lung condition, required a number of hospital stays at various hospitals miles from where the family lived. She remembered boiling plastic toys to sanitize them before the family headed out to visit her sick sister. Gloria told me she cried herself through kindergarten because she didn't want to be away from the sister she felt that she needed to protect. Gloria felt that her sister needed her help, so she gladly accepted the roles of big sister, friend, teacher, and guardian.

Gloria took on the role of caregiver again in college when she needed a job. When she heard about a position with the university's childcare center, she quickly applied. Initially assigned to the infant room, Gloria showed such natural ability with the pre-kindergarten students that her supervisors noticed and moved her to the pre-kindergarten room. Gloria reported that she learned a great deal from her two-and-a-half year stint in the childcare center, an experience that confirmed for her that she enjoyed working with young children—talking, laughing, and working alongside them as they made discoveries about themselves and their world. Interestingly, when Gloria realized she needed to find a different job because her preservice teacher education commitments required so much of her time, she pursued another job related to caregiving—working and living as a nanny for three children.

Gloria's early experiences as a caregiver to her sister, as a helper with the children her mother cared for in her home, as a teacher of pre-kindergarten students at the childcare center, and as a nanny worked together to convince Gloria that she wanted to pursue teacher education and specialize in pre-kindergarten learning.

BECOMING A READER. Gloria didn't remember for certain if she was reading before she entered school. She recalled being read to at night, and that when she was "reading," it might have looked like "holding books up and looking at pictures and telling stories" rather than reading conventionally.

Gloria recalled that it was in the first grade that she made her first visits to bookstores and to the library. "I liked [library] day. ... I remember checking out the same books over and over again." When asked about specific titles she rechecked, Gloria answered quickly, "*Where the Sidewalk Ends* (Silverstein, 1974)." She then added, "There was one about a boy who goes to the sea. Why can't I remember that title right now?" She pulled a face as if to say that for 22 years old, she already has a terrible

memory. She also remembers reading all through elementary school because she was in a book club in which new books arrived regularly after she and her peers selected them from a catalog distributed by their teacher. “I remember getting the *Boxcar Kids*” (*Boxcar Children series*, Warner, 1990) “and I loved those books so much,” Gloria said.

In middle school, Gloria felt miserable after having to change schools; she found it hard to fit into the well-established cliques. Gloria retreated with books, becoming “addicted to comedians’ biographies—[Jerry] Seinfeld, Paul Reiser.” She remembers reading and rereading *Couplehood* (Reiser, 1994) in the sixth grade, acknowledging with a smile, “it was probably totally inappropriate.” Gloria explained that her father eagerly bought her the books she wanted, no matter the content. She remembered that at about that time, her father began talking about the importance of school and how he wanted her and her siblings to be the first generation in the Sanchez family to go to college. Gloria, describing herself as a “real pleaser then,” reported that she took up reading in earnest to impress her father. In high school, much happier even though in yet another new school, Gloria said she had more to do, had many more friends, and slacked on her reading habit except for the literature that she enjoyed as part of her classes.

BECOMING A WRITER. In first grade, Gloria remembered feeling like the teacher’s pet. As a result, she tried everything to keep her teacher’s attention. “I even wrote a letter to a contest about how great my teacher was,” she recalled with a slight smile. She said nothing more about that letter, but her smile made me think I was supposed to question the genuineness of the letter. That she penned the letter was all that Gloria seemed willing to admit.

In third grade, Gloria found writing again, perhaps this time with more purpose: Gloria’s teacher encouraged her to write more often and on her own instead of just for school assignments. “She got me into poetry. I remember reading a Langston Hughes

poem, and I liked writing poetry after that.” Gloria wrote “I’m sorry” patterned poems to her grandmother whenever she found herself in trouble—“which was often,” she added. Yet, she said that all of this writing was done in “private,” and that she never showed it to her teacher. Only her main audience—her grandmother—really knew about her voluminous portfolio; Gloria needed her help in mailing off entries to writing contests. “You’re a great writer,” Gloria’s grandmother told her repeatedly. Gloria added, softly, “No, I never won any of those contests or even got a response.” Nonetheless, the pastime of writing sustained Gloria throughout her elementary years and beyond—all the way into her college years, during which she kept a journal “off and on.”

Early experiences created powerful memories for Gloria. The words of her mother (“You’re always nurturing”) and her grandmother (“You’re a great writer”) became a self-fulfilling prophesy for Gloria. She enrolled in the university’s College of Education with the goal of learning to teach pre-kindergarten children about reading and writing.

SOURCES OF KNOWING THROUGHOUT HER PRESERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION

In her final semester of teacher preparation, Gloria seemed uncertain about her future upon graduating with her teaching credentials. When asked what she might do instead of becoming a teacher, Gloria answered, “I’m 22. I [already] have a good job (as a live-in nanny). I don’t know. I’m fine.” In my last conversation with Gloria, just a few days before the semester’s end, Gloria revealed more: “I’m struggling with...like, I don’t know. I’m just like that. I’m thinking my family wants that for me [to graduate and go into teaching]. Well, my dad probably doesn’t. He thinks the pay stinks and that you don’t get much respect. I think he thinks I want to save the world or something. I’m just floating along. We’ll see.”

Despite her uncertainty, Gloria reported that she established varied sources of knowing throughout her preservice teacher education that will serve her well should she decide to pursue teaching after graduation.

PRIOR WORK EXPERIENCES. Initially, Gloria had decided that teacher education would be a good fit for her due in part to her two-plus years of experience interacting with the children at the university's childcare center. During this experience, Gloria was introduced to a number of children's books, literature that she incorporated into the lessons she prepared for her internships and student-teaching in subsequent semesters. But beyond simply learning about texts as resources, Gloria began developing theories about young children's learning that were built on in her coursework and fieldwork experiences. For example, Gloria explained that from working with pre-kindergarten children, she learned that "if you put pen and paper in front of them, over time you'll begin to see drawings and letters." Gloria said that she learned to "think more creatively" in terms of her instruction and that her teaching should build on "children's natural curiosity." Such budding notions were tested and deeper understandings resulted from the coursework and fieldwork experiences that soon followed these teaching experiences in the childcare center.

UNIVERSITY COURSEWORK EXPERIENCES. Gloria repeatedly credited her readings and discussions in a course titled Guiding Young Children in Groups for her belief that children learn best through self-discovery. Gloria said that she had learned that children are "naturally curious" from her work at the childcare center, and that her burgeoning theories about student learning were confirmed when notions of self-discovery and self-exploration were presented in her coursework. Seeing those concepts in classrooms during her fieldwork observations further solidified the importance of child-directed instruction in her mind.

During one of our interviews, Gloria had just come from the pre-kindergarten classroom where she was student-teaching. Gloria shared that the cooperating teacher was called out of the room for most of the afternoon and that the experience opened her eyes to something important: “When you’re all on your own, you get to see how much you’ve gotten from your [university] classes.” For example, Gloria shared a particular moment in which she taught a lesson that she had prepared in one of her university classes that made her feel “like an expert” in front of her students, even though it was about a subject that she described as “not my forte by any means.” Gloria said that having professors and the content of those courses “as resources has helped so much.” She continued, “I haven’t had to look beyond the materials that I’ve been given and planned in my courses. I have an abundant supply of materials.”

In these ways, Gloria credited her coursework experiences for providing opportunities to mull existing and develop new theories of learning. She also revealed that she viewed her education courses as valuable sources of content learning that she was able to enact confidently in her practice.

RELATIONSHIPS WITH PROFESSORS AND COHORT. When Gloria began her coursework, she wasn’t aware that she would be in a cohort (a group of students who enroll in the same set of teacher preparation courses and practica). That which was initially surprising quickly became gratitude because Gloria found the relationships she formed with her peers to be valuable. When I attended and observed her Language Arts Methods course, I usually arrived beforehand to listen in and even join in on conversations. Although the setting was a university classroom, the atmosphere seemed more like an afternoon get-together with friends. There was some gossiping, but there was also sharing of materials to be incorporated into the lessons they were in the process

of teaching. Gloria said, “You get to know the girls—and the professors—well. It fosters a feeling of community.”

In our last conversation together, I asked Gloria to say anything more that she wanted to say about any of the discussions we had had previously. She immediately talked about being in a cohort. “That experience is what really stands out. You have the opportunity to get really close to your peers and professors.” She then wondered aloud, “I don’t know if everyone took advantage of that. I certainly did.”

In addition, Gloria was assigned to a cohort in which the same instructor taught all three reading/language arts courses in the professional development sequence. She reported that she and this instructor are “close” as a result of being able to build the relationship over a period of a year and a half. She added, “I wouldn’t think twice about coming to [this instructor] three years from now if I needed help.” Gloria also shared a recent experience of relating to a different instructor outside of school: “I was at the park the other day and saw [my professor] and his kids. I played with them for a while. I might kind of feel weird about that otherwise, but I got to know my teachers really well.”

EXPERIENCES WITH HER COOPERATING TEACHER. Gloria discussed how having a “great cooperating teacher” made her fieldwork experiences positive. Early in her professional development sequence, Gloria was placed with a teacher’s pre-kindergarten classroom to do observations. Then, during her final semester, when it was time to take on her student-teaching assignment, Gloria requested to be placed with the same teacher again.

One of the reasons that Gloria reported choosing to teach alongside the same teacher was because “she lets go ... [and] really lets you have her room.” However, in later interviews, Gloria said, “I haven’t met any cooperating teacher who would just let you go [have total freedom with the class].” Gloria related an example of how she was

disappointed when she was presented with an idea in her university coursework about setting up a mailbox center to encourage student writing. Her mind quickly flooded with ideas—“oh my gosh, we could get stickers, use pictures, make notes...” Then she was “snapped back to reality” because she figured that she couldn’t try it in the classroom where she was doing her student-teaching: “There’s too much that the students have to learn [instead], and it’s not possible to restructure [the cooperating teacher’s] whole classroom and day.” Gloria later admitted that she didn’t try to “sell” her ideas to the cooperating teacher often, mostly because the cooperating teacher “was already so free about giving permission to try things.” Gloria decided on her own—without consultation with the cooperating teacher—that trying the mail center idea would be too disruptive to the structure of the classroom. This instance, however, did not sour Gloria’s view of her student-teaching learning, because she continually credited her cooperating teacher as a “master teacher” (Gloria’s term rather than an official certification) who “taught so much” to Gloria.

Gloria also discussed the learning opportunities she gained from being allowed to teach the pre-kindergarten class without her cooperating teacher present. Gloria admitted that, like most of the relationships between student teachers and cooperating teachers, she “leaned on” hers; she seemed to mean that she knew the cooperating teacher would step in and assist her instruction if need be. Gloria drew the analogy of having her training wheels taken off her bicycle—a freeing from the kind of support that ensured you would not fall or fail. Without the cooperating teacher being present to assist, Gloria said she had to put fears aside; only when she taught alone, she admitted, was she able to “see” her real abilities. She added, “Then the next day, I was more confident because I got through it without any help [from the cooperating teacher].”

Thus, teaching alongside the cooperating teacher and teaching without the possibility of help from the cooperating teacher became themes in Gloria's talk about the benefit of participating in teaching and learning in her pre-kindergarten classroom. Being complementary rather than reductionistic, she summed the experience as learning "what works, what doesn't, and what you'd drive yourself crazy trying to figure out on your own."

THE MERITS OF FIELDWORK. Many times, unsolicited by the interview questions, Gloria reported how her university coursework synched up with her fieldwork experiences. In one instance, Gloria stated, "[My professor] said that you should not dumb down vocabulary with kids." Gloria then reported how, during the reading of the picture book *Mouse Paint* (Walsh, 1995) in one of the lessons I observed, Gloria chose to use the word "camouflage" in the context of the story to talk about mice changing their colors with paint. In another read-aloud, of *The Enormous Carrot* (Vagin, 1998), she used the word "cooperating" and found later that one student used the word in a different context to complain about a peer. Gloria described each of these experiences as "a light bulb moment," and then appeared to capture a philosophy of coursework-and-fieldwork experiences: "[My professor] said something, I did it, and it made an impact on me to see it working." She continued, "Maybe I wouldn't have ever figured out to distinguish their speaking and reading vocabularies in that way ... that they wouldn't learn to read that word but that they could understand the concept and see it in their lives." Gloria later recapped her new learning, planted by her coursework and then rooted by her fieldwork: "You have to connect words with something the students are interested in and then it's theirs forever."

Yet, Gloria did report a fieldwork experience that she struggled to make sense of. She shared that she learned in her university coursework about the importance of open-

ended work for students, but then she went into a classroom early in her professional development sequence and observed an elementary teacher who was “consumed” by preparing for state testing. As a result, Gloria felt stymied because she wanted to introduce an open-ended activity for students when she was given the opportunity to teach a lesson, but the teacher wanted the class time restricted to skills-based worksheets. Gloria admitted, “When I had to teach a lesson in that classroom and the teacher asked me to do worksheets instead of what I planned, then I just did it. You just did.” Later, with more experience in the field, she felt that perhaps her experience was an isolated occurrence and concluded that “as interns, I guess you’re supposed to experience whatever it is that’s going on in that classroom, even if it didn’t match what you learned at the university.” She was pleased in later semesters of her professional development coursework because she saw “good moments” in which what she was learning in her coursework was “a good fit” for what she was seeing in the classrooms she visited.

Overall, Gloria reported that she felt “well prepared” in applying her coursework learning in the field. Yet, in one of our last interviews together, Gloria repeated a concern she had stated in an earlier interview—that preservice teachers might benefit from “getting more experience in the [public school] classroom.”

SUPERVISING TEACHER. Only on occasion did Gloria credit her supervising teacher for specific contributions to her teaching. One such instance was cited when Gloria and I reviewed the video-clip that featured a kindergarten teacher sitting on the floor with students in a circle: “You have to get down on their level. My supervising teacher taught me that,” Gloria reported.

Gloria related another instance in which the supervising teacher’s comments encouraged Gloria about her practice—and perhaps made Gloria think twice about not pursuing teaching after graduation. In one of our last interviews together, Gloria

disclosed that she was “feeling better lately.” She explained: “My supervising teacher said that I acted like a teacher now. She meant that I used to get all hung up when kids weren’t doing what they were supposed to do. I wouldn’t ever hold a kid accountable for a consequence even when I knew I was supposed to, but I couldn’t bring myself to do it. But from talking with her after my last observation, I realized that I was affecting other students’ opportunities to learn by not addressing certain behaviors and that the students wouldn’t take me seriously [as a result].” The phrase “from talking with her after my last observation” seemed to suggest that Gloria’s reflections about her practice with her supervising teacher were beneficial, even though Gloria so rarely found opportunities within our conversations to make specific mentions of (or give specific credit to) those moments. Although this specific comment deals with Gloria’s awareness of management strategies, perhaps the supervising teacher reflected with Gloria about other aspects of her practice, such as her reading/language arts instruction, and helped Gloria feel that she “acted like a teacher now” in those areas as well, even though Gloria did not find opportunities across the interviews to provide evidence of such a hypothesis. Further, the supervising teacher concluded this instance of praise by saying that Gloria had become more comfortable with “how and whom she should be” in her role as a teacher—quite possibly a remark that Gloria needed to hear to “feel better” about the pursuit of teaching after the semester ended, especially since she was suffering from feelings of being “burned out” when I first sat down to talk with her.

When revealing on her sources of knowing throughout her preservice teacher education, Gloria cast her experience as enriched by fellowship among teachers and peers alike and by experiences both in university classrooms and field-placement classrooms. Useful experiences and their sources easily sprang into her conversations, and her content knowledge appeared to materialized in her fieldwork enactments. Gloria’s reporting

revealed that her sources were rich and varied and that they have given her a confidence that she feels is evident in her practice.

DEVELOPING NOTIONS ABOUT TEACHING READING/LANGUAGE ARTS

Gloria believes that kids learn best through self-discovery and self-exploration, and this belief was the lens with which she viewed the demonstrations of others' teaching, as well as reflected on her own practice. Gloria began developing these notions from work experiences prior to entering her preservice teacher education program. Her burgeoning notions about children were confirmed and further enhanced by two professional development semesters of working in a pre-kindergarten classroom. On multiple occasions, Gloria said with conviction, "Children grasp most what they discover for themselves. Anything they figure out on their own, that's what they're going to have ownership of. It is a philosophy that I want to hold on to all the time." Such theoretical knowing was embedded in her descriptions of others' teaching as well as in reflections on her own practice.

DEVELOPING A THEORY-DRIVEN PRACTICE. Gloria credited her child-focused orientation to her readings and discussions in a course titled Guiding Young Children in which she learned that children learn best when presented with opportunities to discover for themselves. One way that Gloria advanced a self-discovery approach to learning in her student-teaching classroom was by looking for teaching opportunities that originated from her observations of what students were ready for learning. For instance, although I asked specifically to observe her instruction and reflect with her on her practices teaching reading/language arts, Gloria invited me to observe a lesson that engaged children in using building blocks to create a tall structure. She initiated the lesson because in her observations of the children's play, she noticed that the students were striving to build increasingly taller structures, but that each time those structures would become wobbly

and the students were talking intently about this “problem.” She said, “They were kind of starting to discover things on their own. So, I decided it was time to lead them through a discussion about it [the concept of base support].” She had previously discussed both how she builds on what students already know about a concept and how she uses oral language to assess students’ understandings, so she thought the building blocks lesson would be a good display of that notion as well.

For Gloria, guiding discovery in student learning as a theory has clear implications for the teacher’s instructional approaches. For instance, she reported having learned to be “more comfortable with not knowing exactly the direction that students will take their learning” and to adapt to their course. Gloria described her approach to planning instruction as “knowing the beginning and the ending but letting the children lead the way in the middle.” When I asked for an example, she reflected on her lesson that I observed that began with the retelling of the book *Mouse Paint* (Walsh, 1995) and included a graphic representation as a mathematical equation—such as when a red mouse steps into yellow paint then the mouse becomes orange. The students wanted to display their story understandings differently, insisting that the mouse should be placed inside the puddle of the color that causes it to turn another shade. Gloria showed that she had thoughtfully planned the lesson but that flexibility and adaptability were important to allow the students to direct the course of the graphic display. This philosophy appeared again when she reflected on her building block lesson: “With discovery, you want to leave some openness there always. I like to go with whatever direction the students take me.”

Another aspect of Gloria’s instruction that is in keeping with her philosophy of self-discovery is providing support so that students can work toward making connections on their own. Gloria said on many occasions that the teacher “should always be thinking

about setting up the environment so that students can take responsibility for their own learning.” These two notions—providing support and creating an environment in which students are held accountable for their own learning—surfaced when Gloria viewed the video-clip of the kindergarten students writing in journals. Gloria noted that the teacher was making a point of connecting the students’ drawings—“their version of prewriting”—to their words below the picture—“their story.” She pointed out that there was “prior learning involved here,” meaning that “lots of kids don’t just naturally know that their stories are to correspond with their pictures. If you ask them to draw a picture and then ask them to write something, they don’t connect. So the teacher took steps up to that point, like reading books and showing pictures and how those pictures go with the words.” In this way, Gloria speculated on the teacher’s acts of support prior to the lesson and then complimented the teacher on the nature of the writing task, surmising that the students have learned that writing is not copying what the teacher writes, but creating their own stories in their own journals.

In all of these ways, Gloria is tuned in to her students’ learning—observing it, setting up environments to extend it, referring to and building on it in her lessons. She showed evidence of melding theory and practice, holding allegiance to self-discovery and finding ways to build her practice while staying true to her philosophies. In talking about her practice, Gloria seemed almost unusually confident for a beginning teacher. She spoke of her clear intention to take what she knows from her collective experiences from the university setting as well as her teaching experiences and continue to infuse her practice with these understandings.

DISPLAYS OF CONTENT KNOWLEDGE. Gloria appeared to understand the importance of using literature to engage students in reading/language arts—connecting with, weighing in on, applying, and extending ideas and concepts presented through

story. She reported doing read-alouds at the university childcare center but admitted that it wasn't until she took coursework and went out into the field that she saw how literature can be extended, such as with picture walks, repeated readings, oral retellings, journal writing, and performance. Gloria now views engagement with picture books and other texts as a "starting point for ongoing discoveries," and the selection of books should "build on their experiences and what they know." When I asked Gloria what she hoped students would be able to do as a result of reading and rereading *Mouse Paint* (Walsh, 1995), the basis of one of her lessons I observed, she answered, "I want them to see these basic color combinations in other contexts, such as when they are in the art center, experimenting to learn about other combinations. Now when they paint, they can mix their own colors instead of relying on the ones that come in the bottles. So they'll start to see it in other situations."

Gloria reported understanding the importance of oral language in building the reading, writing, and speaking vocabularies of young learners, initiating conversations about the notion in our interviews about her own practice as well as remarking on it in the practice of the teachers featured in the video-clips. As one example, Gloria reported learning in her Reading Methods course not to dumb down language because doing so would constitute missed opportunities to increase students' vocabulary. She admitted that the notion was a "light bulb moment" for her because she knew that in her pre-kindergarten teaching at the university childcare center years before, she had witnessed and in her own practice constantly dumbed down language, citing as an example calling a train a "choo choo." In her student-teaching classroom, however, she found opportunities to encourage vocabulary building, not shying away from using terms that more accurately communicated meaning rather than dumbing down the language. Interestingly, Gloria pointed out that, in the video-clip of the kindergarten teacher who wrote alongside his

students in his own journal, the teacher didn't "play dumb" in his instructional methods. She was impressed with the way that he stayed true to modeling the process by talking through the writing his own story, a process that would not include acting as though he couldn't spell certain words just to remind students of their strategies.

Gloria's knowledge of reading/language arts content was also evident in her description of the teacher's intentions in the video-clips we viewed. In responses to the clip of kindergarten students' writing, she stated, "The teacher wants his students to be independent writers. He is modeling the task but he wants them to write their own stories. He wants them to know that they have a story to tell, and that they have a way of going about telling it." She appeared to consider the larger picture of the teacher's instruction, not just the content of this particular lesson but what goals he had for his students in this particular moment and beyond. As another example, when describing the clip that featured a readers' workshop, Gloria again sought to capture the teacher's conception of students learning to read: "I haven't seen readers' workshops in the field, just in videos [at the university]. But the philosophy is the same as writers' workshop, which I've seen. And that's students having choice in the texts they'll engage in, reading around the room, reading and rereading books, working on reader's theater." Later, Gloria said more about the matter of student choice, speculating about the teacher's intentions: "She has a goal—to engage them in reading. But it's more than that. It's to foster real appreciation of one's own reading as opposed to 'I'm at school, and I have to read.'"

In these ways, Gloria showed that she was informed about reading/language arts content in her descriptions of her own and others' practice. She discussed extending students' engagement with texts, applying learning to other contexts, using oral language to help students think about concepts and increase their vocabularies, and creating space

for risk-taking and choice. Such understandings came from work experiences with child, course experiences at the university, and observations of and teaching in the field.

THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER. Gloria seemed concerned with the ways in which teachers can create positive learning experiences for children, explaining that pre-kindergarten students are learning what school is now and “how to do school.” She explained her belief that this first year of school sets the tone for students about what they should expect in their present and future learning as students. As a result, Gloria adopted the vision of a classroom in which the teacher follows the lead of the students, inspired by the students’ curiosity and, in return, students become motivated and inspired learners. Her repetition of “I knew kids would enjoy it” as the impetus for the lessons I observed might sound like a simple reason, but given how she conceives of student engagement in broader terms, excitement is an essential criterion for her instructional decisions. Gloria believes enjoyment (engagement) has an impact on students’ attitudes toward future learning.

Because Gloria is an advocate of students’ actively constructing their own knowledge through self-discovery, she sees the teacher’s role as guiding and facilitating discovery, exploration, and risk-taking. Gloria reported that the teacher is to “pay attention to what kids need” in a classroom that “has a community feeling.” Not surprisingly, Gloria pointed out, when viewing video-clips, several classroom environments in which the students were positioned as a community of learners. As she watched the kindergarten teacher seated on the floor and writing with his students, Gloria commented, “I love, love, love that he’s with them in this community, on the floor, on their level, not with a pen or special paper but with their tools.” In addition, Gloria pointed out that “the kids felt free. If they needed a resource, they went and got it and they weren’t asked ‘Hey, where are you going?’ And the teacher let them kind of peer

conference and it wasn't discouraged. It wasn't 'Don't talk. Do your own work' but was 'I'm glad that you asked her for help.'" When Gloria viewed the clip of the readers' workshop, she linked her description to the kindergarten classroom, saying, "They're a community, like the journal writers were. They're enjoying themselves and I see a lot of ownership of their reading and consulting with their peers."

Much of Gloria's sharing of her perspectives on the teaching displayed in the video-clips was about what the students were doing and why and how they were feeling, as well as how the teachers were agents for those effects. Gloria is child-centered in her orientation such that she was most likely to notice and comment on how the teacher related to her students in the three clips. Given her stance toward student learning, Gloria made extremely laudatory comments on the instructional clips in which the students were the focus, as in the first-grade readers' workshop clip. She was more likely to voice criticism of classroom incidents that placed the teacher as the focus. Although her observations of the kindergarten students engaged in journal writing were typically positive, Gloria indirectly criticized the teacher by drawing a comparison between his teaching and how she views her own: "I'm more flexible than he is. He didn't really ask them if they had questions. I ask many more questions than he does. He does so much of the talking. He didn't poll their responses until the end. It's not very open-ended." In the same vein, Gloria criticized what she found to be teacher-focused instruction in the video-clip of the small guided-reading group: "It's all coming from the teacher because they have to wait to know what to do based on her." In addition, Gloria spoke critically of the instruction when student engagement seemed to lag. For instance, Gloria noted that the students in the guided-reading group might have been pleased to have their teacher's attention, but that the text was "boring" and "dreadful" and was not likely the students' choice, and therefore the students "just kind of sat there." Unsolicited, Gloria

drew a comparison between the guided-reading group and the readers' workshop classroom: "The students are getting the message that they need to have skills [in the guided-reading group]. And maybe they're learning skills. But if the teacher wants her students to know that reading is fun, she's not doing that right here. In [the readers' workshop] classroom, students are learning that reading is all around them, that there's choice in reading, and that they're always growing as readers because they take responsibility for it." Thus, Gloria seemed to consistently hold a student-focused orientation as her lens for viewing the video-clips and lauded or criticized them accordingly.

Interestingly, when discussing her view of herself as a teacher and her strengths, Gloria made no mention of the possibility of not pursuing a teaching position when she graduates. In fact, she spoke quickly and with enthusiasm and clearly has envisioned herself working with her own students, in her own classroom. Perhaps her initial feelings of being "burned out" were more indicative of the pressures of her daily life, including her teacher education preparation, current job responsibilities, and intuited pressure from her family about her career choice.

SUMMARY OF GLORIA'S SOURCES AND KNOWING

Gloria learned early about caring for young children, taking on the responsibility of looking after her ill sister and nurturing the other children that constantly surrounded her as a result of her mother's job. These experiences possibly encouraged her to pursue caregiving early in her college career as she took a job at the university's childcare center and learned some important theories about teaching pre-kindergarteners. These theories were built on when Gloria's education courses advanced her understanding of them through readings, discussions, and observations in the field. Gloria felt confident in her ability to work with young children and elected to observe and teach in a pre-

kindergarten classroom. There, she tested her philosophies of guiding students to construct knowledge through discovery. Gloria projected confidence that might not be expected of a beginning teacher. Certainly Gloria was able to articulate her theories and her content knowledge and described the ways in which those understandings are infused in her practice. Perhaps Gloria's repeated exposure to and practice in young classrooms can be credited for such early confidence. Yet, there were points at which her words betrayed her confidence and suggested that perhaps her theoretical understandings are a bit ahead of her ability to employ them. If she chooses to become an inservice teacher, Gloria will likely draw on her sources that confirmed her commitment to theories of student learning that she observed on her own early in her career and made great effort to enact in her apprenticeship.

LANA

Because I had been observing Lana's Language Arts Methods course, I felt assured that I would recognize her face—even though I had not put all names with faces yet—when I arrived at the school in which she was completing her student-teaching. I was to meet her immediately after the voluntary afternoon tutoring that Lana and her cooperating teacher committed to on Tuesdays and Thursdays. I went to the main office and began to sign the register when I saw a face I knew. "You're looking for me," she said with a smile. I nodded as she made her way through the office to the secretary's desk, grabbed a large black spiral, and told the young girl who was clutching her hand that they would call her grandmother. "We're just going to get a ride home for [my student], and then I'll be with you," she called to me. On that cue, I took a seat and waited.

After Lana told the grandmother on the end of the line, “It’s okay. I understand. We’ll be waiting outside at the flag pole,” Lana and her student went outside. From my seat, I watched through the window as Lana talked and laughed with the young girl. I also looked at student-made mobiles hanging near the entrance and observed the last of the teachers and students coming and going. This school, I was to find out later, was much like the one Lana attended when she was in elementary school—largely Hispanic and African American with fewer Caucasian students like Lana. After about fifteen minutes of my inconspicuous nosing around, I saw Lana walk her student to a car and wave goodbye. Lana then came into the office and said, “Ok. I’m all done now. Let’s go talk in the classroom.”

Without expecting to, I had observed my first interaction with Lana as a professional, even before I had been able to conduct my first interview with her. I began to see Lana as patient and caring, and over the course of seven interviews, I was able to confirm those initial impressions as well as come to understand that Lana’s interest in helping children is deeply rooted and has been a constant theme throughout her 23 years.

EARLY EXPERIENCES IN BECOMING A TEACHER OF LITERACY

Growing up, Lana knew she wanted to be a teacher. Although she recalls her reading and writing instruction in school as dull and even discouraging, she developed a love for reading and writing because of home experiences. She became a literacy teacher early, reading her original poetry to her “students,” a captive audience of stuffed animals and stepsiblings. Her interest in working with children was realized again later when she began volunteering in earnest when she entered college. Such experiences led her to believe that pursuing an education degree was the right path for her.

BECOMING A LIFELONG READER. In the first grade, Lana remembers being in the “blue group” for reading instruction. Groups of four were called to the teacher’s table

to read aloud. “It wasn’t the highest group, but it was a high group,” she said, sharing that her peers knew that a certain color represented a certain reading level as designated by the teacher.

Despite the “high pressure situation” of learning to read in the first grade, Lana recalls developing a love for reading at home: “My family was very into books.” One of Lana’s older sisters learned to read well at home before school began and was immediately moved into the first grade, bypassing kindergarten. Lana described this sister as her “reading buddy” who repeatedly read to her at night. Lana was impressed by her older sister and would try to tell outrageous stories to gain her sister’s attention and approval.

Lana remembers her family’s interest in reading as a sustaining one throughout elementary and middle school: “I loved going to the library and the bookstores. I liked getting my own books for fun. When it was time for my family to go somewhere, we’d go grab books to take along, not toys or games.” Her interest in books was fostered in voluntary book clubs in school: “We always had books from the Scholastic Book Club. I still have lots of those books. I remember the *Berenstain Bears* [series]. I remember that I loved Nancy Drew. When I was older, I liked R. L. Stein [*Goosebumps* series].”

Lana’s love of reading was renewed in high school when she had the same teacher for two years of English. She explained that she was inspired because her teacher loved what he was reading with them and “he cared about what his students were learning.” Lana said that in college, although reading for class assignments took priority, she would “sneak time” to pursue reading novels.

EARLY ROLES AS TEACHER. Lana reported that she “absolutely loved school” early on, and that interest seeped over into her spare time. After her first-grade school day ended, Lana went home to play school, not with her friends but with stuffed animals.

“I would line them up. I would make worksheets for them. I would grade their work,” she said. Lana described a play house that she had in her back yard in which she designed the interior to look like a classroom. “I had this old chalkboard. I have no idea where my family got it.” She remembers that she loved to write, even though writing in school was “mostly handwriting practice, never writing a response or writing for enjoyment.” For her stuffed animal students, she wrote short poems on the chalkboard and requested that her students read them aloud with her.

At the end of her first-grade year, and the completion of one year as a first-grade teacher in her play house, Lana recalls getting “a ton” of school supplies as a birthday gift: “I didn’t even know that my parents really knew that I loved playing teacher. I thought it was my little secret.”

A few years later, Lana was still playing school, but she was finally able to have human students. Lana’s parents divorced, and she lived with her mother and eventually a new stepfamily. No longer the oldest, she became the middle child in her blended family, with a younger stepbrother and stepsister. “I liked taking care of them,” she remembers, and part of taking care of them meant that they learned from her teachings. She laughed when she related that she specialized early: “I taught only reading and writing. No other subjects.” The stuffed animals were pushed aside, and Lana’s stepsiblings moved to the front of her reading and writing classroom.

Lana played school all through elementary school and into middle school; she said she might have continued longer had she not developed other interests. Those “strong feelings of really wanting to be a teacher” went away when she realized her strength in math and began pursuing every sport she could. Still, Lana said that she never lost an interest in helping children, perhaps because she had willingly transitioned from being cared for as the youngest child in her family to being the oldest child in the family

after her older sisters had gone off to college. “Even now,” Lana said in our first interview, “I just want to deal with kids, so I don’t care what capacity that is in. I mainly got into teaching because I want to help children.”

SOCIAL WORK ROOTS. Lana said that her “desire for working with young children” led her right out of high school to the doors of the organization Big Brother Big Sisters. She related that she has been a big sister to a boy for five years—beginning in his second grade year and still contributing to his development now that he is in the seventh grade. In addition, she began volunteering with Orphanage Outreach, a program that places volunteers into orphanages for a specified length of time. The experiences made her believe that she wanted “to do something positive with underprivileged kids.” Later, she chose to gear her education fieldwork experiences toward being placed in diverse or minority schools, those that were similar to the ones she attended as a child.

Lana’s service projects caused her to entertain social work as her college major. She took many courses in social work but was told that she would need an advanced degree to do the kind of work that interested her. Lana then began thinking seriously about pursuing a degree in education, assured that she could earn a minor in social work. Lana explained, “I just feel like I have a purpose and that’s to help children. That’s why I’ve done the volunteer work that I’ve done. And after being told that I’d need a master’s degree, it just seemed like education was the best way to help children, although I still have an interest in social work.” Lana eventually decided on elementary education, citing her early interest in the profession and enactments of it. She saw teaching as a “natural fit” for her interests and a path that would put her to work with children immediately upon graduating. Ultimately, she might decide to pursue a master’s degree in social work while teaching. Lana said, “I know I will be very happy teaching.

Teaching is definitely my main path right now. As long as it involves children, I'll be content."

Thus, Lana's early experiences as a big sister to her younger stepsiblings may have influenced or cemented her interest to seek out volunteer work with children when she became eligible to do so. In addition, Lana's enactments of literacy teaching in her play house also shored up and reflected an interest in working with children. These early experiences and the practicalities of degree requirements pointed her to the College of Education.

SOURCES OF KNOWING THROUGHOUT HER PRESERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION

In our interviews together about her preservice teacher education, Lana revealed that she draws on many sources for her professional knowledge. Often she had a clear sense of these influences, easily crediting them, offering specific information about her ties to them, and even mentioning her sources without being prompted to do so.

BENEFICIAL EDUCATION COURSE CONTENT AND ASSIGNMENTS. Lana repeatedly mentioned specific courses from her professional development sequence that provided her with experiences she recognized as beneficial. One of these was a course in reading difficulties. She explained the plan of the course as teaching the interns strategies for teaching reading to young children and then assigning them a student to plan and deliver tutoring. She credited this course for building her arsenal of "options" to pull from when teaching word analysis, fluency, and comprehension. Lana explained that the course structure included first planning tutoring lessons as well as sampling journal articles and textbook readings that related to topics discussed in class. Then the interns met with their tutees twice weekly, implemented their planned instruction, and reported back to the university classroom for reflection, refinement, and additional planning for future tutoring sessions. She repeatedly remarked in our interviews that first

reading and discussing strategies, then going in the field to try them, and then returning to the university classroom to reflect on the effects was a particular experience that stands out for her in terms of learning about teaching reading.

Another course cited frequently for its content was her methods course in language arts. Lana repeatedly mentioned that a strength of the course was its timing; the preservice teachers were taking the class concurrently with their student-teaching assignment. Language Arts Methods was set up like a writer's workshop, allowing the preservice teachers to participate in a writer's workshop as students, with the university instructor as a model of the teacher role. Lana appreciated this "real-life model" rather than "hearing a lecture" about the features of a writer's workshop without the opportunity of experiencing one. Another specific reference to her Language Arts Methods course was brought up in the interview that followed her lesson that included a read-aloud of a picture book. She revealed that she had finally become comfortable with leading read-alouds because she had seen so many good models, citing that her instructor in Language Arts Methods often began a class session by modeling a read-aloud of a picture book.

In addition to specific courses that were helpful, Lana recalled a specific assignment that proved beneficial. When discussing helpful aspects of the course titled Reading Methods, she recalled being asked to do a presentation of her vision of herself as a teacher. Lana said that at first she found the experience hard, especially having to put into words what she believed to be true about the teacher she would be. She reported that ultimately the experience made her reflect on the magnitude of her learning and think about the decisions she has made along the way about her experiences.

Thus, Lana specified the ways in which the course structure and content of her two reading courses and one language arts methods course proved beneficial and enriching. Such course experiences—which allowed her to employ newly learned

reading strategies, placed her squarely within a workshop frame, modeled read-alouds, and asked her to articulate her beliefs as a literacy teacher—continued to appear in her discussions of her perspectives on others’ teaching as well as her reflections on her own practice in the field.

HELPFUL FIELDWORK EXPERIENCES. For Lana, developing her practice in her student-teaching classroom solidified what she had learned in her university coursework: “You can read as much as you want, but you need an opportunity to practice it.” Later, Lana claimed the opposite to be true as well, believing that her fieldwork experiences helped her to validate her coursework experiences: “You can learn a lot from being hands-on in the classroom, but you need to have that background [theoretical] knowledge in place for it [the practice] to make sense. Your knowledge has to have something to stick to.” In our last interview together, she summed up her student-teaching semester, again pointing out the importance of working to put theory into practice: “I could have just watched my cooperating teacher and then gone off and copied what she was doing. But you’ve got to know what you’re doing and why because you have to have a broad range or, well, ... flexibility as a teacher and just copying someone’s practice doesn’t give you those kinds of options.”

Lana described fieldwork experiences that made an impact on her learning. As one example, Lana observed in a fifth-grade classroom as the students engaged in a readers’ workshop, and when she reviewed the clip of the second-grade students involved in the readers’ workshop, she repeatedly referenced the earlier readers’ workshop classroom she had observed. She noted that the fifth-grade classroom had a list of reader responses to choose, and she recalled that a group of students were working together at a table to write a play and that one student working independently was making a comic strip. Lana talked with the teacher who emphasized the importance of students’ freedom

to select texts on their own, and she eavesdropped as the teacher conferred with students about the direction of their writing. Thus, this fieldwork experience assisted her in noticing these same features of instruction in the video-clip. Yet, in a different interview, Lana said that she'd like to see another model of a readers' workshop, mostly because she had begun to develop an affinity for the workshop after her observation in the fifth-grade classroom. Perhaps this longing is a result of not experiencing firsthand a readers' workshop because her cooperating teacher did not implement one in her classroom; Lana reasoned this was the case because a prescribed curriculum is required at that school.

Lana remarked on a number of occasions about another fieldwork experience which involved observing a writing workshop in a third-grade classroom. Her take-away knowledge was that choice is paramount: "One student was doing a biography of Michael Jordan. Another was doing something about a relative going off to college. The teacher's minilesson that day was about beginning, middle, and end. So the students had to decide how that fit with what they were doing." When Lana and I viewed the clip of the kindergarten students engaged in journal writing, she noted that she learned about the writing workshop at the university by reading about its theoretical principles and participating in one as a student in her Language Arts Methods course, while concurrently participating in the teaching of a second-grade classroom that used the writing workshop. The experience of reading about it, participating in one at the university level, and observing and teaching the writing workshop in the field funded her observations and remarks about many features of the innovation.

Lana commented that while she appreciated that her teacher education program often afforded opportunities to go into different schools, the benefit of doing so perhaps made her long for even more varied experiences. She recalled that an assignment in her Reading Methods course involved three groups going into the field to observe different

classrooms and reporting back their experiences. Lana valued that experience but, after hearing from the other groups, wished that she had had all three experiences, rather than one actualized and two vicarious. All in all, she still desired “more times seeing teachers teach” and for more experiences in schools other than the socioeconomically disadvantaged schools that she had chosen to visit. In a later interview, Lana reflected, “I’ve had two semesters in second grade. I remember thinking at some point that I should have taught in an older class.” Nonetheless, she emerged from the collective experiences knowing that her choice of visiting underprivileged schools was a good one because she now wants to be in a school as an inservice teacher in which “the students need good help, where the students need me the most.”

Going into the field also gave Lana a glimpse of the effects of policy in classrooms. She encountered in her student-teaching assignment the ways in which a prescribed curriculum can affect a teacher’s planning of instruction. The school in which she completed her student-teaching was one that used scripted curriculum materials and dictated what should happen instructionally on a weekly basis. In our talks together, Lana brought up the prescribed curriculum on a number of occasions, at one point saying that it “takes away a lot of choice” and another time seeming to capitulate that she had students participate in creating a graphic display of a picture book’s plot only because the structure curriculum mandated it. In these instances, then, fieldwork gave Lana the opportunity to consider how the broader school policies can affect the instructional decisions in a classroom.

Taken as a whole, fieldwork experiences were quite influential on Lana’s notions about the teaching of reading/language arts. Lana’s practice in the field helped her articulate her belief that her education courses and experiences nourished what she was observing and learning in the field. When we watched the video-clips together, she

repeatedly credited fieldwork experiences for informing her descriptions and analyses of others' teaching. Such positive experiences in the field—even exposure to the ways in which district policy affects instruction—made her desire even more learning in classrooms.

RELATIONSHIPS WITH COHORT AND PROFESSORS. Lana made repeated mentions of her three semesters of reading and language arts courses, all taught by the same instructor and with the same peers. Lana said that she was surprised that joining a cohort and having the same peers for classes would end up being such a meaningful and memorable experience: “Our cohort is very close. I didn’t know that I could become so close to fellow classmates. I’m not a really a quiet person, but I’m surprised how interactive and involved we’ve become with each other.” Lana shared that the sense of closeness she felt with her fellow interns extended beyond the classroom socially: “We go to the football games together. We hang out together and call each other all the time. I look forward to going to class because I get to see my friends.” In addition, developing friendships with peers had a motivating effect on the interns academically: “We became competitive in a friendly way. You’re motivated to do well, to get good grades. You care about presenting in front of your peers or working really hard on a project that you’re assigned to do together because you don’t want to let anybody down.”

Lana often considered her peers as resources to be utilized: “We get to class early. We tell each other about what is going on in our student-teaching. We share ideas.” She also felt that concurrently completing a university course and the student-teaching semester was beneficial: “Sometimes [a peer] will be talking about using a picture book or something, and my brain will just start popping with ideas.” In addition, she took advantage of the university’s email system to post questions and share thoughts about teaching ideas. Lana, then, viewed her peers not just as people who were along on

the same journey, but as peers who could contribute to and enhance her learning and experiences.

Lana shared a similar fondness for the instructors of her courses. “I can honestly say that I remember all of my courses in the College of Education really well. I think that’s a good sign,” Lana reported. She emphasized that the “small class size in our education courses” allowed the students to “get close” to the teachers and the students. For Lana, getting close to her teachers meant gaining them as professional resources within a semester and after. When reflecting with me on one of her lessons I observed, Lana noted that if she had questions about planning instruction or coming up with a creative idea, she wouldn’t hesitate to contact her Language Arts Methods instructor, not just because she was taking the course presently but even after, when she becomes a full-time teacher. Lana summed her view of the instructor as “always responsive, always sharing ideas.”

Thus, Lana’s preparation in becoming a teacher of reading/language arts was nurtured and supported by her peers as well as faculty. She looks upon her fellow interns and instructors as resources, and intends to utilize them even after her preservice education ends.

COOPERATING TEACHER. Lana reported that observing and teaching alongside her cooperating teacher for two semesters helped shape her philosophies and views about the classroom environment that she wants to establish in her own classroom in the future. On many occasions, she characterized the second-grade classroom in which she completed her student-teaching as “a community, a fun learning environment, and kind.” Such descriptors made their way into Lana’s articulations of her own philosophies and practice.

Lana reported utilizing her cooperating teacher as a resource as well as a collaborator for planning instruction and reflecting on her practice. She credited her cooperating teacher for assisting in the planning of the two lessons I observed and for “thinking with [her]” about what resources could be used. In fact, Lana said that the picture book that she shared with the students in the first lesson I observed, and the materials she gave the students in the second lesson I observed came from the cooperating teacher’s classroom, resources that were readily available to her in the classroom. In addition, she testified to her cooperating teacher’s willingness to reflect with her on her developing practice: “I probably don’t even know how much I’ve taken in from watching her and her talking to me about what she is doing and why.” In a later interview, Lana again credited her cooperating teacher for fostering reflection: “I’ve been with her two semesters. She’s talked to me so much about what she does and why. I’ve watched her carefully and am always looking to see why she is making the decisions she is making. I’m trying to get everything I can from her.”

Lana’s cooperating teacher also appeared to be a good model of the profession, demonstrating that building a community of learners extends outside of the teacher’s own classroom and into those of colleagues’. That is, Lana’s cooperating teacher served as a model of working in a community with other teachers. Lana reported her cooperating teacher’s philosophy: “She says that the more teachers she helps, the more students she helps.” Lana made a point of saying how impressed she was that her cooperating teacher is often asked to be a mentor and provide training to fellow teachers, even though many of them have more teaching experience: “She’s always welcoming people to come observe her. She likes to share her ideas and to get ideas from others. She has an open door.” In one of our last interviews, Lana emphasized the notion that “there needs to be a community with people you work with” and reported that one of the sources she will

draw on as an inservice teacher is the experience and expertise of the teachers who are teaching on the same grade level that she is assigned.

Lana clearly appreciated being in the second-grade classroom in which she was assigned to student teach. In our last interview together, Lana said that she was glad that she was matched with her cooperating teacher because they “have a lot of similar ideas,” and Lana intimated that some of her peers had been placed with teachers in which the relationship was “full of conflict.” Interestingly, across all of the interviews, Lana’s mentions of her cooperating teacher always included tremendous accolades. For instance, Lana summed her experiences with her cooperating teacher as, “I’ve been with her two semesters. That helps. I think I could have learned a lot just in one semester. But definitely I have appreciated having more time with her. I could stay even another semester and learn even more.” Still, Lana acknowledged that choosing to be placed with her cooperating teacher for two semesters also meant missing out on other experiences: “I’ve had two semesters in second grade. I remember thinking at some point that I should have taught in an older class. I should have seen other teachers.”

While she gave her cooperating teacher high praise without reservation, Lana made no mention of her supervising teacher in any of the interviews. Lana had so fluidly credited those sources that entered her mind when she discussed her experiences as a preservice teacher, so she apparently did not view her supervising teacher as influencing her practice in specific ways that could be credited within our interviews. Thus, some sources of knowing proved more influential than others, and throughout her education, Lana seemed to be cognizant of how various experiences aligned with, nurtured, and supported others.

DEVELOPING NOTIONS ABOUT TEACHING READING/LANGUAGE ARTS

CONTENT KNOWLEDGE. In our first few conversations, Lana typically geared the talk toward broad conceptions of teaching, even when I asked specifically about the teaching of reading/language arts. For instance, she repeatedly seemed concerned with the classroom environment she hopes to create when she becomes responsible for her own classroom: “You have to start with a community of learners; that’s most important. Plus, you have to recognize what students need, and you have to recognize how to get them there.” Across our conversations, I came to understand that “valuing learners” would be an ever-present theme in Lana’s perspective.

It wasn’t until Lana viewed the video-clips of others’ teaching that I was able to capture specific content knowing about reading/language arts. In fact, when we viewed the clip of the kindergarten students engaged in journal writing, Lana rapidly identified key instructional features: “Their picture is their prewriting; the teacher is a model of the process; the students are writing their own stories; he’s modeling strategies, like using tools to make spaces between words; he’s showing his thinking while he’s labeling; he’s explaining the process, not the actual story that he’s doing; the students are becoming independent writers who write in their own journals and he writes in his own; he values their writing; they value their writing.” When I asked Lana to elaborate on her understandings, which was my attempt to unpack some of her knowing, Lana reported that she was struck by “the respect that the teacher showed for his students” as well as how the students are positioned as capable writers. “Listen to his words,” Lana said to me, earnestly, “because he said, ‘This is our very important writing time.’ That’s huge to me.” When I asked why that moment in the video-clip captured her attention, she responded, “He wanted them to know that they should value their writing, that *he* values their writing.” Even here, interestingly, the features of instruction that Lana reported

appreciating and connecting with reflected her philosophy of “valuing learners” that made its way into so many of our conversations.

Lana appeared to understand many of the precepts that undergird the writing workshop, as was evident in her descriptions of the kindergarten video-clip: “Writing isn’t assigned. Writing should be a big thing—their own vision—for what they write about. There are certain things that you want your student to think about along the way, and those are planted through minilessons.” In her discussion of this clip, she repeatedly acknowledged pulling from a number of sources, including participating in a writing workshop as a university student and participating in the teaching of a writing workshop in her student-teaching classroom. She appeared to meld those experiences, confident that in her own practice she is able to incorporate many of the main principles of the writing workshop. One principle she reported was the importance of student ownership of their writing. Her understanding of that principle originated in the university classroom: “I had this different idea about going about my memoir, and I wanted to try it out, so I talked with the teacher about it. She had some suggestions, too, but mostly she was all for it. So it made me glad, made me really want to write it.” Another principle she reported was the importance of sharing and celebrating polished texts. Her understanding of that principle was derived from the field, specifically from observing how the second-grade students in her student-teaching classroom shared their texts: “Author’s Chair is something that celebrates writing, especially the completion of the process of starting with an idea, writing about it, conferring with teacher and peers about it, and then sharing it.” Such demonstrations of content knowing were informed by multiple sources and contexts.

In another instance, Lana, drawing from her field observations, was able to apply her theoretical knowledge to a teaching episode from the video-clip that featured a

readers' workshop. She specifically credited her descriptions of what she observed in the video-clip to her experience observing a fifth-grade classroom engaged in a readers' workshop because she found the two instances to "definitely match." Lana reported some of her understandings of the readers' workshop as giving students opportunities to engage and respond to texts in many ways, preventing the teacher from being the focus, and allowing students to have choices and to take responsibility for their learning. Interestingly, she viewed the readers' workshop as "fitting within" her desire to create a community of learners in her classroom, saying that it allowed for reading and writing to develop in different ways and at different paces for students. Lana made particular mention of a student working on onset and rime with her teacher one-on-one. She found it important to mention that this student, who Lana suggested was still developing important reading skills, would not be shut out from other reading opportunities depicted in the clip, such as readers' theater: "Readers' theater helps with fluency. All readers can participate, given a text that is right for them. I'm sure the student who works with onset and rime is in a readers' theater group. I'm sure the teacher has all kinds of texts available for readers' theater groups."

When I asked her to reflect on her two lessons I observed—a read-aloud and independent writing in journals—Lana also revealed a great deal of content knowing. In the first lesson I observed, she asked students to make predictions about the story based on the title *Sylvester and the Magic Pebble* (Steig, 1987), paused frequently while reading to wonder aloud about events and story meaning, elicited responses from students who wanted to share, and so forth. She reported understanding that a read-aloud should not be the time to work on decoding skills because "decoding takes away from the enjoyment and the discussion aspect." Instead, she viewed the purpose of read-alouds as modeling "thinking about story elements, predicting, and inferring," as well as "eliciting,

monitoring, and building on students' text-to-self connections." Such understandings seemed particularly evident in her practice. The second lesson I observed built on the picture book reading I had observed two days prior. Lana began with what she called a "picture walk," which she explained as the process of asking students to participate in the construction of a retelling of the story's main events by using the illustrations as reminders. She then distributed a pebble to each student, telling the students that each pebble was magical just like the main character's pebble in the book. Students then worked independently to write in their journals about the three things they wished for with their magic pebble. In our debrief about this writing lesson, Lana reported her instructional decisions in this lesson as "picture books can be used as stimuli for writing" and she observed that the students were motivated to write "because they could put themselves in the main character's shoes."

Taken as a whole, Lana revealed that her sources in terms of content knowledge are many and varied. Lana's decisions about the teaching of reading/language arts seemed to be couched within her notion of building a community of learners in the classroom. She repeatedly credited experiences in her education courses, her interactions with her professor of reading/language arts, her fieldwork experience of tutoring in a reading methods course, and her cooperating teacher for her understandings of writing workshop and readers' workshop. In addition, Lana's practice appeared to draw from these same sources.

SHAPING A PHILOSOPHY. Lana credited her cooperating teacher's classroom for helping her shape her philosophy about student learning and an effective learning environment. She expressed her philosophy on a number of occasions, articulating versions of the following: "Students learn best when they're comfortable. Being comfortable makes them confident. More confidence makes them more motivated. It

will make them participate more in class, sharing their understandings and taking risks.” After hearing Lana credit on several occasions her observations and teachings in her student-teaching classroom for shoring up this philosophy, I found that Lana was, in fact, drawing on other sources as well in shaping her beliefs. In one interview, she said, “When a student responds with a wrong answer, how the teacher responds makes all the world of difference. It can make you never want to say another word.” When I asked her to reveal her source for that knowing, I expected Lana to point to her cooperating teacher, but instead she cited one of her university professor’s practices: “In my Language Arts Methods course, we have [a teacher] who might respond to a comment with ‘Oh, I didn’t think of it that way’ or she might offer some alternatives, but she at least acknowledges that you’ve spoken.” Therefore, Lana actively constructed her beliefs by borrowing from her observations and own experiences as a student to envision a practice that fosters “a community approach that involves social skills, cooperating, interacting with others with respect, and taking responsibility as a learner.” Lana’s bits of wisdom she collected from her cooperating teacher and university professor seemed evident in her articulation of her vision for her own classroom: “I want to build a community from the very beginning. We’ll have a community circle and class meeting. We’ll start with compliments. Every person will offer a compliment or receive one. Some kids won’t want to share as much, but it’s always about whatever you are able to participate is okay.”

Not surprisingly, Lana initiated conversations about the learning environments that she saw in the video-clips we watched together. About the clip that featured a kindergarten classroom engaged in journal writing, she summed the classroom environment as “It was a positive place to be.” Lana seemed to be aware of how the classroom environment can affect student learning and participation. Extending her talk about that same classroom, she said, “It was very interactive. The students knew that

they were free to turn to someone around them and talk over something about their pictures and stories.”

In addition, Lana’s student-focused orientation made her apt to point out many instances in which the video-clips showed students working together and contributing to others’ learning. After viewing the clip of the kindergarten class writing in journals, she commented, “They’re free to write and talk about their writing. They’re encouraged. They’re motivated to write. They’re consulting one another while he’s going around and consulting with them.” After viewing the clip of the readers’ workshop classroom, Lana remarked about the partnered readers helping each other to read texts that had been placed around the room: “The girl got to the word ‘cooperation’ and needed help. The other girl helped her. How funny that these two were cooperating to help the girl with a word that means what they were doing.” She made additional comments about the climate as a whole: “They’re liberated. Choice is huge. They enjoy reading. It’s student-based, less talking by the teacher. More talking and reading by the students.” As a point of contrast, Lana then referred to a clip we had seen previously, the one in which four students participate in a guided-reading group: “They’re doing what the teacher asked, but they’re waiting on her to know what to do. It’s so teacher-focused.”

In these ways, Lana’s desire to build a community of learners in her own practice informed the lens she used to view the demonstrations of others’ teaching. As discussed in the following section, that lens continues to inform Lana’s practice.

DEVELOPING HER PRACTICE. Lana spoke highly of her cooperating teacher as someone who reflected with Lana often on their teaching practices. Clearly her close relationship with her cooperating teacher meant that Lana consulted with her cooperating teacher when it came time to deliver instruction on her own. In the debriefs about both lessons I observed, Lana readily admitted that the cooperating teacher was a resource.

Lana selected a picture book from the classroom library and borrowed pebbles that presumably were part of materials the cooperating teacher had already collected. But Lana did not discuss whether her ideas for the lessons were influenced by or imposed upon by the cooperating teacher. She seemed to borrow from and fit her lessons within the structure and routines already established in the classroom by the cooperating teacher. For instance, her lessons seemed in keeping with familiar procedures, such as reading a picture book, responding to a picture book, and writing in journals about topics presented in a picture book. Nonetheless, she reported that had she not been able to utilize resources readily available, she would have pursued such sources as the school's library, or the Internet, and would have met with her grade-level teachers, peers or professors, to discuss, borrow and extend their ideas. Lana seemed to imply that she would look to more varied sources when the semester ended and she no longer had the immediacy of her cooperating teacher to rely on.

Some degree of reliance on her cooperating teacher also showed up in Lana's privileging her cooperating teacher's practice and mirroring it. She talked about free choice in writing, both as a philosophy and as an observation in the video-clips, as a way of enhancing student motivation to write. When talking about her student-teaching classroom, however, she said that writing topics are frequently assigned, perhaps because of the prescribed curriculum mandated by the school district. After I observed her teaching, she said in her reflection on her writing assignment that the students were excited to write about what they would do with a magic pebble. She clearly instructed the students that they had the option of writing the story about how they found the pebble or what they would ask for as their three wishes. Thus, her definition of free choice in writing at times seemed to mean that students can create whatever content they choose within the topic or situation assigned by the teacher. She didn't appear to make a

distinction between writing that is entirely selected by the student and writing that stems from literature and is suggested by the teacher. The point here is not that one practice is better or more correct than another, nor is the inclusion of this example meant to argue that all writing must be free choice and can never be assigned. The point is that Lana did not distinguish the two, blurring the definition of free choice to mean the content is the students' choice as long as it fits within the teacher's-assigned topic. Thus, although she frequently credited her cooperating teacher for reflecting with her on her practice, perhaps Lana's shifting definition of self-selected writing is one example of an unexamined practice.

Lana also appeared to be working through the reality of restrictive policy and its effects on classroom instruction. She frequently referenced how her cooperating teacher was required to follow a prescribed curriculum. Interestingly, she seemed to adopt her cooperating teacher's philosophy that following the prescribed curriculum had to be done because it was important to the school district, but that the cooperating teacher and Lana were to make the most of the opportunities that were provided within the curriculum that allowed for choice on the part of the teacher's planning and delivery of content. For example, Lana did not choose to invite me to observe her instruction when she was mostly following the prescribed curriculum. That is, although the curriculum mandated that a graphic display be created as part of her read-aloud lesson, Lana invited me to view that lesson when it was mostly planned on her own or in consultation with her cooperating teacher. In her reflection on her read-aloud lesson, Lana even made a point of saying that the only change she would make about that lesson, given the opportunity to teach it again, would be to "do the graphic display really quickly and move on" because she found that "it didn't enhance the students' understandings." Perhaps Lana's assessment is true or perhaps Lana's disregard for the instructional prescriptions means

that she does not assign value to them and instead views them as tasks to be crossed off a list.

Beyond learning to work in and around the confinements of policy, Lana appeared to plan instruction that drew on her strengths and confidence as a result of multiple experiences with a particular process or strategy. For instance, over the course of our interviews, I was able to track her talk about read-alouds. Lana said that she saw numerous models of read-alouds in her coursework over her three semesters of instruction in reading and language arts. She also reported that she got to practice read-alouds after seeing her cooperating teacher model the procedure many times. Although she didn't feel confident about doing read-alouds early in her student-teaching semester, over time she reported making her way in terms of pacing, initiating students' responses and incorporating them into the discussion, and thinking aloud to aid comprehension.

Taken as a whole, Lana looked to her cooperating teacher as a resource, collaborator, and reflector on practice, but also showed some dependence on the cooperating teacher as well. She appeared to value her cooperating teacher's perspectives on dealing with district policy and the effects on classroom instruction.

Still, she is in the process of melding theory and practice, and perhaps needs even more and varied opportunities to examine her practice. As is expected with a neophyte, Lana revealed that she feels most comfortable implementing instructional practices that she has had opportunities to try out in her student-teaching semester.

THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER. Across our seven conversations, Lana found opportunities to define and elaborate on her ideas about the role of the teacher. She believes that the teacher is rarely to be the focus, but instead serves as a model and guide, providing challenging and fun situations upon which learners may build their own

knowledge. Lana also frequently described the teacher's role as "finding ways to motivate a student to learn and to have students take responsibility for their learning."

Not surprisingly, Lana often discussed the role of the teacher in relation to the classroom environment that she hopes to create. She further defined the role of the teacher as that of "building a community of learners." She appeared to hold a comprehensive definition of a community, tending to both the teacher's and students' potential contributions. Addressing the teacher's participation, Lana believes that the teacher must hold high expectations for students, creating not a touchy-feely environment, but one that challenges and motivates students to do their best. She sees the teacher as constantly "assessing, sharing, and praising." Addressing the students' participation, she stated that students deserve a good instructional model, and that they should be given the opportunity to take responsibility for their own learning and feel comfortable and confident in taking risks. She said that students "bring a lot to the table, that their learning should build on what they know, and that others' learning should enhance their own." When viewing the clip that featured the kindergarten teacher, she remarked that the teacher "was thinking about and knows what his students already know and he was constantly striving to figure out how to reach them." This statement was almost word-for-word about what she said in an earlier interview about the kind of teacher she wanted to be.

Lana's child-focused orientation was evident in her discussion of the relationship that she sees as vital between a teacher and students. She reported that a teacher has to "really listen to the students" because listening to them "shows that you are caring" and "gives you the opportunity to assess." She remembered being observant from an early age of the teachers in her life, and she knows that her students are watching her and are noticing the ways in which she cares about them. Repeatedly, Lana commented on the

students' learning and students' feelings in the three video-clips we viewed together. In the clip of the guided-reading group, she found the children to be attentive to the teacher but wondered why the teacher "did not give the students much praise at all," commenting that her observations of her cooperating teacher and her views of her own practice included "much more recognition of what the students are doing." In contrast, she remarked that in the other two clips, the students were "engaged," "motivated," and "encouraged." In her own practice, she reflected that giving the students something tangible like the pebble (which was part of the second lesson I observed) really helped the students to "engage with their writing and be excited about it," and in Lana's view, that excitement for the students gave way to "wanting to share their writing with everyone."

In these ways, Lana views the classroom teacher as a powerful model who creates an environment that encourages risk taking, sharing, and accountability. She held fast to these notions when she watched demonstrations of others' teaching, when she discussed her cooperating teacher's practice, and when she reflected on her own developing practice.

SUMMARY OF LANA'S SOURCES AND KNOWING

In sum, Lana's preservice teacher education held at the core a desire to work with children. Lana's early enactments of teaching as well as her interests in literacy learning fed her desire to pursue an education degree and become a teacher. She spoke favorably of her preparation, crediting a wide range of sources, including experiences in education courses and fieldwork, as well as personal connections with professors, her peers, and her cooperating teacher. Her knowledge of content was often detailed and elaborated and evidence of her knowing appeared in her reflections on her practice. However, as a result of Lana's choosing the opportunity to spend two semesters in her cooperating teacher's

classroom, she showed some reliance on her cooperating teacher for planning, implementing, and reflecting on her practice. Nonetheless, Lana developed specific philosophies about the kind of classroom environment she wants to create and the ways in which the teacher can and should support students' learning in reading/language arts.

Preservice Teachers' and Expert Panel's Descriptions/Interpretations of Video-clips

To have evidence of how well the preservice teachers pulled together and applied their reading/language arts instruction, I prompted the preservice teachers' knowledge and sources with the viewing of three demonstrations of others' teaching. I chose examples of nominated teachers engaged in the teaching of reading/language arts from well-reviewed and highly regarded productions that are often used in teacher education programs as examples to discuss and learn from. On three separate occasions, I asked each preservice teacher individually to sit with me and view a short video demonstration. Following each viewing, I prompted descriptions and interpretations with questions about the instructional and assessment strategies, teacher purposes and roles, students' learning, and so forth.

Additionally, in an effort to contextualize the ways in which these beginning teachers synthesized and applied their knowing, I assembled an expert panel to respond to the same three video-clips of teaching. I then juxtaposed the preservice teachers' knowing with that of these more experienced teachers, seeking to determine how neophytes are beginning to approximate expert knowledge.

The organization of the sections that follow is as such: In the first subsection, "Similarities in Identification of Features," I begin by displaying the similarities between the expert panel and preservice teachers in terms of their identifying, labeling, and defining specific features of the teaching demonstrations, indicating that the experts and

novices share a lexicon. These comparisons might be thought of as surface features and as features that both groups noticed without fail and commented on often with the exact or similar wording. The next subsection, “Similarities in Analysis,” points out even more similarities between the groups, this time showing that the groups agreed on more than just surface features by analyzing and evaluating, often deeply, many of the same aspects of the instruction featured on the clips.

Following these two subsections on similarities are four subsections on the differences between the responses of the expert panel and preservice teachers. The subsections on differences address how the preservice teachers selected and attended to certain topics in ways that were disproportional to the expert panel, as well as how the preservice teachers’ elaboration and depth of analysis were uneven when compared to the expert panel.

SIMILARITIES IN IDENTIFICATION OF FEATURES

The expert panel and preservice teachers identified many of the same aspects of instruction, often using the exact wording or similar terms to describe what was taking place in the classrooms. Thus, the experts and the novices demonstrated that they share a lexicon, and an important aspect of the induction into the profession appears to be adopting and applying a professional discourse. (See Appendix L for a sample of agreement between the expert panel and three cases in identification of features of the three video-clips.)

When both groups of respondents—expert panel and preservice teachers—were asked to comment on the clip that featured the small guided-reading group, they had similar comments about the sequence of the instruction, remarking that the teacher began with inviting the students to make predictions about the story based on the title, that the teacher read with the group before asking them to read on their own, and that the teacher

listened and assisted students as they read individually. The respondents also made a point of classifying the students as homogeneously grouped as a result of the teacher's assessment of their reading, and the respondents specified that the teacher had chosen the leveled text that the students were reading. Across all respondents, then, the language of the profession was applied to specific instances of the instruction featured in the video-clips and done so in notably comparable ways.

As another example of parallels in their noticing and labeling of instructional features, the expert panel and preservice teachers showed remarkable similarity in commentary when they viewed the clip that featured students engaged in a readers' workshop. Both groups commented on various features of the reading work they observed in the clip, including that the teacher began by reviewing authorized activities that the students were permitted to engage in, that the students had many choices in texts, and that the teacher gave one-on-one assistance to a student who was working on a particular activity. After viewing several minutes of activity in the classroom, the expert panel and preservice teachers all identified the construct "readers' workshop" as taking place and articulated their understandings of the features of that construct by discussing the teacher's role as support, the students' independence in making decisions about their reading work, and the variety of reading materials available in the classroom.

The expert panel and preservice teachers also recognized important elements of teaching, such as a teacher roles and learning environments, and noticed, defined, and evaluated those features in similar ways. For instance, after viewing the clip of the classroom engaged in a readers' workshop, the expert panel and the three preservice teachers made a point of addressing the teacher's function in the classroom. The expert panel noted that the teacher didn't begin with a minilesson but rather with a reading of a list of sanctioned activities for the children to choose among; thereby establishing a

routine and helping the students know how to function in the classroom as well as affording the teacher the opportunity to assist them. The preservice teachers addressed this topic as well, some noting the teacher's reasons for her reviewing the list of reading activities and her goals for the students, and some providing labels and characterizing the teacher's function in the classroom as "monitoring," "directing," and "facilitating."

Another specific feature that both the expert panel and preservice teachers weighed in on was often termed "learning environment" by them. After viewing the clip of the kindergarten classroom engaged in journal writing, all respondents—expert panel and preservice teachers—offered depictions of the classroom environment, remarking that the teacher chose to be on the same level with the students, not poised above them in a chair or standing at the front of the classroom near a chalkboard. Further, both groups remarked that the students were positioned as a "community of learners," working together in a circle, sharing materials, and freely using peers and other resources in the room at will. The specific element that they pinpointed and termed "learning environment" was offered again when the respondents were asked to review the clip of the readers' workshop. Specifically, the expert panel and the preservice teachers were closely aligned in their noticing of the freedom of students to choose their texts or reading activities as well as the classroom structure that allowed for students to work at their different reading levels at the same time.

Thus, when the expert panel and preservice teachers were asked to view and respond to three demonstrations of the teaching of reading/language arts, the expert panel and the preservice teachers were often aligned in their noticing, labeling, defining, and describing a wide range of features including the teacher's instructional strategies, the teacher's function in the classroom, and the nature of the work the students were

participating in. Both groups shared a teaching lexicon and identified, labeled, and regarded critical features of the instruction with similar facility.

SIMILARITIES IN ANALYSIS

Beyond showing striking similarities in the noticing and identifying of various aspects of instruction, the expert panel and preservice teachers showed a depth of thinking and analysis, weighing and pondering such issues as teaching objectives, the teacher's theoretical and philosophical perspectives, and the scope of instruction. For instance, after viewing the clip of the kindergarten classroom engaged in journal writing, both the expert panel and preservice teachers initiated discussions—perhaps better described as ponderings or wonderings—about the teacher's objectives for the specific teaching instance. The expert panel suggested that the objective was “holistic” because “he wanted the kids to all make a text and for that text to have several features in it.” Yet, the expert panel added that the teacher didn't strictly adhere to predetermined objectives, noting that he took up objectives in response to his students' contributions and that he didn't feel a need to postpone such objectives as using tools for word spacing and taking turns when sharing writing.

Like the expert panel, study participant Karen conceived of the teacher's objectives in broad terms—that his objective is “to get them to become independent writers”—and noted that several important skills in writing “come up during the lesson, like just crossing through a word rather than erasing when you find a mistake.” Gloria, too, focused on the broader objective of “building compositions” and “working toward writing independently ... because they have important stories to tell.” Most of the respondents were highly complimentary of the teacher's ability to be attuned to new skills that his students were ready to take on as well as his seamless ability to incorporate those into his teaching demonstration. The expert panel and Karen both stated that some

teaching professionals, in thinking about objectives, might take issue with the number of “steps or pieces” involved in the lesson but with accolade said that this teacher is “not stumbling around; he’s clear about what he’s doing and why he’s doing it.”

When both respondent groups viewed the clip of the classroom engaged in readers’ workshop, they contemplated the teacher’s philosophical views. The expert panel noted that the teacher conceives of objectives across time, building an environment in which the students make choices about their engagement with a wide variety of reading texts and activities. The preservice teachers addressed the nature of the reading work in that classroom as well, conjecturing about the students’ perspectives. The preservice teachers described the students’ learning as “participatory” with “a lot of choice” which allowed the students to be “responsible for their reading.”

As another example, the expert panel and preservice teachers moved beyond simple descriptions of what was taking place in the classroom when they similarly brought up a point of contention, taking on and evaluating the seemingly restrictive nature of the task that was demonstrated and assigned in the clip of the kindergarteners engaged in journal writing. Most respondents mentioned to some degree that while the teacher’s specificity of the task—draw a picture, then label it, then write prose—did provide “clear expectations for the students,” it didn’t leave much room for “risk-taking in their writing.” The expert panel extended that notion by saying that the teacher’s close attention on the task in the demonstration is evident again when he confers with the students, choosing to “check in to see if they were doing what they’re supposed to be doing” rather than “learn about their language, their writing, and their thinking about the world.” The expert panel called this “instructionally framed assessment” rather than “portraiture assessment.” Karen, too, raised a concern that the teacher is so focused on the students’ understanding and enacting of the task that little discussion about the

content of the writing ever emerged. On two occasions, Karen said, “He’s not focusing on the product. He only talks about the process, never the product.” Gloria and Lana didn’t address this issue as closely as the expert panel and Karen, but they did appear to think deeply about the strictness of structure. Gloria was clearly contemplating her own practice when she noted, “I think I’d be more flexible. He does so much of the talking. He didn’t poll their responses until the end.” Lana’s comment was less direct, and perhaps less critical, as was often the case: “He is so specific about how he wants this process done, very specific.”

In these instances, the expert panel and preservice teachers showed that in similar ways they chose to move beyond describing simply the surface-level features of the teaching demonstrations featured in the clips. They shared a capability of refined and deeper noticings, finding opportunities to pause, to wonder aloud, to speculate, to consider broadly, and to evaluate many critical features of the instructors’ instructional decisions and philosophical positions.

Now that the similarities of the responses of the expert panel and preservice teachers have been discussed, I move on to array the nature of the differences in responses between the groups. Specifically, I categorized those differences between the respondent group according to the selection of topics that were addressed, the emphasis given to certain topics and possibly the reasons for doing so, the ways in which notions were elaborated, and the strength of elaboration and depth of analysis.

DIFFERENCES IN WEIGHING THE IMPORTANCE OF FEATURES

The expert panel and preservice teachers were different in the amount of emphasis or attention that they gave to certain features, especially regarding the aspects of classroom management. For instance, the expert panel, after viewing the clip of the kindergarteners writing in journals, mentioned classroom management only briefly and

did so in relation to other features, such as the classroom environment: “The environment has the students constructed as a community of learners; they want to be good and they’re eager to please.” The expert panel also tied remarks about the teacher’s knowledge of classroom management procedures to the teacher’s instructional medium: “[The teacher is] very clear about what he wants to do with management. Even using his own writing ... he’s drawing on a lot of management procedural knowledge by having the students participate in his writing demonstration.”

The preservice teachers, on the other hand, made a point of addressing classroom management in more detail, often adding personal assessments by remarking how impressed they were with the responsiveness of the students. Their partiality, almost preoccupation at times, for discussing the management of the classrooms highlighted the practical concerns of a neophyte. All three preservice teachers, in fact, remarked that the kindergarten students were attuned to their teacher’s actions, wanting to mimic faithfully what he did and therefore moved their supply baskets out from in front of them whenever he did the same. In addition, all three preservice teachers remarked that, in the few instances in which students’ attention began to wander, the teacher had a “subtle” or “seamless” way for getting students back on task; they noted that the teacher dropped a student’s name into his instructional talk in order to ask a specific student to become focused again. Karen even attempted to recall his exact wording: “He said something like, ‘When I’m writing in my journal, Georgia, I think about ...’” Perhaps the difference in the amount of attention given by the expert panel and the preservice teachers to classroom management can be attributed to the preservice teachers’ present concerns about their practice in their student-teaching classrooms. All three preservice teachers talked in previous interviews about being concerned about their ability to manage a classroom. Gloria made a point of mentioning when her supervising teacher

complimented her on improving her management skills. Lana said that when she first began leading read-alouds of picture books, she was afraid to solicit students' comments because she feared the students would go off task and get out of hand. Such admissions perhaps explain why classroom management is a topic addressed by preservice teachers in the midst of completing their teacher education but was not a topic that captured the focus of the expert panel. Novices, then, appear to share concern about the establishment of routines that ensure that instruction can occur.

DIFFERENCES IN EMPHASIS ATTRIBUTABLE TO ORIENTATION

Another way in which the emphasis on or attention to particular features in the clips differed between the groups had to do with some respondents' predilection for certain features over others. The remarks of two preservice teachers in particular, Gloria and Lana, appeared to be in keeping with the orientations toward student learning that they consistently reported ascribing to over the course of my interviews with them. That is, Gloria repeatedly found opportunities to work with children throughout her life and reported an allegiance to a discovery and exploratory means of learning. Lana as well expressed a desire to work with children, finding opportunities to do so as a volunteer, and she constructed and articulated a vision of her classroom as a community of learners that shows respect and takes responsibility for their learning. Such child-centered orientations no doubt influenced the lenses with which they described and critiqued the three clips of classrooms engaged in learning reading/language arts. These two preservice teachers in particular showed a propensity to discuss the features of student learning and students' feelings much more than any other feature of the demonstrations.

For instance, in commenting about the kindergarten classroom engaged in journal writing, Gloria described the students as "having freedom," saying that if they needed a resource, they simply went off to retrieve it. Gloria spoke of the respect between teacher

and students and that the teacher would not say “Hey, where are you going? Don’t talk. Do your own work,” but would likely say, “I’m glad that you asked her for help.” Gloria appeared to believe that such an environment contributed to the students’ desire to contribute and respond to the teacher’s writing, to the students’ being “engaged” in their writing, and to the students’ confidence and interest in their writing (e.g., “They’re all very into their writing.”). Similarly, Lana summed that the students were “motivated to write, free to write” and “seemed happy.” Additionally, Lana’s desire to build a community of learners in her own practice made her apt to notice how “helpful” students were to one another: “They helped each other and they asked each other about what they were doing, and they looked at resources together.”

Gloria and Lana also had much to say about student learning and feelings when they viewed the clip of the small group engaged in guided reading. While the expert panel reported that the students are “cheerfully compliant” and “want to do a good job for their teacher,” and while Karen reported that “nobody had a light bulb moment,” Gloria’s and Lana’s notions about the students’ learning and feelings were reported in greater length. Gloria first remarked, “They were engaged,” but then immediately wanted to retract that notion somewhat: “Well, I guess you could say that they’re engaged. I mean, it’s a story about boots,” indicating that she thought the book likely lacked appeal. All said, Gloria summed that the children “didn’t appear overly excited.” Similarly, Lana was concerned about the lack of interest that the children appeared to show: “It doesn’t appear to be much fun for them.” Additionally, Lana was concerned that the students were not receiving enough positive feedback from their teacher. Lana clarified that while she didn’t feel that there was an absence of praise, she thought there wasn’t an abundance of it either; she added that she felt that she and her cooperating teacher are more likely more conscious of complimenting students, which is in keeping with her philosophical

view of creating a community of learners. Further, Gloria and Lana both intimated that the students likely enjoy the attention they get from their teacher more than the actual reading work they are doing together.

When viewing the clip of the classroom engaged in readers' workshop, the expert panel and all three preservice teachers seemed aligned in their thinking about the students' learning and feelings, but again Gloria and Lana elaborated on those points at length. The expert panel said that the students were engaged, which created a room that was "bustling and humming with activity." Karen, similarly, noted that "they're engaged" and that the students "probably find reading to be important and enjoy it very much." Gloria and Lana shared these notions, but made a point of emphasizing and elaborating on them. Gloria reported, with a tone marked with enthusiasm:

They're engaged. They're self-sufficient in making decisions about their reading work during their reading time. They enjoy themselves. I saw a lot of ownership of their reading. There's no helplessness. There's no asking the teacher to help every second. They're comfortable in trying. [The teacher] probably conveys in many ways the message "You're always growing as a reader." They take great pride in that.

Lana also spoke interestedly about what the students were doing and speculated on their feelings about their work:

It's student-based, not with a focus on the teacher. Choice is a huge thing in this classroom. They're liberated and enjoy their reading. They're all working at their own levels. These students are choosing things that will make them and do make them feel like confident readers. Because they have choice, they're thinking about their reading. They feel in charge of their learning.

Thus, while the expert panel and one of the preservice teachers, Karen, fairly evenly distributed their thoughts across a number of instructional features of the video-clips, two preservice teachers, Gloria and Lana, chose to emphasize the features of student learning and feelings. Such an inclination for addressing some topics more than

others seemed in keeping with the orientations and philosophies to which they reported allegiance over the course of our interviews.

DIFFERENCES IN HOW NOTIONS WERE ELABORATED

Another difference between the expert panel and the preservice teachers had to do with the nature of the explanations they offered. Often, rather than simply narrating the actions of the teachers in the clips, the expert panel spoke to the intent, motivation, and reasoning for the actions seen—why the teacher was doing something rather than simply what the teacher was doing. For instance, after viewing the clip of the kindergarten class engaged in journal writing, the expert panel noted that the teacher allowed “teachable moments” to enter his demonstration and seized those opportunities to explain concepts and principles that he felt the students were ready to receive. One of those moments was when the teacher discussed spacing between words. While all respondents—expert panel and preservice teachers—noted that spacing between words was a skill that the teacher introduced or reintroduced, only the expert panel elaborated on the teacher’s choice to pursue the skill: “They’re writing with invented spellings, mostly with strings of letters that represent the sounds that they hear. So that’s why he’s trying to get spacing in here now.” Therefore, while the preservice teachers identified the teacher’s unplanned decision to discuss spacing between words, the expert panel speculated about the teacher’s decision in broader terms, emphasizing that the teacher showed flexibility and considered his ongoing assessment of his students’ writing development in order to inform his incorporation of the skills in his demonstration.

As another example, the expert panel and one preservice teacher in particular, Lana, made mention of the teacher’s and students’ use of their “what makes sense” strategy in the clip that featured the guided reading group. When I asked Lana to discuss

the teacher's intention for using that strategy, Lana instead described what the students were doing:

They all plug in words to see what makes sense. A girl did think of a word that makes sense for the sentence, but when they looked at the first letter, they knew it wasn't right. When they looked at the first letter, then they used what they gathered from the context to say "rain." Then it was just a form of that word.

The expert panel referenced that making-sense strategy as well, and explained the teacher's intention without being prompted to do so:

The teacher uses this "what makes sense" strategy that these students already know. She's trying to get the students to rely on a semantic cuing system, to rely on meaning in order to guess what the word could be.

Perhaps Lana thought that inherent in her description—and specifically, her use of the words "what they gathered from the context"—was an explanation of the teacher's intention. Whatever the case, her comments were more descriptive in this instance than filtered and elaborated.

DIFFERENCES IN THE DEPTH OF ANALYSIS AND ELABORATION

A related aspect in terms of differences in how the expert panel and preservice teachers elaborated their notions is the amount and depth of elaboration that the respondents offered. For instance, in their analysis of the clip of the kindergarteners writing in their journals, the expert panel addressed how the teacher is participating in the classroom community as a fellow writer, is using his writing as an example, is inviting his students to participate in his and their own writing decisions, and is modeling a specific process for completing the task. While the preservice teachers' responses to this clip intimated that the teacher's instructional strategies were purposeful, their elaborations were not as detailed as those of the expert panel. When asked to address the same open-ended invitation, "Tell me what the teacher is doing," the expert panel responded with a more thoroughly elaborated answer, as is evident in Figure 4.1.

Figure 4.1: Differences in Depth of Elaboration

Expert Panel	Karen	Gloria	Lana
“Teacher is using his own writing as the instructional medium. It’s not a pure demonstration because he involves the students in his writing. It’s somewhere between an assisted performance and a demonstration. It’s a fairly structured process, although the content is not structured.”	“Teacher is modeling. He did the assignment with them. He was showing them what they will do independently in their own journals. ... He’s talking about the process.”	“Teacher is a model, not in a formal way, but as someone writing along with them. He shows them a way that they might approach whatever they’re going to do independently.”	“Teacher is showing everyone his own drawing and what they will be doing with their own. Teacher is making his own writing in front of the student. He goes through the process with them.”

That preservice teachers often addressed features of the clips with less detail than the expert panel suggests preservice teachers likely understand some theoretical principles less deeply than do expert teachers. As an example, the expert panel discussed at length the teacher’s seemingly narrow conception of reading as illustrated in the clip of the small guided-reading group. That is, while the expert panel made a point of saying that the clip presents such a short moment in that classroom that it would be unfair to conclude that it is a comprehensive representation of the teacher’s practice, they noted that the teacher reported in a voiceover that she focuses on a range of goals for her students, but that those aims aren’t evident in the clip; specifically, the expert panel agreed that comprehension, fluency, and making connections with texts appeared absent. The expert panel elaborated by noting that the teacher’s focus on strategies means that there is little room for comprehension or connection with the text:

The teacher doesn’t see herself as a representative for meaning. She’s not amplifying that something is happening in the book. She is amplifying over and over that this is a performance of written words. She announces to the students at

the beginning of their work together that she wants them to be able to make connections. But not only are they not making connections, they aren't even understanding this text. So they're just not thinking about their reading. They're just reading words.

The preservice teachers, however, had little to say that directly addressed the broader, theoretical principles of reading instruction. Again, the preservice teachers simply narrated the teacher's actions rather than attempting to cast a bigger picture philosophically. For instance, Karen's comments focused on the strategy-driven nature of the teaching: "She is helping the kids strategize when they come to an unfamiliar word. When she covers up that word, she is trying to get them to use context clues." Gloria showed some attempt to address comprehension when she noted that the teacher's one-on-one reading with a student was hasty: "She never told that boy 'Go back and read the sentence.'" Lana, too, noted that the teacher "doesn't wait long enough when a student gets stuck." Yet, these noticings are still practical in nature; they don't speak to the theoretical concerns raised and elaborated on by the expert panel.

DIFFERENCES IN KNOWLEDGE SOURCES

Both the expert panel and preservice teachers reported that they draw from many varied sources of knowledge to inform their practice, but the expert panel privileged self-monitoring and self-regulatory practices over other sources. The teachers that served on the expert panel all discussed a continual effort to make changes in their practice—experimenting with their teaching, evaluating the results of those experiments in terms of student achievement, and implementing changes and reinstituting instructional strategies and content based on what they observed and concluded. They often credited the major contributor to their practice as "experience," intimating that the sheer number of experiences that they have amassed as a result of being veteran teachers has given them ample opportunities to reflect on and improve their practice. Beyond inspecting their

own practice, the expert panel seemed to look outside of the four walls of their classroom, but these sources were less emphasized. They did cite the importance of “staying current” and revealed that reading journals about theory and teacher research is one way to do so. Additionally, the expert panel reported participating in collaborative planning with their grade-level peers and finding opportunities to observe others’ practice and to seek out professional development training.

The preservice teachers, on the other hand, acknowledged utilizing many of the sources that were provided to them by the university as part of their teacher education program. Some of those sources appeared to be similar to those that the expert panel draw from, such as the reading of theory (as part of their university coursework experiences) and collaborating with and observing others’ teaching (as part of their fieldwork experiences). Yet, these similar sources were those that were less frequently mentioned by the expert panel. Reflecting on and improving their practice, as a seemingly solitary endeavor, and the value of accrued experiences seemed more emphatically endorsed by the expert panel. Thus, preservice teachers, by virtue of being beginners, have shorter stints of actual teaching in classrooms to draw from, making their sources stand apart from those that the expert panel privileged.

In summary, the three preservice teachers and the expert panel were aligned in many ways, including the facility with which they identified features of instruction, labeled and defined those aspects with a professional lexicon, and analyzed critical features of the instruction with depth and detail. The differences that existed between the two respondent groups related to the ways in which their present concerns about their practice and their philosophical orientations appeared in their descriptions and analyses. In addition, the expert panel elaborated their noticings with richer detail, more deeply understood important constructs and domains in the teaching of reading/language arts,

and credited different sources for that knowledge. Further implications of these findings are discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER V: FINDINGS, LIMITATIONS, DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

In order to understand more deeply how preservice teachers process, attribute, and apply influential sources of knowing, I investigated three preservice teacher's perceptions of their preparation and practices in learning to teach reading/language arts. Toward that purpose, I used case methodology in an effort to build cogent accounts of the sources that fed the preservice teachers' professional experiences which they reported as useful in informing their learning to teach in elementary classrooms. I asked the preservice teachers to reflect on instances of their own teaching, as well as reveal those sources of knowledge they apply to their practice. Additionally, I sought their understandings of teaching reading/language arts, prompted by video-clips of demonstrations of teaching, and compared their remarks with those of more experienced teachers in order to contextualize the ways in which these beginning teachers synthesized and applied their knowing.

In this chapter, I summarize findings as they relate to my two research emphases—the preservice teachers' sources of knowing, as well as the ways in which the preservice teachers' descriptions and interpretations of teaching demonstrations on video-clips compared with expert knowing. Then, I describe the limitations of the study, especially those that relate to the use of interviews and a small sample. Finally, I synthesize the findings in an attempt to contribute to a theory of knowing and learning, where I suggest implications and future research.

Summary of Findings

SOURCES OF KNOWLEDGE

The preservice teachers who participated in this study were prompted to report on the sources that inform their knowledge of and practices in teaching reading/language arts. Across cases, the sources these preservice teachers credited were not limited to those that were immediately relevant to their teaching lives. That is, although the interviews took place during a semester in which the informants were taking their Language Arts Methods course and were completing their student-teaching practica, the preservice teachers did not restrict their sources of knowledge to those settings and experiences. In fact, their sources were many and varied, and the preservice teachers proved to be candid informants of their understandings (e.g., Elbaz, 1981) and the experiences from which those understandings were derived.

EARLY EXPERIENCES. The portrayals of Karen, Gloria, and Lana that were presented in Chapter 4 of this report seemed to demonstrate that these preservice teachers were pointed to the doors of the College of Education as a result of early influences and experiences. For instance, Karen, as the daughter of a teacher educator, was steeped early on in the culture of teaching, and her mother's influence on her notions about teaching and learning was revealed repeatedly in my interviews with her. Gloria also seemed influenced by her mother, whose work in caregiving and early assessments of Gloria as "always nurturing," gave Gloria a confidence around young children that she pursued even before she entered the teacher education program. And Lana developed the desire at an early age to be a teacher, playing out the role in her makeshift classroom and taking on the role of caring big sister to her stepsiblings.

Yet, even while these three preservice teachers clearly had influences and experiences that helped them arrive at the College of Education, they did not often credit early sources for informing their knowledge and practice. Of the three, Karen appeared most readily reflective about the possibilities of pulling on her own experiences as a young learner to influence her knowledge and practice. That is, Karen appeared to have been initiated into the model of “learn by doing” that her mother espoused and practiced when Karen was a child. In an early interview, Karen credited her mother’s belief in “learn by doing” as influencing her thinking about teaching and learning, although when reflecting on her practice in later interviews, Karen never credited her mother for directly influencing any of her specific instructional decisions. In addition, Karen was the only case who recalled the influence of specific texts on learning to read, so much so that she went in search of the materials when she began her education courses. Even so, she gave no hint that she intended to replicate the practices that her teachers used in teaching her to read and write as a child. Gloria, too, seemed to value resources that she had been introduced to during her work at the university childcare center, but she didn’t credit her previous teaching experience when reflecting on her practice. Additionally, unlike Karen, both Gloria and Lana gave little credit to their early school experiences. In fact, Gloria reported that her interest in reading and writing were developed on her own and at home rather than in school; Gloria wrote in private and read because her interest was nurtured by family visits to bookstores and libraries. Lana, too, developed an interest in reading and writing, despite a lack of dynamic school experiences in the subjects, which included feeling pressured to perform in a reading group and completing worksheets to learn about writing. Thus, despite that some studies on learning to teach have reported that beginning teachers can revert to the ways in which they were taught (e.g., Lortie,

1975), these three preservice teachers did not explicitly report drawing on their own experiences of being taught to read and write to inform their practice.

EDUCATION COURSE EXPERIENCES. Although giving little credit to the influences of early school experiences on their professional knowing, the preservice teachers appeared to both credit and adopt education course experiences. All three preservice teachers credited many of their readings, discussions, assignments, and other experiences in their university coursework. All three preservice teachers cited education course experiences as influencing, informing, and appearing in their practice. For example, Karen, whose goal is to be a bilingual educator, cited specific readings in her courses that helped her to think through her concerns about being an outsider as a Caucasian teacher in a diverse setting. In addition, Karen credited her reading of Lucy Calkins' works (1994, 2000) as helping to shape her methodological beliefs about the teaching of reading/language arts, such as that students should begin reading and writing before anything else occurs in the school day. Similarly, Gloria credited a specific textbook and the discussions that surrounded it as confirming her own developing notions, such as the importance of student self-discovery. She was also able to articulate specific take-away knowledge from course readings and discussions, such as not dumbing down language when communicating new concepts to young children. Lana, too, gave credit to specific course content for influencing her later practices. For instance, she suggested that watching a university teacher repeatedly model a read-aloud helped her grow in confidence in leading read-alouds in her own practice. As another example, Lana described a particular course assignment that caused her to reflect on her learning and articulate the ways in which she viewed herself as a teacher. Although Lana first found the assignment challenging, she came to see the assignment as a way to evaluate her development in the learning-to-teach process.

Furthermore, the preservice teachers underscored those coursework experiences that included a tutorial component. For example, all three preservice teachers cited a specific course, Reading Difficulties, because of a sequence of experiences: first, reading and discussing the teaching of reading strategies; then, being assigned to a student in an elementary classroom to implement, monitor, and assess those strategies; and finally, returning to the university classroom to reflect on the experience and plan additional sessions with the child. Thus, the fact that all three preservice teachers described this same course content as a source of knowing highlighted the importance of coursework-and-application links, which essentially confirms Worthy and Patterson's (2001) study that found that preservice teachers valued opportunities for the practical application of theoretical principles.

In these ways, university coursework—its readings, discussions, assignments, experiences, and links to the field—was instrumental, and crediting of their education course experiences appeared repeatedly in the preservice teachers' reflections on their practice.

FIELDWORK EXPERIENCES. In addition to their education course experiences, the preservice teachers made repeated credits to their student-teaching practica in which they worked with a cooperating teacher. For Karen, she valued her first-grade bilingual classroom because it provided a venue for her to test her theoretical understandings, especially when they collided with those of her cooperating teacher's. Research by O'Loughlin (1991) and others suggest that when preservice teachers face "cognitive conflict" in their student-teaching semester, they privilege the practical (Clandinin & Connelly, 1986) by retreating and accepting the ways of the cooperating teacher's classroom. Karen, however, appeared to work to try to meld theory with practice, and then appeared to insert more of her theoretical understandings into her practice by

investigating and experimenting. Unlike Karen, both Gloria and Lana elected to return to a particular classroom in which to complete their student-teaching assignments. For Gloria, her pre-kindergarten student-teaching classroom was familiar to her because of previous field observations. Perhaps as a result of knowing the routines and the philosophies that influenced the classroom instruction, Gloria reported displaying confidence in implementing her philosophical orientation toward student self-discovery, and she recognized enactments of those theories when viewing video-clips of others' teaching. Lana, too, chose to return to a familiar second-grade classroom as a student teacher, mirroring, borrowing from, collaborating with, and reflecting on her practice with her cooperating teacher.

Perhaps the preservice teachers' positive portrayals of their student-teaching semester owe a great deal of credit to their cooperating teachers' willingness to work alongside them and establish collaborative relationships. Although Schempp, Sparkes, and Templin (1999) noted that veteran teachers can often devalue the university education that beginning teachers bring with them into the field, the three preservice teachers in this study did not report much unwillingness or resistance to those notions that the interns wanted to share or investigate. Although Karen initially willingly enacted some of the established routines of reading and writing in the first-grade teaching assignment, she was allowed to introduce some new methodologies, such as sharing writing through Author's Chair. Gloria, too, seemed able to find opportunities to introduce new lessons. For example, Gloria's block lesson originated from her noticing that the students were having difficulty with a concept, not because her cooperating teacher made the suggestion. As another example, Gloria's decision to use certain picture books for read-alouds and to extend those lessons in specific ways came from her previous knowledge of the books, not because they were available in the classroom or

because the cooperating teacher encouraged Gloria to use them. Interestingly, in terms of contributing to classroom instruction, Gloria seemed limited only by her unwillingness to approach her cooperating teacher with ideas, at times worrying silently that the ideas would interrupt the structure of the pre-kindergarten classroom. Lana, by far, was the most complimentary in her view of the ways in which her cooperating teacher influenced her practice. When Lana was in her observational stage of her student-teaching assignment, she reported that her cooperating teacher took time to discuss her instructional decisions and the rationales that supported them. Then, when Lana transitioned to taking over the planning and delivery of some of the classroom instruction, her cooperating teacher collaborated and reflected with her on her practice. Lana repeatedly described her cooperating teacher as receptive to her ideas and notions about teaching and learning. Lana reported that she had established a close relationship with her cooperating teacher as a result of spending two semesters in that classroom, and that many of the philosophies she articulated across our interviews were fashioned as a result of her time with her cooperating teacher.

Still, although the preservice teachers credited extensively their student-teaching experiences, they also valued their briefer experiences in the field through classroom visits planned as part of their coursework. For example, Gloria appreciated having the experience of visiting grade-level classrooms other than pre-kindergarten; after one series of visits, she began considering the realities of other teachers' pressures as a result of state testing. Lana, too, credited field observations, separate from her student teaching, as sources of knowing. Specifically, she cited a field observation of a fifth-grade classroom engaged in a readers' workshop as increasing her knowledge about workshop frames. The preservice teachers, before advancing to their student-teaching semester, observed in

multiple sites and at various grade levels, but all three expressed a desire for even more time in the field to engage in such observations.

Thus, while some studies have suggested that student teaching is reported as the most beneficial of university education by preservice teachers because it represents actual time with students (e.g., Schempp, Sparkes, & Templin, 1999), the student-teaching practicum experience, while providing important sources of knowledge, did not emerge as the sole source when the preservice teachers in this study reported on the experiences that fed their preparation and practices. In addition, the preservice teachers appeared to draw from various fieldwork experiences rather than just those that were contained to their student-teaching classrooms.

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS. Other seemingly important sources that the preservice teachers reported drawing on can be collectively thought of as participating in “learning communities” (Zehm, 1999). Specifically, professors and peers in cohorts were named by the three preservice teachers as participating in experiences that served as sources of knowledge. Karen reported establishing more sustaining relationships with her professors than her peers, indicating that some instructors maintained relationships even after a particular semester ended and continue to provide advice and resources that have the potential for impacting the practice of their former students. Both Gloria and Lana, who participated in the same cohort, related that close relationships were established with their university instructors, and both indicated that their peers bonded and assisted one another with assignments and ideas for teaching. These two preservice teachers used the university’s email system to post their problems and ask for advice, such as how to teach a particular lesson in their student-teaching practica. Additionally, their cohort appeared to extend their relationships outside of the university classroom, finding opportunities to socialize together. Thus, in a profession that is often described as

a lonely one, perhaps these teachers have a way to think about the professional as a shared endeavor as a result of the ways in which experiences with professors and peers have been valued as sources of knowledge.

UNDERUTILIZED SOURCE. Although the university undoubtedly intends for the role of supervising teacher to be an additional support, none of the preservice teachers reported viewing or interacting with their supervisors in ways that affected their knowing or practice. Karen appeared to think of her supervising teacher as someone who made classroom visits to judge her practice rather than to support or advance it. While Karen never related an incident that supported her view of her supervising teacher as a critical judge, she did appear to change her practices to accommodate a classroom visit by the supervising teacher. Gloria reported slightly more involvement with her supervising teacher, crediting her supervising teacher on one occasion for discussions about particular lessons. Perhaps the direst scenario is with Lana, who made absolutely no mention of her supervising teacher. Thus, as a resource, the university-provided supervising teacher was not cited as influential on the preservice teachers' learning. Perhaps the preservice teachers' constancy of involvement with their cooperating teachers positioned their supervising teachers' visits as incidental; as a result, the potential relationship with a supervising teacher was less valued and had less impact on the preservice teachers' learning and practice. If so, perhaps the supervising teacher's role needs revisiting to take its lead from that of the cooperating teacher, which might include co-planning and co-reflecting on practice.

In summary, the three preservice teachers were forthcoming revealers on their sources of knowledge. They cited and credited many sources—course readings and discussions, assignments, classroom visits, planning and reflections alongside cooperating teachers, and experiences with professors and peers, among others—as

informing their knowledge. All three preservice teachers held clear ideas about the specific ways in which these sources were being utilized to inform and improve their practices.

PRESERVICE TEACHERS' AND EXPERT PANEL'S DESCRIPTIONS/INTERPRETATIONS OF VIDEO-CLIPS

One of the aims of this study was to have evidence of how well the preservice teachers pulled together and applied their reading/language arts instruction. Certainly one way was to watch them in classrooms and hear how and what they reflected on following those acts. Another way I pursued was to determine what they applied when they responded to other teachers' demonstrations of teaching reading/language arts. Additionally, in an effort to contextualize the ways in which these beginning teachers synthesized and applied their knowing, I juxtaposed their knowing with that of more experienced teachers. I assembled an expert panel to respond to the same three video-clips of teaching that I asked the three preservice teachers to respond to individually. After comparing those responses, I expected to find differences between the neophytes and the experts, but what is significant is how closely beginners were starting to approximate expert knowing. In this section, I summarize my findings by first describing the similarities between the preservice teachers and expert panel in terms of identification and analysis of features. Then, I describe the differences in terms of orientation and elaboration of knowing, among others.

SUMMARY OF SIMILARITIES. The preservice teachers and expert panel noticed and identified many of the same surface features of instruction; thus, they indicated that they shared a particular lexicon and often articulated their noticings in exact or similar ways. Further, the features that were noticed, identified, labeled, and defined were considerable. Their noticings seemed to cut across instructional strategies, assessment

strategies, management elements, and student achievement, among others. For example, all three preservice teachers and the expert panel identified that, in the guided-reading clip, the students were “homogenously grouped” and the teacher began by asking the students to “make predictions.” As another example, when the preservice teachers and expert panel addressed the roles of the teachers in the classrooms featured on the clips, they defined those roles using the same terms “monitoring,” “directing,” and “facilitating.” Further, both the expert panel and the three preservice teachers described a range of actions and behaviors, grouped them together in their discussions, and labeled them in similar ways. For instance, all respondents used the label “learning community” or “community of learners” to describe characteristics that included the students’ positioning in the classrooms, the teachers’ interactions with the students, and the nature of the work that the teachers and students were doing together. Such critical features of instruction were noticed with strikingly similar detail and facility by both the expert panel and the preservice teachers.

Besides precise noticing and great agreement in labeling many features of instruction, the expert panel and preservice teachers showed similarities in their analysis of the teaching demonstrations, which suggests that the preservice teachers appear to be developing deep and rich understandings of constructs that are integral to the teaching of reading/language arts. In many instances, the expert panel and preservice teachers showed evidence of casting the short moments of teaching in the video-clips in broader terms. They hypothesized about the teachers’ aims for their students in the teaching and learning of reading/language arts, exploring the ways in which the teachers were “working to build independent writers” and teaching students to be “responsible for their learning.” All respondents discussed the ways in which the teachers were responsive to the students’ needs and enacted their beliefs and philosophies about teaching and learning

(such as that choice is paramount) as examples. As one specific example, the preservice teachers and expert panel discussed how the kindergarten teacher was providing additional instruction based on what he learned about his students' writing from conferring with them. The expert panel said, "He's making it a point to talk about how [one student] found a mistake in her writing and corrected it by drawing a line through it." Lana, too, focused on the teacher's debriefing after his conferences: "He's giving them feedback about how they should share their writing. They were reading their stories at the same time instead of taking turns."

In other instances, the expert panel's and preservice teachers' knowledge appeared to be in conflict with what they noticed in the classrooms featured on the video-clips. When conflicts occurred, all respondents tended to wonder aloud about the roots of a teacher's decisions. As one example, the expert panel and preservice teachers wondered about the kindergarten teacher's attention to process to the exclusion of product in student writing, as well as the seeming inflexibility of the procedure used for the construction of texts. In such ways, the expert panel and preservice teachers showed critical reflection of many aspects of the teaching demonstrations of reading/language arts.

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES. The expert panel's and preservice teachers' remarks differed in marked ways, one of which was the attention to or emphasis placed on some topics over others. Classroom management, for example, was a topic that the expert panel addressed infrequently and not in isolation; in other words, when classroom management did surface as a topic of discussion, the expert panel introduced the topic because it helped to elaborate another feature of the instruction. For example, the expert panel discussed classroom management in relation to the fostering of a community of learners: "The environment has the students constructed as a community of learners;

they want to be good and they're eager to please.” The preservice teachers, however, appeared to isolate classroom management and addressed the topic in much detail. Additionally, all three preservice teachers addressed management in their own practice at various points in our interviews together. For example, Gloria was excited to share that her supervising teacher had complimented her on her management skills toward the end of her student-teaching semester. As another example, Lana said that her ability to lead read-alouds had improved with repeated practice because she finally became comfortable with eliciting students' comments without fearing that their participation would lead the discussion astray. These three preservice teachers, as beginners, seemed to share a concern of novices, especially since, as Huberman (1989) suggested, the acquisition and effective implementation of classroom management strategies is so powerful a demand that it cannot be escaped by a new teacher. Managing the elements of teaching, then, is a concern that appeared in all three preservice teachers' talk of others' practices as well as their own, but it was not a topic that was heavily addressed by the expert panel.

Another difference between the expert panel and preservice teachers was that two of the three preservice teachers tended to weigh their remarks based on a lens they applied to the teaching demonstrations. Specifically, Gloria and Lana, by self-proclamation, have a student-focused orientation. That lens, which they used to filter their reflections on their own practice in our debriefing interviews that followed their teaching, appeared repeatedly in their remarks about the teaching video-clips. For example, Gloria and Lana lauded the teaching instances that involved students' self-selection of their writing and reading. Gloria remarked that the kindergarten students were “all into [enjoying] their writing.” Lana said of the classroom engaged in readers' workshop that the students were “helpful to one another” and that all the students “were responsible for their own reading.” In addition, both Gloria and Lana were more

judgmental of the teacher whose instruction was “too teacher-focused.” For example, Gloria summed the students’ feelings in the guided-reading group as, “They didn’t appear overly excited.” Thus, while these two preservice teachers in particular addressed a range of topics, they gave more attention to and offered more elaboration and evaluation of the features of instruction that involved student involvement, student feelings, and student learning than did the other respondents.

Yet another difference between the two respondent groups related to depth of elaboration. Whereas the expert panel tended to position their comments within the larger context of the teachers’ goals of instruction and student learner, the preservice teachers appeared to be more descriptive than analytical in some respects. Schempp, Sparkes, and Templin (1993) suggest that experienced teachers make a number of decisions while engaged in the act of instruction, perform a variety of tasks, and tend to the immediacy of the demands. The expert panel—experienced teachers themselves—seemed to more readily note these features. Specifically, the expert panel commented about the kindergarten teacher’s ability to incorporate multiple objectives in his demonstration of a writing task, while the preservice teachers merely identified and labeled those tasks. Further, the expert panel speculated about the rationales for the teacher’s decisions, suggesting that the teacher’s on-going monitoring and assessment of his students’ writing informed his spontaneous decisions to augment the instructional act. For example, while all respondents—expert panel and preservice teachers—noted that spacing between words was a skill that the teacher introduced or reintroduced, only the expert panel elaborated on the teacher’s choice to pursue the skill: “They’re writing with invented spellings, mostly with strings of letters that represent the sounds that they hear. So that’s why he’s trying to get spacing in here now.” Such a difference in noticing and commenting between the groups might suggest that the preservice teachers are still

developing their understandings of the ways in which teachers make decisions flexibly and frequently while in the act of teaching.

The last difference between the expert panel and preservice teachers is related to their reported sources of knowledge. The members of the expert panel appeared to primarily privilege their amassed and reflected-on experience over other sources. Berliner's (1994) research on experts and novices notes that an expert pedagogue can be expected to have had thousands of hours in classrooms as a teacher. Instructional acts that are reflected on, changed, and implemented again appeared to be a common approach for the experts' efforts to improve their practice. The preservice teachers, however, having limited experiences by the very nature of their beginner status, do not have the benefit of drawing on such vast experiences as sources of knowledge. Both groups did, however, draw from other sources that appeared to be more similar than not, such as reading professional journals and participating in professional development.

Limitations

When planning this study, I looked to and heralded the primary data source of interviews as a strength of my study. However, I was not unaware of the cautions that researchers before me have advanced, particularly that there is always the chance that participants will engage in performance behaviors. During my interactions with the preservice teachers, I looked for consistency across interviews and found no evidence during my data analysis to disprove my impression that the participants were revealing on their personal and professional lives in honest, straightforward, and forthcoming ways. Because my work was meant to be inductive, I described my research questions in general terms, such as saying that I was interested in their experiences as teachers learning to teach. I did so to guard against the possibility of the participants' shaping

their answers to provide descriptions of what they might have inferred I was in search of. Nevertheless, the preservice teachers were aware that I am a doctoral student in the same program and at the same university as they. Thus, the participants' selections of experiences to share with me might have been both consciously and unconsciously biased by the positioning, discourse, and context in which this study took place.

True, too, is the notion that language is situated and not completely transparent. It is incumbent on the interviewer/researcher to attempt to uncover the speaker's meaning systems and the embedded perspectives concerning context, knowledge, and practice upon which those meaning systems rely (Olsen, 2006). I tried to guard against misrepresenting the participants' experiences by inserting members checks in which the three preservice teachers read transcripts and summaries of their responses and my interpretations of them. Still, there likely exist misrepresented aspects of the portrayals of these preservice teachers' professional lives that can be attributed to the inferential and interpretive nature of this study.

Next, although I intended for a purposeful sampling (Patton, 1990) and for maximum variability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), the two sites from which I chose to draw my participants did not have much diversity in demographics such as gender, age, ethnicity, and previous experience with teaching children. In addition, the number of preservice teachers who volunteered was not as considerable as I had hoped, and therefore I was further limited in an ability to allow for diversity in my cases. Thus, I might have been introduced to a broader range of issues that are germane to people who are learning to teach had my participants included a male student, a student older than early-20s, and a student whose ethnicity was neither Caucasian nor Mexican American.

A small sample also necessitates the guard against generalizing the findings in such a way that they become unrepresentative of the phenomenon had a larger sample

been employed. It was not lost on me that the preservice teachers were generally positive about and complimentary of their teacher education preparation. But one of the participants, Lana, when comparing her experience to another peer's, intimated that this peer was experiencing conflict in her student-teaching assignment. Had a preservice teacher, whose experience was not as pervasively positive, elected to share her experiences by participating in this study, I might have been able to develop additional relevant topics to pursue in future research endeavors. Thus, the sample is not entirely representative of the preservice teachers in the education program at the university, and therefore the data are not generalizable to the whole of the teacher education candidates at this university.

Finally, the study took place over a short amount of time—a few weeks within one semester. I intentionally selected the semester in which the preservice teachers were concurrently participating in a course in Language Arts Methods and completing their student-teaching practica. My aim was for the preservice teachers to report on their perceptions of their preparation and practice in teaching reading/language arts at that specific point in their education program. However, extending the research timeframe and following these preservice teachers into their inservice assignments would likely have revealed additional insight into their perceptions of the value of their teacher education program.

Discussion and Implications

As the previous sections show, the findings in my study suggest that preservice teachers are candid revealers on the multiple sources that they draw from to influence and inform their practice. In addition to asking for the preservice teachers' credited sources, I wanted to determine what they know in an applied and synthesized way and did so by

using the constructions of an expert panel to compare and understand the beginners' applied knowledge. I found that preservice teachers have ready facility with a particular lexicon, and they noticed, labeled, defined, and interpreted important features of instruction in considerable detail. I also found that differences in descriptions and interpretations related to the preservice teachers' practical concerns, orientations, and developing depth of knowledge about teaching reading/language arts.

Based on these findings, I see implications for (1) the potential of preservice teachers' valuing of multiple sources in their teacher education program, (2) the potential of opportunities to examine assumptions about teaching and learning while participating in their teacher education program, (3) the potential for more and varied fieldwork experiences to impact preservice teachers' practices, (4) the potential for utilizing their sources of knowing from their teacher education program as well as opportunities to acquire new sources in their early inservice years, and (5) the potential for the support of a community of learners in their inservice years.

THE POTENTIAL FOR MULTIPLE SOURCES IN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM.

The three preservice teachers in this study identified many of the same sources that were influential on their perceptions of their preparation and practices—education course experiences, fieldwork observations, student-teaching practica, and collegial relationship experiences—and failed to credit one source as being significant—experiences with supervising teachers.

Although some research has suggested that preservice teachers often privilege their student-teaching experience (Huberman, 1989), the three preservice teachers in this study tended not to privilege one source over others. Nor did the case appear to be that practical experiences were needed before beginning teachers could consider theory and ask questions about their practice, as Russell (1988) suggested. In fact, the three

preservice teachers in this study valued experiences that wedded theory and practice, such as education course experiences that included practical application opportunities, among others.

Thus, because the preservice teachers often drew from multiple sources when they reflected on their practice and that of others' teaching, preservice teacher education has the potential for providing rich sources of knowing, especially given how adept the preservice teachers reported to be at making sense of their confluence. Ongoing evaluation of the usefulness, availability, and valuing of sources by preservice teachers could be quite informing to teacher education programs. Furthermore, perhaps the preservice teachers' inclination to pull from a variety of sources to inform their perspectives places them farther along the path to expertise than if they kept their sources compartmentalized and failed to see the ways in which they are interconnected, as Berliner (1986) affirmed is the mark of a novice. Strong, purposeful preparation allows new teachers to demonstrate more accomplished practice than has been expected of beginners in the past, as Darling-Hammond (2000) suggested. Therefore, perhaps more research is needed into preservice teachers' valuing of sources as well as the ways in which teacher educators can work to offer more, richer, and broader sources.

THE POTENTIAL FOR PRESERVICE OPPORTUNITIES TO ACCESS AND INSPECT ASSUMPTIONS.

It cannot be assumed that those sources that are acquired and that fed the preservice teachers' preparation as part of their teacher education program are the only ones from which they are drawing as they are sharpening their practice. Although the preponderance of sources they revealed were developed or adopted once they entered their teacher education program, all three preservice teachers made mention of assumptions that were constructed previous to their entrance into the program. Karen's

notions were derived from experiences she shared with her mother—her young observations of her mother’s ways of modeling and her conversations with her mother as a source and resource as Karen became a preservice teacher. Some of Gloria’s beliefs were developed as a result of her two-plus years in a pre-kindergarten classroom prior to her entrance into the program. Gloria seemed to intimate that her acquired beliefs were in keeping with those that she was introduced to in her university coursework, but perhaps she held notions that were unaddressed in her coursework and fieldwork experiences and therefore remain in place without having had the possibility of inspection. Some of Lana’s beliefs appeared to be rooted in her social work interests, and at times her allegiance to social work philosophies seemed to trump those that she was developing as a result of her classroom teaching experiences. Further, Lana often treaded closely to the conception that teaching is an endeavor to save children; Lana seemed to position herself in such a saving capacity by choosing diverse schools for all of her fieldwork experiences and indicating that somehow minority children needed her more than students who were more like her.

I was not able to determine with any certainty the ways in which these assumptions gained previous to their entrance into the teacher education program were accessed, assessed, dismantled, or reconstructed by the preservice teachers’ experiences in their coursework and fieldwork. That is, the preservice teachers did not share specific instances in which such assumptions were significantly challenged or changed as a result of program experiences. Yet, two of the three preservice teachers, Gloria and Lana, expressed an allegiance to a student-focused orientation and used such a lens to view the video-clips of others’ practices as well as to reflect on their own. A significant amount of research has cautioned against allowing the beliefs of preservice teachers to go unexamined (e.g., Britzman, 1991; Grossman, 1990). Lortie (1975) advanced the notion

that preservice teachers, having spent a great majority of their lives as students, have put in thousands of hours observing teachers in classrooms, forming an “apprenticeship of observation,” and that collective knowledge about teaching is incomplete and full of cultural myths and stereotypes. Such a lengthy stint means that preservice teachers have a knowledge base of past experiences that they must work to make sense of as they encounter new ideas.

Given that the preservice teachers were such ready and keen informants of their knowledge and sources and that they are ready reflectors on their practices in learning to teach reading/language arts, perhaps there is the potential for more opportunities within their coursework experiences to determine the ways in which their assumptions about teaching and learning are appearing in their practices and can be examined and reconstructed within these contexts.

THE POTENTIAL FOR MORE VARIETY IN PRESERVICE FIELDWORK OPPORTUNITIES.

The three preservice teachers in this study mentioned that even though there were fieldwork experiences built into their teacher education program, they all desired more of them. While Karen reported observing and teaching on multiple grade levels and at multiple sites, Gloria and Lana shared that they chose to conduct their student-teaching practica in classrooms in which they had had prior experiences. Gloria revealed throughout our interviews that she was interested in teaching only younger students and therefore shaped her fieldwork experiences so that the majority of them would be on the pre-kindergarten level. In our last interview together, and as Lana was completing the last of her requirements in her teacher education program, she appeared to draw a conclusion that, in retrospect, she should have chosen to participate in classrooms with older children as well.

Both Gloria and Lana reported growing in confidence in many respects as a result of their student-teaching practica. On the one hand, perhaps these two preservice teachers chose to return to particular classrooms for their intensive student-teaching experiences because there was the potential for a level of instant comfort; they were not strangers to these children and the cooperating teachers, nor to the routines and structures of the classrooms. Perhaps this level of comfort upon entering their practica afforded them a greater capacity to take risks, experiment with their practices, attempt to actively position themselves as collaborators and co-teachers, and so forth. More time spent alongside the cooperating teachers might also have meant the ability for these two inservice teachers to develop deeper knowing and more appreciation for the sustained experience. On the other hand, had Gloria and Lana chosen to vary their fieldwork placements, would they still have felt that they lacked sufficient experiences in classrooms? Would Gloria and Lana then have viewed their fieldwork experiences as more or less powerful sources of their knowing?

More variety in fieldwork opportunities quite possibly means more opportunities to meld theory and practice. Karen, because she reported facing more challenges in her learning in the field than did Gloria and Lana, seemed to engage in more wrestling and perhaps eventually more sense-making of how theory can feed one's practice. The fact that Gloria and Lana did not report conflicts and challenges in their student-teaching assignments likely had a great deal to do with their purposefully selecting classrooms in which previous engagement in these classrooms helped them predict that their philosophies and methodological orientations would be exemplified rather than challenged. The differences in experiences for these three preservice teachers begs this question: Does a practicum experience in which the intern actively and continually works to "make sense" of learning experiences mean that he or she will be better able to

manage challenges to her theoretical/practice understandings as an inservice teacher? Grossman et al. (2000), in providing portraits of three teachers in their early inservice years, showed us that moving on the path toward expertise likely means not shutting down, remaining silent, and acquiescing in the face of conflict as a result of school culture, climate, and policy. Following Karen, Gloria, and Lana into their inservice classrooms might reveal more about the question of whether challenges to their learning in their preservice years can possibly help them become better users of theory in their practice as inservice teachers.

Yet, the preservice teachers' requests for more and varied fieldwork experiences didn't seem to mean that they needed to develop their practice before they could begin to think about the theoretical underpinnings, as has been suggested by Russell (1988). Karen certainly illustrated that she went in search in the field for practices that supported her theoretical knowledge, and she incurred conflict when she perceived instances of nonalignment. Lana often revealed theoretical knowing, not because of field experiences, but as a result of textbook readings and of participating in models in the university classroom. In addition, Lana's cooperating teacher, according to what Lana reported, appeared to foster reflecting on not simply "what" was done instructionally in the classroom, but also the "why's" as they related to theory. Thus, the preservice teachers indicated that there were "quality" (Karen's term) experiences that occurred in the field that they appreciated. They were not passive learners, and therefore the request for more fieldwork opportunities most assuredly is a request for more opportunities to construct knowledge about theory and practice in order to inform their teaching of reading/language arts.

THE POTENTIAL FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES TO FUND NEW SOURCES.

The three preservice teachers in this study reported acquiring many and varied sources of knowing while participating in their teacher education program. The intention, of course, is for those sources to feed their practice as inservice teachers. Yet, Clift and Brady (2005) acknowledged that “new teachers are frequently socialized into the practices of their first job and may not base practice on theories and recommended practices from the teacher education programs” (p. 331). Further, the case studies of three preservice teachers’ experiences in their first three years of teaching that were presented by Grossman et al. (2000) are hardly comforting, given that schools’ curriculum mandates pressured the beginning teachers to acquiesce initially; only after more than a year of service did the new teachers appear to draw on the sources of knowledge that they had acquired during their preservice teacher programs. What space, then, are beginning teachers afforded in their first years to use their preservice teacher education sources?

Of equal importance is the question, which professional development opportunities exist that have the potential for funding new sources? As an active constructor of knowledge and theory-builder, Karen demonstrated the importance of beginning teachers’ acquiring new sources in the school settings in which they will serve their first inservice years. Karen was advised by a district curriculum specialist to incorporate her bilingual students’ first language into her instruction, and she reported that on many occasions, she adjusted her practice to incorporate the specialist’s “good teaching principle.” However, when reflecting on an instance of her teaching that I had the opportunity to observe, Karen had a “light bulb moment” in that she realized she had not sufficiently incorporated the students’ first language into her lesson that day. This

example is important because it highlights the importance of new teachers' having access to new sources of knowledge, and yet it cannot be ignored that Karen's recognition of the importance of her source was prompted by her reflection with me, not by her own doing or inclination to reflect. New sources, then, might need to be cultivated with others' assistance if they are to be sufficiently integrated into beginners' practice.

The example of Karen's acquisition of a new source of knowledge should also be considered against the research on the development of expertise. Templin (1988) suggested that by its very nature, the work that teachers do in classroom often isolates them. And Berliner (2001) noted that the accrual of experiences themselves is not sufficient in advancing one's practice to expertness. To move forward on the path toward expertise, then, Karen needs not to work in isolation or simply have more experiences in the classroom. In addition, certainly all three preservice teachers' concerns about classroom management is a clear signal that they might value new mentoring sources in their early inservice years to assist them in this area alone. Suggesting that teachers can become "stuck" in their development without proper support, Glaser (1997) proposed an alternative theory to Berliner's (1986) five-stage model of expertise that underscored the need to provide structured environments for novices initially and to decrease scaffolding as self-monitoring and self-regulatory techniques are learned. A teacher like Lana seems to value such levels of support, given that she reported benefiting from a collaborative relationship with her cooperating teacher (which seemed to constitute dependence at times). Without this source, Lana's practice could stall unless she develops additional sources and means of support in her first years of inservice.

The teachers in this study indicated that their practice is infused with their preservice teacher education sources, and perhaps new sources of knowledge from professional development opportunities have the potential to be readily incorporated into

their practice as well. Certainly professional development opportunities that involve mentoring are in keeping with sources of knowledge that the preservice teachers reported valuing in many and varied ways.

THE POTENTIAL FOR PARTICIPATING IN A COMMUNITY OF LEARNERS.

In considering the potential of new sources to influence beginning teachers' practice, it is striking what Templin (1988) says about inservice teaching: that the kind of work that teachers do isolates them. Being isolated is entirely antithetical to the experiences the preservice teachers reported finding useful in their teacher education program. The preservice teachers in this study reported that peers were utilized as information sources, for sharing teaching successes, and certainly for venting frustrations as they participated together in their learning-to-teach journey; often those relationships extended outside of the university classroom as well. Interactions with professors were viewed as sources that were and are still available beyond the end of a particular semester; these teacher educators were viewed by the three preservice teachers as willing and lasting contributors to their education even beyond the conclusion of the university program. Isolationism, then, would seemingly void sources for these new teachers. Beyond that, participation in a learning community during their preservice teacher education might just mean that these beginning teachers have been oriented to continually developing their practice with others.

Lave and Wenger (1991) argue that knowledge takes place within a framework of participation and that learning is an interactional process. Learning is not an isolated activity but a function of being in a community. Further, Lave and Wenger define communities of practice as a social construct that places learning in the "context of our lived experiences of participation in the world" (p. 3). The participants are actively involved in a community's ways of thinking and acting. Learning, then, is living in the

world; in order for individuals to learn, they must become actively involved in a community. Likewise, Bereiter and Scardamalia (1993) suggested that the scientific community could serve as a model for communities of learning in schools because that working environment requires experts to engage in progressive problem-solving in a continuous effort to build deeper understanding of domains. In a knowledge-building community, members share their knowledge and support one another in knowledge construction so that a collective knowledge base is built. In order to produce experts, schools need a supportive, progressive, knowledge-building discourse.

The key, then, appears to be experts and novices working together, rather than novices working in isolation perhaps with the false notion that they will develop their practice simply through the repetition of performance. The findings in this study suggest that beginning teachers exit teacher education programs with much of what they need to participate in a learning community. Specifically, the three preservice teachers demonstrated that by sharing a lexicon, they have appropriated the language of expert teachers and that they can notice, identify, and analyze important features of instruction. Thus, they have the language tools they need to reflect on their practice, and they value opportunities to inspect their practice with the support of more experienced teachers.

Merely placing novices with experts is not without its problems, though. McIntyre and Hagger (1993) argued that teachers' expertise is embedded in their practice and not necessarily readily articulated, which accounts for why teachers' talk about their practice fails to measure up to the complexity and subtlety of the knowledge that they employ in their practice. Schon (1983, 1987) helped us learn that to practice well, teachers need to be consciously thinking about the practical problems they face, their interpretations of those situations, and the decisions they make. So educating reflective practitioners becomes largely a matter of developing the disposition to reflect and

ultimately finding the words to express those reflections to others—through collaboration, building a shared language, and a shared knowledge of practice (Yinger, 1987).

As a result, researchers and teachers have developed methods for making articulate that which is often implicit or is embedded in the action of one's practice (Schon, 1983). Connelly and Clandinin (1988) divided reflective tools into two groups: those that preservice and inservice teachers use alone, such as personal journals; and those that are used with a mentor, a trusted peer, or a learning community of teachers who are working together to become more reflective thinkers. Action research, peer observation, and group debriefing are tools included in this second group. Further, Connelly & Clandinin argued that given that so much of what experienced and expert teachers know is held tacitly, particularistic stories might provide teachers with a way to communicate their practical knowledge and build shared understandings of practice. These lived-out experiences of experts can provide a vehicle to make known that which might remain tacit otherwise; also, lived-out experiences of novices can be used to problematize beginning teachers' interpretations and enable them to question the adequacy of their views. Additionally, taking a cue from Florio-Ruane (2001), book clubs with novices and experts participating together is yet another forum for reflecting on practice. Thus, being received into a community of learners in their early inservice years seems in keeping with the ways in which preservice teachers have been inducted into the profession. Finding, and/or creating these opportunities to participate as an inservice teacher in a learning community might serve to put beginning teachers even further along the path toward expertise (Darling-Hammond, 2000).

A Final Word

Previous research efforts have advanced the notions that teacher education programs are making differences in classrooms (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Hoffman & Pearson, 2000; Maloch et al., 2003). Hoffman and Roller (2001), in addressing one of the tasks assigned to the National Commission on Excellence in Elementary Teacher Preparation for Reading Instruction, identified common characteristics of excellent reading teacher preparation programs. Those eight areas were content, apprenticeships, visions, resources and mission, personalized teaching, autonomy, community, and assessment. Certainly, the preservice teachers in this study readily reported the influences of their program on their preparation and practices and valued all the areas that speak directly to preservice teachers' learning. Those include content (reported as education course experiences such as readings, assignments, and discussions), apprenticeships (reported as coursework-and-practice links, observations of multiple classrooms, and student-teaching practica), and community (reported as experiences with professors and peers).

Ultimately, my study urges continued dialogues with preservice teachers about the sources of knowledge they value and display in their practices. Preservice teachers are candid informants of their professional experiences, and only from them might we better learn about the complexities involved in beginning teachers' development toward expertise.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Volunteer Participant Questionnaire

Thank you for volunteering to participate in this research study. The information you provide below will tell me more about you, your background, and your experiences in the teacher education program. Please return this form to me next week.

Personal Information

Name: _____

Gender: Female Male

Age Group (circle one):

20-25 26-30 31-35 36-40 Over 40

Ethnicity (circle one):

African American Asian Hispanic Native American White

Other: _____

Graduating High School (name and city/state): _____

Other universities you've attended (if applicable): _____

About Your Student Teaching Assignment

Grade Level Assigned: _____ School: _____

Cooperating Teacher's Name: _____

Supervising Teacher's Name: _____

About Your Experience with Children

What kinds of work have you done with children? _____

Did that work influence your choice of teaching? If so, how? _____

About Your Past Coursework

Your course in reading methods—

Name of instructor: _____

What is a vivid memory of that class? _____

Your course in reading difficulties—

Name of instructor: _____

What is a vivid memory of that class? _____

About Your Current Coursework

What are your goals for your own learning in this language arts methods class? _____

About Your Student Teaching Experience

What goals do you have for your student teaching experience? _____

About Your Teacher Preparation

What do you see as your strengths in teaching? _____

What do you want most to improve in your teaching? _____

About Your Career Plans

What do you think would be your ideal teaching job? (locale, school, or type of school, grade level, children) Why?

Appendix B

Clip 1 Transcript

Teacher: John Sinnett
Classroom: Kindergarten, Houston, Texas
Content: Journal Writing

Summary: Mr. Sinnett and the students are seated in a circle on the floor. In front of them are their individual journals and baskets of writing supplies. The teacher and students turn to a blank page in their individual journals and begin working by writing the date at the top of the page and drawing an illustration in the middle of the page. Mr. Sinnett says that the picture is the plan for their words. As the drawing is happening, Mr. Sinnett checks in with a number of students, asking them about what they are drawing and why. After a short time, Mr. Sinnett asks them to complete their drawings. Using his own drawing, Mr. Sinnett models how to label a picture (e.g., he gives names to the two animals in his picture) and then asks for help in writing the word bed. The students respond do the sounds that Mr. Sinnett makes (e.g., buh-buh-buh) by offering their ideas about a certain letter in the word bed. More modeling occurs when Mr. Sinnett moves on to writing his sentence. Then Mr. Sinnett asks the students to do as he has done in their journals, to label their illustrations and write a sentence. Again, Mr. Sinnett talks with individual students as they are working. He says that he sits on the floor with them and writes along with them and talks about writing with them because he wants to build a community and he wants his students to see that he values writing and that he, too, has stories from his life to put down in writing. Following this individual writing time, Mr. Sinnett narrates to the students what he saw happening in the process. He praises good writing practices, such as leaving spaces between words in their sentences, helping one another as they wrote, and using sources in the room write words. Then Mr. Sinnett invites the students to share their writing with a partner.

Complete Transcript:

Student: It's real hard to draw an angel.

Teacher: I don't know what an angel looks like.

Student: They have flowers in their hair and they have wings and they fly ...

Teacher: Okay.

Student: in the clouds.

Teacher: Okay. So how ever you draw it, it's okay, though, right?

Student: Yah.

Teacher: Yah. How come you're drawing, how come you're writing about an angel today?

Student: Because I have one.

Teacher: Where did you get it?

Student: From my daddy. He got, he buyed it for me.

Teacher: Alright, great. That's a great thing to write about.

Teacher: Georgia? Georgia? How did you make your turkey?

Georgia: With my hand.

Teacher: With your hand. Good.

Student #1: I like your picture, Mr. Sinnett.

Teacher: Thank you, I'm not done yet. I have a few more things to do.

Student #2: This is the sun.

Student #3: I know how to make a sun.

Student #1: Mr. Sinnett, can I use that brown for a minute?

Teacher: Oh yeah sure.

Student #1: Thank you.

Teacher: You're welcome.

Teacher (voice-over): I just like being down there with them. It makes it more personal. It makes, it builds a better community. Instead of my being up on a chair. Or just letting them go freefall and I go off to my desk. I mean, I want to be in there with them.

Teacher: Okay, boys and girls, let's go ahead and stop. Ah, Ah. Great, thank you. Everybody stopped right away.

Teacher: Since this is our very important writing time, let's sit flat on the floor. Get comfortable so we can really learn. I'm going to move this out of the way so you guys can see what I am doing, okay?

(Students and teacher move crayon boxes behind them)

Teacher: You've made your plan just like I did in your notebook. If you didn't write your picture, draw a picture you wouldn't know what to write about, would you? It'd be hard. We're going to label our picture and then we're going to write a story down here. (Points to bottom of picture). And of course, I'm going to show you what to do. And you know what, I'm expecting you guys to be able to do this now. We've talked about this for a long time. Especially putting down, Georgia, letters that we know. Okay? Alright, so I'm going to go first. Of course, I have Chuy and Gizmo. Now I know how to write their names so I'm not going to have to go Ch-Ch-Ch and think about – I know how to write their names.

Student #4: I know how to write my name. Okay.

Teacher: So I'm going to write Chuy and Gizmo. Okay, then this is the bed cuz that's what I am going to write about. They like to sleep under the bed, Okay?

Student #5: With you?

Teacher: So I'm going to label the word 'bed'. So bed, b-b-b.

Students: B.

Teacher: I hear B at the beginning, thank you. Now what do I hear, listen to the middle. B - eh - eh - eh.

Students: B, A.

Teacher: Not A.

Students: E.

Teacher: E, like elephant right? Yah.

Student #6: Like...eagle!

Teacher: Well, not like eagle. Like eh- eh - elephant. Now what do, what do we hear at the end? Bed-d.

Students: D.

Teacher: D, right. OK, Bed. Um, got my spacer. See, so I'm going to write Chuy and I put my space down, Chuy and...

Student #7: Gizmo.

Teacher: Gizmo. Hey, can you use your finger if you don't have a stick?

Students: No. Yes.

Teacher: Yah. Can you use a crayon if you don't have a stick? Yah. You can use.. yah.

Student #8. Or a pencil.

Teacher: You could use a pencil. Chuy and Gizmo and then a space... like.

Teacher (voice-over): And I could show them what good writers do when, when they're writing. I show them about spacing and I show them about listening for sounds. Even though I can, I can write the words you know, I can show them how they should be doing it. Putting down words and letters that they know.

Teacher: And then I put a period because I'm done. Okay? Then I'm going to read it, just like we said good readers do, to see if it sounds right. You tell me.

Teacher: (Reads from paper) Chuy and Gizmo like to sleep under the bed.

Students: Bed. Yes. Yah.

Teacher: Okay. (Some students begin to write.) Not yet. Wait a minute. When you are doing your writing, I want to see you and hear you. I want to see you looking at the word wall and using word wall words. I want to hear you saying words so you can write down letters that you know. Okay? Alright. Go ahead. Why don't you put your baskets back in the front like this. (Teacher moves basket in front of student next to him).

Video indicates "Next day." Teacher and students sitting in similar arrangement as the day prior.

Teacher: Let me, let me get out here in the middle in case some kids need some help.

Student #9: I – I – I-S?

Teacher: For what, is? Yah. (Moves closer to students).

Teacher: What are you writing?

Student #10: Umm.

Teacher: Oh, you're labeling. Okay, what did you label?

Student #10: A flower.

Teacher: Okay, what don't you start writing down here? (Points to bottom of paper). What are you going to say today?

Student #10: I like the flowers.

Teacher: (Gives student thumbs up). Love that!

Teacher: What are you writing about, Laura?

Laura: A house.

Teacher: A house? Is this your house right here? I see the word, I see the letter 'H' for house, good.

Teacher: What are you going to write down there today?

Student: I play with my brother outside.

Teacher: (Moves to another student). Great idea, Kim. Oh, no you don't have to change that. Just cross this out, just cross this out. (Points to page). This is alright. Yesterday I had a party. Okay? So these are Okay. But you know what? I'm glad that you read it and you listened and you heard that you made a mistake. That's great, Kim!
Wow!

Teacher: Okay, boys and girls. Let's go ahead and stop. Wow. Boy, I tell you what. I have got some great things to talk about today.

Teacher: I, Oh! Hands in your lap. Great job. Boys and girls, you are – I can't believe your writing today. It was fantastic!

Students: (Inaudible).

Teacher: Well, that's Okay.

Student #10: Better than the morning class.

Teacher: Well, you know and better than yesterday. What you did yesterday too. I see spaces in everybody's writing so I can look around and I can read all of your writing. And you know what, what's even better, you can read it to me. You can read it to me. That's great. I heard people helping each other. Ouzy helped Elizay. I didn't even have to help, 'cause Ouzy took, did it for me. Kim was, Kim had a great idea. Kim, how did you know how to write the word party? What did you do?

Kim: 'Cause I looked at the pocket and the books we read.

Teacher: She went over and got the book that she read at the table out of the pocket and she wrote the word party.

Teacher: She also said, she started to read. Do you mind if I tell them, Kim? Can I tell them what you did?

Kim: (Nods head yes).

Teacher: She started to read her story and it didn't sound right. So you know what she did? She fixed it.

Student: Fixed it.

Teacher: Right, she just fixed it. I like how you are reading to each other, but you know what you're doing? You're trying to read your stories at the same time. For example, if these two girls were going to read. They're trying to read at the same time. Can you do that?

Students: No.

Teacher: No, you can't hear each other read. So you have to take turns. One person reads, then the other, while this person listens. Then Lillian would read and then George would listen. OK? Can you do that for me? And then we are going to put them on the art table.

[END OF CLIP]

Appendix C

Clip 2 Transcript

Teacher: Hildi Perez
Classroom: First grade in Boston, Massachusetts
Content: Guided Reading

Summary:

This section of the video is titled “Guided Reading.” Ms. Perez invites four students to join her at a small table. Ms. Perez, in a short voiceover, explains that this particular group is a homogeneous one and that these students “back in September were reading at a beginning first-grade level.” The book the students are reading for the first time is called “New Boots” and before they begin reading, Mrs. Perez asks for predictions about the story based on the title. Several students offer suggestions (e.g., the boots are needed because it is raining outside and the boots are needed because it is snowing outside). Mrs. Perez then begins the story reading by asking certain students to read aloud as the group members follow along. She stops the reading at various points to discuss strategies for decoding unfamiliar words. After a few pages of reading aloud together, Mrs. Perez asks them to read independently. As they do, she moves around the group and offers individualized help. When all students reach a certain place in the text, they form a group again. As a group, the students try to determine what a word is in the text that Mrs. Perez has covered up with a post-it note. Mrs. Perez names this strategy “making sense.” First the students read the sentence containing the hidden word (“They are for ___ days”) and offer possibilities (e.g., one student offers “here” and another offers “many”). Next, Mrs. Perez allows the students to uncover just the first letter of the hidden word. When the students see that the first letter is “r,” they revise their guesses (e.g., one student says “rain”). Mrs. Perez asks the students to read the sentence again, inserting the suggested word. Soon after, the students determine that “rainy” is the hidden word and remove the post-it note to reveal that they are correct. In a voiceover, Mrs. Perez explains that her goals for this small group of students are to develop fluency, expand sight word vocabularies, increase comprehension, and build connections to texts.

Complete Transcript:

Teacher: Today we’re going to start with a new book about our characters Jack and Billy. And who can tell me what you see on this picture.

Maya?

Maya: Billy and Jack putting on boots.

Teacher: Putting on boots. Can you guys find the word boots?

Teacher (voice-over): This guided reading group is composed of children that back in September, were reading at a beginning first-grade level. And I put them all together because I felt like they had the same needs and they need to be working on the same skills.

Teacher: Why do you think they're getting new boots, Maya?

Maya: I think because it's raining out and they want to splash in the puddles.

Teacher: So you think that maybe it's raining outside and they want to splash in the puddles, so maybe that's what they're getting boots..

Student #1: I think it's, I think they're using they're boots for the snow.

Teacher: You think they might be using the boots for the snow? So, we're going to check out what's going to happen in this story.

Teacher (voice-over): My goals for this guided reading group is for them to develop more fluency, to expand their sight word vocabulary, comprehension and really making sense of what they read, and to make connections with the text.

Student #1: Jack and Billy went to the, went to the sh- shop with mom.

Teacher: OK, stop for a second. I know that Gianna did something that good readers do. Did anybody notice something she did? 'Cause I know she got stuck. Raheem, what did she do?

Raheem: She think that she got it.

Teacher: How do you think she thought about it? How do you think she went about thinking about it?

Raheem: Because, because it says (sound out) sh and op. It says shop.

Teacher: I noticed that too.

Teacher (voice-over): I really want to verbalize the strategies I see children using. Because the more you verbalize, the more it gets internalized and then kids start verbalizing the strategies they use.

Teacher: You're going to read until you get to the paperclip.
(Teacher gets up from her chair and kneels next to readers to listen.)

Student #2: (reading) I like the red boots said Billy.

Teacher: Good for you.

Maya: (reading) Mom and Jack and Billy went home with the boots.

Teacher: Good, alright.

Gianna: (reading) ...the boots

Teacher: OK, keep reading.

Student: (reading) Dad, Dad.

Teacher: Let's see and look at this, do you know this word right here?
(Teacher covers the sh and ed to read out)

Student #1: (reading) S- shout.

Teacher: Good for you, so this says shout. And this says shouted.

Student #1: (reading) Shou-ted.

Teacher: Good for you. (reading) Dad! Dad! shouted...

Student #1: (reading) Jack. Mom got us some boots. Look!
(Teacher moves on to assist another student.)

Raheem: (reading) Jack and Billy ran ...

Teacher: Are you stuck?

Raheem: (Nods yes).

Teacher: What can you do? Do you know this part of the word?

Raheem: In.

Teacher: So you know in. Jack and Billy ran in . . . ssss

Raheem: side.

Teacher: I like your boots, said Dad. Good, alright. So you can remove the clips.

Student #1: Oh, no!

Teacher: Gianna, what do you notice?

Gianna: That you covered it.

(Teacher has placed a post-it note covering a word in the book.)

Teacher: Raheem, why do you think I covered it?

Raheem: There's a hard word there.

Teacher: Well, maybe there's a hard word. Maybe it's not hard.

Gianna: Why don't we try, doing making sense.

Teacher: Try to think about what makes sense? I think that's what we are going to have to do. 'Cause, could we sound it out, Maya?

Maya: Nope.

Teacher: Why not?

Maya: Because, because you have to see the word to sound it out.

Teacher: That's right. So, um, I'd like Sammy to read up to where you get stuck.

Sammy: (reading) Your boots go in here, said Mom. They are for..

Teacher: Now, we're going to skip it. They are for ... days. What would make sense there?

Raheem: I know!

Sammy: They are for here...

Teacher: Does that make sense? They are for here days. Does that make sense?

Students: (shake heads no)

Teacher: No. Gianna, what do you think makes sense?

Gianna: They are for many days.

Teacher: They are for many days. So, you think like, they're going to use them for a lot of days?

Gianna: (shakes head yes)

Teacher: They are for many days. I'm not sure. Let's see. You know what's going to help us? Let's peek just to the first letter right here. Raheem, what's the first letter that you see?

Raheem: Oh, R!

Teacher: Oh, R. Do you think . . .Raheem, what could it be?

Raheem: (reading)They are for rain days. No.

Teacher: They are for rain days. Well, that doesn't makes sense. But what could make sense? If it's a day with a lot of rain, what kind of day is that?

Raheem: (reading) They are for rainy days.

Teacher: Does that make sense?

Raheem: (shakes head yes)

Teacher: Well, let's check if it's rainy. (Students and teacher remove post-it note covering word.) Good for you.

Teacher and Students: (reading) They are for rainy days.

Teacher (voice-over): My goal for this guided reading group is for them to have a balanced cueing system. Basically having different strategies to rely on when you're reading a text.

[END OF CLIP]

Appendix D

Clip 3 Transcript

Teacher: Becky Pursley
Classroom: First-grade in Austin, Texas
Content: Readers Workshop

Summary: In this clip, the teacher begins by transitioning from a whole-class reading of a large-print magazine article to their independent, paired, or group work in readers workshop. The teacher asks the students to read a list of possibilities for their work in readers workshop. Then viewers see several students reading together or in pairs. Afterwards, the teacher and one student work together to make words using magnets on the side of a filing cabinet. This student, as told to the viewer with the voiceover, is working on putting blends and rhymes together. Finally, students are showing working together in a small group. They are a readers' theater group. They are showing negotiating the tasks of reading the book before they will make that book into a script.

Teacher: This can be a reading choice as we begin reading workshop. Or you can just take this home and do it at home. So for reading workshop let's review our choices. We've got them all listed here. Read with me. We know these choices. You can read a book. Read it again. Write and draw about the book. Read a book with tape. We have magazines. We have word books. We have big books. You have wonderful poems in your binder. You can read the room—that would be closets, posters, charts, and labels. The computers, we have, yes. The social studies and science books. And readers theater. We have a group that will be practicing that today. Otherwise, show me how you go and get your just-right book and start your readers workshop.

Teacher (voice-over): Reading workshop is basically based on time. Small amount of

teacher talk is involved. The lessons are called minilessons because they're shortened to give less time to the teacher teaching and more time to the actual practice of reading. Choice is a big part of reading workshop so that the kids can have ownership in what they're reading. And response is a big part of the workshop approach. In other words, they're allowed to reflect on what they've read, talk about it with others, share all kinds of connections, predictions, or wonderings with each other.

+++

(Shots of several students reading independently or in pairs.)

Student: (reading) No not past the tree, but up the tree.

Student: (reading) I let Sam run with me. I let him jump with me. He likes it.

Teacher (voice-over): Sometimes you may feel like you're lacking control, but if you step back and do a status of everyone, and make sure that every child has something to do that's engaging for them, the workshop will work.

Student: (reading) Now Pal and Sal run in the field together.

+++

(Student looking at the side of a file cabinet where magnets showing two letters per magnet are placed.)

Teacher: Why don't you pick a blend to start with.

Teacher: Now do you want to pick an ending?

Teacher (voice-over): I have some children who need to practice putting the initial blend and rhyme of the word together. For instance, “fr” being the initial blend and “og” being the rhyme—the onset and rhyme.

Teacher: Can you say that?

Student: Fram.

Teacher: Is that a real word?

Student: No.

Teacher: Want to pick the next one and put it together.

Student: (sounding out) Frig.

Teacher: Is that a real word? No.

Teacher: Want to pick the third one and put it next to there.

Student: Frog.

Teacher: Right. That makes frog and that’s a real word. So what are you going to do.

(Student takes pencil and clipboard and begins to write.)

Teacher: Right. Write it down.

Teacher: When you read, if you see the two consonants together, you might want to say them together and see if there’s an ending. Take them apart and put them together just as you’ve done here. And you can take this pencil too, sweetie.

+++

Screen flashes “Readers’ Theater”

Student: (reading) You think this is bad, said Father. Just wait until you see the living room.

Student: Katherine’s turn.

Teacher (voice-over): The point of readers theater is to build fluency, intonation, and oral reading. Today I have a small group of students who read “Arthur’s New Puppy.” And then they practiced their readers’ theater script once. Tomorrow they’ll practice it a time or two. And then they’ll perform it.

Student: Kara, it’s your turn. These are two pages, so just read these two.

Student: No, just these two. Cause that’s no fair.

Student: But see all of this is a page.

Student: No, that’s not fair.

Student: Yes, just these two pages.

Student: No, let’s ask Ms. Pursley. This whole page is full of them. Does she get to read all three.

(Mrs. Pursley walks up.)

Teacher: Do you feel comfortable reading all that?

Student: Yes.

Student: But that’s not fair.

Teacher: Well, let’s just go with it.

Student: Okay.

Teacher (voice-over): The teacher is like an orchestra leader and an artist and a secretary and a mother all rolled up in one. I think we have to view the children as people and there are people who are going to need certain skills in thinking and working but also in interacting with each others, so we have to address all those skills.

(Camera pans out, showing entire room where all kinds of reading activities are happening simultaneously.)

[END OF CLIP]

Appendix E

Part One of Introductory Interview

1. Tell me about your life growing up.

Probes: What place or places were you raised? What feelings do you have about that place/those places? Talk about your family (parents and siblings). Talk about your interests then.

2. Tell me about your early school experiences.

2a. Tell me about your middle and high school years.

Probes: How did you feel about school? Did you have memorable years or memorable teachers? What interested you? What troubled you?

3. Tell me about what you remember about being taught to read and write in school and/or at home?

Probes: What are your visual memories of reading time? Any books that you recall? Do you remember any specific reading and writing assignments at

particular grade levels? How do you remember feeling about reading and writing? What were your reading and writing teachers like? Did you think of yourself as a reader or a writer as a child? Do you now?

4. Tell me about your college experiences so far.

Probes: How did you decide to come to this university? What has surprised you about college life? What has gone according to your expectations?

5. Tell me about your decision to pursue a teaching certificate.

Probes: Do you recall when you decided you wanted to become a teacher? Were there any particular “a-ha” moments that fed your desire to become a teacher? What other choices did you consider?

6. I’m interested in what you have to say about becoming a teacher. What have we not covered or what have I failed to ask you about your experiences that you would like to add?

Appendix F
Part-Two of Introductory Interview
(Being-a-Preservice-Teacher Interview)

1. Tell me about your decision to teach elementary school.
Probes: What factors helped you to make that decision? Is there anything that still troubles you or you wonder about regarding that decision?
2. Tell me about your experiences in the College of Education.
Probes: What classes have you taken? Did you develop friendships in those classes? Do you belong to any organizations? What has been surprising? What has met your expectations?
3. Tell me some of your strongest beliefs about good teaching.
4. Tell me what you think about how kids learn best.
Probes: What impact do you think teachers can have on students? What is the role of the teacher in the classroom? What is the role of the teacher in the school, district, and profession?
5. Tell me about the experiences in the teacher education program so far that have helped shape your views.
Probes: What courses/readings/experiences/models have made you think you have made the right decision to enter the teaching profession? Has anything made you doubt your decision? What courses/readings/experiences/models have been helpful to you? In what ways do you think you will use the courses/readings/experiences/models?
6. What do you consider your strengths so far as a new teacher?
7. Talk about about something you are pleased to have experienced so far in your teacher education program.
Probes: Why are these experiences ones that seem most helpful to you? How might your views be different had you not had these experiences?
8. Tell me about what you still hope to experience in the teacher education program but haven't so far.
Probes: What did you expect to learn but haven't yet? What did you expect to happen but it has yet to?
9. What have we not covered about you and your thoughts about teacher education that you would like to add?

Appendix G

Classroom Demonstration Viewing Interview

Introduction by Researcher: I'm going to show you a short video clip of a (kindergarten, first grade, second grade) classroom. I invite you to look at it closely so that we can talk about what you saw and thought about when the tape has concluded. But you can talk anytime. Here is the button that will pause the DVD if you want to stop and comment at any time. Because it's sometimes hard to distinguish what kids in classrooms are saying, I have a transcript for you. You can look at the transcript later to refresh your memory or you can use its margins to make any notes you want to. Do you have any questions?

1. Have you ever seen this classroom demonstration before?
Probe if the answer is "yes": Where did you see it? What was said about it? By whom? Do you remember what you said or thought about it at the time?
2. Tell me about what was happening in the tape we just watched..
Probes: What is the nature of the work that the teacher and students are doing? What else did you notice going on in that classroom?
3. Tell me about the what the teacher was doing.
Probes: What did you notice the teacher doing? What are the teacher's instructional and/or assessment strategies? How well is that teacher using a particular instructional and/or assessment strategy? Based on the teacher's actions, what knowledge is the teacher using? What do you think the teacher was aiming to accomplish, and how successful was this teacher? How do you know?
4. You've said a lot about the teacher and his/her goals and decisions. What were you drawing on to interpret that teacher's actions as you did?
Recast/Probe: What are your experiences, as someone learning to teach, that make you view this teacher in the way you just described? What learning experiences have you had that help you to know what that teacher was doing?
Experienced Teacher: What are your experiences as a veteran teacher that make you view this teacher in the way you just described?
5. Tell me everything you think you know about the students.
Probes: What did you notice the students doing? What did the students learn or not learn? How do you think the students felt about what was happening in their classroom? How do you know?
6. You've said a lot about the students and what they were doing. What were you drawing on to describe those students and their actions as you did?

Recast/Probes: What are your experiences, as someone learning to teach, that make you view the students in the way you just described? What learning experiences have you had that help you to know what those students were doing?

Experienced Teacher: What are your experiences as a veteran teacher that make you view the students in the way you just described?

7. Tell me how what you saw in that classroom compares with how you were taught.
Probe: As someone learning to teach, tell me how your experiences in grade school influence your learning about reading/language arts instruction.
Experienced Teacher: Do your experiences as a student in grade school learning to read and write influence your teaching practices today in teaching reading/language arts?

8. Tell me how what you saw in that classroom compares with your own ideas about teaching? your own teaching experiences?
Probes: What was interesting to you? What surprised you? What was not surprising to see? What experiences have you had that influence how you responded to what you saw?

9. While watching the clip, did you take any notes that we didn't cover?
Probe: Is there anything you wanted to say that my questions didn't allow you to discuss?

Appendix H

Preservice Teacher's Teaching Interview

1. Tell me about what you were doing with the class.
Probes: What is the instructional strategy that you were using? Where did you learn that instructional strategy?
2. Tell me how you decided to teach that lesson.
Probe: Where did you learn that instructional strategy?
3. Tell me how you feel about what just happened.
Probes: What went well? What didn't? How do you know?
4. Tell me about what you hoped would happen.
Probes: What plan did you have before teaching just now? What were your goals? What helped you to decide that those should be your goals?
5. Tell me about the students' response to your lesson.
Probes: How do you know?
6. Tell me how this experience was similar to or different from your other teaching experiences.
Probes: What aspects of your teaching just now, specifically, is similar to and different from others? What makes you say that?
7. Tell me what you would keep the same or change if you were to teach that same lesson again.
Probes: What makes you say that?
8. If you got to teach that lesson again, what would you wish you knew more about?
Probe: How would you go about learning it?

Appendix I

Summary of Introductory Interview Analysis

The following is part of the summary of introductory interview analysis written for the case of Lana.

Early Memories of Learning to Read and Write

In the first grade, Lana remembered being in the “blue group.” She said, “It wasn’t the highest group. But it was a high group.” Lana remembered that her family was “very into books.” Lana said, though, that she was not reading at home before she entered kindergarten. One of her older sisters did learn to read well at home before school began and was moved into the first grade, bypassing kindergarten. Lana remembered this sister reading to her at night.

Lana’s reading was developed because literacy appeared to be a priority in her family: “I loved going to the library. I liked getting my own books for fun. When we [her family] went somewhere, I’d take along books. We always had books from the Scholastic Book Club. We’d go to bookstores too. I still have lots of those books. I remember the Berenstein Bears. I remember that I loved Nancy Drew. When I was older, I liked R. L. Stein.”

Lana reported that writing in her early years of schooling included “lots of handwriting practice in school.” She elaborated, “I remember doing lots of writing sheets. I don’t remember writing a response or writing for enjoyment. I would write a poem for myself.”

After school would end when Lana was in the first grade, she would go home and play school, not with her friends but with stuffed animals: “I would line them up. I would make assignments for them. I would write poems for them.” That year she received “a ton” of school supplies as her holiday gift. She said, with a slight smile, “I didn’t even know that they [her parents] really knew that about me. I thought I was my little secret.”

Appendix J

Example of Video-Clip Analysis

The following presents one section of analysis between the data statements of the expert panel and one of the cases, Karen.

Video-clip 1: Kindergarten Class Engaged in Journal Writing

<i>Instructional Strategies/Teacher Actions</i>	
Expert Panel's responses	Karen's responses
"He is clear with students about what he wants."	"He makes his expectations known."
"He has a piece of his writing as a demonstration."	"He is using his own writing, but he wants them to make their own individual entries."
"He confers with students."	"He checks in with them while they're working."
"It's a fairly structured process, while the content is not structured."	"He didn't really emphasize the product; it's mostly the process [the procedure]."
"He has several objectives that are holistic; objectives emerge as responses to what is going on."	"He has determined in advance what are reasonable goals for his students. His objectives are getting them to be independent writers and produce writing."

Appendix K

Summary of Debriefing Interview After Observation of Teaching

The following is part of the summary of debriefing interview analysis written for the case of Gloria.

Vision for the Lesson

Gloria noticed that her pre-kindergarten students during center time were making discoveries about building when working with blocks. In her observations of their play, Gloria noticed that the students were striving to build increasingly taller structures each time, but that those structures would become wobbly and the students were talking about this “problem.” She said, “They were kind of starting to discover these things on their own. They had built one tower, one block on top of one block, and it wobbled easily. So I decided it was time to lead them through a discussion about [base support].” Gloria decided to plan a lesson around the concepts of height—“Is this building taller or shorter?”—and introduce the concept of base support structures. Gloria noted, “I didn’t expect them to use any particular terminology. I just wanted them to see this concept—that the more blocks you have on the bottom, the taller your building can get—and to realize this concept by measuring the sizes of the towers that they created.”

Instructional Strategies

Gloria reported that her instructional strategies included modeling, discussion, hands-on building, and questioning. She said that she wanted to employ a “self-discovery” approach instead of taking a direct instruction approach. In addition, she said she “wanted information sharing. I wanted to build on what they already knew—they already knew vertical, horizontal, and stacking.” Gloria used questions to allow students to articulate their thinking and to make guesses about what might work to improve their structures.

Gloria traced her teaching philosophies and these particular instructional methods to a course called Guiding Young Children. She described the course’s focus as “making learning child-directed.” She added, “I’ve always felt that kids are intrinsically motivated to learn and that they are curious about their world and that a teacher’s job is to keep that going and inspire them more. I never thought our job was to sit around and direct them but to actively build on that curiosity.”

Gloria stated that she leaned on her knowledge from her university coursework when thinking through the lesson design. She said, “I knew that modeling would have to be part of it. That’s what I had in mind when we were all building together. And modeling sets up clear expectations of what you want. Not for them to copy you but for them to understand the process of what they should be doing.”

Appendix L

Sample of Agreement Between Expert Panel and Three Cases in Identification of Features of Video-Clips

Expert Panel	Karen	Gloria	Lana
Students are writing in a circle.	Students are sitting in circle; attention is on teacher.	Students are writing in their journals on the floor in a circle.	Students are in a circle writing their own stories.
Students are working independently.	Students are working in their own individual entries in journals.	Students are working on their own after the teacher models.	Students are working on their own.
Teacher is using own writing as model.	Teacher is directing students with his writing and talk.	Teacher is a model; he shows them a way that they might approach the task.	Teacher is the model for their writing.
Teacher is on floor with students.	Teacher is sitting with students on the floor.	Teacher is on the floor with the students, on their level.	Teacher is working alongside the students with his own writing.
Teacher makes expectations clear.	Teacher makes expectations known.	(No matching comment.)	Teacher was clear about his expectations.
Students use resources in room.	(No matching comment.)	Students felt that they could get resources as needed without asking.	(No matching comment.)
Writing workshop.	Writing workshop.	Writing workshop.	Writing workshop.
Writing in journals.	Writing in journals.	Using journals; each student has one.	Journal writing.
Teacher introduces spacing between words.	Teacher talks about spacing.	Teacher shows the students in his own writing that he puts spaces between words.	Students learned to put spaces between words.
Drawing and labeling picture is the students' prewriting.	Journal writing to these kids is drawing a picture and using your own	Teacher talks about his process. He says, "Your picture is your planning."	Teacher is conveying that writing is a process; they do their picture first. So

	words to share something important.		that's their prewriting.
Students are making predictions.	Students are being asked to make predictions based on the cover illustration.	Teacher is asking students for predictions based on the cover.	Teacher has students predict what will happen from looking at the cover.
Teacher reads with the students.	It starts with the group reading together before individualized help.	Teacher begins the reading of the book together.	The group starts reading all together with the teacher there for support.
Teacher helps each student individually.	Teacher goes around to listen to each student read.	Teacher gets to hear everyone read.	Teacher goes around and hears everyone at least once.
Teacher wants students to verbalize strategies.	Teacher is talking to students about their thinking patterns and discussing strategies.	Teacher helps students verbalize their strategies.	Teacher stops frequently to ask students what strategies they are using.
Students are homogenously grouped.	Students are homogenously grouped.	Students are in this group because they are at the same level.	Students are grouped homogenously.
Group is using leveled text.	Instruction is based on their skill level. So the teacher is using a leveled story.	Teacher selects the text based on her assessment of their level.	Teacher chooses a text that is on their level.
Teacher has chosen text.	(No matching comment.)	Teacher selected the text.	The students haven't seen this text before; they didn't pick it.
Teacher reviewed choices for workshop time.	Teacher reminds students about the activities that they should be doing.	Teacher showed students a list of agreed-upon ways of working in workshop time.	Teacher started out by telling them all the places where they could go and what they could do.
Students have many choices in texts.	The room is filled with texts and other kinds of writing.	Choice is the big thing.	There's free choice about what to do.
Teacher meets with one student who is having trouble with	Teacher does work with that one student on	Teacher monitors the group but also does one-on-one	Teacher has her eyes on them even when she's working with

onset and rime.	syllables, a fundamental skill.	with the student working on onset and rime.	that one student who still needed help with onset and rime.
Readers' workshop.	Readers' workshop.	Readers' workshop.	Readers' workshop.
Teacher's role is to monitor and assist.	Teacher is monitoring students' progress; she also policed a reader's theater dispute.	Teacher is helping, monitoring, directing. She visits groups and likely does other assessing.	Teacher's role is to monitor and to drop in to talk with students.

References

- Anders, P., Hoffman, J., & Duffy, G. (2000). Teaching teachers to teach reading: Paradigm shifts, persistent problems, and challenges. In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3, pp. 719-742). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Austin, M. C., & Morrison, C. (1961). *The torch lighters: Tomorrow's teachers of reading*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Baker, E. A., & Wedman, J. M. (2000). Lessons learned while using case-based instruction with preservice literacy teachers. In T. Shanahan & F. V. Rodriguez-Brown (Eds.), *49th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 122-136). Chicago: National Reading Conference.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Barr, R., Watts-Taffe, S., & Yokota, J. (2000). Preparing teachers to teach literacy: Rethinking preservice literacy education. *Journal of Literacy Research, 32*(4): 463-470.
- Bean, T. W., & Zulich, J. (1989). Using dialogue journals to foster reflective practice with preservice, content-area teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 16*, 33-40.
- Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1993). *Surpassing ourselves: An inquiry into the nature of expertise*. Chicago: Open Court.
- Berliner, D. C. (1986). In pursuit of the expert pedagogue. *Educational Researcher, 15*(7), 5-13.
- Berliner, D. C. (1994). Expertise: The wonder of exemplary performances. In J.N.

- Mangieri, & C. C. Block (Eds.), *Creating powerful thinking in teachers and students: Diverse perspectives* (pp. 161-186). Fort Worth: Harcourt College Publishers.
- Berliner, D. C. (2001). Expert teachers: Their characteristics, development and accomplishments. *International Journal of Educational Research* 35, 463-482.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Boling, E. C. (2003). The transformation of instruction through technology: Promoting inclusive learning communities in teacher education courses. *Action in Teacher Education* 24(4), 64-73.
- Borko, H., Bellamy, M. L., & Sanders, L. (1992). A cognitive analysis of patterns in science instructors by expert and novice teachers. In T. Russell & H. Munby (Eds.), *Teachers and teaching: From classroom to reflection*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Borko, H., Lalik, R., & Tomchin, E. (1987). Student teachers' understandings of successful and unsuccessful teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 3(2), 77-90.
- Bransford, J. D., Sherwood, R. D., Hasselbring, T. S., Kinzer, C. K., & Willams, S. M. (1990). Anchored instruction: Why we need it and how technology can help. In D. Nix & R. Spiro (Eds.), *Cognition, education, and multimedia: Exploring ideas in high technology* (pp. 115-141). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Britzman, D. P. (1991). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Broadus, K. (2000). From peacemaker to advocate: A preservice teacher's case study of an emergent reader. *Journal of Literacy Research* 32(4), 571-597.

- Bromley, D. B. (1986). *The case-study method in psychology and related disciplines*. New York: John Wiley.
- Bromme, R., & Tillema, H. (1995). Fusing experience and theory: The structure of professional knowledge. *Learning and Instruction*, 5, 261-267.
- Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, 17(1), 32-41.
- Butt, R. L. (1984). Arguments for using biography in understanding teacher thinking. In R. Halkes & J. K. Olson, *Teacher thinking: A new perspective on persisting problems in education* (pp. 95-102). Lisse, Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Calderhead, J. (1989). Reflective teaching and teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 5(1), 43-51.
- Calkins, L. (2000). *The art of teaching reading*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Calkins, L. (1994). *The art of teaching writing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.
- Carter, K. (1990). Teachers' knowledge and learning to teach. In W. R. Houston (Ed.),
- Carter, K., Cushing, K., Sabers, D., Stein, P., & Berliner, D. C. (1988). Expert-novice differences in perceiving and processing visual classroom information. *Journal of Teacher Education* 39(3), 25-31.
- Carter, K., Sabers, D., Cushing, K., Pinnegar, S., & Berliner, D. C. (1987). Processing and using information about students: A study of expert, novice, and postulant teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 3(2), 147-157.
- Cazden, C. (1988). *Classroom discourse*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

- Chriseri-Strater, E., & Sunstein, B. S. (1997). *Fieldworking: Reading and writing research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Christensen, C. R., Garvin, D. A., & Sweet, A. (Eds.). (1991). *Education for judgment: The artistry of discussion leadership*. Boston: Harvard Business School.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1987). Teachers' personal knowledge: What counts as personal in studies of the personal. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 19*(6), 478-500.
- Claridge, P. B., & Berliner, D. C. (1991). Perceptions of student behavior as a function of expertise. *Journal of Classroom Instruction 26*(1), 1-8.
- Clift, R. (1989). Unanswered questions in graduate teacher preparation. In A. E. Woolfolk (Ed.), *Research perspectives on the graduate teacher preparation of teachers* (pp. 179-193). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Clift, R., & Brady, P. (2005). Research on methods courses and field experiences. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 309-424). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. M. (2005). Executive summary: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 1-36). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cognitive and Technology Group at Vanderbilt. (1990). Anchored instruction and its relationship to situated cognition. *Educational Researcher, 19*, 2-10.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher, 19*(5), 2-14.

- Cox, B. E., Fang, Z., Carriveau, R., Dillon, D., Hopkins, C., & Niersteimer, S. (1998). Preservice teachers' construction of professional knowledge: Teacher learning about literacy education. In C. K. Kinzer, K. A. Hinchman, & D. J. Leu (Eds.), *47th yearbook of the National Reading Conference*, 508-516.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). Teachers and teaching: Signs of a changing profession. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 267-290). New York: Macmillan.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. Seattle: University of Washington, Center for Teaching Policy.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). *Studies of excellence in teacher education*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- de Groot, A. D. (1965). *Thought and choice in chess*. New York: Basic Books.
- Denzin, N. K. (1970). The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods. Chicago: Aldine.
- Dexter, L. A. (1970). *Elite and specialized interviewing*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Dooley, C. (1998). Teaching as a two-way street: Discontinuities among metaphors, images, and classroom realities. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49, 97-107.
- Dreyfus, H. L. & Dreyfus, S. E. (1986). *Mind over machine*. New York: Free Press.
- Elbaz, F. (1983). Teacher thinking: A study of practical knowledge. London: Croom Helm.
- Ellwein, M. C., Graue, M. E., & Comfort, R. E. (1990). Talking about instruction: Student teachers' reflections on success and failure in the classroom. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(5), 3-14.

- Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Whittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.). Old Tapan, NJ: Macmillan.
- Ericsson, K. A., & Charness, N. (1994). Expert performance: Its structure and acquisition. *American Psychologist*, 49(8), 725-747.
- Feltovich, P. J., Spiro, R. J., & Coulson, R. L. (1997). Issues of expert flexibility in contexts characterized by complexity and change. In P. J. Feltovich, K. M. Ford, & R. R. Hoffman (Eds.), *Expertise in context: Human and machine* (pp. 125-146). Cambridge, MA: AAAI/MIT Press.
- Ferdig, R. E., Roehler, L. R., Boling, E. C., Knezek, S., Pearson, P. D., & Yadav, A. (2004). Teaching with video cases on the web: Lessons learned from the Reading Classroom Explorer. In A. Brown & N. E. Davis (Eds.), *World yearbook of education 2004: Digital technology, communities and education* (pp. 164-175). New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Flanders, T. (1983). Teachers' realities, needs, and professional development. In R. L. Butt, J. Olson, & J. Daignault (Eds.), *Insiders' realities, outsiders' dreams: Prospects for curriculum change*. Vancouver: Centre for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction and the Canadian Association of Curriculum Studies.
- Florio-Ruane, S. (2001). *Teacher education and the cultural imagination*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Fuller, F. F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. *American Educational Research Journal*, 6(2), 207-226.
- Gage, N. L. (1978). *The scientific basis of the art of teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Garmon, M. A. (2001). The benefits of dialogue journals: What prospective teachers say. *Teacher Education Quarterly* 28(4), 37-50.
- Gee, J. P. (1991). *Sociolinguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. London: Falmer.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. NY: Aldine.
- Glaser, R. (1996). Changing the agency for learning: Acquiring expert performance. In K. A. Ericsson (Ed.), *The road to excellence: The acquisition of expert performance in the arts and sciences, sports and games* (pp. 303-311). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Glesne, C. (1999). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday.
- Greeno, J. G., Smith, D. R., & Moore, J. L. (1993). Transfer of situated learning. In D. K. Detterman & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *Transfer on trial: Intelligence, cognition, and instruction* (pp. 99-167). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Grifalconi, A. (1987). *Darkness and the butterfly*. New York: Little Brown.
- Grimmett, P. P., & MacKinnon, A. M. (1992). Craft knowledge and the education of teachers. *Review of Research in Education*, 18, 385-456.
- Grossman, P. L. (1990). *The making of a teacher: Teacher knowledge and teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Grossman, P. L. (1995). Teachers' knowledge. In L. W. Anderson (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of teaching and teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 20-24). Kidlington, Oxford, UK: Elsevier.

- Grossman, P. L., Valencia, S., Evans, K., Thompson, C., Martin, S., & Place, N. (2000). Transitions into teaching: Learning to teach writing in teacher education and beyond. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 3(2), 631-662.
- Guilfoyle, K. (1996). My journey through the land of transformation: Navigating uncharted territory. In K. Whitmore & Y. Goodman (Eds.), *Whole language voices in teacher education* (pp. 25-36). York, ME: Stenhouse.
- Hamachek, D. (1999). Effective teachers: What they do, how they do it, and the importance of self-knowledge. In R. P. Lipka & T. M. Brinthaupt (Eds.), *The role of self in teacher development* (pp. 189-224). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hammerness, K., Darling-Hammond, L., & Shulman, L. (2002). Toward expert thinking: How case-writing contributes to the development of theory-based professional knowledge in student-teachers. Seattle: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.
- Hammerness, K., Darling-Hammond, L., Bransford, J., Berliner, D., Cochran-Smith, M., McDonald, M., & Zeichner, K. (2005). How teachers learn and develop. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 358-389). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hartocollis, A. (2005). Who needs education schools? Retrieved July 31, 2005, from www.nytimes.com/2005/07/31/education/edlife/hartocollis31.html.
- Hoffman, J. & Pearson, P.D. (2000). Reading research in the next millennium: What your grandmother's teacher didn't know that your granddaughter's teacher should. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 35(1), 28-44.

- Hoffman, J., & Roller, C. (2001). The IRA excellence in reading teacher preparation commission's report: Current practices in reading teacher education at the undergraduate level in the United States. In C. Roller (Ed.), *Learning to teach reading: Setting the research agenda* (pp. 32-79). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers*. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.
- Housner, L. D., & Griffey, D. C. (1985). Teacher cognition: Differences in planning and interactive decision-making between experienced and inexperienced teachers. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 56, 45-53.
- Huber, G. L., & Mandl, H. (1984). Access to teacher cognitions: Problems of assessment and analysis. In R. Halkes & J. K. Olson (Eds.), *Teacher thinking: A new perspective on persisting problems in education* (pp. 58-72). Lisse, Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Huberman, M. (1989). The professional life cycle of teachers. *Teachers College Record*, 91, 31-57.
- Hughes, J. E., Packard, B. W., & Pearson, P.D. (2000). The role of hypermedia cases on preservice teachers' views of reading instruction. *Action in Teacher Education* 22(2A), 24-38.
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (2002). Student achievement through staff development. (3rd ed.) Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Kagan, D. M. (1990). Ways of evaluating teacher cognition: Inferences concerning the Goldilocks principle. *Review of Educational Research*, 60, 419-469.
- Kaplan, D. S. (2001). Preservice reading teachers' self-awareness of past learning and development as motivation for continued learning. In J. W. Hoffman, D. S.

- Schallert, Colleen M. Fairbanks, J. Worthy, & B. Maloch (Eds.), *50th yearbook of the National Reading Conference*, 300-310.
- Kinzer, C. K., & Risko, V. J. (1998). Multimedia and enhanced learning: Transforming preservice education. In D. Reinking, M. C. McKenna, L. D. Labbo, & R. D. Kieffer (Eds.), *Handbook of literacy and technology: Transformations in a post-typographical world* (pp. 185-202). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Knowles, J. G. (1992). Models for understanding preservice and beginning teachers' biographies: Illustrations from case studies. In I. F. Goodson (Ed.), *Studying teachers' lives* (pp. 99-152). London: Routledge.
- Lampert, M., & Ball, D. L. (1998). Teaching, multimedia, and mathematics: Investigations of real practice. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LeCompte, M. D., & Preissle, J. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research* (2nd ed.). Orlando: Academic Press.
- Leinhardt, G. (1990). Capturing craft knowledge in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 19(2), 18-25.
- Leinhardt, G. (1993). On teaching. In R. Glaser (Ed.), *Advances in instructional psychology, Vol. 4* (pp. 1-54). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Leinhardt, G., & Grenno, J. G. (1986). The cognitive skill of teaching. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 78, 75-95.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- MacLeod, J. (1987). *Ain't no makin' it: Leveled aspirations in a low-income neighborhood*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

- Maloch, B., Flint, A. S., Eldridge, D., Loven, R. Fine, J. C., Bryant-Shaklin, M., & Martinez, M. (2003). Understandings, beliefs, and reported decision making of first-year teachers from different reading teacher preparation programs. *The Elementary School Journal* 103(5), 431-454.
- McIntyre, D., & Hagger, H. (1993). Teachers' expertise and models of mentoring. In H. H. D. McIntyre & M. Wilkin (Eds.), *Mentoring: Perspectives on school-based teacher education* (pp. 86-102). London: Kogan Page.
- Merriam, S. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Merseth, K. K. (1996). Cases and case methods in teacher education. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed.; pp. 722-744). New York: Macmillan.
- Moll, L. C. (1990). Introduction. In L. C. Moll (Ed.), *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology* (pp. 1-27). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Morrison, C., & Austin, M. C. (1977). *The torch lighters revisited*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Munby, H., & Russell, T. (1994). The authority of experience in learning to teach: Messages from a physics methods class. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 45, 86-95.
- Munby, H., Russell, T., & Martin A. K. (2001). Teacher' knowledge and how it develops. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 877-904). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

- O'Loughlin, M. (1991). Beyond constructivism: Toward a dialectical model of the problematics of teacher socialization. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago.
- Olsen, B. (2006). Using sociolinguistic methods to uncover speaker meaning in teacher interview transcripts. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19(2), 147-161.
- Olson, J. K. (1984). What makes teachers tick?: Considering the routines of teaching. In R. Halkes & J. K. Olson, *Teacher thinking: A new perspective on persisting problems in education* (pp. 35-42). Lisse, Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Paley, V. (1989). *White teacher*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Putnam, R. T., & Borko, H. (2000). What do new views of knowledge and thinking have to say about research on teacher learning? *Educational Researcher*, 29(1), 4-15.
- Reiser, P. (1994). *Couplehood*. New York: Bantam.
- Richardson, V., & Placier, P. (2001). Teacher change. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (4th ed., pp. 905-947). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.
- Risko, V. J., McAllister, D., Peter, J., & Bigenho, F. (1994). Using technology in support of preservice teachers' generative knowledge. In E. C. Sturtevant & W. M. Linek (Eds.), *Pathways for literacy: Learners teach and teachers learn* (pp. 155-167). Pittsburg, KS: College Reading Association.
- Risko, V. J., Yount, D., & McAllister, D. (1992). Preparing preservice teachers for remedial instruction: Teaching problem solving and use of content and

- pedagogical knowledge. In N. Padak, T. V. Rasinski, & J. Logan (Eds.), *Inquiries in literacy learning and instruction* (pp. 179-189). Pittsburg, KS: College Reading Association.
- Roe, M. F., & Stallman, A. C. (1994). A comparative study of dialogue and response journals. *Teaching and Teaching Education* 10(6), 579-588.
- Russell, T. (1988). From pre-service teacher education to the first year of teaching: A study of theory into practice. In J. Calderhead (Ed.), *Teachers' professional learning* (pp. 13-34). London: Falmer.
- Sabers, D. S., Cushing, K. S., & Berliner, D. C. (1991). Differences among teachers in a task characterized by simultaneity, multidimensionality, and immediacy. *American Educational Research Journal* 28(1), 63-88.
- Savery, J. R., & Duffy, T. M. (2001). Problem based learning: An instructional model and its constructivist framework. (CRLT Tech Rep. No. 16-01). Bloomington, IN: Center for Research on Learning and Technology at Indiana University.
- Schempp, P. G., Sparkes, A. C., & Templin, T. J. (1999). Identity and induction: Establishing the self in the first years of teaching. In R. P. Lipka & T. M. Brinthaupt (Eds.), *The role of self in teacher development* (pp. 142-161). New York: State University of New York Press.
- Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Sherman, R. R., & Webb, R. B. (1988). Qualitative research in education: A focus. In R. R. Sherman & R. B. Webb (Eds.), *Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods*. Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4-14.
- Shulman, L. S. (1992). Toward a pedagogy of cases. In J. Shulman (Ed.), *Case methods in teacher education* (pp. 1-30). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Silverman, R., & Welty, B. (1992). *Education: Case studies for teacher problem solving*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Silverstein, S. (1974). *Where the Sidewalk Ends*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Smith, J. C., & Diaz, R. (2002). Evolving uses of technology in case-based teacher education. Retrieved July 14, 2005, from www.literacy.org/SmithandDiaz.
- Smith, L. M. (1978). An evolving logic of participant observation, educational ethnography and other case studies. In L. Shulman (Ed.), *Review of research in education*. Itasca, IL: Peacock.
- Sparks-Langer, G. M., Simmons, J. M., Pasch, M., Colton, A., & Starko, A. (1990). Reflective pedagogical thinking: How can we promote it and measure it? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(4), 23-32.
- Spiro, R. J., Coulson, R. L., Feltovich, P. J., & Anderson, D. K. (1988). Cognitive flexibility theory: Advanced knowledge acquisition in ill-structured domains. In *Tenth Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society* (pp. 375-383). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Spiro, R. J., Feltovich, P. J., Jacobson, M. J., & Coulson, R. L. (1992). Knowledge representation, content specification, and the development of skill in situation-specific knowledge assembly: Some constructivist issues as they relate to cognitive flexibility theory and hypertext. In T. M. Duffy & D. J. Jonassen (Eds.), *Constructivism and the technology of instruction: A conversation* (pp. 57-75). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Starkes, J. L., Deakin, J. M., Allard, F., Hodges, N. J., & Hayes, A. (1996). Deliberate practice in sports: What is it anyway? In K. A. Ericsson (Ed.), *The road to excellence: The acquisition of expert performance in the arts and sciences, sports and games* (pp. 81-106). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Staton, J. (1988). ERIC/RCS report: Dialogue journals. *Language Arts*, 65, 198-201.
- Steig, W. (1987). *Sylvester and the magic pebble*. New York: Aladdin.
- Stephens, L., Leavell, J., Fabris, M., Buford, R., & Hill, M. (1999). Producing video-cases that enhance instruction. *Journal of technology and teacher education* 7(4), 291-301.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Horvath, J. A. (1995). A prototype view of expert teaching. *Educational Researcher* 24(6), 9-17.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Sykes, G., & Bird, T. (1992). Teacher education and the case idea. *Review of Research in Education* 18, 457-521.
- Tabachnick, B. R., & Zeichner, K. M. (1984). The impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teacher perspectives. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(6), 28-36.
- Teale, W. H., Leu, Jr., D. J., Labbo, L. D., & Kinzer, C. (2002). The CTELL Project: New ways technology can help educate tomorrow's reading teachers. *Reading Teacher*, 55, 654-659.
- Templin, T. (1988). Teacher isolation: A concern for the collegial development of physical educators. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 7, 197-207.
- Vagin, V. (1998). *The enormous carrot*. New York: Scholastic.

- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Walsh, E. (1995). *Mouse paint*. New York: Red Wagon Books.
- Warner, G. (1990). *Boxcar kids*. Morton Grove, IL: Albert Whitman & Company.
- Weinert, F. E., Schrader, F. W., & Helmke, A. (1990). Educational expertise: Closing the gap between educational researcher and classroom practice. *School Psychology International 11*, 163-180.
- Weinstein, C. S. (1989). Teacher education students' preconceptions of teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(2), 53-60.
- Weiss, R. S. (1994). *Learning from strangers: The art and method of qualitative interview studies*. New York: Free Press.
- Wilson, S. (1979). Exploration of the usefulness of case study evaluations. *Evaluation Quarterly, 3*, 446-459.
- Worthy, J., & Patterson, E. (2001). "I can't wait to see Carlos!": Preservice teachers, situated learning, and personal relationships with students. *Journal of Literacy Research, 33*(2), 303-344.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study methods: Design and methods* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yinger, R. J. (1987). Learning the language of practice. *Curriculum Inquiry, 17*, 299-318.
- Zeichner, K. M. (2002). Ability-based teacher education: Elementary teacher education at Alverno College. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), *Studies of excellence in teacher education: Preparation in the undergraduate years*, (pp. 1-66). Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

- Zehm, S. J. (1999). Deciding to teach: Implications of a self-development perspective. In R. P. Lipka & T. M. Brinthaupt (Eds.), *The role of self in teacher development* (pp. 36-52). New York: State University of New York Press.
- Zeichner, K. M., & Gore, J. M. (1990). Teacher socialization. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 329-348). New York: Macmillan.
- Zumwalt, K., & Craig, E. (2005). Teachers' characteristics: Research on the demographic profile. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 111-156). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

Vita

Charles David Fuhrken was born in Alice, Texas, on September 2, 1970, the son of Alta Ree Fuhrken and Hilbert Fuhrken. After completing his work at Orange Grove High School in Orange Grove, Texas, in 1989, he entered Texas Lutheran University in Seguin, Texas. From the summer of 1990 through the spring of 1991, he attended Del Mar College, in Corpus Christi, Texas, and Texas A&M University—Corpus Christi. In the summer of 1991, he entered The University of Texas at San Antonio. He received the degree of Bachelor of Arts from The University of Texas at San Antonio in August 1992, and the degree of Master of Arts from The University of Texas at San Antonio in December 1994. During the following years, he was employed as a classroom teacher in Orange Grove and Alice, Texas, and as a reading and language arts specialist for several educational publishers. In August 2001, he entered the Graduate School of The University of Texas at Austin.

Permanent address: 1902 Ralph C. Craig Lane, Austin, Texas 78748

This dissertation was typed by the author.