The Dissertation Committee for Margie A. Mast certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Fostering Pre-service Teachers' Inquiry as They Learn about and Tutor Struggling Readers

Committee:

Jo Worthy, Supervisor

Judith Lindfors, Co-Supervisor

Beth Maloch

Colleen Fairbanks

Sylvia Thompson

Fostering Pre-service Teachers' Inquiry as They Learn about and Tutor Struggling Readers

by

Margie A. Mast, B. A., M. Ed.

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, 2002

Acknowledgements

It is with great appreciation that I would like to thank my friends and family for the support given me throughout my graduate studies. To the following persons, I extend a special thank you.

To the six pre-service teachers who participated in the study- Thank you for your willingness and generous gift of time and energy toward this project.

To my committee- Thank you for your willingness to support me across the miles from Austin, TX to Goshen, IN. Judith Lindfors, whose wisdom and meticulous editing was extremely helpful throughout this process. Jo Worthy who was always just an e-mail away when I needed a nudge. Colleen, Beth, and Sylvia, who made my graduate school journey joyful.

To my colleagues at Goshen College who have been supportive throughout the dissertation process – Anita Stalter, Rachel Lapp, Kathy Meyer Reimer, John Smith, Barbara Stahly, Michael Nolt, and Marilyn Bayak.

To Merle and Elaine Shetler Miller for editing countless pages throughout my graduate studies.

To my dad – for without his support I would never have had the courage to even attempt this program of study. Thanks.

Fostering Pre-Service Teachers' Inquiry as They Learn about and Tutor Struggling Readers

Publication No._____

Margie A. Mast, Ph.D.
The University of Texas at Austin, 2002

Supervisors: Judith Lindfors and Jo Worthy

This study explores the nature of six pre-service teachers' inquiry (sense-making and wondering) as they worked with an elementary school age struggling reader in the context of a twice a week tutoring clinic for nine weeks, a component of a reading methods course for which I was the instructor. Data sources included three participant interviews, weekly dialog journal entries, and weekly lesson plans/reflections. Identification and analysis of instances of pre-service teachers' thinking, wondering, and sense-making inquiries fell into four categories: 1) Inquiring about Assessment, 2) Inquiring about Students, 3) Inquiring about Relationships, and 4) Inquiring about Teaching. Cross case analysis of participants' inquiries revealed that 1) an inquiring stance assisted pre-service teachers in their professional identity development, 2) interviews between the professor and the participant generated the greatest number of instances of inquiry and scaffolded participants' inquiry in a way that the other sources did not suggesting the need for one-on-one, professor/student interactions in methods courses, 3) the data sources invited different expressions of inquiry illustrating

how the participants' perception of the use of the data source helped determine their expression of inquiry. Case studies of four of the participants revealed the uniqueness of each participant's inquiry style, as well as the range of topics their inquiries explored. This study found that the context and the format in which we invite pre-service teachers to inquiry is key to the development of inquiry as an orientation and recommends that scaffolded one-on-one interactions between professors and students is significant to the process.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Chapter 1

Introduction and Purpose

INQUIRY

This study focuses on inquiry. Inquiry has been defined, and described in many different ways. For some, inquiry is a method, an action or a strategy. The act of research is often associated with inquiry. For example, teacher research is at times referred to as classroom inquiry (Goswami & Stillman, 1987). For some, systematically defining, approaching and finding an answer to a question or to discover something is an act of inquiry (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993). The *American Heritage Dictionary* also views inquiry as an action: "a question or close examination of some matter in a quest for information or truth" (p.664). Sometimes inquiry is characterized as the act of questioning. Interrogatives can strategically spark inquiry. The unearthing of questions can serve as the genesis to inquiry.

Others see inquiry as an orientation, a framework, a philosophical stance (Lindfors, 1999; Mills & Donnelly, 2001; Reagan, Case, & Brubacher, 2000). Inquiry as an orientation grows out of curiosity. It is social endeavor.

> It is a way of living and learning together; a way of viewing and learning about the amazing world in which we live; a

> way of honoring and learning from the diversity that is humanity; a way of being true to ourselves, our children, and the profession; a way of fostering genuine professional development; and most importantly a way of respecting, building upon, and supporting all learners, tall and small (Mills, 2000, p. xix).

Another facet to inquiry as an orientation is the presumption of multiple constructed realities. "For true inquiry to take place, it is essential that the individual be open to differing –and even unexpected and surprising – evidence and interpretations" (Reagan, 2000 p. 41). It draws on various perspectives of experience (Lindfors, 1999). Evidence does not speak for itself, but rather the inquirer must make sense of the evidence by placing it in theoretical or conceptual context. Yet as different as these characterizations of inquiry may be, they seem to share a desire or thrust to know, to understand, to makes sense of the world – and to wonder about it. They also embrace the questioning of what often is taken for granted. In education, the process of problematizing the teaching situation is central to inquiry (Tom, 1985). "To make teaching problematic is to raise doubts about what under ordinary circumstances appears to be wise practice" (p.37).

For the purpose of this study, inquiry was defined by three characteristics: 1) it is a language act; and 2) it is a seeking of information; or 3) it is an expression of wondering (Lindfors, 1999). Participants' inquiry was identified through their oral and written expressions of information seeking and wondering.

This study was an exploration of pre-service teachers' prompted inquiry in the context of a one-semester experience in which each one tutored an elementary

school age struggling reader. Specifically the research question for this study was:

- What is the nature of pre-service teachers' inquiry (wondering and information seeking) while working one-on-one with a struggling reader in the context of a 9-week tutoring clinic?

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Olson (2000) writes about how pre-service teachers have "learned through the hidden curriculum that their own ideas and experiences have no place in the authorized curriculum" (p. 118) believing that they learn through "receiving knowledge" (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986) from others. This kind of orientation leads pre-service teachers to discount the value of their personal knowledge.

Dillon's (1981) study of students enrolled in a university level education course clearly illustrates that students have questions, but have been conditioned to not ask them. Students are fearful of publicly exposing their inquiries. This kind of orientation leads pre-service teachers to discount the value of their questions.

Teacher education programs need to demystify inquiry. Teacher –inquirers like Vivian Paley and Karen Gallas provide powerful examples of how inquiry can help students become empowered meaning makers. Drawing on multiple

perspectives (Lindfors, 1999), teacher-inquirers puzzle over questions that invite uncertainty and make spaces for thinking and reflecting (Schon, 1983). The challenge lies in creating spaces in teacher education programs to foster an inquiry stance.

SCOPE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The intent of this study is to inform, not predict. It is meant to be a contribution to our understanding of the nature of pre-service teachers' inquiry, an understanding that ultimately will help us design pre-service programs that more effectively foster inquiry as an orientation.

CHAPTER ORGANIZATION

This study will be organized into the following five chapters:

Chapter 1 – Introduction/Overview

This chapter introduces the study and the research question, as well as describes the problem and significance of the study.

Chapter 2 – Review of related literature

This section reviews the available literature related to: 1) inquiry as an orientation; 2) inquiry as a methodology; 3) inquiry and questions; 4) barriers to

inquiry; 5) tutoring (the context of the present study), and 6) teacher research (the methodology of the present study).

Chapter 3 – Methodology

Chapter three presents the methodology used in this study. It explains the process of identification and analysis of instances of pre-service teachers' thinking, wondering, and knowledge seeking inquiries as expressed in the data sources. Also included in this chapter are the results of an inter-rater reliability check employed to assess the trustworthiness of the categories established.

Chapter 4 – Findings

A cross-case analysis is presented in the fourth chapter in which I describe the major themes that emerged across the six participants' data sets. Four categories are discussed: 1) Inquiring about Assessment, 2) Inquiring about Students, 3) Inquiring about Relationships, and 4) Inquiring about Teaching. Each category includes: 1) a definition, 2) a table illustrating instances of inquiry across time and data sources, 3) a discussion of themes emerging from the data, and 4) conclusions about the category. The cross-case analysis is followed by four case studies. Each case study provides background information about one participant and describes his/her inquiry style as evidenced in the data.

Chapter 5 – Summary of the Findings, Implications and Limitations

Chapter five provides a summary of the study's findings, situates the individual case studies and cross case analysis of the present study within the literature, explores the implications from this study for both teacher education programs and future research, and discusses the limitations of this study.

Chapter 2

Review of Related Literature

INTRODUCTION

This study examines education pre-service teachers' inquiry within a tutoring context. The literature reviewed in this chapter focuses on: 1) inquiry as an orientation; 2) inquiry as a methodology; 3) inquiry and questions; 4) barriers to inquiry; 5) tutoring (the context of the present study), and 6) teacher research (the methodology of the present study). Major themes emerging from this literature review are summarized at the end of the chapter.

INQUIRY AS AN ORIENTATION

Inquiry means different things to different people. Some would define it as a quest, seeking information from outside sources (American Heritage Dictionary, 1982; Goswami & Stillman, 1987). Others see it as arising from within – a puzzling, wondering, reflecting (Reagan, Case, & Brubacher, 2000). While still others would see it as a combination of the two – a notion emerging from a sense of wonder that then becomes an act of language and/or action in engagement with others (Lindfors, 1999; Mills & Donnelly, 2001; Tom, 1985). According to Mills (2001), it is a philosophical stance rather than a set of

strategies, activities or methods, "a way of living… and learning together; a way of viewing" the world" (p. xix).

Lindfors (1999) suggests that: 1) inquiry arises in knowledge; 2) inquiry draws on multiple perspectives; 3) the world is comprehensible and people try to understand it; 4) various language acts support inquiry's sense-making; 5) inquiry involves knowledge in action; 6) inquiry involves feeling as well as thought; 7) inquiry stands at the intersection of know/not-know; and 8) inquiry's stance is uncertain and invitational (p. 120-127).

Some scholars have observed that inquiries do not always receive, or even have answers. Often inquiries include our puzzlements, our wonderings, and our haunting questions. As Duckworth (1987) posited, "The virtues involved in not knowing are the ones that really count in the long run. What you do about what you don't know is, in the final analysis, what determines what you will ultimately know" (p.68).

Creating an Inquiry Oriented Environment in Schools

Eisner (1991b) linked Duckworth's idea of the virtue of not knowing with his assertion that what really counts in schools is teaching students how to formulate their own questions, and creating the kind of environment that welcomes wondering and kindles imagining. Classrooms historically have rejected the fostering of the kind of inquiry environment recommended by Eisner.

From the inception of public schools, inquiry has been in conflict with inculcation. According to Pyle (1997), "Students and teachers who dissent from the community's wisdom are still denied their voice, and the ideal of genuine Socratic inquiry is still very much an elite proposition, confined to a few privileged institutions of higher learning" (p.85). The current public school environment's emphasis on high stakes testing and the use of multiple- choice tests implicitly teaches students that for every question there is a single correct answer. The job of the student is then to learn how to provide the answer supplied by an outside authority (Eisner, 1991b). According to Duckworth (1987), "Knowing the right answer requires no decisions, carries no risks, and makes no demands. It is automatic. It is thoughtless" (p.64). Are current public school conditions implicitly training students to be thoughtless, robotic answer-givers?

Eisner (1991b) posited an alternative pedagogical view with implications beyond the classroom in the support of inquiry as a frame for meaning making:

> If we created teaching practices that put a premium on the imaginative aspects of learning, if we encouraged children to maintain that wonderful fantasy and speculative ability they possessed when they started school, we would be better able to create a culture that was much more receptive to the possibilities of human experience and much more educationally productive (p.15).

Classroom teachers who embody a teacher-inquirer stance and sustain inquiry classrooms have contributed rich descriptions of their classrooms to the existing education literature. Vivian Paley demonstrated how to build rich

discussions around her true inquiries – through the use of questions she does not know the answer to and through a welcoming of every child's ideas (Paley, 1981; Paley, 1997). Through what Karen Gallas calls "science talk," inquiry was fostered through her creation of a safe environment for exploratory discourse. She brought students together as equal participants in the conversation. Students talked to each other rather than to the teacher in the typical IRE pattern, demonstrating their willingness to trust each other as partners in their meaning making (Gallas, 1995). Patti Seifert (1999) described her shift to a more student-centered inquiry classroom through her use of Explorers Club. Kindergarten students in her classroom were encouraged to explore their own personal questions. "Because the children had a personal interest in their own topics, they had a personal interest in their own learning" (p.113). This allowed the students opportunities to cognitively explore topics that were important to them, use multiple sign systems to make meaning, and collaborate/co-construct their knowledge within a community of inquiry.

Enactment of this culture of inquiry can be seen in the work at the Center for Inquiry in South Carolina where reflection, apprenticeship, and collaboration serve as foundational to the development of curriculum and pedagogy. "Wonder Why Walls" and "Journals of Ordinary Thoughts" are just two examples of the embodiment of inquiry as an orientation played out in educational practice (Mills & Donnelly, 2001).

Guiding principles for creating a curriculum framework conducive to a culture of inquiry practiced by the Center for Inquiry (Mills & Donnelly, 2001) include:

1. Demonstration – ideas are formally demonstrated by the teacher that not only model the concept, but explore it in application and discover the "why it matters."
2. Engagement – opportunities are created for students to "live the process," to act as mathematicians, writers and historians through authentic reading, writing, and investigating.
3. Reflection – individual and group reflection about their investigations, progress, and learning, are woven into the fabric of everyday interactions.
4. Celebration – opportunities to share growth and change publicly allow students to learn from each other's accomplishments and honor achievements.

INQUIRY AS A METHODOLOGY

During the 1950's teacher research was promoted in education by Stephen Corey (Anderson, Herr, & Nihlen, 1994), who believed teachers would find their own research results more useful than the findings of university based researchers. He believed that teacher research would prompt teachers to question curricular practices. Fifty years later, many pre-service teaching programs have embraced

Corey's assertions by incorporating inquiry-oriented approaches, requiring pre-service teachers to participate in activities encouraging critical consumption of research, to engage in teacher research projects, and to reflect on pedagogical decision-making (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999). The findings from research on the effects of incorporating teacher research into teacher education programs are unclear: some studies report a teacher research component provided a significant influence, while others suggest only a modest influence.

Gitlin et al.'s (1999) study examined a teacher education program that included an inquiry component to learn how pre-service teachers viewed research and whether participating in research changed these perceptions. Through initial interviews of an elementary and secondary cohort, they found participants consistently reported the belief that research is a practical and technical matter. In other words, research specified practices to improve teacher effectiveness. At the end of the cohort program, pre-service teachers' views had not changed. However, a significant difference between secondary and elementary teachers' attitudes toward research emerged. The elementary responses focused on accessibility of research, while secondary responses centered on the lack of time to engage with research.

Another interesting finding of Gitlin et al.'s study was that pre-service teachers stated initially that they would rely on experienced teachers to help them problem solve. They rejected research as an influence for decision-making. After

participating in the cohort, more pre-service teachers felt they would rely on sources other than teachers in making decisions, but still emphasized the importance of the practical by only looking to sources that provided specific teaching strategies.

Gitlin et al. (1999) reported that an inquiry-oriented approach had only a modest influence on pre-service teachers' thinking about research. The researchers recommended that inquiry programs build on and extend pre-service teachers' thinking, examine program components and student teacher placements, and look at the types of cultural socialization that shaped the participants' views. They also suggested that the way research is written and the outlets for this writing also require reevaluation, as do school structures that limit teachers' time for reflection and inquiry.

While Gitlin et al (1999) reported participation in teacher research as only modestly influencing pre-service teachers, Breidenstein et al. (2001) reported that participating in a qualitative research project helped pre-service teachers develop an inquirer's stance that followed them into their teaching careers. According to the participants, (including a current pre-service teacher, two graduates currently teaching, and two cooperating teachers) the key outcome of completing a qualitative research project was the development of their stance as inquirers. Although no longer conducting formal research, after becoming teachers, they continued to act as inquirers. Four areas of inquiry emerged from their study:

inquiry in the classroom with students, inquiry with colleagues, inquiry regarding curriculum and pedagogy, and reflective self-inquiry. The reported success of this study could be linked to the small sample size and the fact that the participants were selected on the basis of participation in a conference presentation.

Broaddus' (2000) study of a pre-service teacher's case study of an emergent reader reported how inquiry as a methodology provided a context for posing meaningful questions and encouraged deliberate and reflective practice. She also advocated using case study methodology as a means to provide differentiated instruction in reading methods coursework. "Through case studies, a pre-service teacher poses questions and searches for answers that are context specific. Research takes the individual into account" (p.594).

Poetter (2000) reported mixed results in a program that included teacher research with pre-service teachers during their student teaching. Key to the pre-service teachers' positive feelings about participation in a teacher research project was the receptivity of the cooperating teacher to the project. Some cooperating teachers reported that the teacher research helped strengthen and focus their relationship with the student teacher. Having interns share their projects with in-service teachers was reported as beneficial in helping interns develop a sense of themselves as professionals.

Taken together, these studies suggest that understanding students' perceptions of research, and addressing issues of time for and accessibility to research are important subjects for teacher education programs. Berthoff's (1981) challenge is as relevant to pre-service education as it is to in-service education:

> Educational research is nothing to our purpose, unless we formulate the questions; if the procedures by which answers are sought are not dialectic and dialogic, that is to say, if the questions and answers are not continually RE-formulated by those who are working in the classroom, educational research is pointless. (p. 31)

INQUIRY AND QUESTIONS

Verbal inquiry is expressed in many different syntactic/grammatical forms. However, speakers of a language sense question forms to be the most basic way of inquiring verbally. This close connection of inquiry acts and question forms (interrogatives) invites an exploration of questions – an important type of inquiry expression.

Meaning making is apparent from birth. Babies use their hands and mouths as they explore the objects within their grasp in an attempt to understand them. Later, language will help them gain understanding. As pre-schoolers, one way they use language to make sense of their world is by asking questions. As children develop, so do their questions, often arising from a sense of puzzlement and a desire to make sense of things. By four, children are master questioners, often tiring their parents (Wells, 1986). Students enter kindergarten primed with

curiosity, a natural desire to make sense of the world, and the language ability to elicit information from others. But as Wells (1986) discovered in his comparison of children's home and school language use, classrooms often fail to continue fostering students' natural sense of inquiry. Teacher domination of the discourse often relegates students to positions of passivity. Even though school days are filled with talk, according to Palincsar (1986),

> Only a limited amount of this talk would qualify as dialogue because the percentage of teacher statements made in reaction to a student's statement or teacher use of an idea expressed by a student is a mere 3% to 5% in the primary grades. (p.75)

This teacher-student imbalance of talk is also found at the secondary level. Dillon (1988), found (6 schools, 27 classrooms, 721 students, 1 hour observations) students generated only eleven questions out of the twenty-seven hours of observed class time. Only one percent of the students verbally engaged in the discussion (8 out of 721students). Teachers, on the other hand, asked lots of questions consisting of an overall rate of eighty questions per hour. The disparity of the talk is illustrated in the fact that students overall averaged only one question per two hours.

Students have opportunities for active participation and unlocking trapped knowledge through good instructional questions. Yet, most teacher questions are ensnared in the typical initiate–respond–evaluate

(IRE) format (Mehan, 1979) controlling the subject and the talk, and primarily seeking the answer to, “Do you understand?” rather than “What do you understand?”

Student questions can be viewed by teachers as impositions (Lindfors, 1999), or as threats to their knowledge base (Dantonio & Beisenherz, 2001). Viewing inquiry and questions as a threat is not a new problem. Socrates’ enactment of inquiry through relentless questioning of everything (including sacred spiritual issues) challenged the ontological foundations of his society, and ultimately created a threat so compelling that it led to his conviction and death (Pyle, 1997).

Bertho ff (1981) described her distress when her high school English students asked her questions that got her off track of her carefully planned agenda. However, through listening to her students, she discovered that when the class discourse centered on the students’ emergent questions, she “came to class not thinking of a territory to be covered, but with a compass – a metaphor, or juxtaposition, or a question from the class before” (p.35). She learned how to use questions to unlock her students’ inquiry. She learned how to listen to her students.

Lindfors (1999) described two types of inquiry acts, often (though not always) expressed as questions: information seeking and wondering. Information-seeking acts are product oriented. They are no nonsense - I need

this- kinds of acts. The information seeker turns toward someone to help him or her complete the act toward a specific end. Wondering acts sound different than information seeking acts because their purposes are different. While wondering holds the discourse open, information seeking seeks closure. Wondering has a propensity to be playful; information seeking tends to be work-ful. Wondering's goal is engagement in the process; information seeking's goal is product. "The sound of going after something is different from the sound of reflection on something" (p.40).

Garmston (2000) called for teachers to use "meditative questions" in order to enhance the development of intellectual functions of teaching. He outlined the anatomy of a meditative question in the following nine characteristics:

1. Open-ended and allowing for divergent answers
2. Expresses affirmative presuppositions about respondent
3. Judgment free
4. Uses tentative and explorative language
5. Uses approachable voice welcoming inquiry
6. Invites thinking on knowledge, analysis or evaluation level
7. Links the affective and cognitive
8. Invites crossing of categories
9. Includes essential dimensions of preparation for questions, elicitation of cognitive processes, and concentration on thinking

Inquiry is not limited to questions, but certainly the kinds of questions that frame our classroom discourse can serve to open or control the talk.

Barriers to Inquiry

Traditional classroom discussions often leave little room for student inquiries (Dillon, 1988). The general rhythms of classroom interactions often make it difficult for students to fit a question into the cycle of the discourse. First, the teacher talks. The student may be generating a question, but the teacher has no idea whether her talk has sparked an inquiry or not. Teachers usually signal the end of their turn through the posing of a question, thus beginning the cycle of 1) teacher asks a question; 2) student answers the question; followed by 3) teacher evaluates the answer and asks the next question (Cazden, 1988).

Students typically do not break the flow of the teacher talk, but wait for a gap in the cycle. Even then, students must ask permission to even ask a question, positioning themselves as subordinates in the conversation (Dillon, 1988). In addition, the norms of behavior may be unwritten, but students have clearly learned that they must ask the right question, timed at precisely the right moment, or their query will be shut down through statements such as, "We'll discuss that later" or "We've already covered that" from the teacher, or "What a dumb question" from other classmates. "From long experience, most poignantly in the earliest years of schooling, watching what happens to self and others who ask

questions, students have reasonably drawn the appropriate lesson: 'Don't ask questions'" (Dillon, 1988, p.17).

But students do have questions. In a survey of student-teachers enrolled in university education courses, ninety-five percent of respondents claimed they did indeed have questions (Dillon, 1981). However, they did not ask them because: 1) the question was not pressing enough (10%); 2) the situation or the teacher prevented the question from being asked (18%); or 3) they were too afraid to ask (72%). Previous conditioning of students to not ask questions and overcoming students' fear of asking questions are impediments to fostering a climate of inquiry in classrooms. Establishing an environment of trust among participants – one that invites student inquiries is imperative.

The biggest stumbling block that Olson (2000) found in using inquiry with pre-service teachers was their initial reluctance to accept their personal knowledge as valuable knowledge. Schools have been heavily influenced by standardized tests which have indoctrinated teachers to go for the right answer whenever possible (Duckworth, 1987). Formal education implicitly teaches that personal knowledge is prejudiced, inapt and immaterial. Olson offered four components to facilitate inquiry development with pre-service teachers: 1) process should emerge from an issue transpiring from their own narrative knowledge, 2) oral or written comments from the professor must be made from an inquiry rather than judgmental perspective, 3) attentive listening, respect and authentic curiosity are

essential components, 4) respectful responses that elicit new questions and new possibilities are needed to move students' thinking forward.

In addition to having a "strong knowledge base," and "practical knowledge grounded in deliberative and reflective practice," Cochran-Smith (2000) asserts that teachers need to problematize their knowledge through communities of inquiry. Working in communities of inquiry allows teachers to locally generate knowledge systematically and intentionally (Anderson et al., 1994; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993). Goswami and Stillman's (1987) idea that every lesson should be an inquiry for the teacher is useful in that it suggests rigorous examination of one's own practice as a basis for professional development. Problems experienced by teachers should be subjected to empirical examination by practitioners themselves, rather than by outsider researchers. Teacher researchers are teachers who daily pursue relevant topics to improve their teaching.

Collaboration can complicate communities of inquiry. Fecho and Lytle's (1993) study suggested the need for less prominence on transmitting information and more emphasis on support structures (personnel, schedules, conceptions of work) that connect teachers within classrooms and allow them opportunities to do substantive work. Inquiry exists within the sharing of practice "by which teachers go beyond sharing information to use these opportunities to pose questions,

collect classroom data for each other, and become, in the process, an interpretive community" (p. 138).

Olson's (2000) work with pre-service teachers also draws on the process of developing interpretive communities through discussions. She found that as students developed a sense of trust within the class community, they were less tentative in trying out new ideas. Making thoughts public needs encouragement by the professor whose inclination may be to take over discussion and fall into a banking (Freire, 1970) model rather than supporting collaborative inquiry among all the participants. Exposing diverse views is risky. Discussions may lean toward homogenous confirmations of popular views if students are not challenged to look deeper.

TUTORING

Teacher education programs have long valued the use of field-based experiences in blending pre-service teachers' learning in course work with hands-on application opportunities. Opportunities to work with real students help teachers examine their personal beliefs in relation to theory, a component of effective teacher preparation (Pajares, 1992). Duckworth (1987) asserts that in the interest of learning about learning, pre-service teachers need to spend a significant amount of time in a one-to-one teaching situation.

Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann (as cited in Zeichner, 1996) suggest three questions from which practicum experiences should be framed: 1) What is the pre-service teacher learning in the here and now about being a teacher, about students, classrooms, and the activities of teaching? 2)How do these lessons of experience relate to the central purpose of teaching, helping students to learn? 3) To what extent do these lessons of experience foster the student's capacity to learn from future experience?

While framing curriculum to center on these questions, Zeichner and Gore (1990) suggest that educators remain cognizant that what students learn from practicum experiences draws heavily on their assumptions and ideologies. Examining these sometimes deeply rooted constructions must also be a goal of the practicum experience.

Dewey (1938) argued for the importance of first-hand experiences, but also cautioned that not every experience is helpful:

> The belief that all genuine education comes about through experience does not mean that all experiences are genuinely or equally educative. Experience and education cannot be directly equated to each other. For some experiences are miseducative. Any experience is miseducative that has the effect of arresting or distorting the growth of further experience (p. 25).

Practicums become miseducative when they do not provide students with the tools needed in constructing their own professional development journey.

Looking at the design of most practicum experiences, Zeichner (1996) identified three conceptual approaches: 1) apprenticeship, 2) applied-science, and 3) inquiry-oriented. The apprenticeship model or situated learning model (Lave & Wenger, 1991) is most commonly thought of in terms of student teaching placements. The pre-service teacher apprentices under the tutelage of a cooperating teacher and thereby learns how to teach. The drawback to this model is in finding good mentoring cooperating teachers. An additional difficulty is that one good mentor is often insufficient in meeting the needs of the pre-service teacher, requiring that the setting of the apprenticeship offer several good role models for optimum experience.

The applied-science model emphasizes pre-service teachers' application of knowledge and theory learned concurrently in coursework. The professor teaches, the pre-service teacher learns, the professor assesses students' understanding through observation of experience. The problem with this framework is that it treats teaching and learning as simplistic and linear. Schön (1983) criticized the technical nature of this approach because it doesn't solve the messy, complex, overlapping issues that classrooms organically create.

The inquiry-oriented practicum "is viewed as a form of research and teachers as reflective practitioners" (Zeichner, 1996). This approach values teachers' "personal practical knowledge" (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988) and reflection in assisting pre-service teachers in developing new knowledge about

teaching and learning. Common methods used in this approach are collaborative discussions, writing (journals, narratives), and action research projects.

According to Worthy and Prater (1998), pre-service teachers often begin with vague notions of how to help struggling readers. However, after participating in a semester long tutorial program in tandem with a reading methods course, the pre-service teachers in their study reported affirmation for opportunities: 1) to situate theory into practice, 2) to be supported by more knowledgeable others, 3) to develop relationships with a struggling reader, 4) to participate in a community of learners. Strong support from the pre-service teachers, along with the research for effective educative practicums, indicate that tutoring holds much promise for reading methodology courses.

In a review of seventeen tutoring programs, Wasik (1998) identified the following components as important for effectiveness:

1. Presence of a coordinator who knows about reading and reading instruction.
2. Structure of tutoring including a) reading of new material by student, b) reading books on student's independent reading level, c) inclusion of word analysis and letter-sound relationship activities, d) inclusion of a writing activity focus on composition. In addition, the structure must address active participation of the student during tutoring. Juel (1996) reported that dyads in which the tutor did most of the reading and writing were less successful than those in which the student was doing the actual work of the tutoring session.)

3. Training provided to the tutors. Assisting tutors in developing specific techniques, such as scaffolding, explicit instruction, and modeling assisted tutors' ability to offer effective instruction (Juel, 1996).

TEACHER RESEARCH

Over the last decade the number of teachers conducting inquiry in their own classrooms and schools about literacy teaching and learning has grown tremendously (Lytle, 2000). Teacher research is usually defined by several features: a) researcher has an insider or emic perspective; b) researchers mix theory and practice while teaching and researching within a learning community; c) researchers are pragmatic – they focus on real classroom problems that need exploration and explanation; d) researchers are intentional and systematic (Baumann & Duffy-Hester, 2000). Cochran-Smith & Lytle (1993) define teacher research as a "systematic and intentional inquiry by teachers about their own school and classroom work" (p. 23). They based this definition on the work of Stenhouse (1985) who defined teacher-research as "systematic, self-critical enquiry" and Goswami and Stillman's (1987) idea that every lesson should be an inquiry for the teacher. Cochran-Smith and Lytle's definition is useful in that it suggests that rigorous examination of one's own practice can be a basis for professional development, and that problems experienced as problems by teachers can be subjected to empirical examination by practitioners rather than by

outsiders - creating an image of teacher researchers as teachers who daily pursue relevant topics to improve their teaching.

McKernan (as cited in Henson, 1996) suggested four features that recommend teacher research over traditional research. Teacher research:1) increases participants' own understanding of personally experienced educational or curriculum problems; 2) focuses on problems of immediate concern; 3) is geared toward practical short-term solutions; and 4) encourages collaboration as an equal partnership.

Like all types of research methodologies, teacher research has advantages and disadvantages. Some benefits are in relation to practice for the teacher researcher, such as personal positive changes (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993; Elliot, 1991; Goswami & Stillman, 1987). Teacher researchers often become active professionally, and tend to be more articulate, insightful, and critical. In addition, teacher researchers are apt to take curricular risks, see teaching as a joint teacher/student venture and become active producers of meaning rather than passive consumers of others' research findings (Elliot, 1991; Kincheloe, 1991). As teachers become more empowered, through praxis they have continuous opportunities to clarify their understandings and thereby service educational reform through their continual learning (Henson, 1996).

An advantage to teacher research as a methodology is that it is contexualized. Classrooms are complex webs of interactions. Teacher research is

deeply contextualized in every day events (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993) and rejects positivistic approaches unable to untangle the strands (Kincheloe, 1991). In addition, teacher research grants the researcher a privileged emic stance and special knowledge, such as long-term knowledge of the setting, well-established relationships within the context of the study, etc. (Lytle, 2000).

Disadvantages to teacher research include the limited rewards offered by school systems in support of teacher research, which discourages participation (Henson, 1996). Teacher culture discourages teachers' questioning of practice: the myth is that good teachers do not have questions that they cannot answer about schools and schooling (Lortie, 1975). Time is also a major barrier to teacher research due to the intensification of teaching (Apple, 1986) and schools' inflexible schedules. Lortie (1975) found that most teachers work in isolation, whereas teacher research calls for collaboration and substantive opportunities for intellectual exchange (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993). Another barrier to teacher research is that many teachers do not perceive themselves as having the necessary skills to conduct their own research. Teachers often lack confidence in their research abilities and feel inferior in status to university researchers (Henson, 1996).

In relation to teacher research as a methodology, one disadvantage is the role of teacher/researcher often becomes problematized. Teacher researchers must maintain a dual stance of teacher and researcher. In practice, this becomes

difficult when one must decide whether to stand back or intervene, or record or attempt to alter the situation (Lytle, 2000). In addition, the advantage of being an insider can also be seen as a disadvantage for two reasons: 1) reliance on self-knowledge is not necessarily valid; and 2) examination from an insider's perspective may not consider the wider context (Hammersley, 1993).

Because the relationship between the researcher and the researched is central to this approach, it is important to consider ethical issues in teacher research. Eisner (1991a) suggested that furthering the public good through the creation of knowledge "can involve harming others in order to achieve that good" (p. 214). He then identified three issues in relation to the protection of the researched: 1) informed consent, 2) confidentiality, and 3) allowing those studied to opt out of the research. The issue of protection of participants revolves not so much around the principle of protection, (there is consensus that protecting participants is important) but rather around the difficulty of achieving it (van den Berg, 2001).

The issue of informed consent is critical to teacher research because this approach relies heavily on collaboration and the relationship between the researcher and the subjects. Eisner (1991) debated whether consent can ever truly be "informed." How can researchers ever assume subjects have an understanding of the project the same as their own when the researcher has typically spent significant amounts of time wrestling with the creation of the project? "Informed

consent implies that the researcher knows what the event will be and its possible effects. Just how does one get such knowledge?" (Eisner, 1991, p. 214). This knowledge also becomes problematic in teacher research as many "teacher researchers report that their methodological tools and perspectives evolve along with their questions" (Baumann & Duffy-Hester, 2001).

Teacher research needs to be collaborative because participants hold multiple perspectives of the context. The researcher must be accountable to the participants or the research is likely to reflect only the voice of the researcher rather than a multiplicity of perspectives (van den Berg, 2001). Lee (2001) discussed the differences in ways researchers might look at those they are researching:

- Subjects - like objects to be studied, unable to influence the course of the research;
- Informants - contribute information, but can change the course of study by revealing or withholding information;
- Participants - engaged in the research process, but are offered limited opportunities;
- Collaborators - co-researchers in equal relationship that protects both from exploitation and shares responsibility for all phases of the research process.

Moving from conducting research on subjects to conducting research with participants and collaborators is Lee's goal.

Teacher researchers must also consider the implication of voice as they report their findings as Zeni (2001) reminded us in the introduction of her book on ethics and research:

> I believe that voice is fundamentally an ethical issue in writing about education. A university researcher, for example may collaborate with school people, but report the findings in a mode of discourse that excludes the uninitiated. When that happens, any critique of the research by the stakeholders is effectively silenced. I would argue that those of us who work in the intellectual spaces between schools and universities have an ethical obligation to write in a style that communicates to both audiences (p. xviii).

The presence of an audience shapes how we write about our study and our thinking. How and what we think is often shaped by the audience created in our minds.

Zeni (2001) offered four checkpoints for ethical issues based in part on the work of Gesa Kirsch in *Ethical Dilemmas in Feminist Research* (1999):

1. *Location*: What the researcher brings to the study – gender, race, class, status. How do these connect or divide the researcher from the participants?
2. *Relationships*: How could friendships, professional responsibilities, human dynamics be enhanced or threatened by the study?
3. *Interpretation/Definition*: How do participants define the issues? How does the researcher represent the subjective experience of others considering multiple perspectives?

4. *Publication*: How does the researcher bring texts, forms and voices to further the knowledge base? How does the researcher tell a complex story truthfully to different audiences?

As "ethical dilemmas facing practitioner-researchers tend to be ambiguous, context-sensitive, and therefore resistant to generic regulations" (Zeni, 2001, p xi) these questions offer assistance for teacher researchers to systematically examine their own practices and the contexts within which they work.

SUMMARY

From this literature on inquiry, field based tutoring, and teacher research the following themes emerged in relation to the proposed study:

1. Inquiry is a stance, a framework or orientation for our interactions.
2. Expressions of inquiry are manifested in knowledge-seeking and in wondering language acts.
3. Sometimes inquirers utilize the methodological form of teacher research to systematically and intentionally seek answers for their wonderings.
4. Teacher education programs are beginning to investigate the potential that teacher research has for fostering pre-service teachers' disposition toward inquiry as an orientation.
5. Classroom discourse rarely supports student inquiry.

6. Obstacles to inquiry include students' fear of asking questions and the devaluation of their personal knowledge.
7. Effective teachers need opportunities to problematize their knowledge through communities of inquiry.
8. Working one-on-one with struggling readers, pre-service teachers develop pedagogical knowledge about reading and personal practical knowledge about teaching.
9. Effective tutoring programs have a) a knowledgeable supervisor, b) training for tutors, and c) a lesson structure including students rereading texts at their independent level, reading new material at their instructional level with scaffolded tutoring, doing word study, and writing for sound.

Chapter 3

Methodology

This study is an examination of the information-seeking and wondering inquiries of six pre-service teachers in the context of their tutoring interactions, a component of a Reading Problems course for which I was the instructor. The study was guided by the following research question: What is the nature of pre-service teachers' inquiry (wondering and sense-making) in the context of a Reading Problems course, including a nine-week tutoring clinic, working one-on-one with a struggling reader?

The primary objective of this study is to understand pre-service teachers' inquiry as they work with struggling readers in a tutoring context. I identify and analyze instances of pre-service teachers' thinking, wondering, and knowledge seeking inquiries, which they express in interviews, journals, and lesson plans/reflections during a nine-week tutoring experience with struggling elementary school readers.

CONTEXT: TUTORING

I collected data at Midwestern College. Midwestern is a small private religious-affiliated institution located in a town with a population of approximately 20,000. The sixteen pre-service teachers in the class were all white and middle class. Thirteen students were female and three were male. The methods course met twice weekly for two and a half hours for one semester. Class sessions were held at Moses Elementary School and typically consisted of a one-hour class and then 50 minutes of tutoring followed immediately by 30 minutes of debriefing the tutoring experience in small groups with other tutors working with tutees at the same grade level. The tutoring clinic lasted nine weeks.

Moses Elementary School serves a population of primarily low-income white and Hispanic children. There was an established after-school enrichment program at the school, which the tutoring clinic joined. The principal and I met and decided that the school's advisory team would determine the age levels that would most benefit from the tutoring clinic. This group decided that two students from each of the first, second, and fifth grade classrooms (8 classrooms total) would be invited to participate.

Classroom teachers chose the tutees from their classrooms. I had requested that each classroom teacher be asked to choose students they believed needed help, but were not necessarily the most severely struggling readers in the

class. This request was based on my assumption that such students would enable the pre-service teachers to see and document growth over the nine-week clinic as these students moved away from being labeled "struggling readers." I assumed that struggling readers with intense reading difficulties would most likely require more time than nine weeks to make significant progress.

The school took responsibility for the referral process, although I supplied a letter to parents inquiring about their interest in the program and requiring a signature on a commitment form ensuring participation for the entire semester (See Appendix A). Classroom teachers reported chronological age levels and guided reading levels for each referred student. Each tutor was then given that information about his or her tutee.

Before tutoring began, I met with each of the elementary students out in the hallway by their classroom for approximately fifteen minutes. My objectives for these sessions included: 1) doing some initial assessments on each of the students; 2) getting to know a bit about the students so I could try to match personalities/ styles/interests of tutors to tutees; and 3) letting the students get to know me so that they might be less distracted during my observations of their sessions with their tutors. Each of these sessions included an informal sharing time with the student about his or her interests, likes/dislikes, and strengths/challenges. Each student read several brief passages of different levels

of texts aloud to me, and then wrote brief messages about themselves for their tutors.

Pre-service tutors were assigned a struggling reader based on grade level and reading level as reported by the classroom teacher. Tutors were given an opportunity to state grade level (first, second, fifth) preferences prior to these assignments. I tried to match preferences with referred students as much as possible and was able to give all but one tutor her first choice in grade level.

The tutoring component used the following research-based assumptions as a framework (based on those used by the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (Fitzgerald, 2001)): a) children learn to read in meaningful contexts; b) the goal of reading is making meaning with texts; c) the major work of beginning reading is figuring out the words; d) phonological awareness is important in early literacy learning; e) reading and writing develop concurrently; f) learning to read is built in relationship with a more knowledgeable other.

The tutoring design was patterned after the format used by Invernizzi, Rosemary, Juel, & Richards (1997) (based on aspects of Reading Recovery (Clay, 1993)). Their four-part lessons included: 1) reading of familiar texts; 2) word study; 3) writing for sounds; 4) reading a new book.

Reading Familiar Texts

Re-reading well-known texts builds struggling readers' confidence. As they experience success with reading, they begin to think of themselves as readers and to believe that reading is something that they can do. Re-reading also assists students in developing the automaticity needed for effective fluent reading (Samuels, 1979; Stanovich, 1986).

Word Study

Research suggests that explicitly helping children to analyze words and to learn strategies may be beneficial to struggling readers (Pearson, 1985). Studies also suggest that there is a strong relationship between spelling ability and word identification ability in reading (Adams, 1990; Zutell & Rasinski, 1989). Using games and activities such as Making Words (Cunningham & Cunningham, 1998) and Words Their Way (Bear, Templeton, Invernizzi, & Johnston, 1996) allows struggling readers to see patterns, and manipulate letters and sounds, and provides their tutors with opportunities to begin to understand the tutee's phonemic awareness knowledge as demonstrated through their experimentation.

Writing for Sounds

In this part of the lesson, students write a sentence of their choosing. Tutors help students use their knowledge of letters and sounds in the composing. The segmentation of speech and the matching of letters to sounds further assist

beginning readers in the development of phonemic awareness (Invernizzi et al., 1997).

Reading a new book

Each session, a new book is presented through guided reading (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996). This gives the students the opportunity to work with instructional level reading material in a scaffolded manner within their zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978).

CONTEXT: METHODS COURSE

The Reading Problems course, of which the tutoring was a component, was designed to prepare students to understand the literacy problems children may encounter, and to analyze theories, principles, and philosophies of instruction created to ameliorate these difficulties. The course focused on diverse learners from multiple perspectives in order to help these pre-service teachers build knowledge about assessment and pedagogy (Allington, 2001; Delgado-Gaitan, 1987; Delpit, 1995; Klenk & Kibby, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1994). The tutoring clinic was embedded in this course to give students an opportunity to gather information firsthand and to assess elementary school age struggling readers, and to plan and implement individualized instructional plans. Students engaged in the critical analysis of instructional strategies and programs related to reading. The overall goal of the course was to prepare students to become confident, student-

centered, effective, problem-solving classroom reading teachers. (See course syllabus and schedule in Appendix B).

The following seven learning intents guided the course content. These were developed in accordance with the Indiana Professional Standards Board content, developmental, and performance standards for elementary school teachers. Students will:

1. Gain a better understanding of reading and writing processes and of the factors that may cause a learner to have difficulty with reading or with reading instruction.
2. Discuss the nature of students' reading/literacy difficulties.
3. Develop familiarity with a variety of formal and informal assessment strategies appropriate for groups and individuals and the ability to interpret and evaluate data from these assessments to design instruction.
4. Identify and plan appropriate instructional procedures and materials to meet the specific needs of individual learners and be able to support this instruction theoretically.
5. Evaluate a child's current reading strengths and challenges, write a reader profile, design an instructional plan, implement an instructional program and write a case report.
6. Develop a sense of self as an educational facilitator who continually reflects on his/her teaching.

7. Investigate reading/literacy problems from multiple perspectives.

The course was framed to foster an inquiry orientation. The dialog journal became a place for me to intentional prompt their inquiry and model my own inquiring stance. My responses to journal entries were predominantly questions – my questions in response to what they said, and extending questions pushing them to explore issues at a deeper level. Class sessions were participatory and often included time for students to struggle with issues in a collaborative, small group setting. All students participated in an inquiry project where they worked with a group of students who shared their same area of interest as they researched a reading program.

PARTICIPANTS

Participants in this research study were chosen from the students enrolled in my Reading Problems course during the Spring 2002 semester. The elementary pre-service program requires two reading methods courses; Reading Problems is the second of the sequence. Students are advised to take this course during their last semester in the program (spring), following their student teaching semester in the preceding fall. However, scheduling difficulties make it necessary for some students to enroll in the course prior to their student teaching semester.

Sixteen students, thirteen female and three male, were enrolled in Reading Problems during the semester I collected data for this study. Eight

students had completed their student teaching, seven had not, and one student was a practicing high school English teacher. Originally, I intended to invite six students who had completed their student teaching to participate in the study. I planned to choose the six based on my beginning observations of the students' first two weeks of tutoring, the students' lesson plan reflections, and my conversations with these students' previous instructors in the education department. I was hoping to select three students who showed an orientation toward inquiry, and three students who seemed less inclined toward inquiry to participate in the study. My goal in selection was to assure a range of students' perspectives and inclinations toward inquiry as a stance; I was not trying to represent the course's population. I wanted a selective, not random sample.

During the first class meeting, I briefly discussed my research intentions and indicated that there would be an opportunity for some members of the class to participate. I asked the students to consider their willingness to participate in the study. As I reflected further, it seemed to me that since eight of the class members had completed their student teaching, it would be best to extend the invitation to participate to that select group, rather than making a selection based on impressions of the students' inquiry tendencies. However, I thought it would be awkward for me (as the professor of the course) to eliminate two students out of this population based primarily on my beginning observations of them. On January 17, 2002, I dismissed my class fifteen minutes early, but asked the eight

seniors who had completed student teaching to remain so we could discuss the opportunity to participate in the study.

This meeting's agenda included: 1) an outline of the time frame of the study; 2) a brief summary of my research interest for this particular study - "I am interested in understanding what pre-service teachers think about, wonder about, and question as they are working with a struggling reader"; 3) an outline of the data collection procedures (interviews, field notes, dialog journals, lesson plan reflections, and survey); and 4) a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of participating in the study. Advantages included:

- opportunity to deeply reflect with a partner (me) which may foster deeper insight into ideology, stance and methodology;
- time to wonder;
- individual attention from the instructor;
- fostering of an inquiry orientation that may serve them well as in-service teachers.

Disadvantages included:

- devoting time outside of class for one-on-one interviews;
- wondering could bring up uncomfortable issues with which they would need to struggle;

- as I was both the researcher and the professor, issues of power could arise that might block participants' ability to openly share their wonderings and might require extra time to work out.

I explained how some of the data sources would be collected from all of the students enrolled in the class as part of their course requirements (dialog journals, lesson plan reflections, survey), while some would be collected only from the study's participants (interviews, field notes) and would require time outside of class. Because willingness to invest outside class time in this study was necessary, I explained that participation was strictly voluntary and would not influence coursework assessments. Students were given an opportunity to decline participation.

I asked all eight potential participants to think about their interest in participating and to inform me of their decision in person, by phone or by e-mail by January 22, 2002. Two students talked to me immediately following the invitation meeting and expressed their willingness to participate. Six more students e-mailed me by the deadline, four accepting and two declining. I then asked the six pre-service teachers who agreed to participate in the study to sign consent forms that described their participation responsibilities and indicated their willingness to be involved in the study. (See Appendix C)

Sources of Data

Data sources for the present study include:

1. Surveys (pre and post)
2. Journals
3. Lesson plans
4. Field notes
5. Interviews

Survey

A key aspect to inquiry-oriented teaching is knowing what your students know so that you can build from a functional knowledge base as you begin to scaffold their instruction. I administered an open-ended survey to the entire class at the beginning of the semester to help me determine the students' understandings and ideology about reading. (Appendix D) This instrument served as a tool for pedagogical decision-making as I taught the course, but was also coded for themes and is discussed in the individual case studies (Chapter 4). This same instrument was given during the final class session and was also coded for themes and compared to the initial surveys. The data set includes a pre-study and post-study survey for each case study participant.

Journals

Each student was required to write a reflective journal entry electronically to me weekly. This reflection could be based on whatever the student was thinking about, challenged by, or discovering, but was not to include summaries of course materials. To diffuse the issue of power, I did not grade journals. Students received an automatic twenty percent of their grade for participation, although late or un-submitted journal entries caused several students to lose percentage points for these assignments. I assumed that students would be more willing to reveal their thinking about their thinking if the threat of formal evaluation was eliminated. I responded to each journal entry electronically within two days of submission. From a social constructivist learning perspective, these journals needed to be dialogic to ensure inter- and intrapsychological processing (Vygotsky, 1978). Journals were collected eight times over the fifteen weeks in the semester. Each journal entry was analyzed for instances of inquiry. The data set for this study includes the eight journal entries per case study participant. (See Appendix E for sample journal entry)

Lesson Plans

Students were required to write lesson plans in preparation for their tutoring sessions, and immediately following each session were required to write reflections on the actual plans and turn them in to me before leaving class. The

plans of the case study participants with their reflections were copied and analyzed for instances of inquiry. There are between nine and eleven lesson plans/reflections per case participant in this data set depending on the number of absences of the tutor and/or tutee. (See Appendix F for sample lesson plan/reflection).

Field Notes

Throughout the tutoring sessions, I recorded ethnographic field notes (e.g. participant's language use, tutee's responses, tutee's physical expressions, etc). Following each session, I typed my field notes. From my multiple readings of these typed notes, I developed questions to ask during the participants' interviews. These questions were couched in anecdotal information gathered from my observation and recorded in my field notes (e.g., "I noticed…Can you talk a little more about this?") Participants were also asked to read the typed field notes during the interview and discuss their thinking about the tutoring sessions. This allowed students to critically reflect on their performance and make new observations about their tutees. Many times during the interviews, field notes triggered "ah-ha" moments, revealing to the participants behaviors that they had not noticed or thought about previously. During tutoring sessions, I took notes for isolated segments of the lesson, not the entire lesson, as I did not want to spend all

of my time during tutoring focused on my case study participants, to the neglect of other course members.

I observed each case study participant's tutoring at least weekly, but most often for some part of every tutoring session. These observations may or may not have included written field notes. However, I was careful to take field notes during the two sessions prior to each of the three scheduled interviews with each case study participant. There were four to six field note transcripts (depending on the number of absences of the tutee) per case study participant in this data set. (See Appendix G for sample field note transcript).

Interviews

Interviews with each case study participant occurred three times throughout the study. One interview occurred close to the onset of tutoring, one in the middle of the study, and the final one after tutoring ended. Each interview lasted approximately one hour. Interviews were tape-recorded, conversational and open-ended (Anderson et al., 1994). Prompts emerged from my examination of my field notes recorded during tutoring sessions. I used open question stems like, "I wonder…" and "Help me understand…" during interviews, opening opportunities for meaningful conversations. I also asked direct questions such as: "Did any new questions or wonderings come to mind? Any questions haunting you? What did you find most memorable?" (See Appendix H for interview

protocol). Throughout the interviews I hoped to demonstrate my own wondering and information seeking, a stance that I hoped would invite participants to be more comfortable with their own inquiries. Lindfors (1987) posited, "classrooms in which teachers ask a higher proportion of genuine curiosity questions and do a lot of wondering are those classrooms in which the children ask a higher proportion of curiosity questions too" (p.314). Based on the same premise, my intent was to demonstrate my own curiosity, so participants would inquire as well.

I transcribed all 18 interview tapes. I transcribed and reviewed previous interviews prior to the next scheduled participant interview to see if there was any information that needed clarification and to help me remember the topics and themes revealed earlier. I coded the transcripts for instances of inquiry through multiple readings of the transcribed data. There were three transcribed interviews per participant in this data set (total 18).

Data Analysis: Cross-Case

I began my analysis by doing multiple readings of each of the interview transcripts. First, I read them through just trying to absorb all of the words and ideas. Secondly, I coded them based on my working definition of inquiry: 1) it is a language act; and 2) it is a seeking of information; or 3) it is an expression of wondering. Language acts are defined as overt expressive acts (verbal and/or written) that carry out a purpose. "To act is to do something; to perform a

language act is to do something by means of language" (Lindfors, 1999 p.3). Some common language purposes include to comfort, to deceive, to teach, to seek, to challenge, etc. Wondering includes, but is not limited to, episodes of curiosity and uncertainty, expressions of tentativeness, and engagements that "play with possibilities, reflecting, considering and exploring" (Lindfors, 1999, p.41). I highlighted utterances of seeking information in yellow and utterances that were instances of wondering in green. The third time through the transcripts, I wrote summary statements, suppositions, and/or my own questions about the transcript's content in the margins.

Needing some way of organizing the data, I decided to make tables of responses to the questions that I had asked all six participants. Since these questions had been developed to seek out participants' inquiry it stood to reason that they could also be used to provide a preliminary organizational format for the data. However, I soon realized that this approach was flawed because the responses did not include many of the themes/ideas that were evident in the transcripts, but not elicited by my questions.

I then returned to the transcripts to go beyond my initial, preliminary highlighting and identify every instance of inquiry, that is, every utterance that was an expression of information seeking or wondering. I was especially attentive to the following characteristics which often (though not always) signal an act of inquiry: 1) interrogatives, 2) tentativeness markers ("perhaps," "maybe,"

"possibly," "if"), 3) shifts in topics of discussion, 4) hesitations, 5) expression of feelings, 6) episodes (chunks of transcript) indicating meaning-making (working through an idea, trying to make sense of something), 7) expression of curiosity, or wondering, and 8) expression of uncertainty ("I don't know," "I think," "I guess," "maybe"). I had to remember that these features of speech do not necessarily indicate inquiry. For example, interrogatives often carry out other communication purposes than inquiry (requests: "Would you help me with this?" threats: "Are you trying to get yourself grounded?"); hesitations can signal a lapse in attention; tentativeness can indicate deference to a person of higher status (which I was in these interviews). Nevertheless, these speech characteristics helped me identify all instances of inquiry in the interview transcripts. I wrote each identified unit on a yellow post-it note (total 556). I coded each unit/note on the back for participant, interview sequence, and page number of the transcript so that I could easily reference the context of the unit if necessary.

I then began a constant comparative (Glasner & Strauss., 1967) sorting process, using the units from three out of the six participants. I tried to group like responses together until categories and themes emerged. I was able to find some foci, but I had a large number of units that remained uncategorized. The next day I spent some time thinking about my sorting from the day previous. I realized there were essentially three broad categories within which all of the units could be categorized: 1) inquiry about assessment, 2) inquiry about students, and 3)

inquiry about teaching. I tested this new idea by sorting the remaining three participants' units. When I felt confident that this was a practical organizational scheme for the data, I re-sorted the first three participants' units into these three categories. I was also intrigued by the fact that these categories aligned well with the course content, reinforcing the possibility of a reciprocal relationship between the course content and participants' inquiry. I sorted all of the units into each of these three large categories and then sorted the units in each of the large categories into subcategories, using the same sorting process to find emerging subcategories.

Subcategories that were established at this time are represented in the following table:

Table 3.1 Initial Set of Categories and Subcategories

Category	Inquiry about Assessment	Inquiry about Students	Inquiry about Teaching
Subcategory	Beliefs and Feelings	Relationship and Rapport	Confidence and Insecurity
Subcategory	Questioning Assessment	Questions about Students	Questioning Instructional Approaches
Subcategory	Assessment Usage and Outcomes	Assumptions about Students	Beliefs about Reading and Reading Instruction
Subcategory		Drawing Conclusions	Tutoring
Subcategory		Descriptions/Observations	It's All about Me
Subcategory		Parents/Home/Culture	

Next, I analyzed participants' journal entries. I read through each entry several times. Using basically the same analysis procedure as I had used with the interview transcripts, I highlighted the instances of inquiry, wrote these units on green post-it notes (total 232), and coded each of them as to participant and journal number sequence so that context could be referenced. I then sorted these units into the existing categories that had emerged from the interview transcripts. During this sorting procedure, I was open to the emergence of new categories. It became clear early on that many of the journal units did not fit well into the existing subcategories. I took all of the uncategorized journal units and sorted them for new categories. Three new subcategories emerged during this process: 1) Connecting Thinking to Student Teaching, 2) Questioning the Author, 3) Thinking about my Thinking. These all fell under the larger category of Inquiry about Teaching.

Then I repeated the same analysis procedure on the lesson plans/ reflections. These units were recorded on pink post-it notes (81 total) and coded as to the participant and lesson plan number sequence. These units were then sorted into the already established categories. Although I was open to the emergence of more new categories, none emerged during the sorting of the lesson plans/ reflections.

Because new categories had emerged during the sorting of the 869 units (the total from interviews, plus journal entries, plus lesson plans/reflections), it

was necessary to go back and reread all of the units to make sure that they were placed in the right category/subcategory. While most units remained primarily within their original categories, as a result of this rereading, I revised my subcategories further, collapsing several into one, eliminating a few and adding a few. My final set included:

Table 3.2 Final Set of Categories and Subcategories

Category	Inquiry about Assessment	Inquiry about Students	Inquiry about Teaching
Subcategory	Beliefs and Feelings about Assessment	Inquiry about Relationships and Rapport	Questioning the Author
Subcategory	Questioning Assessment	Questions about Students	Thinking about my Thinking
Subcategory	Assessment Usage and Outcomes	Assumptions about Students	Connecting Thinking to One's Own School Experience
Subcategory		Drawing Conclusions	Connecting Thinking to Student Teaching
Subcategory		Parents/Culture/Home	Confidence/Insecurity
Subcategory		Descriptions/ Observations about Students	Questioning Classroom Management and Organization
Subcategory			Questioning Differentiation
Subcategory			Questioning One's Own Knowledge and Performance
Subcategory			Questioning Instructional Approaches
Subcategory			Questioning Teachers and/or School Practices
Subcategory			Inquiry about Skills/Strategies
Subcategory			Posing Strategies
Subcategory			Inquiry about Materials
Subcategory			Inquiry about Planning
Subcategory			Inquiry about Time
Subcategory			Inquiry about Effectiveness
Subcategory			Beliefs about Reading and Reading Instruction

Looking at the units within each category and subcategory, I wrote a definition for each subcategory. I used these definitions later as a guide during

the inter-rater reliability check. It was helpful to visually have the units in front of me as I wrote the definitions to make sure that I was describing all of the kinds of responses that I had determined belonged to each grouping.

As each subcategory was coded, I recorded data: 1) across participant (how many instances each participant had in the grouping); 2) across data source (how many instances in interviews, in lesson plans/reflections, in journals) 3) across time (first interview, second lesson plan/reflection, third journal entry, etc).

INTER-RATER RELIABILITY

To test the reliability of my created categories, I employed an inter-rater reliability check. I trained two college educated recruits to sort the units into my defined categories and subcategories. One rater is currently the academic dean and former professor in the education department at Midwestern College. The other rater is Midwestern's Director of Public Relations and is currently applying for graduate studies in communications and women's studies. Both women have had successful academic careers and a history of work experience in school settings.

Each rater was supplied with approximately twenty percent (180 units) of the original units to be sorted. We then discussed my definition of inquiry as it is used in this study and I wrote the definitions and characteristics of instances of inquiry on the classroom chalkboard for future reference if needed. I then

supplied each of the raters with a list of the three major categories, and twenty-seven subcategories, as well as the definitions for each and two examples of units that would fit the definition of each subcategory. (Appendix I) After several practice examples, the raters began sorting. I instructed them to first sort for the three main categories: 1) inquiry about assessment, 2) inquiry about students, and 3) inquiry about teaching. During this process, the raters were sometimes confused about a unit. I would then read from the original data source (the unit in context) to give the rater a greater understanding of the context from which to work.

In the process of working through my inter-rater reliability check, with the help of my two raters, I came to realize that I had two inter-relational subcategories (Relationship and Rapport and Parents/Home/Culture) that were not sufficiently defined by either the Inquiring about Students or the Inquiring about Teaching categories. I created a new category: Inquiring about Relationships that subsumed these two subcategories. The inter-rater reliability check was done originally on three categories with twenty-seven subcategories (See Table 3.2). After the rating process, I created the fourth category Inquiring about Relationships and moved the data for the two subcategories on relationships from Inquiring about Students to this new category. I then calculated the percentage of agreement for the final established four categories. Percentages of agreement

between my ratings and the two outside raters are represented in the following table:

Table 3.3 Inter-rater Reliability Percentage of Agreement

Category	Rater A	Rater B
Inquiring about Assessment	90%	95%
Inquiring about Students	79%	83%
Inquiring about Relationship	93%	93%
Inquiring about Teaching	95%	97%

DATA ANALYSIS: CASE STUDY

Although my study included six participants, I decided to include case studies on only four of them. I chose these particular four because their inquiry styles were distinctive and thought provoking. Poppy inquired cautiously which contrasted interestingly with Sybil's expressive style. Natalie was a doubter, while Luke was a knower. Rebecca and Anna, the two I eliminated, had unique styles also, however, they were less interesting to me.

Rebecca's inquiry style could be characterized as meanderer. She floated from topic to topic often, and spent a great deal more time generating discourse than centering her talk or wondering. Anna was the exact opposite. In the analysis of her interviews, I realized I had done most of the talking, and she did a great deal of agreeing. The transcripts revealed an attempt on my part to try to prompt her by revealing my own thinking about a particular topic, but in the end, she often agreed with my point and offered nothing more of her own. There was

little evidence of Anna's inquiry process in the data because of the limitation of her talk during the interviews. Her lesson plans/reflections and dialog journals provided more verification, but even there, there was far less evidence for Anna than the other participants.

Before writing a case study, I reread all of the data sources for that particular participant. As I read, I tried to remain open to new thoughts and patterns of inquiry illustrated in the data. With post-it notes, I jotted notes and marked places in the data sources that I thought would best reveal the inquiry process demonstrated by the participant. I then reread all the jottings and determined an organizational pattern for each case study. This methodology was repeated for all four case studies included in Chapter 4.

ESTABLISHING TRUSTWORTHINESS

Lincoln and Guba (1985) posit that reliability and validity are inappropriate standards in qualitative research and that trustworthiness is a more relevant standard of rigor. Trustworthiness was established through triangulation. Journals, lesson plans/reflections and interviews were all compared. Although prolonged engagement (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) was not possible in this study, the diversity and amount of data sources achieved informational redundancy (Lincoln & Guba, 1985)

Chapter 4

Cross-Case Analysis

This chapter looks across all six participants instances of inquiry in a cross-case analysis. Four major themes are discussed: 1) Inquiring about Assessment, 2) Inquiring about Relationships, 3) Inquiring about Students, and 4) Inquiring about Teaching.

Inquiring about Assessment

Inquiries in this category focused on assessment and assessment tools, and included wondering, expressions of feelings (confidence, concern, frustration) and criticism.

Table 4.1 Inquiring about Assessment

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	26	47	20	93
Journals	8	3	1	12
Lesson Plans	2	2	4	8
Total units across time	36	52	25	113

Out of the 932 instances of inquiry analyzed in this study, 113 (12%) were classified as Inquiring about Assessment. As the table indicates, assessment inquiries occurred from the beginning to the end of the semester, and across all data sources. This is perhaps not surprising for a significant portion of the Reading Problems course focused on the topic of assessment. The major assignment for the course was the preparation of a case study based on the participant's tutoring experience. The case study was heavily graded on the participant's use and interpretation of assessments, as well as the contextualization and diagnostic nature of their tutoring instruction. It stands to reason that participants' inexperience with diagnosis and assessment would intensify their inquiry about the topic. As participants tried to make sense out of their experience in relation to assessment, their inquiry included the following meaning making acts: 1) wonderings, 2) feelings – confidence, concern, and frustration, and 3) challenges and criticisms.

WONDERINGS ABOUT ASSESSMENT

Participants' wonderings about assessment choices, provided a glimpse into the kind of questions they hoped their assessment choices could provide answers to. In the following example, a participant reflects on why she chose a particular assessment.

> Well I did…the reading interview. I wanted to find out what her thoughts are about reading and who is good at it

> and how she sees herself and what her teacher uses – yeah I wanted to see what she thought about, what her teachers taught her in comparison to what I saw her doing and seeing if they were similar at all and they were - because she didn't really do much of anything.

This participant's wondering guided her in the selection of an assessment tool that could help her find the answers to her questions. In this case, the participant believed the reading interview would help her discover her tutee's understanding of what a successful reader is.

Another source of participants' wonderings was their struggle to find a focus for their instruction with their tutees. It was evident in the data that they wondered if assessments were helpful in this quest. An example of this can be found in the second interview with one participant who particularly struggled to find a focus for her tutee. This participant spent little time using formal assessments and moved right into instruction hoping to find a focus from cues the tutee exhibited during their sessions. However, after several weeks of this approach, the participant was still without instructional goals for the tutee.

> Interviewer: When you think about tutoring, what questions keep coming up for you?
> Participant: I mean just the thinking of like <u>where am I going with him</u> (laughing) because I don't really know what he needs help on.

Later in the interview, I pressed the participant specifically about what she was thinking about doing in relation to assessment.

> Interviewer: What are you thinking of doing?
> Participant: I wasn't really sure like what to do.
> Interviewer: What were you thinking?
> Participant: Um- yeaaaaaah.

This participant had done little thinking about what assessment steps she wanted to take, even though she felt that she had not determined a focus for her sessions. However, the participant was receptive to suggestions that I gave her as the interview continued in regard to assessment possibilities. Throughout our conversation, this participant's inquiry about her tutee's needs was apparent; however, she obviously wondered about the use of assessment as a way to find a focus.

Feelings about Assessment – Confidence, Concern, and Frustration

Expressions of confidence about assessment were evident in the data. One participant was not only able to see the instructional benefit for the student, but also was able to understand how running records informed her teaching and her understanding of a student's reading process.

> Participant: Running records aren't that bad…I mean I've learned a lot from doing them, like I can tell you that she made this mistake from visual without writing it down anymore. Just by knowing right there – I can see why she made the mistake now.

Feeling confident in the use of running records was important in that the use of running records as an assessment tool has become prevalent in elementary

classrooms nationwide. For most of the pre-service teachers enrolled in the course, this was their first opportunity to learn how to take and analyze running records. Although most had the opportunity to observe the use of running records during student teaching, none of the participants had actually taken or analyzed a running record prior to the tutoring clinic. This participant believed in the value of using running records, but struggled with the implementation of them in practice. This tension seemed to encourage her to be contemplative and by her third interview (above), she was able to express a change in her thinking. Despite all the difficulty she experienced in using running records during the tutoring clinic, her overall conclusion in the end was they were not "that bad." Though she had struggled with running records, this participant was – finally – able to see their instructional benefit for the student, and also was able to understand how running records informed her teaching and her understanding of a student's reading process.

Feelings of concern about assessment were also apparent in participants' talk. One participant discussed her concern regarding formal assessments. Her comments also revealed her understanding that her teaching would be continually judged by state testing initiatives, and her frustration with using time to assess instead of instruct.

> I think one of my biggest frustrations is spending so much time worrying about assessment. I know that is what we are judged upon, but even in just this one tutoring thing it is so frustrating because I want to use the time for teaching, not for assessment…

> What I feel that (participant's tutee) as a student can do compared to what a test says to someone else are two totally different things. I mean I know that I have seen some very strong students who don't test well. And I test well, but I never study like I should. There are both extremes and informal assessments can go beyond where formal assessments are – you are one or the other. No matter how much you prepare there is always going to be test anxiety.

This participant's discussion seemed to indicate two areas of concern about assessment – time and validity. At this point in the participant's teaching career, she did not have a clear understanding of the value of assessment and therefore felt resentful of the time required to implement assessments. While most experienced teachers would rather spend their time teaching than assessing also, they would most likely acknowledge that assessment informed their teaching making it worth the time investment. On the issue of validity, the participant asserted that a test may not reveal a student's capabilities that a teacher may be able to observe over time. While this idea has merit, it should not be used to render all assessments invalid, which seemed to be what the participant was trying to accomplish in her discussion. It appeared that the participant's feelings of concern about assessments might be influencing her to believe that they are nothing more than a requirement to fulfill.

Participants were also concerned about using assessments to help them find a focus for their tutoring instruction. Some participants found this process to be somewhat frustrating. When asked if there were any questions that kept coming up every week one participant said,

Participant: Just my biggest question is - you know I feel like there are so many possibilities of um activities and lesson plans and not knowing what she needs specifically. Just – I don't know – just how broad it is. Like I feel I need a really small focus and I don't have that right now so that is kind of my biggest question.
Interviewer: Are there things that you are thinking about to help you understand that more?
Participant: You mean like assessments?
Interviewer: Well that's one of the things that might help.
Participant: I mean I guess I just try to pick things out from listening to her read, and
Interviewer: But you are not finding a lot when you are doing that?
Participant: No, not really. Yeah I feel like I really am – that's a fair statement that I really don't know what her problems or her weaknesses are.

In trying to make sense of her assessment, this participant became frustrated with her inability to use the assessments constructively in the tutoring context. She expressed concern about whether assessment tools could help her identify a focus for her instruction. This participant seemed to question assessment as a valid source of help in determining areas of focus for her work with her tutee. She tended to rely more on her own intuition than on the use of assessment tools. Yet, the participant seemed very frustrated by the fact that she was unable to determine instructional areas on which to focus.

CRITICISM AND CHALLENGES ABOUT ASSESSMENT

Participants' also discussed their criticisms of assessment tools in relation to their inquiries about assessment. One participant, in her attempt to ensure her

tutee's success, often found it difficult to refrain from supplying answers or giving significant hints as a way of demonstrating her encouragement. This participant felt the running record protocol interfered with her encouraging approach.

> Participant: What do you do in running record - and I don't help with the word, but I might give her the beginning sound. Is that teacher assistance?
> Interviewer: Um-hmm.
> Participant: Any way you help them?
> Interviewer: Any way that you help them.
> Participant: If they look at you – then that might be – <u>she won't keep reading if I don't say just try it</u> (in a defensive tone).
> Interviewer: But then you record teacher help on the record.
> Participant: But she will get it, but only if I encourage her.
> Interviewer: Have you talked to her about not looking at you for help first?
> Participant: No – probably not.
> Interviewer: She appeals for help as her first strategy.
> Participant: Mmmmm, that's true. (Quiet and contemplative followed by three-second pause) Well I might have given her that crutch because of the book. I'll say I will help you – you just need to try if you get stuck – that might have helped her become dependent.

The participant initially felt a bit defensive about the limitations imposed on her by the assessment, but she seemed to have come to a new understanding about her use of encouragement and a deeper understanding for the running record protocol by the end of the interview. Her inquiry into what she initially believed to be a limitation of the assessment helped her come to a new

understanding of her own actions, and she began to see that her encouragement was actually interfering with her tutee's reading process.

Participants also challenged the validity of assessments as they tried to make sense of what the results they gathered communicated about their tutees. One participant challenged the results of the Informal Reading Assessment that she gave during the tutoring clinic because the results did not align with what she believed to be true about her tutee's reading process.

> Participant: Well mostly it was trying to interpret the assessments and deciding whether I thought they were valid or not because some of them - I think they told me things, and some of them like the IRI (informal reading inventory) – I don't think it necessarily told me anything. I don't know…The reading interview told me things and the Garfield Attitude Survey – she supposedly had a worse attitude than before so I didn't know what to make of that – like according to that – I don't think that is necessarily true, but I don't know. So I didn't feel like any of my assessments are extremely valid except for the interview.

This participant wanted to believe in her own informal assessment based on her observations, but there was still a part of her that was confused when those observations conflicted with the results of the formal assessment. Which was more reliable? What was the most valid kind of assessment? Whom should she trust?

Participants also critically evaluated assessment tools. By the end of her experience in the tutoring clinic, one participant was able to critically evaluate her options in relation to assessment tools.

> I wish I would have had an assessment that would have assessed her use in strategies. Like the letter identification stuff seemed kind of pointless because that is not even what my goal was. So I couldn't even formally assess what my goal was. And that was just sort of frustrating to me because it was only sort of her saying that she could use those things that- and by her demonstration of that when she was reading which I guess…I don't know if I could change the assessment a little bit and make it – like put the words in a sentence so that they could have had meaning so that she could have used the strategies to figure out the word. And I don't know if I could have done that. It seemed like my assessment was kind of going against what I had been teaching her to do. Like in the assessment she – the only thing that she could do was sound it out or look for chunks and stuff, which are good strategies sometimes, but we were working on context.

This participant wondered if it was acceptable practice to change an assessment to better serve her and/or her tutee's needs. Her thinking about the assessment tools themselves, allowed her to offer possibilities for change. She also considered whether there were other sources that could possibly satisfy her wonderings about her tutee's strategy use. While this participant knew through her documentation of running records that her tutee was demonstrating mastery of targeted strategies, she still sought the reinforcement of a formal assessment to validate her tutee's progress

Conclusions about Inquiring about Assessment Category

Two patterns evident in the data seemed particularly interesting. First, participants' inquiry about this area seemed driven by the course requirements more than by participants' own interests. An examination of the time patterns for this category suggest that although participants wondered about this topic, their wonderings were most often provoked by course assignments. Would their inquiry about assessment have been as prevalent if the course assignments had been different?

A second interesting pattern was that most instances of inquiry were generated during participant interviews rather than in journals or lesson plans. While participants were ready to articulate their inquiry about assessment with a partner during an interview, they were less inclined to do so in their lesson plans/reflections or journals entries. Perhaps they preferred to work out their inquiry on this topic in dialog rather than documenting their wonderings in writing, more of an individual activity. Or perhaps the dialog itself was supportive of this kind of inquiry. In either case, it may be that since they were assessment neophytes, participants found it helpful to inquire with a more knowledgeable other as they pursued their inquiry about assessment. The lack of references to assessment in participant lesson plans/reflections suggests that perhaps there was a disconnect between theory and practice in this area. Talking

about their wonderings in an interview was prevalent, but applying their wonderings about assessment in their planning and reflecting was less evident.

Inquiring about Relationships

Inquiries in this category focused on relationships and included inquiring about tutor-tutee relationships and rapport, and inquiring about relationships among school, students, parents, home and culture.

Table 4.2 Inquiring about Relationships

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	15	21	39	75
Journals	3	3	9	15
Lesson Plans	1	1	1	3
Total units across time	19	25	49	93

Most instances of inquiry in this category were generated by participant interviews. Participants were less inclined to connect their questioning with the course readings in their dialog journals or with their practice in the tutoring clinic through their lesson plans/reflections. Participants' inquiry about relationships increased throughout the semester.

Table 4.3 Inquiring about Tutor-Tutee Relationships and Rapport

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	14	17	11	42
Journals	1	0	0	1
Lesson Plans	1	0	1	2
Total units across time	16	17	12	45

Instances of inquiry on this topic were generated primarily across the three interviews, with two units from lesson plans/reflections, and one from a dialog journal entry. The two participants that tended to have the most tenuous relationships with their tutees produced instances of inquiry at markedly different rates, with one of the participants discussing her relationship much more than other (10 instances of inquiry in one case and four in the other). Interestingly, the two participants that seemed to have the easiest relationships also produced notably different numbers of instances of inquiry (14 instances of inquiry in one case to two instances of inquiry in the other). Success in the relationship did not account for the amount of attention a participant gave this category.

Relationships can be difficult as discovered by several participants during their tutoring sessions. Some participants were never able to get to a point of

comfortableness in their relationships with their tutees. In one participant's second interview, she discussed her relationship with her tutee.

> I'm curious if she likes coming to tutoring and being with me because sometimes she doesn't act like it. We don't have a real like buddy buddy relationship. She doesn't come up to me, and like hug me, or you know like talking talking talking to you. She doesn't act – I mean she is always ready to go at 4 o'clock. So I am just wondering – I mean I don't necessarily take that personally, but I'm wondering why she hasn't really attached to me - kind of how other elementary students tend to do – you know – oh a neat college student coming in – you know it seems like – at least most of the students that I've worked with before have been really receptive to me and like she's not extremely receptive or you know – it's not a problem. It just maybe is her personality. Like it doesn't bother me. It just is different.

This participant apparently believed she should be accepted by virtue of the fact that she was a young adult. This revealed her underlying assumption that all children should feel privileged to have the attention of a college student. While I do believe that this participant tried to establish a good rapport with her tutee, I wonder whether her assumption that she deserved to be accepted because of her status might have interfered with her ability to form a mutually respectful relationship with the child.

Another participant also struggled in her relationship with her tutee, which she discussed at the very beginning of her first interview, and then again at the very beginning of her second interview. One might conclude that since her

talk during interviews began on the topic of relationship, this participant felt a sense of urgency and puzzlement about it.

> I keep wondering if what I am doing is making him comfortable. Like if he's like, like, if the whatever I say or you know whatever activity it is – is it making him want to come (Interview 1)

> Participant: I feel like I need to make a better relationship with him.
> Interviewer: And what are you thinking about that you could do to get at that?
> Participant: Um – I don't know. I thought playing a game. Like if it is a game it will be motivating. (Interview 2)

In the first interview she wonders if she is doing and saying the right kinds of things. Was he finding her interesting enough to want to come to tutoring? This participant was looking for signs of acceptance in their relationship, based on his attitude toward participation in the tutoring clinic.

In the second quote, this participant centered her inquiry on the issue of fun. In order to move their relationship toward a more positive stance, this participant believed that focusing the tutoring components toward game-like activities would be helpful. Making tutoring fun seemed to be the only course of action that this participant considered in attempting to improve her relationship with her tutee. Preoccupation with being viewed as fun, however, can actually be detrimental to relationships. Mutual respect perhaps would have been a more appropriate goal.

Other participants found rapport easier to establish. One participant discussed her thinking about how she established a strong rapport with her tutee in her second journal entry.

> Well, I wasn't just getting down to the business of learning how to read. It's like you got to make personal connections - and making our time together meaningful so that he is not dreading coming or whatever else. And having the atmosphere light and more energizing than heavy, rather than this is another thing that you have to do, and it is school work, and it is boring, and it is dumb. But no – this is something different, and it is fun. I don't know.

While this participant also was concerned about setting a tone of engagement that was fun, she did identify other aspects of rapport that had to do with mutual respect and connecting on a personal level, as well as academically.

Inquiring about Relationships Between School, Students, Parents, Home, and Culture

Table 4.4 Inquiring about Relationships Between School, Students, Parents, Home, and Culture

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	1	4	28	33
Journals	2	3	9	14
Lesson Plans	0	1	0	1
Total units across time	3	8	37	48

Participants' talk included the following:

- Assumptions about the role of the home in relation to a student's school success.
- Descriptive statements about the tutee's home or family.
- Questions about tutee's family.
- Discussion of the role that culture played in relation to a student's school experience.

Instances of inquiry about the relationship of the student and his/her home and culture increased as tutoring progressed. Most responses were generated from participants' interviews. This was partly due to the fact that the third interview was intentionally scheduled after each participant had met for a conference with his or her tutee's parent at the conclusion of tutoring.

Participants talked about what they believed the role of parents and a student's home life was in relation to a student's academic success. A discussion during our second class session sparked much inquiry as I presented the pre-service teachers with the idea that perhaps it was not so much a teacher's job to tell parents what to do in their own homes with their own children, but to work at aligning school practices with those of students' home culture. One participant's journal reflected how this discussion got her thinking in new directions.

> There was one conversation in class when we were discussing poverty and if that affected a child's reading ability. You really got me thinking. At first I disagreed

> with you, but then you said that some do succeed, so what was different about what these children have. This is when I started thinking about it. Do we just have to work harder to find ways that these children can connect with reading? What are ways to help them catch up to others? I still struggle with believing that poverty has nothing to do with a child's success. If the child has trouble reading, I sometimes associate it with whether or not they get support at home. I also think that parents should be encouraged to read to their children and that it is okay if the teacher is the one to tell them to. (Journal 4)

While this participant was willing to accept the notion that school practice was in some ways limiting certain students' academic performance, she was unwilling to let parents off the hook. If a child were experiencing difficulty in learning to read, she still would look for reasons connected with the child's home as a source of the problem. She also felt teachers should tell parents that they needed to read with children. The underlying assumption here was that she presumed most parents were unaware that reading to their children was beneficial. Her comments also suggested her understanding of the power differential between parents and teachers. The implicit connotation was that teachers know what is best for children (more so than parents), and are obligated to share this knowledge with parents. Her wonderings in this journal made little allowance for reciprocal relationships between parents and teachers.

Following the performance party at the conclusion of tutoring, one participant had an opportunity to meet with her tutee's mother. In her final

interview, she talked about her assumptions about the mother and what she believed the mother was capable of doing in support of her son's education.

> Participant: Being a single mother, she also seemed like a person who thinks that they are great ideas, but probably won't implement – much of what I said because of time constraints. She seemed like a wonderful person. She really cares for her son, but I think a lot of his education is going to be done in the classroom because of her time constraints.
> Interviewer: Did you have assumptions about her before you met her? Like in your head – did you have any thoughts about what she would be like?
> Participant: Um – She was actually a bit more working class than I thought. Um – I pictured a person maybe like in an office – like a secretary or something. Just because (my tutee) – even though I mean you see his dress and his actions – he is obviously not upper class, but he is very mannerly and you don't often see that in lower class students.

This participant's assumptions about working class parents became evident in this excerpt. Even though her tutee's mother was responsive to her suggestions, this participant had little faith in any follow-up actions. Her surprise by the mother's appearance revealed her construction of what working class parents should look like. She assumed her tutee's mother would be more professional looking because the tutee's appearance was always neat, and his demeanor mannerly. It was unclear whether or not this participant was able to dismantle her construction of working class parents through this experience.

Descriptive statements about the tutee's home or family provided a glimpse of how a child's home life influenced participants' thinking about their

individual tutoring situation. One participant wrote in her fifth lesson plan/reflection,

> I found out his dad is remarried and (my tutee) feels very strongly that his dad doesn't like him because he has another child and never calls.

This participant recorded this information in her lesson plan reflection because she believed her tutee's feelings of insecurity about his relationship with his father might be affecting his behavior and his confidence, and that in turn might be affecting his reading process.

Sometimes participants' inquiry led to questions about the tutee's family. In one participant's third interview, wonderings about the influence of the parents' divorce on the tutee's behavior was discussed.

> I wonder what affects the divorce of his parents had on him. You know how that influences communication and why – usually only children are very talkative and outgoing because they have to find friends because they don't have brother and sisters to rely on for that – and so why as an only child is he such a quiet student? Also he - you – he really seems to enjoy time with his dad, but I don't think it is a big thing and I wonder the effects of that. I would love to see him in relationship with his dad. It was interesting to see him with his mom. That really seemed natural, but I'm kind of curious what he and his dad are like. And if maybe that is part of the reason why he has some especially shy tendencies toward myself – as a male adult.

This participant wondered about the father/son relationship. He was curious about how the parents' divorce may be affecting the tutee's ability to relate to other men. This participant also revealed an assumption about only

children. In this participant's experience, only children are talkative and outgoing because they don't have siblings on whom to rely. The assumption was then transferred to the tutee's situation as the participant tried to find reasons for the tutee's shyness rather than accepting his behavior as inherent in his nature.

Another participant also became curious about the role of the father in her tutee's life after her tutee asked to write a letter her father in Virginia. In the subsequent tutoring session, the tutee told the participant they would not be able write to her dad because her mother did not have the address. This sparked the participant's inquiry, which she discussed in her second interview.

> Participant: I'm curious about her home life and set up – I mean how that is obviously influencing her at school and her learning and what kind of – because I know her address - and um not to be nosy or anything, but I drive past it on my way home. The last time I was looking at the numbers trying to figure out which house it was. I didn't see it, but I saw the vicinity where she probably lives.
> Interviewer: And?
> Participant: I mean it is not a terrible part of town – poverty stricken. It is not the kind of street that people walk down in town, you know. Yeah, it is interesting. She has a younger brother. So they are pretty young and a single mom. She is there every day after school to pick her up – so she seems very involved, but you are always curious about – and she seems attached to her dad. Like that is who she initially wanted to write to when I suggested writing a letter. And then she came back the next session and said that no we don't have that address so we switched to her mom, but yeah.

This participant was curious enough to actually drive in the tutee's neighborhood and look for her house. While she tried not to be judgmental on

the surface, her comments as she described the neighborhood were clear – poverty stricken, young single mom, not the kind of street people walk down. She tried to balance these negative images by talking about how involved the mom was in her tutee's schooling.

One participant's second journal entry discussed her beliefs about the role culture played in a student's school experience. This entry followed a discussion in which I suggested perhaps teachers should spend more time building bridges between home and school culture and less energy telling parents what they should do in their own homes.

> During student teaching, we told a lot of parents that they should read to their children daily. They should not only read books, but they should cook and read recipes, read signs, and packaging at the grocery store. All of these experiences are part of normal life, not taking any extra time or energy, except for having to talk to their child a bit more. Is that too much to ask? If teachers want their students to be successful, why wouldn't they even suggest these things to parents?

The assumption here seems to be that parents do not typically talk to their children. There are assumptions, too, about "normal life." It is clear what this participant considered to be best practice not only for her classroom, but also for how her students should experience life outside of the classroom.

Another participant also discussed the role of culture in her seventh journal entry. Her concern was about differing values. Midwestern has had a significant shift in population demography over the last decade with an influx of

Mexican immigrants. As the population has become more diverse, Midwestern Public Schools have slowly begun to shift practice to be more accommodating, at least as far as English as a New Language is concerned. This participant would have been enrolled in Midwestern Public Schools and observed first hand the discongruence between her values and those of her Hispanic peers.

> No two people are alike and so every student is going to come to school with a different learning experience. The article went on to say that this needs to be considered when we teach students, that we need to be aware that many of our students aren't dumb, but that they learn differently from how we are used to teaching. Every culture has a different set of values. I think anyone that has taught in Midwestern will soon see how important family is to our Mexican community, including extended family. School is a whole family issue. Everyone is involved. Yet at the same time, in many of these same homes, school is considered as valuable for only so long. We seem to have a very high dropout rate and high teen pregnancy rate within our Mexican community here in Midwestern. Obviously these experiences are going to affect how a student gathers information at home, and will in turn affect how they will expect to gather information at school. I must also realize that I am a person from a traditional Mennonite home. Hard work has always been taught me, pushed upon me. This value is different from some people. I don't mean to say that Mexicans are lazy in any way, that's not my point. It's just a value that I know our church community is known for that I can use as an example.

The comments at the beginning of the quote seemed to indicate that this participant was cognizant of the role that cultural diversity played in the classroom. In this excerpt, she tried to bridge her own values to her perception of a population considered as 'othered' in her community. Her example of

believing strongly in working hard suggest an unease with a different cultural orientation and may be the beginning of her questioning in an area that will strongly influence her decision-making in the classroom.

Another participant was also concerned with discongruent home and school practices, but she tended to align herself with students at the expense of her future peer group. In her seventh journal entry she said,

> Teachers seem to have an excuse for every problem in the classroom. I realize teachers are highly scrutinized in the public eye, and I know I will want to defend myself for the work I do too. However, it's frustrating to me how teachers seem to always be able to find a scapegoat for problems in the classroom. Most often, blame is placed on the parents or home life of the student. During student teaching, this was always the case. Teachers meetings seemed to turn into ranting and raving sessions on the bad parenting in our society today. " Parents just don't…" while it is true that children are coming into our classrooms less and less prepared, this is not the sole reason why students are not seen as being successful in our classrooms…Middle-class white teachers best understand middle-class white students; thus they are held in higher esteem. It all relates to the fact that teachers are not knowledgeable about the child's home life and upbringing. Thus the transfer from home to school has not been a good fit and the students feel threatened and misunderstood. It is difficult to totally understand a culture different from your own; however, if we are to be good teachers, it is our duty to at least attempt to understand the different cultures of the student in our classroom.

This participant raised some interesting questions. What do teachers expect? The job should be easy? When teachers find tasks that kids are unable to do, where should they focus? Do they concentrate on what kids are unable to do

and complain about their students' limited abilities, or seize the opportunity for a teachable moment? If students already possess the knowledge to complete every task laid before them with minimal assistance – what is being taught? What is the point of teaching? While this participant was offended by the teachers' lounge talk during student teaching, the question is, will that sensitivity remain once she assumes the role of teacher? The ethos of many school campuses allows for the blaming of students and parents as acceptable discourse. As a pre-service teacher, this participant was idealistic about her intention to build bridges to students' homes. As an in-service teacher, we must wait and see whether she carries out this idealistic intention.

CONCLUSIONS ABOUT INQUIRING ABOUT RELATIONSHIPS

It is interesting that the inquiring about relationships category contained less than ten percent of the units generated in this study. While the participants' inquiry in this category showed an emerging sensitivity toward issues of diversity, it is possible that the limited number of instances of inquiry may be due in part to pre-service teachers' limited experience in working with children from diverse backgrounds. Wondering about their relationships with children from varied backgrounds can only emerge from experience in working with them.

Additionally, I found that the data did not confirm my initial expectation. At the onset of this study, I believed that participants' inquiry would initially

revolve around anxiety about getting to know their student and wondering whether they were liked; then move to a more comfortable place in which the relationship worked because of shared experiences; and then center around a feeling of loss at the end of tutoring. This was not confirmed by the data. Several of the participants struggled with their relationships throughout the tutoring clinic and all but one participant said that they felt little emotional connection at its conclusion.

Inquiring about Students

Inquiries in this category focused on participants' tutees and included raising questions, making assumptions, drawing conclusions, and describing.

Table 4.5 Inquiring about Students

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	45	38	30	113
Journals	1	1	3	5
Lesson Plans	11	6	15	32
Total units across time	57	45	48	150

Eighty percent of instances of inquiry for this category were generated from participants' interviews. Apparently participants were less inclined to share their wonderings about students through the more typical formats used in

methods courses (e.g. journals and lesson plans/reflections) than they were in a dialogic context with their professor. Instances of inquiry occurred fairly equally across the three time periods of the semester.

RAISING QUESTIONS ABOUT STUDENTS

Table 4.6 Raising Questions about Students

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	10	10	8	28
Journals	0	0	2	2
Lesson Plans	1	0	1	2
Total units across time	11	10	11	32

Participants expressed their curiosities, puzzlements, and wonderings about their tutees' behaviors and processing, and raised some questions about kids in general. Instances of inquiry on this topic were generated from all three data sources and occurred in all three time periods. All participants contributed instances of inquiry on this topic; however, three participants produced only a few units (2-3 units), while the remaining three participants contributed considerably more responses (6,8, and 10 units).

Some of the participants' questions were about student behaviors. The following participant's observations during sessions led to her concern about her tutee's rushing through texts at the expense of his decoding and fluency.

> I wonder why he rushes through everything so fast and why he tries to read so quickly. Like why does he think like speed equals fluency or correct reading. Who gave him that impression and whoever they are – that's really stupid. Um – so I wonder about that. (Interview 3)

She not only questioned the tutee's behavior, but also who was responsible for sending him messages that were affecting his reading process.

Some participants questioned their tutee's social behaviors as in the following example.

> Socially – like what is going to happen? He just doesn't seem like he is going to keep a lot of friends because he is always just moody.

This kind of questioning seemed to indicate a questioning of the whole child. Not only was this participant concerned about her tutee in the tutoring context, she wondered how his social behavior would influence his life outside of academics. This tutee's emotional meltdowns during tutoring were leading this participant to wonder about her tutee's ability to maintain positive social interactions and sustain friendships.

Several participants also questioned their tutee's reading history. Participants alluded to the fact that they could never know their tutees as well as tutees' classroom teachers. In some respects, this was true. Classroom teachers had more shared experiences with the tutees. However, rarely do classroom teachers spend time intentionally focused on one student in isolation twice a week for nine weeks. Participants wanted pieces of the puzzle filled in and many

thought that if they knew what was going on in the classroom and in their tutee's previous learning experiences, they would be better equipped to serve the needs of their tutee.

> Participant 1: I would still like to know more about stuff she's worked on and level she can read at.
>
> Participant 2: I think we are always curious about a student's reading history – I mean – um – you wonder what he's done to get him to where he is at – or what he should have been doing. That kind of thing, but we don't – he is doing OK.

The excerpt from Participant 1 was taken from her first interview. Perhaps she was still questioning her focus with her tutee. This participant wished for clues from the classroom to help her think about what would best meet her tutee's needs. Participant 2's excerpt came from the third interview. Her interest in knowing her tutee's reading history was not so much about helping her focus her instruction, but more to satisfy her curiosity about what had happened in the past that had contributed to her tutee's reading difficulties.

MAKING ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT STUDENTS

Table 4.7 Making Assumptions about Students

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	4	2	8	14
Journals	1	1	1	3
Lesson Plans	0	0	0	0
Total units across time	5	3	9	17

Participants observed their tutees and interpreted their observations in terms of their beliefs about students and teaching. Units were generated almost equally across participants, but most were produced toward the end of tutoring. Most instances of inquiry were generated from participant interviews with only a few produced from participant journals, and none from lesson plans/reflections.

All participants came to the tutoring clinic with assumptions about struggling readers. The (dis)congruence between what they believed to be true and what they were experiencing triggered participants' inquiry. At the conclusion of tutoring, one participant found her assumptions needed modification because she no longer believed her original characterization of struggling readers to be true.

> I think before – I was thinking that struggling reader meant that they just didn't know letters and sounds. I think that is what a lot of people assume.

Coming into the tutoring clinic, this participant had a somewhat simplistic, skills-oriented view of a struggling reader. She had never considered the complexity of factors that could contribute to a child's difficulty in learning to read. Experience in the tutoring clinic, as well as participation in the Reading Problems course, allowed this participant to construct a different picture of struggling readers.

Some participants' assumptions were confirmed by their tutoring experience. One participant struggled with labels over the entire semester. Some of this stemmed from her personal experience of being labeled "at-risk " and living with the stigma. This participant held the belief at the beginning of tutoring that all struggling readers were normal students who just needed more time or an alternate instructional approach. When in the third interview I asked how her tutee had influenced her thinking, this participant responded,

> They (struggling readers) are normal kids. That they are not weird or – not that I thought they would be weird or stupid at all, but just – that he is a normal guy and he just needs added – he just needed a little more attention and a little bit more encouragement and um – direction – and time.

This participant's tutee confirmed her belief that struggling readers did not need labels, but just a little more time and attention.

Some participants' talk revealed how their assumptions about students changed. At the beginning of tutoring the following participant believed that struggling readers would come with no skills, but she left tutoring with the understanding that all students have strengths and challenges. In her third interview, she stated,

> Well like I was expecting that struggling readers would have no concepts of print, but they do (passionately)! They just aren't the best at it. So I think all struggling readers are proficient a little bit – they just need a little boost – a little more. So – not coming into it assuming that they can't do anything – that they are totally dumb – because they are not.

Coming into tutoring with a rather simplistic construction of what a struggling reader looked like, this participant believed that struggling readers basically had no skills at all – somewhat reminiscent of the blank slate. This assumption would indicate that all a teacher would need to do is present the skills to the child. This view does not account for diversity, nor does it examine the interconnectedness and complexity of the factors that could be contributing to a child's difficulty. While this participant no longer believed that struggling readers came with no skills, she indicated that it was the teacher's job to identify a child's needs and to present that information in an accessible form or in her words – "a boost." This view of teaching, suggests her belief that it is the teacher's responsibility to present the information in a way that is most accessible

to the students, rather than that the students need to accommodate to the teacher's instructional approach.

Another participant believed the difficulty struggling readers faced stemmed from a lack of confidence. This participant understood her role to be that of a coach. She assumed all struggling readers needed encouragement and positive affirmation first and foremost. When the student felt confident, s/he would no longer struggle with his/her reading process. Her tutee, however, dismantled this construction of struggling readers.

> Participant: I thought tutoring was – it was more confidence building and that for some reason I thought this really shy kind of person like just
> Interviewer: You assumed you be with someone who was really shy?
> Participant: Right and they would try to read and they would struggle and I would be like – OK let's look at it again kind of thing.
> Interviewer: And that so was not your experience?
> Participant: Right. (Laughing) Not all struggling readers are quiet and passive.

This participant's experience with her tutee forced her to re-examine her construction of struggling readers, as well as her role as a teacher of struggling readers. The role of a coach and encourager sometimes is the approach needed with particular students. However, her tutoring experience caused this participant to understand that her role must be dictated by her student's needs, rather than by her preconceptions.

Table 4.8 Drawing Conclusions about Students

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	4	4	5	13
Journals	0	0	0	0
Lesson Plans	1	0	0	1
Total units across time	5	4	5	14

Instances of inquiry in this category were based on multiple participant observations occurring over a period of time, thus allowing the participants to draw specific conclusions about their tutees. Units on this topic were generated fairly equally across the three time periods. Almost all units were generated from participant interviews, with only one unit emerging from a lesson plan/reflection, and none from journal entries.

Participants drew conclusions about their tutee's progress. Based on her observations after multiple sessions with her tutee, the following participant was able to see progress in her tutee's abilities, a view confirmed by her tutee's classroom teacher. These pieces helped this participant to draw general conclusions about the progress yielded by her tutoring.

> I mean - I know this isn't going to happen with every kid I work with, but with my tutee – he has shown tremendous progress and his teacher said that his reading level has just jumped significantly and uh I can see that too. He has

> become more expressive just as a person outside of his reading as well. That has been fun to see. (Interview 3)

This participant discussed her tutee's progress in terms of his reading level growth, as well as his expressive communication. How she was attempting to measure this growth was unclear. As their tutoring relationship became more comfortable, it would seem that the tutee would be more willing to open up to the participant. Did she believe that this comfortableness was evidence of increasing the tutee's expressive language?

Participants also drew conclusions about their tutee's behavior. One tutee's indifference toward tutoring was always something his tutor was thinking about. In this excerpt of her second interview, the participant posited reasons for the conclusions she had drawn about her tutee's behavior.

> Sometimes it's just kind of – like he comes from tutoring straight from school and I think that kind of wears on him. And then like I don't know if he really sees me <u>like something fun</u> (laughing) to go to or like another something else that he has to do.

Difficult tutoring relationships tended to compel participants to draw conclusions concerning reasons for the tutee's behavior that were often outside of their control. In this example, the participant believed culpability lay within the tutoring framework. Her tutee's participation in the regular school day rendered him unable to engage appropriately during tutoring. While this could be at least partly true, putting energy into possible solutions within this participant's realm of control would most likely have served her and her tutee better.

DESCRIBING STUDENTS

Descriptions fell into two categories: academic and behavioral.

Academic	Behavioral
• Observed strategies and or skills used by the tutee. • Statements about a tutee's reading behavior • Attempted instructional approaches in relation to a tutee's academic performance	• Tutee's interests • Tutee's actions • Tutee's motivation • Tutee's willingness/ unwillingness to participate

Table 4.9Describing Students

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	27	22	9	58
Journals	0	0	0	0
Lesson Plans	9	6	14	29
Total units across time	36	28	23	87

All participants generated instances of inquiry on this topic. Interviews produced the most units followed by lesson plans/reflections. Journal entries contributed no units. Units were generated across the time span of all three

interviews and across all lesson/plans reflections. The reliance on description in the participants' talk may partly be due to the fact that in trying to help them secure data for their case reports, I reminded them that the more details they recorded on their plans, the easier it would be to write their case report. In retrospect, I believe I was overzealous in my quest for description to the detriment of their reflection and wondering.

As one would expect in a tutoring situation where pre-service teachers were required to connect instruction to specific observations of their tutee's reading process, many participants described academic behaviors. One participant commented not only on her tutee's reading behavior, but also on the responsibility level her tutee displayed for his reading process.

> Every once in awhile I will pick out a word in the text where you know he stumbles over the decoding so I don't think he knows the word and I'll ask him, "So what does that mean?" And sometimes he gets it and sometimes he doesn't and uh but he still unless I say something he won't pick them out. And uh I'm not sure why? (Interview 1)

This participant's questioning allowed her to think about her own instruction – when to intervene and when not to, but also required her to examine the possibility that if she lets it go, her tutee may never tell her when he does not understand. This participant was ready to recognize the dilemma, but was unsure of the cause of her tutee's passivity.

Not all descriptions focused on academics. Early on, one participant understood that motivation was an issue for her tutee, and that it would be

necessary to create sessions that were highly engaging. This participant chose to use a Language Experience Approach strategy during one of her sessions because she believed the hands-on nature of the approach would capture her tutee's interest. In her eighth lesson plan/reflection, this participant recorded,

> She didn't seem motivated by LEA (Language Experience Approach). She went through the motions, but relied on my prompting. I don't know what it is going to take.

This participant's description of her tutee's behavior indicated that she was unsuccessful in engaging her tutee as she had hoped. The participant's frustration seemed evident in her last sentence: Instead of positing a new approach for their next session, she indicated she had no idea what direction she should pursue.

Often descriptions of tutees' behaviors led tutors to posit explanations for them. In the following examples, two participants described behaviors that they observed during their tutoring sessions and hypothesized reasons for these behaviors.

> Sometimes she has this puzzled look on her face like I can't tell if she is really concentrating on something or if she is so confused, but she is not confused because she knows what is going on, but it is like a constant like when she is writing she looks like that and when I'm reading to her, she looks like that. She just has this intense look and I should take it as a good sign like she is really paying attention. (Participant 1 - Interview 2)

> He is very active, but I think he was hyper because he was uncomfortable (Participant 2 - Lesson Plan/Reflection 3)

These examples show the reciprocal relationship often displayed between observation and inquiry. Inquiry is born out of what they see; what they believe to be true. Inquiry then leads them to begin to question the why behind their observation.

CONCLUSIONS ABOUT INQUIRING ABOUT STUDENTS

An interesting pattern evident in the data was what seemed to be a disconnect between some participants' inquiry and their practice. For example, one participant only checked her tutee's comprehension after he had read out loud to her during their tutoring sessions.

> I wonder how much he comprehends like when I read aloud or when he is reading silently –like when he takes books home – how much is he actually getting out of these books? Is he getting a lot of practice reading silently because it didn't seem like he was doing well.

After I suggested she should consider doing some silent reading work, she began rethinking what she knew about her tutee's comprehension capabilities, and what she believed about helpful instructional practice. However, her questioning was not influencing her planning. Without outside reinforcement, in this case, the professor, this participant seemed disinterested in pursuing her questions. The kinds of questions this participant posited could have prompted her to examine her tutee's comprehension through the use of various reading

approaches. Why was there no apparent bridge between her questioning and her actions?

Another example of a participant's inability to connect inquiry with action can be found in the following excerpt. This participant knew her tutee did not enjoy writing and so for the most part she avoided including writing activities in their sessions, a decision she seemed to regret at the conclusion of tutoring. During her final interview, this participant voiced her wondering and discussed her feelings about her tutee's dislike for writing.

> I wonder why he really dislikes writing or why – well I mean he told me that the reason he doesn't like to write is because he is afraid that he will get something wrong. He's got these preset notions that everything has to be correct and fast and perfect and that is kind of sad because he doesn't get to explore and experiment and do it for himself. I don't know.

Although this participant felt sadness that her tutee did not get a chance "to explore and experiment" with his writing, she did not provide the kind of safe environment for him to do just that. This participant was aware of the need, was able to think about questions in relation to the problem, but her inquiry did not spur her on to action. Perhaps she believed she was pursuing other more pressing needs during the tutoring clinic, but her "I don't know" seemed to be an indication of regret that she had avoided action.

Throughout the data, participants' wondering about students seemed to be natural, however they often felt at a loss as to how to use their inquiry to further

their knowledge and/or practice. Providing tools and settings in which pre-service teachers can safely explore their own questions may be an important component in teacher education programs.

Inquiring about Teaching

Inquiries in this category focused on classroom practice and included questioning from three different perspectives: as teacher, as student, as tutor. The context of the tutoring clinic seemed to provoke participants' inquiry into classroom teaching practice. The hope for pre-service teachers' field experiences was to provide opportunities to put the theory they were learning into practice. Successful tutoring of one student provided an opportunity for pre-service teachers to practice effective research-based approaches as well as to learn from studying a child's reading process in-depth. These experiences should also be translatable into classroom practice.

INQUIRING AS TEACHER

When participants inquired from a teacher perspective they seemed to be taking on the role of professional inquiring beyond the context of their current tutoring experience. Inquiries in this category focused on classroom management and organization, differentiation, school and teachers' practice, and reading beliefs and reading instruction.

Table 4.10 Inquiring as Teacher

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	18	38	36	92
Journals	36	21	31	88
Lesson Plans	0	0	0	0
Total units across time	54	59	67	180

Questioning Classroom Management and Organization

Table 4.11 Questioning Classroom Management and Organization

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	0	4	1	5
Journals	8	2	9	19
Lesson Plans	0	0	0	0
Total units across time	8	6	10	24

Participants were thinking about how they might organize and manage their future classrooms and/or instruction. A total of 24 inquiry instances focused on classroom management and organization. All of these were generated from participant interviews (5 units) and journal entries (19 units), with no lesson plans/ reflections producing any units. Clearly the lesson plans/reflections were tied to the immediate tutoring context and did not invite speculation about classroom practice beyond the current tutoring experience. Journals generated

the most instances of inquiry about this theme with eight units coming from the beginning of tutoring, and then nine units at the end. The second interview produced the four instances of inquiry on this theme. This theme encompassed thirteen percent of the instances of inquiry represented in the inquiring as teacher category.

The issue of grouping generated instances of inquiry for many of the participants. In one participant's last journal entry, she discussed how she still felt confused about how to effectively group students for instruction.

> Grouping is a hard one for me. They (Cunningham and Allington, 1999) pulled out all the important points for and against grouping and I still can't figure out what to think. It is totally situational, I think. And for a beginning teacher, it is hard for me to know how to go about designing a reading program so that I can be completely helpful and not at all hurtful. Maybe that just isn't possible. I guess I'll just have to learn.

Although this participant still felt puzzled about grouping, she came to understand the importance of context as indicated by her belief that grouping was situational. She recognized that in relation to grouping there would be overlap and messiness. Clear answers and procedures would not be applicable in all situations, she would have to look to the students to provide answers for her inquiries about grouping.

Trying to figure out how to manage guided reading groups was also a common inquiry. One participant, in her second interview, discussed her wondering about to how to organize her reading program in a way that would

allow for the maximum engagement of all children including those children who were working independently. She wondered how she was going to carve out extra time in her day to meet with struggling readers.

> Participant: I mean the time – like how am I going to meet with them and keep everyone else going?
> Interviewer: So what do you think you will do?
> Participant: I don't know. Um. Um. (10-second pause) Maybe – because we (student teaching classroom) had DEAR (Drop Everything and Read) time, I could use that as one-on-one. I mean still have it be DEAR time for them, but with me. You know - kind of switch off days with me.

This participant posed a strategy for working with the struggling readers in her future classroom, but only after a considerable pause. Does this participant believe DEAR time to be a workable possibility? Or did she feel compelled to provide an answer because her professor asked her? While tutoring provoked her questioning of how to meet the needs of struggling readers in her future classroom, without the context of an actual classroom, this participant seemed to have difficulty thinking about possible options. This participant's discussion also illustrated the connection between management and time. She discovered how the organization of her classroom agenda affected the kind of time she could devote to differentiated instruction.

Questioning Differentiation

Table 4.12 Questioning Differentiation

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	2	4	8	14
Journals	5	0	0	5
Lesson Plans	0	0	0	0
Total units across time	7	4	8	19

This theme encompassed 19 instances of inquiry, eleven percent of the total units (180) in the inquiring as teacher category. This theme specifically addressed participants' inquiries and concerns about how to meet the individual needs of the students they serve. Instances of inquiry about this theme were generated exclusively from participant interviews and journal entries, with no lesson plans/reflections producing any units, again supporting the close tie of the lesson plans/reflections to the immediate tutoring context. Across time, each interview produced more instances of inquiry than the previous interview (2, 4,8 units). Journal entries generated instances of inquiry only at the beginning of the semester.

Participants wondered how they would be able to meet the needs of all their students. In her second interview, one participant expressed her thinking

about differentiated instruction, thinking that had been sparked in a practicum context from another course in which she was enrolled.

> I think just – you know – just meeting the needs of all students. Like I struggle with that now in my practicum. Like part of me wants to spend a lot more time with them because they are lower and I feel like I need to get them up to like average, but part of me wants to – hopefully I will be at a school where I can do some things - grouping and some sort of collaborative – reading – guided reading so I can like group them – I think that would be a good thing. But – just also when you teach the whole class – where do you aim? Yeah that's just my biggest thing. Like where do I put the energy in? Not necessarily about teaching them – I don't really have any specific worries or wonders about that.

First, I find it interesting that this participant equated worries with wonderings. Manipulating teacher worries into wonderings seems like a constructive way to use what concerns us most to inform our practice. The interview question that initiated this response was, "What puzzles you most right now?" I expected the participant to share a puzzlement related to the tutoring context. At this point, emerging from her middle school practicum, she was much more interested in questioning the practical issues related to differentiated instruction. While she indicated that she felt confident about teaching the material, she felt far less confident about deciding how to individualize her instruction to best meet the needs of all her students. Unsure of how to organize her instruction to differentiate was leaving her torn about where to focus her instructional attention, and toward whom.

In her second interview, one participant discussed how the tutoring context and her student teaching context caused her to wonder about differentiated instruction.

> Participant: I wasn't nervous to teach, but I was always on edge kind of like am I doing this right – am I reading the right stuff and now I kind of feel like I know what I am doing and it is one child compared to twenty some so I just feel so much more better prepared.
> Interviewer: So when it was twenty kids, what did you wonder about? Were they different kinds of questions?
> Participant: Yeah, because now I can focus on my tutee and when there were twenty kids, you were always hoping that they were all kind of paying attention and that you were at least reaching some of them.

This participant felt much more confident in addressing the needs of one student than she did the whole class during student teaching. It seemed as if classroom management caused her the most concern when working in whole class situations. Whereas when working with one student during tutoring, there was little need to manage her tutee's behavior, and she could focus solely on instruction. The link between classroom management and differentiation was distinctly illustrated in this excerpt.

Participants not only struggled with questions related to managing differentiation, but also with determining the value of differentiated instruction. In her last interview, one participant discussed how she felt that the most influential aspect of participating in the tutoring clinic was learning the importance of differentiation.

Interviewer: What do you think has been most valuable for you from this experience?

Participant: I think just realizing the importance of more time and more differentiated instruction probably. Even if they are on the same level, they could have completely different weaknesses. That just because they are on Level B doesn't mean that they all struggle with a certain skill. That it could be completely different things.

Interviewer: Are there other kinds of questions that you've been thinking about?

Participant: Besides how in the world do you do that?

Participant and Interviewer: (laughing)

Participant: I can do it with one kid fine, but when you get twenty-some in a room and yeah it just seems overwhelming.

Interviewer: But do you think it is possible?

Participant: It is possible because I've seen people do it, but they've also been teaching for like forty years.

Interviewer: So are you thinking – can you think about it in smaller ways?

Participant: I haven't yet, but I'm sure I will once – I haven't really been thinking about it.

Clearly this participant saw value in differentiating instruction, but was concerned about how to actually achieve it. She seemed unable to think concretely about the steps she would take to differentiate instruction without the context of an actual classroom. Her inquiry was provoked during the study, but tabling her questioning for when she became a classroom teacher seemed to be sensible for the time being.

Questioning School and/or Teacher Practices

Table 4.13 Questioning School and/or Teacher Practices

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	4	1	1	6
Journals	13	4	18	35
Lesson Plans	0	0	0	0
Total units across time	17	5	19	41

This theme included instances of inquiry related to general beliefs and observations about classroom teachers, and questioning school practices in terms of issues of equity and efficiency. This theme contained twenty-three percent (41 units) of the instances of inquiry in the inquiring as teacher category. Instances of inquiry on this theme were generated across all participant interviews and journal entries. The first and last journals reflected this topic more frequently than any of the data sources (13, 18 units). No lesson plans/reflections contributed any instances of inquiry on this theme suggesting once again the close tie between the lesson plans/reflections and the immediate tutoring context. It is interesting to note that instances of inquiry emerged primarily from journal entries. Much of the readings assigned in the Reading Problems course looked to broadening issues toward school and classroom teacher practices. This may

account for participants' recording of their thinking about these issues in their dialog journals.

School practices such as bilingual education provoked many participants' inquiry. One participant, in her seventh journal entry, tried to situate her feelings on bilingual education.

> I don't know where I stand on bilingual education. I am all for recognizing the importance of and including other languages in the classroom. I'm just not sure how you decide which languages are important enough to be taught. In Midwestern, Spanish is obviously the most predominate second language, but I still couldn't justify teaching bilingually in Midwestern schools. What about the Russian-Americans? The Asian Americans? Where do you draw the line? I suppose in certain geographic areas, it would be pretty obvious which languages were appropriate to teach. I am 100% in agreement with the theories behind bilingual education. I think ethnocentrism is a huge problem in the country, and I don't want The United States to become a melting pot. No one can argue with the fact that the US continues to be more diverse, and I want our differences to be celebrated. I would love to experience working in a bilingual Spanish-English school some day. I love the idea of native English-speakers learning a new language right along with the Spanish-speakers. But I also see some logistic problems.

This participant questioned the equity in the current practice of bilingual education. While she seemed to advocate for a true bilingual program - one with a dual language approach, rather than making every language other than English into a second, less dominant language - she still questioned how that would actually work in practice. Her thinking in this excerpt was grounded in the theory that ethnocentrism was wrong and served to exclude rather than embrace

diversity. In theory, she embraced dual language programs, but in practice she still questioned the logistics of such programs.

The school practice of retention sparked much inquiry in the Reading Problems class. While most students in the course generally believed that retention did not work for most children, a few had very strong opinions to the contrary, believing it acceptable practice to retain students who did not reach a mandated standard by a mandated date. After reading a chapter in *Classrooms that Work* (Cunningham & Allington, 1999) for class, one participant used her first dialog journal entry to record her thinking about the school practice of retention.

> I was glad to see another study about how retention does not help a child. It was interesting to read that tutoring or summer school is less expensive than retention. I don't see why more schools don't resort to that instead. I can understand how students might see it as a punishment, but had never thought of it that way. I agree that all measures should be taken before retaining a child.

This excerpt suggested that the participant questioned the school practice of retention and used the reading to gather alternatives in support of her belief that retention should be less commonly used for struggling students. While this participant believed retention to be an ineffective approach, she seemed to have grounded this more in her experience than in theory. She seemed genuinely surprised by alternatives to retention, as well as by students' perception of retention as punishment.

Questioning the pervasiveness of old practices also initiated instances of inquiry. In one participant's first journal entry, she questioned why so many old solutions are omnipresent in so many of our schools.

> In the survey you dispersed at the beginning of the semester, I asked about the controversy over what is the most important aspect of reading/learning to read. I questioned several of the methods that Cunningham and Allington (1999) shot down. I had to laugh, because they introduced – phonics, retention, tracking, etc. – as 'old' solutions that were introduced years ago. Then, why are so many of these methods still around and very real in our classrooms? Obviously, no one has still found the right answers it seems.

At the heart of this inquiry beat the sound of this participant's underlying assumption that right answers are possible and desirable. As this participant shifted through her beliefs trying to critically consume what others have written, she had difficulty understanding how old solutions could still be practiced once research established the practices as obsolete.

Questioning Reading Beliefs and Reading Instruction

Table 4.14 Questioning Reading Beliefs and Reading Instruction

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	12	29	26	67
Journals	12	14	3	29
Lesson Plans	0	0	0	0
Total units	24	43	29	96

across time				

This theme included instances of inquiry regarding participants' beliefs about reading and reading instruction (96 units total) and accounted for more than half (53%) of all the inquiries in the inquiring-as-teacher category. Perhaps this is not surprising given that these inquiries were generated within a course and tutoring experience that focused explicitly on reading instruction. Discussion included statements about specific reading programs, instructional approaches, and learning theories. Again the inquiries came only from participant interviews (67 units) and journals (29 units). The second and third interview produced more instances of inquiry than the first interview (12 first interview, 29 second interview, 26 third interview). Instances of inquiry from journals increased in frequency toward the middle of the semester and were less at the beginning and the end of the semester.

For some participants, this course was the first time they were required to articulate their beliefs about reading. Never having put much thought into her beliefs about reading before, one participant tended to be more preoccupied with the accumulation of practical ideas and techniques to use in the classroom.

> So what beliefs have I formed about reading? Up until this point in my educational career, I hadn't really thought about reading beliefs at an in-depth level much. I've always just thought about general teaching techniques and how those might apply in a number of different areas. I guess I still feel the same in some ways, but every time that I get more experience, I see that every subject is just

> as unique as the students that I teach and must be treated thusly. Reading seems to be so much more technical than I ever assumed. I had always thought that it was just a natural thing - like talking. (Journal Entry 4)

This raises the question of what best equips teachers. Are pre-service teachers better prepared by establishing a well thought-through theoretical framework on which they can base their practice? Or are they better prepared for the classroom by gathering a variety of teaching tools? This participant was more interested in acquiring tools for her teaching belt, than she was in examining her beliefs. However, gathering tools does not help a teacher know what tool to pick when, nor does it address the quality of tool selection.

Reading programs were also a source of inquiry. Most of this questioning focused on the kinds of reading programs adopted by the schools in which participants had done their student teaching. Based primarily on her experience using the newly adopted Scott Foresman basal series during student teaching, one participant described her love/hate relationship with basal reading programs.

> I hated them (basals), but I really loved them because they gave me so much material and then I could decide how I wanted to use it. And there was a lot of opportunity to bring other books into the curriculum - like they gave you suggestions of books -like trade books - that you could have read and connect then to what they were doing. (Interview 2)

The ease and accessibility of the basals were very attractive to this participant, as was the organization. She liked the basals because she found it easy to make connections across materials. All of this participant's comments in

this excerpt were materials-related: basals helped her gather materials; basals helped her make connections across materials. There are no references to students, to how basals aided her in planning for her students' individual needs. Will her inquiry widen to include questioning whether basals assist her in making connections to her students, as well as to other materials?

Participants also discussed some of their beliefs about successful reading instruction. One participant in her fourth journal entry wrote about her belief in the importance of reading outside of the classroom.

> I believe that students need to read outside the classroom. Some may disagree with me about my feeling that this is a necessity, but I maintain the argument. If students don't begin to read outside the classroom on a regular basis, they do not form the habits that they may need to be successful adults. No matter how much time we spend reading in the classroom, certain types of reading may just not happen. I know it is my job to as much as I can to help every student, but they must use their time as well. I also want to create life long learners. To do this, I think that I must show them how to be students away from school as well. Kids need to be kids, but kids need to be prepared gradually to become adults.

This participant seemed to believe that it was impossible to meet all of a student's reading needs within the context of a classroom reading program and in order to compensate, she would require students to read outside of the classroom. The point that was unclear from this excerpt was how requiring recreational reading would help develop lifetime learners.

Beyond sharing a belief about reading instruction, this excerpt expressed the underlying belief that school was primarily preparation for adulthood. This

participant apparently believed that adults should read recreationally; therefore if students were required to read recreationally, they would form habits that would last throughout their lifetime. Is this a correlation grounded in theory, or is this participant working from a set of assumptions arising from her experience?

Conclusions about Inquiring as Teachers

One interesting pattern that emerged from the inquiring-as-teacher theme was that participants eagerly voiced their objections to a variety of classroom and school practices. It will be interesting to see which, if any, they actively seek to change as professionals.

Another interesting finding was that participants were often able to articulate inquiries, but found it difficult to struggle with their questionings without a concrete classroom context. As this was their last semester, thinking about getting their first teaching job initiated many inquiries, but most participants seemed to wish to postpone answering their questions until they were actual teachers in actual classrooms. Many questions about teaching were related to particular situations, e.g., particular grade levels, student populations, school ethos, administrative mandates.

A third interesting finding was that across the time of the study, participants' inquiries about classroom and school practices increased. This seemed to suggest that as they approached the possibility of actually being the

teacher, their inquiries about teaching became more predominant in their thinking.

Also interesting is the fact that none of the instances of inquiry for the inquiring-as-teacher category were generated from participants' lesson plans/reflections. Out of the 180 total units, 92 were from interviews and 88 from journal entries. This seems to point to the impact that the response format has on student responses. Participants did inquire as teachers beyond their immediate situation, but they did not do it in their lesson plan/reflections, which they understood to be reflections about their tutoring experience. The frame of the response did not invite participants to respond beyond the present context.

INQUIRING AS STUDENTS

While participants eagerly awaited their transition from student to teacher, they all were still undergraduates enrolled in a reading methods course and many of their inquiries were from this perspective, expressed within this role. As students, they questioned the authors whose works they read, they reflected on their own thinking, they connected their thinking to their own school experience and to their student teaching experience, and they questioned their own knowledge and performance.

Table 4.15 Inquiring as Students

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	43	39	11	93
Journals	27	44	10	81
Lesson Plans	0	2	1	3
Total units across time	80	85	22	177

All but three of the instances of inquiry in this role were generated from participant interviews (93), followed by dialog journals (81), which may suggest that participants were most likely to engage in inquiry as students in interactions with a more knowledgeable other than alone (as in lesson plan/reflections). Instances of inquiry were more prevalent at the beginning of the semester than at the end, the reverse pattern in the teacher role, where participant inquiries increased over the time periods of the study. Also since this semester was the last in the participants' college careers, they may have become increasingly interested in focusing their inquiry on securing a job.

Questioning the Author

Table 4.16 Questioning the Author

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	0	0	0	0
Journals	3	15	3	21
Lesson Plans	0	0	0	0
Total units across time	3	15	3	21

Assigned readings in the Reading Problems course sparked some participants' inquiry: they questioned what they believed about an author's presented idea and/or they questioned their comprehension of the assigned material. The 21 instances of inquiry for Questioning the Author were all generated from participants' journals. They were most frequent in the middle of the semester (15 units) and less frequent at the beginning and the end of the semester.

All participants contributed instances of questioning the author except for one. However, two participants contributed only one instance each in this category. This was interesting because these three participants tended to be very open to questioning their own practice, yet they shied away from questioning

others'. The three participants who contributed more instances of inquiry on this topic tended to question outside factors rather than their own practice throughout the study, so it might stand to reason that these three participants would be more likely to question the authority of the author and/or study, especially when the content of the reading ran counter to their beliefs.

Some of participants' questioning was motivated by confusion over details or an inability to comprehend the author's point of view. One participant's questioning in a journal entry was very specific. As she read the study (Wiesdendanger & Bader, 1987) on how to teach easily confused words, she questioned specific practices and implementation procedures.

> One question I had while reading the article was what happened in the first group if more than one word was confused with the target word. Does the teacher go over every word confused, or do they decide on which word to compare? If so, how do they decide; is it the first word that happens to be confused? It seems as if it would not be fair to only teach one of the confused words, if other students were having trouble with other non-target words. I understand that the teacher cannot and should not teach more than two words at a time, but how is that fair to the other students?

This questioning revealed the participant was reading this article critically, pushing for clarity on items she felt were not clearly addressed in the article. She seemed very concerned about the fairness and equity of this approach. Who she was thinking this might not be fair for however is not explored. Her last questions suggest that she assumed that this was a whole-class

approach rather than small group or individual. Since the article was basing target words on individual miscues, it is unclear why she drew the conclusion that it was based on whole group instruction. Perhaps her reading was being influenced by her student teaching and field experiences thus far.

Some participants challenged the authors' presented ideas when they conflicted with their own beliefs about learning. One participant wrote in her journal,

> First, Cunningham and Allington are right in saying that we have a lot of intrusive breaks in our schedule. However, they said that we should try to avoid a lot of this as it wastes instructional time. To this point, I'm not sure that I do agree. Students in elementary schools that I have seen have trouble concentrating on anything for too long. Just as I need to take breaks when writing papers or reading text material. We may have more instructional time without these breaks, but will the students be able to constructively use these massive blocks of time without some outside stimuli? I don't feel that nearly all of them can. I like the schedule that was proposed in the book to some extent. I don't think however, that the 200+ minute block could ever be used as such in a completely productive manner. One other problem I had with the schedule is that it didn't allow for much social time, or recess. Many of today's youth are lacking in social skills, which causes some of their classroom struggles. They can't cooperate in groups because they don't have to outside of school; they simply go home and play computer games by themselves or go to a babysitter's house and watch TV. I think it is very important to include recess in the day's schedule as a break for students and a time where they learn how to work as a team and how to lead a group in activities like soccer and tag.

This reading seemed to challenge the following two beliefs of this participant: 1) students cannot maintain their attention without frequent breaks, and 2) social interaction should be highly valued and provided through unstructured breaks. Both of these beliefs seemed to center around the conflict between the authors' understanding of planning instructional time and the participant's. The authors advocated that teachers allow for fewer interruptions in order to maximize their instructional time. They also suggested including a variety of activities within the instructional timeframe, allowing for the active engagement of students. This participant seemed to be referring to a more traditional, sit in your seat, kind of approach, which would be difficult to maintain in a two hundred minute block of time for any student. As for social engagement, the authors clearly believed that learning was a socially constructed event and advocated that instruction should be planned from a sociolinguistic approach. The participant seemed to believe that learning was separate from social interaction and that although social skills should be valued, they should be informally practiced through recess opportunities rather than within the classroom.

Reflecting on Their Own Thinking

Table 4.17 Reflecting on Their Own Thinking

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	9	3	7	19
Journals	5	16	4	25
Lesson Plans	0	0	0	0
Total units across time	14	19	11	44

Throughout this study, participants seemed to question their own thinking. Participants shared not only what they were thinking about over the course of the semester, but also how their thinking had changed and influences affecting these changes. The data also included participants' discussion of their own learning process, and then how that influenced their practice.

Instances of inquiry on this topic were generated across both participant interviews (19 units) and journals (25 units). These inquiries were most prevalent in the middle of the semester (in the second interview and the fourth journal entry). No units were produced in lesson plans/reflections.

One participant said her thinking about struggling readers was changed by her participation in the Reading Problems course. During her third interview, this participant said,

> Participant: I guess that I just look at it like everybody is a struggling reader. Everybody is learning.
> Interviewer: That's a good point.

> Participant: They are all just at different points.
> Interviewer: Did you think that before this?
> Participant: Well – (3 second pause). No I did think that there were like kids that were separate – like these are the low kids.
> Interviewer: Well that sounds like a big influence – that it is just like everybody is at a different point.
> Participant: That's true. That's true. I never thought about it – because I never viewed my tutee as like struggling. It was just kind of like you know – she needs, but so does Mr. Smarty-Pants over there - you know.

This seemed to be an *ah-ha* moment for the participant. This understanding seemed to evolve during her experience with her tutee, an experience that transformed her thinking about struggling readers from a sorting perspective to that of a continuum. This participant had difficulty in isolating goals for her work in the tutoring clinic, but her struggle seemed to have served her well in the development of her portrait of struggling readers.

Sometimes participants talked about their own processing. Several course assignments required them to explore their communication processing and this may have prompted this participant's discussion of her process for writing her journal reflections in her fourth journal entry.

> I highlight constantly while reading and take notes in the margins, so I have a basis to start on when going to reflect. Although I still cannot always put into words what I am thinking, debating, and feeling, I am weighing ideas carefully and attempting to create my own ideas, and put those down on paper. I am constantly asking question in my head while reading, and I try to capture many of those on paper as well. I believe my journals reflect this on-going process.

All participants were asked what they reflected most on after they finished their tutoring sessions. Here is one participant's response from the first interview.

> Interviewer: When you get done with a session, and you are thinking back, do you think more about what you did as a teacher or what she did?
> Participant: (5 second pause) um (4 second pause) I don't know. Like I would like to say that I think about what she was thinking, but a lot of times I think I think about what I did and did it help her, but I probably should be thinking about what she did.

Her struggle is evident between what she actually does and what she believes she should do. This participant goes on to explain later in the interview that she believed once teaching became a more natural process for her, she would be less concerned about what she did and said, and would focus more on the student.

Connecting Their Thinking to Their Own School Experience

Table 4.18 Connecting Their Thinking to Their Own School Experience

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	3	6	1	10
Journals	3	1	1	5
Lesson Plans	0	0	0	0
Total units across time	6	7	2	15

Participants also discussed the influence of their previous school and learning experiences on their present thinking about school and learning. The 15 instances of inquiry were generated in participant interviews (10 units) and journal entries (5 units) with the second interview producing the most instances (6 units). No lesson plans/reflections produced any units on this theme.

Lortie (1975) described how teachers often emulate the kinds of instruction that they apprenticed under during their own school experience. While participants' practice may not always be reflective of their own school experience, one participant felt constantly called on to try to reconcile her current experiences with her own educational experiences. This participant believed that her school experience prepared her well throughout her educational career. Now that she was presented with alternative ideas, she felt compelled to check them against her past experience.

> Although I love to read, love books, and love to work with other children in reading, I am still unsure how to instill the basic reading strategies in children. I grew up with a very phonics-based curriculum and thus am a bit of what I believe the best approach is. My beliefs in this respect are still changing (almost daily!) (Journal Entry 4)

This participant was trying to mesh what she believed and what she was learning. Believing in phonics and being able to articulate what she believed about good phonics instruction may help her connect her old and new beliefs. In another example from her second interview, this participant discussed why she

didn't think it was good practice for her to always look back on her experience as her guide; yet her apprenticeship as a student clearly influenced her thinking.

> Participant: I've heard that kids come up with their own spelling words or the spelling words come from the text or from – or are spelling words worthwhile to memorize every week for a test or I don't know.
> Interviewer: So what do you think?
> Participant: That's something I don't know yet. (Laughing)
> Interviewer: You don't know yet?
> Participant: Well I just spell so well I just have this – but it is like I instantly see it when I spell a word wrong and I correct it and how I know it and I mean I had spelling tests all the time I was growing up on words that related to nothing. It was just a list of twenty words and you learned it and memorized it so – I hate looking back to what I learned, but that (inaudible) deciding how, what's best, I guess. I'm not sure.
> Interviewer: But are you leaning toward doing the twenty words?
> Participant: Not as much as I used to be – because I gave it this fall and it wasted so much time. Pretest on Wednesday. Spelling test on Friday. The kids that passed pass every time and the kids that don't, don't every time.

Some participants discussed their own learning experience in relation to their teaching experience. One participant thought the fact that she did not have to struggle to learn anything throughout her educational career would make it challenging for her to work with struggling readers.

> One of the biggest issues I'm going to face when I start teaching is frustration with bubble students or low-end students just because school has always been easy for me. And um - patience is just one of the biggest things that I've had to work on. I've seen it grow in myself a lot over the last year, but I know it will be an issue for several years to come as I adjust to different paces of thinking. Uh where I

> expect something to take thirty minutes, it might take forty-five. (Interview 2)

This statement exuded confidence, believing it would only require a couple of years of experience for her to acquire adequate patience to deal with "different paces of thinking." This participant was heavily influenced by the status of being labeled academically gifted. Instead of finding ways to bridge her experiences with those of her students, her thinking led her to focus on their differences. This separation was indicated by her labeling students as "bubble students" and "low end students."

Connecting Their Thinking to Their Student Teaching Experience

Table 4.19 Connecting Their Thinking to Their Student Teaching Experience

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	2	8	0	10
Journals	8	0	0	8
Lesson Plans	0	0	0	0
Total units across time	10	8	0	18

Evident in the data were instances of inquiry in which participants connected their thinking about their readings, course content and/or tutoring with their student teaching experience. The 18 instances of inquiry on this topic were generated from the first and second interview (2, 8 units) and the first and second

journal entries (8 units). Perhaps participants were drawing on the context of their student teaching to support their inquiry until they became well established within the new context of the tutoring clinic. All participants contributed instances of inquiry on this topic.

Participants tried to reconcile their instructional concerns in tutoring with what they observed during their student teaching experience. For example, during her second interview, one participant tried to connect her student teaching experience with her assessment of her tutee's comprehension difficulty on the Informal Reading Inventory.

> Participant: Maybe – well maybe (comprehension is a problem) just with expository text.
> Interviewer: You've only used narrative texts during tutoring?
> Participant: Yes. She knows what is going on. I know she does. Well, I mean – from the kinds of questions that I ask her I think she knows what is going on. And doesn't every kid struggle with expository text? I don't know. At least all my fourth graders in student teaching – it took them so long to get through a chapter in the social studies book and these kids were good readers – I don't know.

This participant was questioning the factors she believed influenced the assessment outcome. Was it expository text? Was it interest level? Was it her tutee's prior knowledge or lack thereof that interfered with her comprehension? During student teaching, students whom this participant characterized as good readers had trouble finishing reading a chapter in the social studies text. Based on her experience, she drew the following conclusion: if good readers have

difficulty with expository text, all readers should have trouble with expository text. Interestingly, this participant continued to use narrative text primarily during tutoring sessions even though she indicated that she found her tutee to have no difficulty comprehending stories.

Participants' talk also expressed their attempts to connect their organizational concerns in tutoring to their student teaching experience as in this excerpt from one participant's second interview.

> Participant: I think – I don't know – student teaching at the beginning especially was more worries of management than curriculum. And that is how I think most of us were until we got the hang of it. And then it became more of an issue of is this effecting them and are they getting it.

This participant's first concern was management, which clouded her ability to focus on her effectiveness. The tentativeness of her language at the beginning of her comments (several false starts and a declaration of uncertainty) seemed to imply that this participant was uncomfortable with the topic. As this participant became more comfortable with management issues during the semester, she was able to refocus her attention more on her effectiveness.

> Participant: I can focus on my tutee. With her, she's listening, but I don't know if she is actually applying what we are doing and what we are talking about to – like if it has sunk in enough that it is becoming just like second hand for her to be using.

With one child, this participant doesn't have to worry about management, just effectiveness: Is her tutee applying what she has been focusing on during

their tutoring sessions? In both contexts, tutoring and student teaching, it was clear that this participant questioned her effectiveness.

Some of the participants' talk compared time issues in their student teaching experience and their tutoring. One participant found tutoring a harder situation in which to get to know her tutee because of the disjointedness of the time frame.

> I think – personally I think it is difficult to really see what type of reader she is. She has only missed two sessions, but that is enough to make me feel like it is disjointed in the last two weeks. That's been frustrating because I think it would be totally different in a classroom. Like I don't think I could have done anything like this when I was student teaching, but I knew the level of my students a lot more than I feel like I know her level – because I had them everyday and so when they were having a bad day and why things didn't go well and when they are having a good day and how their learning was affected – all the connections they made within. (Interview 2)

This participant felt that if she spent all day with her tutee she would have better insight into the child's moods as they related to her academics. This participant was able to draw these conclusions based on her student teaching experience. In the classroom, she did not experience the difficulties in this regard that she was having during tutoring. Comparing the two contexts may have allowed this participant to develop a deeper understanding of how time affects relationship-building as well as informing her teaching.

Questioning One's Own Knowledge and Performance

Table 4.20 Questioning One's Own Knowledge and Performance

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	29	22	3	54
Journals	8	11	3	22
Lesson Plans	0	2	1	3
Total units across time	37	35	7	79

79 instances of inquiry related to participants' expertise, knowledge base and ability to perform teaching/tutoring responsibilities. Discussion included units regarding participants' insecurity and/or confidence levels in their abilities as a teacher and/or tutor. This theme constitutes 45% (almost half) of participants' instances of inquiry in the Inquiring as Students category suggesting that pre-service teachers are interested in inquiring about how their readiness to enter the profession.

Instances of inquiry for this theme were generated from all three data sources. Participant interviews produced the most instances of inquiry with unit frequency decreasing with each subsequent interview (29, 22, 3). This may suggest that as participants gained experience in the tutoring context, they either felt less insecure about their teaching ability or they felt less compelled to explore

their insecurity. There seemed to be no clear pattern related to time for instances of inquiry produced by journal entries and lesson plans/reflections.

One participant felt that time lapses between field experiences lessened her effectiveness at the beginning of each new experience. In her second interview, she said,

> Yeah like I need to get into the mindset and the mode of teaching. And I need to be able to give time to and plan for it and feel prepared and everything. And if I just jumped into it and felt like I had no clue as to what's going on or any grounds that I'm standing on - like then I feel like I'm an ineffective teacher and um so it's just – now I know – I know where my tutee and I are at and we have a really good relationship and I feel – I feel like I know what is going on.

This participant was able to use the tutoring experience to question her performance as a teacher. Because she was able to effectively plan and implement their tutoring sessions well, and because she had established a strong rapport with her tutee, the participant felt more secure in her role as teacher.

Some participants questioned their performance based on their tutoring sessions. In her second interview, one participant questioned her teaching performance and wondered whether that might be influencing her tutee's engagement.

> Participant: I wonder sometimes if I don't get enthusiastic enough about what we are doing. You know like if that is one thing that is influencing how he behaves you know – not that he behaves badly, but just like that he is kind of sluggish.
> Interviewer: You don't feel like you are being enthusiastic?

> Participant: I think that – I mean yes, sometimes, but there are times where I like I don't really want to do a certain thing or something like that and so.

This participant did not want to appear judgmental of her tutee's behavior. Her wondering about how her own actions influenced her tutee's level of engagement during their sessions seemed to be the kind of question that could lead her to possibilities. Was she influencing his behavior negatively? Why was she planning things that even she did not enjoy? Was she searching for something to blame? The participant's questioning of the relationship between her performance and her tutee's behavior could possibly lead her to find ways to structure sessions that would be more productive and enjoyable.

Participants often questioned their knowledge as they were forced to put theory into practice. One participant wondered when to intervene and when to let her tutee struggle. She described this difficulty in her third journal entry.

> This is something I struggled with most in my last tutoring session. Whether or not to tell my tutee if a word was spelled correctly (especially when she asked!) was quite difficult for me. I am still unsure of how to approach this, but after reading I can see that invented spelling does not always need to be corrected.

Reading about invented spelling was influencing this participant's understanding of why she could let some spellings stand without correction. She was exploring the idea of allowing the purpose of the writing to dictate the use of conventional spelling rather than assuming that everything should always be spelled conventionally.

Conclusions about Inquiring as Students

Only three out of the 177 instances of inquiry in this role were generated by lesson plans/reflections. Participants inquired as students through the more dialogic data sources (journals, interviews) with a more knowledgeable other. Also, in their lesson plans/reflections, they may have felt less like students and more like teachers, as the lesson plans/reflections were tightly tied to the tutoring context.

Though participants, in the role of students, questioned authors, reflected on their own thinking, and related their thinking to their own school and student teaching experience, mostly what they did in this role was question their own knowledge and performance. Of the 177 inquiry instances in this role, 79 of them focused on knowledge/performance. While this many not be surprising, it does raise some interesting implications for teacher education. While it is important for teacher education programs to help pre-service teachers explore how their past experiences may be influencing their present practice, it may be more important to provide avenues in which pre-service teachers can openly investigate the application of their knowledge and performance. Providing a field placement structure alone may be insufficient to allow pre-service teachers to do this. Field placements may generate the questions, but what forums are we providing in which pre-service teachers can explore their insecurities safely?

INQUIRING AS TUTOR

The tutoring experience was a major one for the participants and within that role – that ongoing current experience – they inquired about instructional approaches, materials, planning, time, and participant's effectiveness. These inquiries were either in relation to the tutoring experience or else sparked by that experience and related to practice beyond the immediate tutoring context.

Table 4.21 Inquiring as Tutor

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	40	56	13	109
Journals	8	12	10	30
Lesson Plans	11	23	17	51
Total units across time	59	91	40	190

Inquiring about Instructional Approaches

Table 4.22 Inquiring about Instructional Approaches

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	26	28	5	59
Journals	7	12	10	29
Lesson Plans	9	21	11	41
Total units across time	42	61	26	129

This theme included instances of inquiry related to specific instructional strategies and skills as well as general instructional practices like:

- What skills/strategies were targeted
- What participants thought about targeted skills/strategies or reading behaviors
- What participants are focusing on, will focus on, or wished they had focused on
- Participants' suggestions and thinking about possible directions in their tutoring and/or classroom

It also included approaches participants attempted during the tutoring clinic, approaches whose effectiveness they had come to question. Instances of inquiry also included more general areas of instruction like

- What kind of instruction best serves certain populations of students
- What type of instruction best meets common public goals

All participants produced instances of inquiry on this topic. Not surprisingly, the lesson plans/reflections – tied directly to the tutoring context – emerge as an important source (41 instances). Yet even in this tutor perspective, participants still favor the interview format in their sense-making (59 instances). Of the 129 inquiries about instructional approaches, 26 came from the first interview, 28 from the second interview, and five from the third. Instances of inquiry from journal entries (29 units) and lesson plans/reflections (41 units)

were distributed across the three time periods of the study, with the middle period garnering the most (12 journal entries, 21 lesson plans/reflections). This theme contained 68% of the units for the inquiring-as-tutor category.

Many participants, after a tutoring session, documented the need to work on a specific skill or strategy and thought about ways in which they could best instructionally approach that need. One participant, after observing the difficulty her tutee experienced during word work, posed a strategy that would help him be more successful. Using the making words approach (Cunningham & Cunningham, 1998), this participant chose the word "vegetable" based on the title of the book used during build-up reading.

> He really enjoyed this part. When he finds new words, he gets excited. I wrote the words on the back. I had to help him with the hidden word. Even when it was all together, he had trouble with it. Then I pulled out Vegetable Soup. He saw that they were both the same and was able to say the word. He was excited when he saw the relationships. I want to use smaller words for word work next time. (Lesson Plan/Reflection 4)

It seemed important for this participant to scaffold this tutoring component because her tutee enjoyed the activity and was motivated to participate with little cajoling on the tutor's part. This participant speculated little as to why her tutee had difficulty with the word vegetable, even though he was exposed to the word during build-up reading. Instead she decided in the future to lower the difficulty of the word used in the activity ("use smaller words"). It was interesting to note in her lesson plan/reflection about build-up

reading for the lesson the participant said that her tutee did "an excellent job of sounding out words he didn't know and used picture cues." Questioning why the word vegetable was difficult in one context, but not in the previous context might have served her better than an immediate lowering of her expectations.

Sometimes participants' inquiry about instructional approaches was sparked by their reflection about their tutoring practice. In one participant's first interview, she said,

> Well the first couple of weeks we were focusing so much on the individual words so the last two sessions I've been letting that go and working more toward meaning. Um, I think I had overdone the pronunciation the first couple of sessions – because every time he didn't get a word – we would stop and focus on it and uh again it is like it is if we focused on the – it seems like when we focused on pronunciation then I really had to work with him on the meaning, but if I didn't – if I let him slack on that pronunciation then he would understand more.

This participant's instructional approach originally focused on decoding. However, after reflection, she was able to see that her approach was actually interfering with her tutee's ability to comprehend the text.

Another participant questioned whether she should be discouraging her tutee's use of fingerpointing during their sessions.

> Participant: One thing that I'm wondering about is his fingerpointing. I think that it is a way to keep him focused. It seems to keep him active. Like if he didn't do that would he just be like – you know- he is always moving so would he be able to really look at the words without doing it?
> Interviewer: Good question. What do you think about his fingerpointing?

Participant: Well that could be something that we could get away from.
Interviewer: Does it worry you?
Participant: No. It doesn't worry me because sometimes I have to do it too if I want to concentrate so I do this when I'm concentrating.

The questioning of whether she should try to steer her tutee away from fingerpointing was a struggle because while she believed the practice to be helpful for her tutee, she also seemed to believe that fingerpointing was a weakness. Relating her own reading process to that of her tutee's was a way that this tutor was trying to decide what would be the most helpful way to approach this issue.

Inquiring about Materials

Table 4.23 Inquiring about Materials

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	5	9	4	18
Journals	1	0	0	1
Lesson Plans	2	2	6	10
Total units across time	8	11	10	29

This theme explored the kinds of materials used and/or participants' consideration of materials in the tutoring clinic. Participants were concerned about finding appropriate materials, modifying materials and using materials

effectively. The 29 instances of inquiry for this theme were generated primarily from participant interviews (18 units) and lesson plans/reflections (10 units). Instances of inquiry were produced across all three interviews and all ten lesson plans/reflections. This theme contained 15% of the instances of inquiry represented in the inquiring-as-tutor category.

Participants talked about what kinds of materials they were choosing for their tutoring sessions. In her last interview, one participant talked about what she wished she had focused on more in regard to material selection during tutoring.

> Participant: I wish I would have done more poetry. At the time, I thought I was doing some, but now that I look back, I rarely did any. Like I wanted to have time for other things, but how long does poetry really take? Two minutes at the most. So I wish I would have done more of that.
> Interviewer: You wish you would have done poetry because -?
> Participant: Just so that he could have had the experience of other types of reading and the rhyme of it. He said he thought it was kind of weird so it was obvious that he hadn't had much exposure to it anyway so I should have.

In hindsight, this participant was able to see the value of exposing her tutee to other types of materials. Apparently she shied away from the use of poetry because she felt that other materials would be more effective in the pursuit of her instructional goals, and because her student did not enjoy the genre. Rethinking her choice, this participant could see that poetry would not have required a large investment of time, and would therefore not have undermined time devoted toward instructional level texts. She also seemed to understand that

if she had included more poetry, her tutee would have become more comfortable with the genre and might have learned to enjoy it more.

Not only did participants reflect on what materials to use, they also discussed their thinking about how to best use materials during tutoring. One participant described how she learned that providing for choice in materials made a difference in her sessions.

> Well I started at the end giving him different – well because at the beginning I started giving him the running records that we were doing in guided reading that day so it was brand new for him. He didn't always necessarily have a choice in that because it was the book that we were going to use for guided reading. And for the build-up reading, it was the books that we had already read. He would always be kind of tired of those because - like we had read them before. And so toward the end I started doing build up reading with leveled books that he knew. Like they would be D's or E's or something like that. And then he could choose one of those and it would be a level that he could read. But it was a new book and I would do a running record on that, and then do guided reading on a different book. That seemed to work well. And he – and I noticed that he did really appreciate that choice and liked the new books. And he could definitely read the other books that we had and he didn't mind that, but having that choice and having a brand new book to read – he really really liked that. So I wish I would have started doing that sooner, but not really because I learned from it so – so I wish that we had more time that I could have been doing that longer. (Interview 3)

Clearly this participant noticed – questioned - her tutee's boredom with rereading previously-covered texts during build-up reading. This wondering led her to experiment with using materials that were similar in difficulty to their

familiar texts, but were new to her tutee. Although she may have sacrificed some fluency inherent in repeated readings, this participant based her decision on her observation of her tutee's engagement and motivation with new independent level texts. Although this participant wished she had discovered her new use of choice sooner for her tutee's sake, she recognized the value her inquiry brought to her own learning.

Participants wrestled with finding appropriate leveled materials for their tutees. One participant, in her first interview, discussed her questioning.

> I am still trying to find books that are challenging for him because I keep trying to move up, but they are still not enough so – she (the classroom teacher) did guided reading with him today so I remember what book it is - so I will look to see what level it was because he did really well with that one. So hopefully – there will be some stuff that he gets stuck on.

This participant did not feel confident about basing her material choice on her observation of her tutee's reading and decided to depend on the teacher's expertise in determining his reading level. Her inquiry about finding appropriate materials caused her to look to a more knowledgeable other to at least start her in the right direction. In subsequent interviews, this participant felt much more confident in her material selection, and began to question her genre choices, rather than instructional level. Perhaps her collaboration with a more knowledgeable other helped her shift the inquiry to a different level.

Inquiring about Planning

Table 4.24 Inquiring about Planning

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	3	8	0	11
Journals	0	0	0	0
Lesson Plans	0	0	0	0
Total units across time	3	8	0	11

This theme explored the following:

- How participants were planning
- What participants were thinking about while they were planning
- What forces drove participants' planning

The 11 instances of inquiry for this theme occurred only in the first (3 units) and second (8 units) participant interviews. All of the participants except for one contributed instances of inquiry on this topic. This theme consists of 6% of the instances of inquiry represented in the inquiring-as-tutor category.

Participation in the tutoring clinic tended to provoke participants' inquiry about their ability to plan instruction for their tutoring sessions. One participant in her first interview discussed her questioning of how to effectively connect the tutoring components.

> Another thing I know is I didn't relate this (word work) back to the book because I didn't know how. And I don't know what to

> take out of that book that I want to teach. Yeah. I don't really – don't know how to relate the word work to the text.

Class discussion often prompted participants to look at students' miscues and writing samples to help them develop a focus for word work. Because her tutee was not miscuing during guided reading, this participant struggled with determining a focus for planning. She felt that it was important to try to connect the tutoring components with the materials she was using; however, she felt less confident about being able to pull all of it together effectively. This participant believed that her planning should be strategic and that her materials should support her instructional goals, but she questioned how to make those kinds of decisions.

One participant's questioning of planning during her student teaching provided an example of the connection between planning and organization and management. In the student teaching context, she had found it hard to plan because she questioned her role in the classroom. In the tutoring context, however, she felt more confident in her role and found planning to be less problematic.

> Here I plan one lesson at a time. I don't plan a whole chunk. And there (student teaching) I would plan like a whole week before I even started so then if I found that they had certain needs – it was really hard for me – like I did change what was happening to try to meet those needs, but it was kind of more difficult for me because I felt like I was under this time constriction. So here I am a lot more flexible with time and I can totally go at my own pace. I'm not trying to meet anybody's demands or like my

> cooperating teacher saying that I had to be through a certain amount of stories by a certain time and here it is like no we are going at the pace of my tutee and that's what matters. (Interview 2)

This participant found that she was able to differentiate her instruction easily in the tutoring situation, but experienced greater difficulty in doing so during student teaching. Now that this participant's confidence in her ability to plan for individual needs has increased, will she be able to apply that to a classroom situation?

The connection between material selection and planning can be found in the example of this participant as she described how her selection of materials influenced her planning more than her observation of her tutee did.

> Interviewer: When you are planning instruction for (tutee), what are you thinking about most? What kinds of professional judgment decisions are you making to decide what you are going to do?
> Participant: Like when I'm picking out books?
> Interviewer: Or like how do you know what your focus is going to be?
> Participant: Um. Well like sometimes I would pick a poem and see something that appears in there a lot – like if there are words that rhyme with different endings. One time we did vowel sounds like looking at different ways that vowel sounds are made. And we looked for adjectives one time.
>
> > Interviewer: So your decisions are driven more by the materials that you are picking and seeing what kind of things that it lends itself too?
> > Participant: Yeah – sometimes
> > Interviewer: And there are times when you make your decision based on what you see (tutee) do?
> > Participant: Yeah
> > Interviewer: Can you think of any example?

> Participant: Like when he read and I saw he was really good at making the different voices …so I tried to find a book that had a lot of talking – there was a lot of talking back and forth. So I tried to find a book like that. (Interview 2)

When initially I asked this participant about planning, she immediately referenced book selection. Even when I rephrased the question to try to open up her options, she described how she planned her lessons based on the content of the book she selected. Even when I finally asked her to give an example of a time when she planned instruction based on her observation of her tutee's needs, she still focused on her selection of material indicating a strong correlation between planning instruction and material selection.

Inquiring about Time

Table 4.25 Inquiring about Time

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	4	3	2	9
Journals	0	0	0	0
Lesson Plans	0	0	0	0
Total units across time	4	3	2	9

Participants reflected on how time affected the process of tutoring The nine instances of inquiry on this topic were generated across all three participant interviews. No units were produced from journals or lesson plans/reflections.

All participants except for one contributed units on this topic. This theme comprised 5% of the instances of inquiry represented in the inquiring-as-tutor category.

Participants questioned their effective use of time. One participant wondered if she was using her time efficiently during her tutoring sessions. During the first interview, when asked if there were any questions that kept coming up for her week after week, she said,

> Time is always an issue and I am always concerned about not finishing something that would be valuable, but at the same time, not getting to something else that he also needs. And uh I'm having trouble drawing the line between those two areas like when is enough enough or when is it more important to move on.

The decision when to move on was time related, but she was also questioning her ability to make professional judgments about when to move on based on her observations. (This participant's lesson plans indicated that she only covered one or two component of the lesson plan per session.)

Participants also questioned their use of time as they reflected back over their tutoring experience. One participant in her last interview said,

> We started out experimenting and there was some good work that was done, but you know – you felt like time was wasted because (at the end) you really see the direction that you (should) go the most in and uh you don't have that starting out. There is always that. I definitely would have done more journaling right away and also more poetry work. We did some warm-ups and stuff, but the comparison and contrast exercises really seemed to help him, and that we did near the end of the tutoring sessions.

In this participant's reflection, she lamented that she wished she had known at the beginning what she knew at the end. By the end of tutoring, she was able to be much more strategic and knowledgeable about what worked for this particular tutee. In the beginning, she had to experiment to find out what approaches were most effective. In comparing the beginning to the end, she felt that she was less effective at the beginning and therefore wasted time.

Participants not only questioned their time use during tutoring, but also discussed their thinking about the how the lack of daily interaction with their tutees affected their tutoring. In one participant's first interview she stated,

> I wish I had more time because just two days a week – you know – it doesn't give me a good enough picture of what she can really do because it fluctuates so much from one day to the other. Tuesday she will read the book fine and not struggle with certain words, and then Thursday she will struggle with words that she didn't have trouble with before. So I don't know if it is a bad day at school, or you know there are so many factors that play into it.

As she questioned her observations of her tutee, this participant began to see that there were numerous factors that may be influencing her tutee's reading process that she was unable to readily discern because her contact with the child was limited to the tutoring clinic.

Inquiring about Effectiveness

Table 4.26 Inquiring about Effectiveness

Data Source	Weeks 1-3	Weeks 4-6	Weeks 7-9	Total units per Data Source
Interviews	2	8	2	12
Journals	0	0	0	0
Lesson Plans	0	0	0	0
Total units across time	2	8	2	12

Participants questioned their effectiveness as tutors and the long/short term progress tutees gained from participation in the clinic. The 12 instances of inquiry were produced from the three participant interviews only. Eight instances came from the second interview, which may suggest that early on in tutoring other questions preoccupied participants' thinking, and by the last interview, it was too late to influence effectiveness so this focus became less relevant. Most participants generated one or two instances of inquiry in this area. However, one participant produced six instances of inquiry, with at least one unit being generated in each interview. This theme produced 6% of the instances of inquiry represented in the inquiring as tutor category.

As one of the primary goals of the tutoring clinic was to increase tutee's reading abilities, it was easy to see how the topic of effectiveness would prompt participants' inquiry. In her second interview, when asked what kinds of questions haunted her, one participant said,

> Is this helping him? Cause I can tell – I'm still – I mean – I think I see a bit of difference in his reading, but I don't know if that is because he is reading the same books over and over. I mean he is reading those better, but I am still wondering - like yeah how much improvement. I think I've seen a lot of difference just because I started out way too easy because he is reading a lot more difficult words and a lot longer texts and stuff, but maybe he could have read those at the beginning, and I just had no idea because I was still trying to figure out – like what level he was at. But he is starting to use – like he used a new strategy the other day, which I was so excited about. I forget what it was. I wrote it down on the lesson. It was a breakthrough. I'm still wondering if any of the strategies that we are trying to use are helping him.

While this participant offered evidence of her effectiveness, she also questioned whether or not she could actually trust her observations. Was she actually seeing improvement in the tutee's fluency or was he reading texts that were too easy? Was she actually influencing his strategy choice when encountering new words, or was his application of the strategy a fluke? Being able to trust the evidence seemed to be central to this participant's inquiry about instructional effectiveness.

Participants often questioned whether the tutoring clinic would have a lasting effect on their tutees' reading process. One participant, when asked what she still wondered about her student, in her last interview said,

> I asked him what strategy his teacher would suggest to him if he came to a word that he didn't know and he said she would say sound it out. That's what he said at the beginning of tutoring too so I was just wondering if he was going to forget about all those strategies or not use them as much because it doesn't seem like anyone else is telling him to use them.

While this participant believed that she was effective during the tutoring, she doubted whether her instruction would have any long-term effects on her tutee's reading ability given that her instruction was not reinforced outside of the tutoring clinic.

Conclusions about Inquiring as a Tutor

Blending field-based experiences with course work gives pre-service teachers opportunities to work with real students as they begin to situate theory into practice. Learning about being a teacher, about students, about the activities of teaching during a tutoring experience allowed the participants to form many inquiries related to their practice.

One interesting pattern to note was that although all participants were practicing tutors, their lesson plans/reflections accounted for only 27% of the instances of inquiry, while interviews accounted for 57%. The lesson plan/reflection structure provided less support for participants' wonderings about tutoring than did their extended one-on-one interactions with their instructor.

A second interesting pattern was that the five areas that emerged from the tutoring perspective suggest that the use of tutoring clinics in teacher education programs helps pre-service teachers wonder about issues that relate to regular classroom settings. Planning, time, materials, effectiveness, and instructional approaches are significant in teaching in a one-on-one setting; they are also key

elements in regular classroom settings. The tutoring clinic invited participants to consider these issues on a small scale, looking deeply at the context with one student. Hopefully this will help them apply their learning to the larger context of a regular classroom.

Chapter 5

Case Studies

This chapter presents four case studies of four pre-service teachers' expressions of inquiry throughout the semester they were enrolled in a Reading Problems course, in which they tutored a struggling reader twice a week for nine weeks. Looking at how individuals inquire provides a different perspective. Each individual inquires differently. This allows us to begin to understand the complexity and uniqueness each student's inquiry process brings to the classroom. Background information about each participant is given as well as a discussion of each case study participant's inquiry style as expressed in his or her data set. All case study participants were seniors who had completed their student teaching practicum in the fall semester. This was the last course in their professional sequence. All participants graduated at the end of the semester in which the data for this study was collected.

Case Study 1

Poppy, a Cautious Inquirer

INQUIRING IN THE MINIMAL-RISK ZONE

Twenty-two years old, middle-class, and white, Poppy was a pre-service teacher who grew up in a large metropolitan area in the Southwest. This study coincided with Poppy's last semester at Midwestern College where she had been enrolled for the last four years. Poppy completed her student teaching in an urban, first grade, culturally diverse classroom prior to her participation in this study. Overall, Poppy was a strong student who actively participated in class and completed high quality assignments.

In the tutoring clinic, Poppy was assigned to Elena, a working class white girl. Elena was a small, shy, blond and blue-eyed first grader with a sly dimpled grin whose interests included art and soccer. Poppy tried to link her planning with these interests during tutoring, believing strongly in trying to correlate student interests with her instructional approach. Elena made considerable progress during the tutoring clinic. Her instructional reading level at the beginning of the tutoring clinic was a guided reading Level B (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996) whereas at the end of tutoring, Elena was reading instructionally at a Level F (approximately 1.7 grade level equivalent).

Because both Poppy and Elena could be characterized as reserved, it took a little time for them to warm up to each other and create some shared history that enabled them to be comfortable with each other. Throughout the tutoring clinic, Poppy wondered about Elena's perceptions of their tutoring relationship. In her first interview, Poppy questioned how Elena personally felt about her: Does she like me? By the second interview, Poppy believed that Elena did accept her as a person, but began wondering if she was creating an atmosphere that was fun and engaging for Elena.

> I think also – I wonder like not how attached she is, but how she feels about me like as a person. (Poppy's first interview)
>
> Not that she doesn't like me (laughing), but that just if she is having fun – like I wonder about that. (Poppy's second interview)

These excerpts suggest a shift in Poppy's thinking. She moved from a more self-centered kind of questioning (Does she accept me?) to a more student-centered concern (Is she having fun?). While Poppy's concern with Elena's enjoyment was more student-centered, it still indicated her insecurity in their tutoring partnership. Preoccupation with being viewed as fun suggests that Poppy was more concerned with being liked than with being viewed as instructionally effective. However, once their relationship was established, substantial progress did follow.

Another example of Poppy's inquiry moving from a more self-centered focus to a more student-centered focus occurred as she discussed her thinking about the use of poetry. Tutors were encouraged to use poetry during their tutoring sessions. The use of poetry as a warm-up was advocated because of the playfulness of the language, predictability of the text, and brief length of many

poems. Poppy tended to avoid the use of poetry because it was a genre that she did not really enjoy. However, the following journal entry indicated that the tutoring experience was causing Poppy to rethink her stand on the use of different genres.

> I also found the article about literature that hooks reluctant readers very interesting as well (Worthy, 1998). Reading about why poetry, verse, and speeches are important was also helpful because I tend to steer clear of having to teach things that I am not really interested in or have had bad experiences with. Although I personally am not a huge fan of poetry, speeches, etc., there may be students in my class who are or could be very successful at those genres of literature. It is important for me to keep this in mind when I am planning my curriculum. (Poppy Journal 3)

Moving from a more self-centered approach – *I tend to steer clear of things I am not interested in* – to a more student-centered approach – *there may be some students who could benefit* - seemed central to Poppy's questioning of the use of different kinds of materials. Her inquiry seemed to be driven by a combination of her reading on the topic and her experience in the tutoring clinic. The repetition of the same message from a variety of sources seemed to help Poppy push herself out of her comfort zone and to begin to think more about what was best for students and less about her own personal interests.

As an inquirer, Poppy often felt uncomfortable taking risks. Her academic success had taught her well to provide the kind of answers that her teachers often wanted. She rarely questioned the authority of authors and/or teachers. Poppy's first journal entry systematically summarized sections of an assigned course reading (Klenk & Kibby, 2000) point by point.

> Klenk and Kibby, in "Re-Mediating Reading Difficulties," discuss the issues surrounding remedial reading in the past, the present, and the future. The article discusses remedial reading and how the term and perceptions need to be redefined in order to help readers with difficulties. In the

> article, lack of fluency was pointed out to be a major problem within students who have reading difficulties. Fluency is described as "reading smoothly, without hesitation and with comprehension." (p.672) Two suggestions or methods for developing fluency within students include having the teacher model the text that the student will read perhaps by finger pointing to the text. Another recommendation is to have students read a text repeatedly for more practice so that students' rates of reading and comprehension meet a certain standard.

Apparently, her previous schooling had programmed her to regurgitate rather than reflect and wonder about her reading. Although I responded throughout her journal entry, indicating points within her summary where I felt she could go further and explore her own questions, I ended my response with the following comments:

> It is very obvious that you read the articles and that you comprehended the information beautifully. It is also very apparent that you are a caring and committed teacher who knows about learning theory and reading strategies. However, you are a little skimpy on the wondering and struggling with your own questions. I am freeing you up to take a risk here. You have mastered the art of summarization – you never need to show me how well you can do that again. Instead of telling me what the author thinks about something, tell me what YOU think about something. What confuses you? What makes you angry? What fills you with passion? What questions stir any emotion? And then struggle with your questions - asking yourself why over and over again - digging deeper with each why? Why do you believe what it is that you believe? Where do these beliefs come from? Hopefully if you dig deep enough you will come across some new understanding. Make that your goal for your next journal.

This invitation became my mantra for Poppy as I beseeched her to open up and allow herself to walk within her own wonderings. As the semester progressed, Poppy did push herself to think about her own questions, but negotiated most of her inquiring within the minimal risk zone.

TAKING A RISK – INQUIRING ABOUT THE ROLE OF CULTURE

Poppy found the subject of home and culture to be of particular interest throughout the reading methods course. In Poppy's pre-tutoring survey she indicated that the home played a large role in students having difficulty learning to read. The following are excerpts from the short answer section of her survey. (The words in bold indicate the sentence starters.)

> **A struggling reader is** a student that cannot use reading strategies, and has not had a lot of good experiences with books.
> **Some students have difficulty reading because** they have not been read to a lot and have not had good experiences with books. They don't use strategies. They don't enjoy reading. They can't make connections.
> **Some students are good readers because** they have been read to and have a lot of experience with books and language.

Poppy's beginning assumptions all seemed to place responsibility for students' difficulties on their lack of prior experience: struggling readers have not been read to enough; struggling readers have not had access to books; struggling readers don't enjoy reading and don't value reading because it is not valued in the home. These assumptions soon became conflicted when at the beginning of the semester, as a result of some course readings and a class discussion; Poppy found her beliefs at variance with the professor's. Many pre-service teachers during the class said they believed that teachers should tell parents that they should read with their child every night.

On the surface, this idea is acceptable and well intentioned. However, I pushed them to think about this from the parents' perspective. What about parents who are unable to read, or parents who cannot read in English, or parents who already felt intimidated by the school system? I suggested that telling these

parents to read to their children daily might make them think the teacher believed they were doing an inadequate job of parenting their children. It is one thing to connect parents with resources they are seeking, but it is clearly another for the teacher to assume a position of power as the all-knowing giver of wisdom. In Poppy's second journal, she took a risk and questioned my position,

> During Thursday's class, we discussed parents' roles of reading and writing with their child. You said that as teachers it is not our job to tell parents to read and write with their children. I can see your point, parents are busy enough and bothering them with one more thing to get done in a day will be a hassle. However, in order for children to view reading and writing as authentic and helpful for them in life, I think that children need to experience it outside of the classroom too. They need to see and have authentic experiences with their parents – with the people that they are most influenced by. I think that asking parents to include their children in authentic experiences would not be too much to ask.

This was a big step for Poppy. She disagreed with me, and willingly articulated her thoughts in writing. Standing at variance with the professor can be precarious. One must trust the relationship in order to contest. Poppy took my risk-taking invitation to heart and presented her thinking, even though that thinking was somewhat in opposition to some of my beliefs. The dialog journal gave us an opportunity to extend the inquiry initiated during class and explore it more deeply.

The tutoring context gave Poppy another opportunity to think about the role of the family over the course of this study. Elena rarely made references to her family during their tutoring sessions. Poppy became intrigued by her tutee's family after contacting them to arrange make-up sessions due to her tutee's frequent absences from school, and consequently from tutoring. She was able to arrange an extra session over spring break, but she found her telephone conversation with Elena's mother to be odd. This sparked her curiosity and she

was anxious to finally get to meet Elena's family in person. After the performance party, she had this to say about her conference with Elena's mother.

> P: Yeah like her – her (mother's) eyes weren't crossed, but they were like not right, but maybe that is…
> M: Did she ask you any questions?
> P: Not really. It was just kind of awkward because I really wanted to talk to her, but she didn't show any interest – like I said at how amazed I was at her progress and she was saying that she had been reading since she was an infant – which kind of – she said that they read a lot at home. It just seems like if they had been – I don't know.

Poppy tried hard to not be judgmental as she discussed this conference during her final interview, but she was obviously concerned about the mother's behavior. While she would not blatantly accuse the mother of substance abuse, she alluded to it. Poppy was also struck by the mother's disinterest in speaking to her about her daughter. This was not the reaction that Poppy viewed as acceptable parental behavior. The mother's contention that Elena had been reading at home since before school also raised red flags for Poppy and she began to distrust anything the mother said.

This event may have provided an opportunity for Poppy to define her beliefs. Poppy's journal indicated she believed that teachers should tell parents they should be reading with their children. In this case, Elena's mother reported that this was a common practice in their house since Elena was a baby, yet Poppy did not believe the mother. In telling parents to read with their children, Poppy seemed to believe that she held the power to actually make it happen. This incident with Elena's mother seemed to prove the opposite and may have pushed Poppy to rethink her role with parents who hold beliefs that are different from her own.

Midwestern, as part of his or her general education program, requires each student to spend a semester living and studying in a third world country. The first half of the semester is focused on studying the language, culture and history of the country. The second half of the semester is spent living with families and working in service settings throughout the host country. Poppy had spent the previous spring semester in Costa Rica. This cross-cultural experience may have helped her think about the role the culture plays in school practices. Questioning cooperative learning approaches was the topic of discussion in Poppy's seventh journal in which she related her experience with schools in Costa Rica to her experience with schools in the United States. Poppy was struck with the level of acceptance of cooperative work during her time in Latin America.

> It seemed that cooperative work was encouraged and deemed as an acceptable way of completing tasks and solving problems. Why shouldn't it be? In any other situation, besides a classroom, people can freely ask for help and work with others to solve problems and complete tasks. If adults, in a work setting, need assistance with problem solving and figuring something out, we expect the adult to ask a colleague (classmate) for help and then if they couldn't figure out the problem together they would then go ask the boss (teacher). Why do we expect differently from students? However, there is always the conflict of cheating and if students really know the material or if they are relying on other students for that information.

Observations of school practice both in the United States and abroad were leading Poppy to question the underlying assumptions behind the approach. Some cultures value collaboration more than others. Professional employment requires people to work collaboratively. Why, then, do schools spend so much time requiring students to accomplish tasks individually? Working class jobs are more individualistic. Are we training students for these kinds of jobs? What are our

practices really training kids to do? Poppy seemed at the edge of a new understanding, but the question is where will she go from here? Her inquiry is prompting her to ask the question, but will it influence her practice?

At the end of the semester, on her post-tutoring survey, Poppy's ideas about struggling readers' home experiences showed a change from her initial survey. On the short answer section she wrote:

> **A struggling reader is someone who** has difficulty using/applying different strategies when reading in order to decode new words.
> **Some students have difficulty reading because** they are not familiar with many strategies, haven't had practice, and/or lack exposure/encouragement.
> **Some students are good readers because** they have had practice, experience, encouragement and modeling.

At the end of the semester, as Poppy reflected back on her pre-tutoring and post-tutoring survey answers she wrote:

> Previously I put a lot of emphasis on the child's previous experiences. Although that is important, it is not the determining factor for whether or not a student will be successful. This also goes along with the importance a teacher puts on a student's background and home life. It isn't necessary to put a lot of importance on it because it doesn't always matter what the students' background is.

Clearly Poppy's thinking had changed, but most likely it was still under construction. She seemed to be minimizing the importance of diversity, rather than valuing it. Poppy wanted to believe a student's cultural background need not be a determining factor for academic success. Poppy seemed to be moving toward a more inclusive stance. She may have to work at ways of aligning her students' home lives with life in their classroom.

INSECURITY FUELS CAUTIOUS INQUIRING

Poppy's tendency to inquire cautiously may be influenced by her lack of confidence due to her limited teaching experiences. Poppy's insecurity led her to explore issues such as agency and effectiveness.

Poppy's insecurity in relation to her knowledge and performance seemed to indicate her cautious nature. Even in light of Elena's tremendous progress, Poppy still doubted her own teaching ability.

> I think I was so impressed by how many levels she moved up. That sort of scares me. I keep thinking that maybe I was doing something wrong. She was reading a B level at first and her last book was an F. That just seems like a huge jump. I just keep questioning if something was wrong. I mean I did the assessments and everything seems to be OK. So – yeah – I just keep thinking about that.

Even though Poppy had documentation to prove that she was successful based on Elena's progress, she still questioned her effectiveness. This insecurity may be caused by her inexperience. Poppy seemed to question if it was reasonable to expect with other students the kind of progress she had documented with Elena. In some respects, she may have doubted her abilities, but perhaps even more she was questioning her knowledge about expectations for first graders. This excerpt also illustrated the continual questioning that characterized Poppy's approach to her teaching. Even though she had what she believed to be proof, she felt compelled to continue to question. This kind of on-going questioning tended to help her explore options and wonder about alternative possibilities.

More than any other participant, as indicated by the frequency of the topic in her interview transcripts, Poppy was concerned about her effectiveness with her tutee. Was she doing all that she could? Was her instruction making a difference?

> Is she learning anything (laughing)? That is always – I am sure that she is taking some things out of it, but is it the stuff that I was planning for her to take out of it and will she actually remember it tomorrow and a week from now and yeah that is the biggest things. And is what I am doing like effective for her. Like the way that she learns?

Putting time and energy into her work with Elena and documenting Elena's progress was not enough to satisfy Poppy's questioning of her ability to actually make a difference. Her concern moved beyond the here-and-now questions, to wondering about long-term effects. Will this serve Elena well in the future? Will the progress be able to sustain itself in the future? Or once tutoring is over and Poppy is no longer available to reinforce strategy use, will Elena stop applying them? Poppy's questioning of her tutoring effectiveness seemed to be fueled by a sense of insecurity.

Poppy embraced numerous ideas and suggestions brought up in class and by the authors of the class readings, but was concerned about how she was actually going to be able to put it all into practice. In her second journal entry, she wrote,

> I would love to incorporate all of these ideas into my classroom, but how does a first year teacher do that? During student teaching it took a lot of time for me to plan the lesson, the centers, the books for Guided Reading, etc. How do I do all of this? I would like to implement all of these ideas into my class, but is that a realistic goal? How does a first-year teacher do all of it? That takes me to Guided Reading. If there are no assistants or paraprofessionals, how in the world do you assess all of your students at the beginning of the year to figure out what level they are even on? How do you take time to assess each student while keeping the other twenty-five students busy with meaningful work?

One can almost hear the worry and edge to Poppy's questioning. Her unvoiced question was really, "Can I do this? Am I capable of crafting this kind of environment?" Her desire to do what she believed would best serve her students

was offset by her concern about establishing an organization system that would allow her to accomplish her teaching goals. Poppy's questions are pragmatic, but necessary. The first step in skillful inquiry is determining the kinds of questions worth asking. The next step is struggling with them. Poppy was ready to ask the questions, but was she ready to really struggle with answering them? Can she even attempt to begin to answer them without having the context of her own classroom to aid in her reflection?

TRENDS AND PATTERNS OF INQUIRING

Poppy did not find it natural to question the authority of authors. Only once did she question an author of an assigned reading. As she read, she accepted most ideas with little opposition. However, some readings prompted her not to challenge that author – but to raise questions about points that intrigued her. For example, although Poppy did not necessarily disagree with the author (Durkin, 1978/1979) in her article on comprehension, she was surprised by its findings and wondered if they were still true today.

> Durkin's article really surprised me. I definitely wasn't expecting her research to find that teachers spent hardly any time teaching reading comprehension. However, I have to wonder if that has changed since she wrote the article in the 70's. Do teachers teach more reading comprehension now that there are endless amounts of standardized tests or are they still removing it from their daily plan? It's hard for me to believe that teachers aren't focusing more of their time on reading comprehension now that standardized tests focus on comprehension. Is this still the case? (Journal 5)

The high stakes testing environment currently pervading our public schools influenced Poppy's questioning of the article. Her wondering about the relation of the past to the present and future helped focus her thinking while she was reading.

However a main point of the article was the finding that teachers spent more time assessing comprehension than teaching comprehension. High stakes testing also focuses on the assessment of comprehension. Poppy's questioning missed that point of the article, suggesting that she may have been more interested in questioning the use of high stakes testing than in the topic of comprehension.

Unlike the other participants in the study, Poppy had no instances of inquiry connecting the ideas she was encountering in the course to her own school experience. Although she had a successful educational background, she rarely looked to her own school experience as an influence on her thinking. While it seemed to influence her performance in the reading methods course (e.g. in her tendency to summarize and regurgitate readings in her journal entries), she did not articulate its influence in her talk or writing. It may be that Poppy was apprenticed in her academic career to do little questioning. She did not question her school experience, but rather accepted it. She did not feel free to question the authority of an author because for the most part she was required to understand the author's message, not critique it. These previous experiences may be partly responsible for the cautions nature of Poppy's inquiry.

Though Poppy typically avoided questioning authority, she did question school practices sixteen times in the data. After reading an article (Allen, Michalove, Shockley, & West, 1998) for class, Poppy used her dialog journal to record her thinking about the school practice of retention.

> So many schools use retention when students do not meet the expectation and standards of a certain grade level. However, studies have shown that retention is not effective for students, socially or academically. Then why do schools keep retaining students? I think that one reason retention is still being used is because it is an easy option. It seems easy

> to hold the child back and not have to give the student the individual attention, time, and appropriate instruction that he or she may need in order to catch up with the state's standards. It seems like administrators and teachers think that by hearing the information a second time, the student will become successful in reading and writing. That doesn't make sense at all.

Poppy was in agreement with the authors of the reading and used the authors' authority to help articulate her point about retention. She had no difficulty questioning the use of retention. This, however, took minimal risk on her part; it is somewhat safe to question a practice that is unpopular and take a position that is supported by many studies. While Poppy felt free to question, she still did it somewhat cautiously.

Poppy believed that retention gave teachers and administrators an easy option. On this issue, Poppy aligned herself with the student's perspective, not the teacher's. Questions more from a teacher point of view may have included what should be done with the student who has been given more time and individualized instruction and still lags behind their peers. Should students be passed along without having to reach a certain level of competency? If so, as the work becomes increasingly difficult, will students begin to view themselves more and more as academic losers? At this point, Poppy wasn't raising these questions; she was more inclined to question school practice from a student perspective.

Another example of Poppy using the author's authority to support her questioning of school practice can be found in her last journal entry. After reading the last chapter in *Classrooms That Work* (Cunningham & Allington, 1999), Poppy wrote,

> So many of the things that were said in there got my blood a bit boiling, not because I disagree with them, but because

> they are the things that I agree should be changed within our school systems.

Poppy went on to express her thinking about free lunches, smaller class sizes, teacher empowerment, and professional development. The following is an excerpt from her discussion of professional development. Notice the level of inquiry embedded in this excerpt as compared to her very first journal entry.

> Again, I agree with the authors on what they say about professional development for teachers. But, again, it seems so idealistic. How in the world will teachers find time to discuss with and observe other teachers? Will they get subs and take off days of school? Will teachers even want to take even more time out of his or her day to go and observe and talk with teachers?

Poppy agreed with the authors, but believed this position to be idealistic. Her inquiry here stands in marked contrast with her initial summarization of course reading material. It still was a somewhat safe inquiry as her questions still aligned with popular opinion. This time she questioned the school's agency in relation to management and organization. While Poppy believed in the importance of staff development, she found thinking about the implementation of it to be more of a struggle. In reality, most staff development concerns are related to time management and organization. There is nothing new, no "ah-ha" moment, unearthed by her questioning. It was relatively risk-free.

WONDERING GUIDING POPPY'S INQUIRY ABOUT TEACHING

Evidence of how Poppy's inquiry guided her thinking about her tutoring was evident throughout the data. For example, Poppy kept questioning her time management during her tutoring sessions week after week. In her first interview she said,

> P: I am still trying to figure out time wise. Like guided reading went fast the other day so we spent a lot more time on word work which was fine, but I would like to have some sort of happy medium. The other day was completely opposite then. She didn't even get to word work. So I don't know.
> M: So what makes the difference?
> P: How much I plan first of all. If I don't have…If I had thought of enough things to do with guided reading, or different routes I could take, it doesn't go – I mean we don't go as much because I can't think of anything else (laughing). Or if she is interested. I haven't really had that problem yet, but. I assume that if she is not interested I won't keep pounding it into the ground.

Poppy's questioning was helping her begin to understand the reciprocal relationship between her planning and her struggle with time and pacing. The more she had thought through her lesson and possible directions it could take, the less difficulty she had with her pacing. While experience will lessen the necessity for comprehensive planning, Poppy's wondering about her time efficiency will undoubtedly will help guide her instructional preparation.

Inquiry about skills and strategies within the context of her tutoring sessions was also reflected in Poppy's talk as in this excerpt from our interview after Poppy's classroom observation of Elena's reading group.

> M: You can say – she doesn't know where to apply the strategies and that gives you a perfect focus.
> P: I just really don't know quite for sure how to do that.
> M: How do you do that?
> P: How do you teach someone to know which strategy to use? Just for me, it's hard because I know – oh I just have to reread it because it doesn't make sense and I guess I just need to keep reinforcing that or

Finding a focus, but being unsure of how to address it forced Poppy to look for outside help. Initially, she looked to her own experience. What strategies does she use in her own reading process? While she was able to articulate one strategy

(rereading) she needed a partner to extend her wondering. Poppy does not finish her sentence, but leaves it hanging with the word "or." This seemed to be invitational, a request for me to join her in her inquiry and we went on to discuss possible strategies she could use to give Elena tools for figuring out unknown words.

Poppy went on to describe the kinds of approaches she had already tried.

> We talked about using pictures a lot. Like I covered up some words and said, "How would you know what this word was if you didn't know it?" And she said because she knows. And I said, "How would you know that?" And so she said, "Look at the picture." So she knows to do it. She just doesn't know when it is best to use certain ones.

Poppy was thinking deeply about Elena's reading process. If Elena could understand the concept in one situation, why was she unable to transfer it to a different context? In Poppy's fourth lesson plan/reflection she said,

> Elena saw the relationships on the Lego board, but I'm not sure in reading that she is making the connections.
>
> Again she is thinking beyond a surface level as she considers Elena's ability to make connections across contexts.

POPPY'S FUTURE PLANS

Although Poppy was very interested in securing a primary elementary classroom teaching job, she decided to spend the next year doing service in Lithuania. As Poppy was questioning her job opportunities, her relatives who have been living in Lithuania for the past year, invited her to join them. Before acquiring household goods and a romantic attachment, Poppy decided she was at a good place to take advantage of living in another culture before pursuing her own classroom.

Case Study 2

Natalie, a Doubting Inquirer

INQUIRING AS A DOUBTER

Brown haired Natalie was a twenty-two year old, easy going fourth year senior at Midwestern College. The semester prior to this study, Natalie completed her student teaching in a fourth grade mixed socioeconomic classroom. Natalie graduated with an elementary education degree, but in addition, completed a middle school math endorsement. During the semester I collected data for this study, Natalie was hired to teach one section of a seventh-grade algebra class at a private, religiously affiliated middle school in Midwestern. Natalie had not yet completely rejected an elementary focus; however her interests seemed to lie more within teaching math and teaching at the middle school level. In Natalie's third interview she stated:

> I think I just want to be a math teacher to be honest. Yeah, I do. I really like things to be logical and one way and that's not how reading is. I don't know. Even math has different ways to do a problem, but I mean there is an answer. I don't know. Maybe it is just because I am more familiar with math. It just comes naturally to me. But it just seems like there are more specific skills where like reading…I don't know. Maybe because when we were brought up we were taught specific math skills, but not specific reading skills. I don't know.

Natalie's interest in math may be a natural inclination to that particular subject matter, but her discourse seemed to indicate that it might also be growing out of a sense of her doubting her ability to teach reading.

For tutoring, Natalie was matched up with nine-year-old Marcia, a Caucasian, light brown haired, working class, female. Marcia lacked confidence in her reading ability, which often resembled a lack of motivation. Believing that she was not a good reader caused Marcia, when offered a choice of texts, to select the easiest, most familiar, or shortest text available. Marcia did not experience pleasure in reading and therefore often avoided opportunities to engage with text.

INQUIRING ABOUT RELATIONSHIP AS A DOUBTER

The relationship between Natalie and Marcia could be characterized as tepid. No feelings of dislike were apparent, but there was little evidence of warmth or bonding between them. Natalie was troubled by their rapport, but in her attempts to make sense of their relationship, she often blamed Marcia for their difficulties. In her first interview, when asked what she was curious about in relation to Marcia, Natalie responded:

> Hmmm. Well I'm kind of curious whether she wants to be in tutoring right now because I haven't seen her - she doesn't smile very often and just that one day that she didn't come. I don't really – she told me last um session that she had a lot on her mind on the day that she missed and I don't know if that was it. Yeah I don't really – but we – we didn't really talk about it that much, but I feel like she is kind of not always there – wanting to be there and so that's – I wouldn't say that we have like the best relationship – you know – we are not like buddies – you know. She doesn't come up to me and hug me and you know act happy to see me or anything like that so I'm kind of wondering what is going on you know. Most kids are really – I don't know. It seems like a lot of the other kids in the class really like that one on one attention, but she doesn't seem to necessarily like that.

Much of Natalie's doubt about their relationship seemed to come from the lack of outward signs from Marcia. While Natalie seemed unwilling to admit that

she would like hugs, and would like Marcia to show enthusiasm for spending time with her, her talk seemed to indicate that she was bothered by the lack of positive response she was receiving from Marcia. In her final interview, Natalie discussed her feelings about Marcia. There seemed to be little change in her thinking about their relationship over the course of their tutoring partnership.

> She's not like always – I don't know – most kids just really want to talk to adults and tell you everything that is going on in their lives and have all this attention – to me anyway. She is just like take it or leave it. I don't know. She is different than most kids I think. Most kids I've worked with because it is a special treat you know – that is how I am used to them reacting to the extra attention – especially younger kids, but she just isn't like that at all. I don't know.

While the tone of the talk seemed to place major responsibility on Marcia's aloofness, Natalie still was unsure of the cause of their relationship struggles. The tentativeness of her speech as indicated by the choppiness of her expression and the abundance of "I don't knows" suggest her struggle within the inquiry. Much of Natalie's discourse followed this kind of pattern. Her speech was often punctuated with the phrase "I don't know," indicating an element of doubt that frequently appeared in her inquiry process. (In her second interview, the phrase "I don't know" occurred sixty-five times).

The issue of being perceived as fun was important in participants' inquiry. Natalie's concern with making tutoring pleasurable stemmed from her tutee's display of some motivational issues throughout their sessions. All tutors were required to meet their tutees at their classroom door at the end of the school day. One session, Natalie did not pick Marcia up after school at her classroom door, which resulted in Marcia leaving the campus, thus missing her tutoring session. When Marcia did not show up for tutoring, Natalie went to her classroom to check

on her whereabouts. Upon Natalie's return to the reading clubhouse, she acted hurt and disappointed by Marcia's departure, but when she talked about it in her interview, she said it had not bothered her that Marcia had left, but it did spark her curiosity.

> Well I'm kind of curious whether she wants to be in tutoring because I haven't seen her – she doesn't smile very often and that one day that she didn't come.

Natalie believed that Marcia's lack of emotional display and her skipping of their tutoring session indicated that she did not want to participate in tutoring. However, Natalie's curiosity never led her to explore her own role in relation to this issue. Would Marcia have gone home if Natalie had picked her up? Marcia was characterized by her classroom teacher, and by Natalie, as a bit scattered. Perhaps Marcia truly forgot about tutoring. What had Natalie planned to include in their sessions that Marcia would truly enjoy - that would initiate a smile? Reading was an area of weakness for Marcia. It would only stand to reason she would not show great enthusiasm for opportunities that engaged her in a process with which she struggled. Natalie seemed to be looking for reasons for the insecurity she was feeling in her tutoring partnership. She found these reasons by questioning Marcia's behavior, not her own.

Inquiring about Student Motivation

Wondering about her ability to motivate students to read also grew out of Natalie's experience in working with Marcia. Natalie was encouraged to focus her tutoring on cognitive factors (reading strategies and/or skills) that could be measured and remediated, rather than on affective factors such as motivation that were more difficult to measure and often require substantial time to address.

However, motivation seemed to be Natalie's primary concern about Marcia's reading process. In her second interview, she discussed how tutoring influenced her thinking in this area.

> It just seems like finding their interests is so key and that is also what I am wondering about – like how you draw kids into something that they are not interested in because they are not always going to be jumping for joy when they open up their social studies textbooks. I don't know. I mean with her it just seems so hot and cold whether she wasn't to – I don't know – comprehend – I don't know. I don't know.

Natalie's repetition of "I don't know" in this excerpt suggests that, while she was willing to struggle with her question, she still was stuck in doubt. Marcia's hot and cold behavior seemed to spur Natalie's inquiry on, but kept her in a state of puzzlement. Theoretically, she believed that keying texts to students' interests was important, but the transformation of her beliefs into practice became the focus of her inquiry.

Later in this interview, Natalie posed strategies related to motivation.

> M: What are some possible responses on your part that could maybe support her motivation?
> N: Right. I know. Right I need to – we – obviously varying the session, I think. And the lesson plan kind of provides for that. I noticed last tutoring session that she got really excited about those letters. I had just bought those. And so I don't know if like that could be like some kind of reward or having some sort of – I also thought about you know having – doing like a language experience approach.
> M: Actually that would be a good idea.
> N: With – I don't know – what we would do. I really haven't thought <u>too much about that – but that</u> (laughing) is definitely something that I should be thinking about.

This excerpt suggests that Natalie is able to reflect on her responsibility for Marcia's motivation when she is guided to do so ("What are some possible responses on your part…?") Natalie was able to pose two strategies that she

believed would help motivate Marcia – Language Experience Approach and rewarding her with an activity she enjoyed, in this case working with letters. Both approaches were similar in being hands-on and experientially based. However, the motivation behind the use of the letters seemed much more of a reward to Natalie. Did Natalie believe that manipulating Marcia through the use of extrinsic rewards would serve her better than trying a different instructional approach?

Natalie's speech in this excerpt suggests that her concern regarding Marcia's motivation was the root of her engagement in the inquiry process. Characteristic of inquiry, Natalie's word repetition and false starts marked her speech as she began to think about possible ways to address the situation. The laughter that accompanied her admission that she needed to devote more time and energy to reflection showed her discomfort with the situation and possibly with the inquiry process itself.

Doubting One's Ability to Make Connections

One area of concern that Natalie questioned was her ability to plan for connections between the tutoring components. When I asked her in the first interview if there were any questions that seemed to recur for her session after session, Natalie said,

> N: I know I didn't relate this (word work manipulating plastic magnetic letters) back to the book because I didn't know how and I don't know what to take out of that book that I want to teach.
> M: Out of *Ralph S. Mouse*.
> N: Yeah. I don't really – don't know how to relate the word work to the text.

Natalie doubted her ability to make authentic connections within the tutoring framework. In this excerpt she seemed to be seeking answers rather than

wondering about possibilities. As the interviewed continued, I guided Natalie to think about her observations of Marcia's writing and spelling patterns, so that she would be able to find a focus for her word work, and we discussed how that could connect to the text she had selected for guided reading.

Natalie also articulated feelings of doubt in relation to her use of assessment. She had difficulty connecting what she believed intuitively about Marcia to her interpretation of the assessment results. When asked in the third interview what struck her as she reflected back on the tutoring, she said,

> Well mostly it was trying to interpret the assessments and deciding whether I thought they were valid or not because some of them - I think they told me things, and some of them like the IRI (Informal Reading Inventory) – I don't think it necessarily told me anything. I don't know…The reading interview told me things and the Garfield Attitude Survey – she supposedly had a worse attitude than before so I didn't know what to make of that – like according to that – I don't think that is necessarily true, but I don't know. So I didn't feel like any of my assessments are extremely valid except for the interview.

The tentativeness of her talk here, punctuated with "I don't know," suggests that she was trying to reconcile what she believed with what the assessment results indicated. There was a part of her that wanted to believe in her own informal assessment based on her observations, but there was still a part of her that was confused when those observations conflicted with the results of the formal assessment. Which was more reliable? What was the most valid kind of assessment? Which should she trust?

In her third lesson plan/reflection, Natalie's observation of the difficulty Marcia had with a particular task led her to question her strategy for approaching

future sessions. Here the connection at issue was her pedagogical role and Marcia's success.

> I was surprised how hard making words was for her. I think I needed more of a focus.

For Natalie, lesson plan reflections were the primary format in which she examined her own role. Throughout her interviews and journal entries, Natalie tended to focus her questioning on the role that outside forces played in relation to their tutoring sessions. Often she made excuses or tried to blame outside sources for their tutoring sessions or their relationship not going well. In this particular instance, however, Natalie observed Marcia's difficulty with the task and questioned how she may have negatively influenced the situation. It seemed that lesson plans/reflections helped Natalie focus and take responsibility for her tutoring situation, whereas the other formats - interviews and journals - drew her wonderings to factors outside of herself.

Natalie also doubted her ability to make connections during her own reading of course materials. A common complaint of Natalie's was that too many of the readings focused on primary reading instruction, making them irrelevant to her context of tutoring a fifth grader. In Natalie's fourth journal entry, she articulated a change in her feelings.

> One of my biggest struggles in this class is taking material relevant to the primary grades and trying to make it relevant to intermediate grades. I was talking with Anita (a high school English teacher enrolled in the reading methods course) about how this class is useful to her as a high school teacher. After that, I realized that if Anita can take ideas and make them useful to her, I can make ideas about primary relevant to intermediate. For instance, while reading the chapter in *Classrooms That Work* about a home-simulation kindergarten class, I was able to think about the

> overall idea the text was trying to get across rather than throwing my hands in the air and saying this isn't useful!

This seemed to be an "ah-ha" moment for Natalie. Her conversation with Anita was able to move her on to a new place in her thinking. She was able to respond to texts for broader ideas, rather than just thinking about them as step-by-step guides considered useful only if they could be immediately applied.

QUESTIONING ONE'S TUTORING PERFORMANCE

Natalie found tutoring to be somewhat frustrating. Although she was interested in teaching middle school and had student taught in fourth grade, she indicated at the beginning of the semester that she was interested in tutoring a first or second grader. When assignments were given, Natalie was given her third choice, which was a fifth grader. Natalie's frequent mention of primary tutoring being "easier" may indicate that she never reconciled herself to having an intermediate tutoring placement. Areas of struggle within the tutoring context ranged from issues of planning to execution of tutoring sessions.

In Natalie's first interview, she indicated that planning was what she questioned the most about the tutoring context.

> M: When you think about tutoring, what kinds of questions are you thinking about most?
> N: What went well? What would I like to try again? What didn't go well? What I need to work on? I think about things that I found that she needs help with and how I can do that next time. Or the things that we did that she seemed to fly through and so ok I know now that we don't need to work on that anymore.
> M: Do you find that you think more about Marcia or you think more about what you did?
> N: Both. I mean it's interchangeable. Probably more about what I did I think – in response to her. It's hard because I feel like I don't know her very well. I don't

> know what her needs are at this point. But I think about what I am doing more probably yeah (chuckling).

It may be that Natalie was responding with the kind of answer that she thought was correct. The types of questions that she gave as examples of her thinking are the kinds of questions that had been modeled for her throughout her preparation program. Did Natalie really use them to guide her tutoring? In subsequent interviews Natalie discussed how she was unable to pinpoint any of Marcia's weaknesses other than motivation. Yet in this first interview, she talked about observing Marcia's abilities and being able to identify her strengths and weaknesses. There seemed to be a disconnect in what Natalie believed theoretically to be guiding questions for her instruction and what she was able to apply in her current tutoring context.

Questioning her timing in relation to her tutoring was another avenue of inquiry. Trying to cover all the components within the tutoring framework caused Natalie to feel rushed in her instruction. In her second interview, she discussed her frustration with time.

> N: I just feel like there is not time – like an hour - like for tutoring there are so many things that I would like to do and really you can't get into something. Maybe with younger kids it is easier because you are working with these really simple tasks that don't take as long – like they write a sentence.
> M: Time is always an issue – whether you are talking about tutoring or about teaching in the classroom.
> N: There are just so many times that I would just want to spend the whole hour on word work or the whole hour on guided reading or the whole hour on poetry. By the time you really get into something -
> M: Then you have to move on. Do you think it would be more beneficial to do the whole hour on one component?
> N: Possibly – like today we got into poetry and she was flipping through reading a whole bunch of poems

> deciding which one she wanted to do and that took a good fifteen minutes. But I was OK with it because she was reading them.

At the beginning of this excerpt Natalie stated she needed more time because as she and Marcia approached one of the tutoring components, they would become absorbed in the task. Because motivation was a problem for her tutee, it seemed reasonable to think that it could be beneficial for them to devote longer periods of time to fewer components if Marcia became engaged in the instruction. However, Natalie's poetry example later on in this excerpt showed Marcia's engagement, but no instruction. Fifteen minutes of free reading poetry with little focus other than to find a poem to recite for the performance party was not an example of instruction that was strategic or diagnostic in nature.

Questioning her ability to ascertain a focus for her work with Marcia seemed to be a constant source of inquiry and doubt for Natalie over the course of the study. In her second interview, when asked what she wondered about tutoring, she stated,

> I wonder how you – I don't know – how you know where to start with a student. Like I still feel like there's such an amazing amount of possibilities that I don't – I just feel like I don't' really know what to do with her. Like it is not clear-cut like I want it to be. I want it to be like this is the problem and this is what you need to do and it is not like that and so I just feel like overwhelmed with the amazing amount of options that I have…I am envious of the primary people because it seems like it is a lot more obvious what they are supposed to be doing with them.

Natalie seemed to really want a script with answers rather than possibilities to explore in terms of reading instruction. Possibilities seemed to overwhelm her to the point of not knowing what to do. Instead of relying on assessment resources, Natalie tried to use her observations and intuition to develop her goals

for Marcia. When she found it difficult to identify areas of weakness to address, she became less confident in her ability to teach reading and wallowed in her own self-doubt for much of the semester.

Questioning One's Ability to Teach Reading

As the semester progressed, Natalie seemed to question her ability to teach reading more and more. At the end of the semester, after completing both the pre and post surveys, Natalie reflected back on the differences in her responses.

> I was really surprised that I'm not a more confident reading teacher according to the surveys. I think this class brought up more questions and issues. Plus, I still don't have my own classroom to try all these things in. How can I really be that confident? I think that my definitions of good teachers and readers got more clearly defined and I think Marcia taught me something about what it means to be a good reader.

Although at the end of the reading methods course Natalie felt less confident about her abilities to be a good reading teacher, her inquiry may actually have placed her in a better position to be a reflective practitioner. The more you are willing to question and admit you do not know, the further your inquiry can take your thinking. Many of Natalie's questions were context driven. Her reference to needing her own classroom to be able to more aptly struggle with her own questions was echoed by all of the participants in this study.

Natalie's questioning of her ability to meet the needs of individual students seemed to grow out of the tutoring clinic's focus on differentiated instruction. This created a natural bridge for Natalie to raise some basic questions about differentiation in her last interview.

> I'm totally stuck on that (differentiation) right now – like I don't know what to do. Yeah like it is so easy to say you –

> meet the needs of all kids, but how do you do that? Because first you have to assess each kid to know where he or she are at and then you have to - you know - figure out the game plan and then you have to carry it out and then you have to measure whether you have actually done what you were supposed to do.

Natalie clearly delineated the steps she would need to follow to be able to differentiate her instruction, but her words seemed swaddled in skepticism. Did Natalie believe she might be unable to do what is necessary to meet the needs of all of her potential students? Was she worried about having enough time to differentiate, or was her concern more about having the knowledge to perform the necessary steps? Or does she think that this approach just sounds like too much work? In this interview Natalie went on to discuss how she was differentiating her instruction in her part-time job teaching middle school math. While she was able to articulate how she sought to meet the individual needs of her mixed-ability math class, she still seemed perplexed about how she would be able to apply those same principles of differentiation within a reading class. Perhaps this, too, is an indication that Natalie needed the context of her own classroom in order to more aptly struggle with her questions. The tutoring context confined her questioning to issues arising in working with one student, but Natalie wanted to think about differentiated instruction in a classroom setting.

Making sense of what she believed reading to be was another area of inquiry about reading that Natalie grappled with over the course of the semester. Was reading more about cracking the code, or was reading more about making meaning? Natalie said that she did not believe that reading was decoding, but she often made reference to her belief that primary tutors had an easier job because early reading was more focused on decoding. Three times in her second interview

Natalie stated that reading was decoding before – with a prompt from me - she attempted to articulate what she really believed, or perhaps what she thought I wanted to hear.

> N: I don't know. Maybe it's just because in my mind I think so much about decoding. I think reading is decoding. Maybe that's just my own hang up that I think reading is decoding.
> M: Do you really think reading is decoding?
> N: No. I don't – but can't you see how people think that?
> M: Yeah
> N: Like people who don't really know much about education. They would just think that - oh if you can read these hard words then you must be a good reader but they are not really thinking about meaning and many I over – I don't' know. Maybe I oversaw – maybe when I first heard Marcia read, and she read so fluently and at her level, I just sort of assumed that she didn't have any problems. But, I don't know. I still feel like. I don't know.

Natalie was not really sure what she thought about reading, but she was hard at work trying to sort through her thinking as indicated by her halting speech patterns and repetition of the phrase, "I don't know." She wanted to believe that reading was more than decoding, but for so long now she had believed that reading was more about being able to decode words and read fluently – the outward signs of reading-than about the inside meaning making part of the process.

Beyond her difficulty in trying to define what she believed about reading, Natalie also struggled with knowing what she believed about reading instruction as exemplified in this excerpt from her second interview.

> N: There are so many – like – I just feel overwhelmed. Like I don't know what to do. Like every teacher does things differently and there are so many programs and ideas that it seems like everybody just throws them together in a haphazard – not haphazard, I mean there is thought behind it. I don't know. It is so eclectic. I don't know. I don't know what I'm going to do. It seems like it depends on the school – like what they want you to do. I don't know. I just

> feel like I'm not going to know until I'm like a third year teacher and it is kind of scary. I don't know how I am going to teach reading. I feel like so confident with math and social studies and science, but like reading - it just seems so broad that it is scary. Because it is important. It is like the most important thing…yet it is the most ambiguous to me like how – there are just so many ways to do it. I don't know.

Natalie clearly was unsure of her beliefs as indicated by her abundant use of the phrase "I don't know" throughout her discussion of reading. She was obviously scared and overwhelmed by reading instruction. While the tutoring clinic's structure did allow for variation, there was a clear framework intended to guide all tutoring instruction. Yet Natalie described reading instruction as "haphazard" and "eclectic." It seems the context of tutoring intensified her insecurity rather than helping her establish an understanding of what she believed to be best practice for reading instruction.

Beyond expressing many insecurities about her ability to meet Marcia's needs in the tutoring clinic, Natalie questioned her ability to teach reading in a primary grade as in this excerpt from her second interview.

> Oh my word – I wouldn't know what to do. I'll be honest. If I were a first grade teacher, I would panic. I would absolutely not have the first clue what to do with them. That is really scary. Fourth and fifth grade I think I could manage pretty easily. It would still be a little scary, but yeah – that's a fair statement. I don't know if it is my preparation. I just like things to be really straightforward so maybe that's not how you teach reading.

For all of Natalie's complaining about too much of her teacher reading methods preparation being primary focused, and for all of her statements about primary reading instruction being easier than intermediate instruction, she seemed quite insecure in her knowledge of primary reading instruction. The other area of

focus that was interesting was Natalie's interest in clear-cut answers and straightforward approaches. Natalie seemed to struggle with her own inquiries more than any of the other participants. However, it seemed as if she did not enjoy the process and wanted someone to supply neatly packaged answers to all her questions. Part of this might be because Natalie - while not lazy - was not as driven by a strong work ethic as Poppy or Luke. On several occasions, Natalie framed her wonderings about issues such as differentiation or grouping for guided reading in terms of how much more work certain approaches demanded than other practices that may be viewed as less effective, but required less of the teacher.

NATALIE'S FUTURE PLANS

Natalie chose not to pursue a teaching job in the fall. Instead, she accepted a church service mission position in Texas. Natalie's assignment will be working with middle school students in an alternative school setting in a Hispanic low-income neighborhood for a year. Upon completion of her voluntary service term, Natalie is unsure as to what she will do.

Case Study 3

Sibyl, an Expressive Inquirer

INQUIRING WITH EMOTION

Sibyl was a feisty, brown haired, emotionally driven twenty-two year old traditional student at Midwestern. Sibyl held deeply personal religious convictions, which often caused her to actively seek out mission opportunities. She spent the summer between her Junior and Senior year at Midwestern in a Pastoral Ministry Inquiry Program in Arizona where she worked as a summer youth pastor intern. Her student teaching was completed in Chicago at a religiously affiliated, private elementary school. Sibyl was placed in a combined first grade / second grade classroom with a population of primarily low-income Hispanic students. While Sibyl described this experience as positive, she also felt that her preparation was inferior to that of her Midwestern peers whom had student taught in public schools. Sibyl had spent most of her life in Midwestern. However, her adventurous spirit drove her to experience life in diverse settings.

Sibyl was assigned to tutor Ray, a perky, Caucasian, working class, first grade boy. Establishing a positive relationship was easy as they both approached tutoring enthusiastically. Their sessions were dominated with lively conversation and friendly banter almost from the beginning. It was obvious from observing their sessions that they thoroughly enjoyed each other's company. In Sibyl's last

interview, she stated that what was most memorable for her throughout tutoring was their relationship.

> Just our relationship - because we are like friends. I don't know. I'll miss him. I'll miss our interactions together. He was just so excited, and so fun to be with, and we really kind of fed off of each other. We would run down the hall and be tigers. I mean we just had a good time together. It was a fun time after school. So I will miss that.

Sibyl mentioned relationship throughout her interviews as part of her core beliefs about teaching. In her first interview she said,

> S: I just think that education is a relational field and if you don't have relationships to base things off there is no meaningful anything.
> M: But aren't relationships tricky?
> S: Yeah they are. I don't know.
> M: With Ray it seemed so easy.
> S: Yeah.
> M: But is it always that easy?
> S: No. – uh -uh – Well, I don't know. I just like making the child feel like they are special. When, when they feel badly - I don't know. I don't know <u>much about anything</u> (laughing).

It seemed as if positive relationships had been easily established in Sybil's experience in working with children. When the question was raised about the complexity of relationships, Sybil agreed with me, but then backed off ("I don't know"). It was as if Sybil knew that her understanding of relationships was limited, but in her experience so far, she had not seen the complexity of relationships play out. Her knowledge and experience were at odds, causing her to be unclear about her beliefs. Sybil ended the conversation on this topic with redundant "I don't knows" in a tone of self deprecation, seeming to indicate her discomfort with the topic and her desire to move on to the next area of discussion.

In her second interview, she again discussed her feelings about relationship and teaching. Tutoring had seemed to reinforce rather than challenge Sibyl's thinking about relationship, perhaps because she established rapport so easily with Ray.

> Well I've always considered teaching – not it's like – yeah well it is just more affirmation and yeah I can do this. And I am excited when kids learn and do that. I love – like I'm very much focused on relationships that I build with students and that the teaching stuff is kind of secondary, but then when you can really integrate those two and it is not those separate fields like either you are – you know - you have positive relationship with them or you are teaching them something. When you can bring it together and through that positive relationship you can teach them something that is really cool and it really works.

Sibyl indicated that she believed affective factors to be primary in teaching, and cognitive factors secondary. This notion was not as apparent in her practice. Because Sibyl had a strong rapport with Ray, she was able to focus her tutoring sessions toward Ray's cognitive needs. Would Sibyl feel differently about relationship if she and Ray had been less comfortable together? Would she consider affective needs to be primary if they hindered her ability to effectively address academic needs?

INQUIRING EXPRESSIVELY

Sibyl's inquiry process seemed to be highly driven by her emotions. Emotions were highly evident in her talk as she discussed her love, passion, hate, excitement, and frustration with any given topic. She abundantly used all capital letters and/or exclamation marks throughout her journal entries in an effort to be more expressive. She expressed herself verbally with an informality that conveyed emotion. In her seventh journal entry, she discussed her thinking after having read

an ethnography about the incongruity between home and school practices (Delgado-Gaitan, 1987).

> How can you teach without recognizing the home life and culture that students come from? Especially when it is with an ethnic group that is growing so much in the schools? It just seems really naïve and um – retarded that teachers would work to facilitate learning by embracing the culture of students. It's like, duh, why do you think they are having a hard time? They AREN'T stupid!

Her writing style seems intended to provoke an emotional response rather than an intellectual one. Her use of interrogatives seemed to invite the reader to participate in her inquiry. Using words such as *retarded, naïve, duh* and *stupid* seemed designed to provoke a reaction from the reader regardless of the reader's agreement with the line of thought.

Sibyl seemed to find it helpful to think in metaphors as she tried to make sense of her thoughts. Here's what she wrote in her eighth journal entry as she tried to express her feelings about the influence of politics on the educational system.

> It is as if we are building a sandcastle and it is starting to get dry and fall apart. But instead of rebuilding it with stronger materials and better support, we just slap more wet mud on to try to keep it together. That's what I think of this country. We need to care for what is at the core of our country and whether or not the big heads realize it, it is not the military or stock exchange, it is the people and it is the kids.

Sibyl found the politics of teaching to be discouraging. Her sand castle analogy offered a way to voice her anger over school funding issues. Tenets of Sibyl's religious affiliation included simple living and pacifism, which may have influenced her to see the stock exchange and the military as less important factors for governmental attention than public schooling. Another example of Sibyl

expressing herself metaphorically came in her fourth journal entry when she focused on the topic of student choice of reading materials. Sibyl believed in giving students reading options, but felt strongly about the need for balance.

> Maybe within the teacher choosing the books, a number could be offered and then the student could choose within what the teacher offers. That way they still feel ownership in the reading process. I think ownership is really important. If a student is just doing what the teacher says and never has ANY freedom (to whatever extent) to make personal choices, she'll just become like tofu…not having any defined opinions, but taking whatever is given to her (which is sort of how I feel I am, sadly enough).

Sibyl seemed like anything but tofu. She was spicy and brought life and enthusiasm to all that she did, even maniacally at times. Her analogy seemed to suggest that she believed that lack of choice caused students to become robotic. However, Sibyl seemed to struggle with providing choice within a structured framework. While she believed choice to be important, she also believed the teacher needed some power over students' choice in order for students to be pushed in new directions. Sibyl seemed to assume that if students were given complete freedom of choice, they would become complacent and only choose materials with which they were already familiar.

INQUIRING INSECURELY

Evident in the data were emotional highs and lows - episodes of self-confidence and episodes of insecurity. An example of an emotionally low episode can be found in her fourth journal entry.

> Heck, at this point, I don't even necessarily think I want to teach. So part of me feels I don't have any ownership in saying what I believe about teaching because I figure I am not a good teacher (in my head not having the desire to teach = being a bad teacher).

Throughout the semester Sibyl struggled with doubting her ability to be a good teacher. In some cases, as in the excerpt above, she seemed to believe she was *bad* because she was questioning her vocational choice, rather than actually examining her practice. Sybil also discussed not being good enough to be a teacher in her first interview. When I asked if there were any questions that kept coming up for her week after week she said,

> S: Yeah, like should I be (a teacher)? (Laughing) Like that is a major question.
> M: Really? Like when you are tutoring does that come up – like do I really want to do this?
> S: Well – not do I really want to do this, but am I really qualified to do this? Like, like, am I good enough to do this - which stems back to personal issues.
> M: That's the issue? I thought the issue was desire - that you really wanted to do counseling or ministry?
> S: Oh, I definitely have those desires. But, well, I just think that I – I just think that – I'm just afraid that I'm not good enough to be a teacher and so I don't think about that as being – I don't know.
> M: Where did that come from? You didn't get that from student teaching did you?
> S: No. I think I've gotten that from growing up and just having to be perfect all the time. And if I do something it has to be perfect and that is a whole other issue, but I think it comes out here and well is this really what I should be doing? Is this really what I am best at? Am I good enough to be a professional? Just comparing me to everyone else.
> M: Everyone else in the class?
> S: Yeah
> M: And when you compare yourself to everyone else in the class, what do you think?
> S: I think – oh my gosh! They are so far ahead of me! They are thinking about things so much better than I am. I am missing everything.

The negative self-talk was abundant in this excerpt. I was caught off guard during this part of the interview because her response was totally unexpected. Sybil was also the teaching assistant in the education department so I had more

opportunity to get to know her – personally and academically – than any of the other participants. Still her response surprised me. Sybil expressed interest in going to seminary early on in the semester, a possibility that our department was encouraging because she seemed motivated to go into the ministry. We did not realize that part of her interest in pursuing another degree and another career option had a great deal to do with her insecurity in her ability to teach.

Sybil went on to explain her need to be perfect. She felt teaching was such an important job that she needed to be able to do it well if she was going to do it at all. She also voiced her tendency to compare herself to others in the class. Her perception was that everyone else was always doing a better job than she was. As Sybil was on the brink of a major change in her life, it was good for her to question her choices. But her wondering here seemed to wallow in negative self talk that seemed to fixate her thinking on her lack of ability, rather than allowing her to explore the positive. This excerpt was taken from Sybil's first interview. By this time she had established a wonderful rapport with her tutee, and was executing successful sessions. It seemed that Sybil tended to focus on measuring herself against her perception of her peers rather than focusing on herself and her abilities as demonstrated in her tutoring performance. This path of questioning may continue to interfere with her confidence level if she persists in pursuing it.

Driven by her perfectionist nature, Sybil wanted to make sure that she had covered all possible avenues in regard to Ray. Her persistent questioning seemed to indicate that she doubted her ability to be an effective teacher. In her second interview she said,

> Am I missing something? Is there some other need that Ray has that I am not aware of? Or something else that I could

> be doing that you know – that would be really beneficial to him that I'm not thinking of. And if there is, how am I going to find that? I don't know. Stuff like that. I mean I feel really good about where I am at, but I want to keep moving forward. Like I think we have made a lot of progress, but I want to keep making progress. I don't want it to be at a standstill and become stagnant. I want it to keep being energizing and exciting and stuff so – what can I do to find (inaudible) that will be helpful?

Sybil recognized the progress that she had made with Ray, but still questioned if there was more that she should be doing. Was Sybil questioning herself to the point of self-doubt? Or was she using the questions to help further her thinking about her work with Ray? Hopefully Sybil's questioning will augment her quest for continued progress by opening up new possibilities as she searches for answers, rather than cause her to toil in self-doubt.

Sybil also questioned her performance during her tutoring sessions. In her first interview, when I asked Sibyl what she thought about after a tutoring session she said,

> Well I always think about whether or not what I did was the best thing that could have been done and I always get mad and I think oh gosh there is something that I could have done that would have been so much better or I could have said something different or this word would have fit that – that example better or things like that, but um

I asked Sibyl if she thought that her questions were positive or negative things to be haunted by. She responded that she did perceive her questions as negative, but also as a form of reflection that would make her more effective in upcoming sessions. While reflection can strengthen her practice, negative self-talk could possibly hinder her from focusing on the positive.

INQUIRING CONFIDENTLY

For all Sybil's expressions of insecurity about her teaching, there were times that she exuded confidence, as in this excerpt from her second journal.

> So having this one on one interaction, I'm gaining a sense of where you start and how to do it for one kid. Because if I can do it for one kid, then I can do it for more.

This comment seemed to stand in direct contradiction to Sibyl's earlier insecurity. She seemed to vacillate between feeling positive about herself as a teacher and feeling incompetent. Her last sentence articulated the goal for the tutoring clinic. The hope was that tutors would be able to take their experience from the tutoring context and apply it – confidently, knowledgeably – in a classroom. Hopefully, if one studies a child's reading process closely, one may understand how to apply that understanding in teaching groups of children. However, other participants struggled with this idea and stated that while it was easy to focus on one child, they did not see how that experience could carry over into classroom practice. Sibyl seemed to understand this relationship better than some of her peers.

In Sibyl's surveys, she expressed a degree of confidence. On her pre-course survey, she refused to circle any of the reading concepts/instructional approaches on which she was asked to indicate her level of confidence in her teaching. Instead she wrote on the bottom, "I'm pretty unfamiliar with all these terms. No, I am familiar with them because I've heard of them, I do NOT yet feel confident in teaching them." On her post-course survey, Sibyl gave herself all high scores on these items, indicating she felt a high degree of confidence in the

various factors often associated with quality reading programs. As Sibyl compared her answers on her pre and post course surveys she stated,

> I definitely learned A LOT! I didn't circle anything on the third part the first time, but this time I was proud to know about each area and to say I would feel comfortable including it in teaching. Yeah! My response for the first part didn't so much change as they were clarified and reworded. I think initial beliefs about reading have deepened and I have become more knowledgeable. I felt more able to talk about what my future reading program will look like. I was pretty clueless before.

Sibyl was able to identify growth on all three parts of the survey from her beliefs to her practice to her application in a classroom setting.

ARTICULATING HER WONDERING PROCESS

Sybil talked often about her own mental processing. In her second journal entry she talked about her inquiry style.

> Where to begin. Oh and I was wondering – can I respond instead to what you responded back to me earlier? Or should I do that too, but in a different e-mail? You asked some questions that I have in me and would like to explore further. But I can't do it on my own (I am very verbal, auditory, visual – I can't think in my own head. It needs to come out to make any sense.) In time I suppose, in time.

Sibyl was a very social person and this may have contributed to her feeling that she could not make sense of things alone. But then too, inquiry is often a joint venture. Sybil looked to finding out the rules. She sought direction and approval within her dialog journal, and yet she was uncomfortable with the journal in that she disliked waiting for a response. In her fourth journal entry, she discussed how the journal format was problematic for her.

> I know I don't reflect very well. It is hard for me to do reflection individually. I like the idea of a dialog, but I have a hard time when it is me saying a whole bunch and trying

> to figure things out and then having to wait to receive input. I know that the more we push ourselves to think about what we are reading the more we will learn, I just have a hard time with it. And honestly, I tend to think of it as just needing to get it read to fulfill the assignment. That is not something I am proud of; it is something I am trying to work through to find a deeper level of understanding in my learning. I have never been a good question-asker. I sort of take what comes and I generally don't have qualms unless it is an obvious diversion from what I have been taught or strongly feel.

Again Sybil referenced feelings. She seemed to need to feel strongly about something before she could initiate her inquiry. She believed that for her, inquiry was a socially constructed event. She believed that reflection was important, but she found waiting problematic to her construction of her thinking about a given topic. She needed dialog. Letting ideas resonate - giving them space – was not something she easily incorporated into her sense-making process. There was evidence of negative self-talk in this excerpt: "I don't reflect well," and "I've never been a good question-asker," indications that she felt insecure in her ability to make sense of her thinking on her own.

Sybil goes on in the same journal entry to discuss how she believed her process was aided significantly by experience. This again seemed to reinforce the idea that she needed to "feel it" to be able to make sense of it.

> I think I am at the point where I have very few ideas that I feel super strongly about. I want to hear more of what is out there and explore different ways of doing things and EXPERIENCE the reading scene so that I feel more connection and *personal* understanding about it.

Sibyl had little interest in thinking about her reading beliefs until she could do so in a context of real "experience" that had "personal" meaning for her. She stated that she had very few ideas about which she held strong opinions, yet the data would indicate otherwise. All of the data sources reflected that Sibyl felt

strongly about a variety of topics and articulated her feelings openly and vigorously. However in this instance, Sybil minimized her passion about ideas.

As Sibyl tried to make sense of a particular idea, she often qualified her statements by indicating that she was not through with her questioning. For example in her fourth journal entry she stated,

> Oh! I strongly believe that for reading to be fun and successful, it needs to have meaning and connection in the child's life. Whether through prior knowledge, an LEA, or something – a connection should be made to the kid's life. To some degree. I don't know yet though. I have to think about this one more. I just think there needs to be some connection so that the reading is meaningful.

In this written excerpt, she started out declaring her belief, but ended her declaration by saying that she needed to think about it some more in order to really make sense of it. Another similar example can be found in her second interview where she emphatically described her belief about the importance of affirmation to a child's reading process and then backed off with "I don't know.". (This discussion grew out of her description of her observation in Ray's classroom during reading instruction.)

> I think that affirmation is crucial there because at that age – like right now – I know that I am capable and if other people aren't telling me or affirming me, then I go do that for myself and I can remind myself that I am capable and I can affirm myself. But like at that age, he is totally working for other people. I mean he is developing his own skills, but it is kind of because someone else is prompting him to and so if that other person is not encouraging him, then I think he's not sure if what he is doing is correct. I don't know.

Sybil's talk was so confident until she concluded it with "I don't know." It is almost as if she wanted to leave herself an out after she declared her belief. All throughout this excerpt her talk seemed to build – the more she talked, the more

she felt she was communicating what was in her heart. The "I don't know" at the end seemed to let all the air out of the balloon – to usurp the power out of her words.

EMOTIONALLY DRIVEN BELIEF SYSTEM

Sibyl believed that all teachers needed to be passionate to be effective. In her first journal entry in response to an article about at-risk students (Polakow, 1993) she said,

> The article that included the different case studies made me furious as it depicted teachers who really didn't care about their students. When it comes to vital life skills such as reading, it feels impossible to meet each student's needs because they are on such varying levels. How can teachers teach if they aren't passionate about their students' learning and well being? There is such hopelessness in a teacher writing off a student even before she meets the kid, just because she heard the kid comes from a low-income family or whatever. Augh…No child deserves to have their backs turned on him/her. And the people who work to develop reading skills or whatever in children. Rats, OK, so any teacher-esk person needs to be so passionate about what they are doing, otherwise, it will flop.

Sibyl was eager to express her frustration with the issue. Her word choices - *furious, passionate, hopelessness, augh* - were punctuating her thought process as if the emotions fueled her inquiry process. This was just one of several times in the data that Sibyl referenced passion as requisite for effective teaching.

Sibyl also had strong feelings about teachers addressing students' affective needs as well as cognitive ones. In her second interview, she discussed her frustration with Ray's teacher for not providing enough of an atmosphere of support, in her opinion.

> Even in that little guided reading session that I saw (in his classroom) like I didn't hear her once affirm him for doing something good and he was doing so many things that I thought were really great that I didn't see him doing the first couple of times that we met. And that just really frustrated me. Because I saw him withdraw into this kind of question thing and he was standing up and looking around – not trying to know what other people did, but kind of have a sense for where to go with it and he just wasn't sure. I don't know.

Sibyl went on to say that Ray's teacher was not necessarily negative, but took a more neutral stance in her teaching approach. Sibyl believed that if the teacher had a neutral stance, then Ray was going to remain neutral and be "unable to proceed with confidence and energy." This strong belief in affirmation also caused Sibyl to question how to think about Ray's challenges without focusing on him negatively.

> I don't want to say that what he has done is wrong. And I think that is my subconscious fear of critiquing him. But I think I need to do that more…I don't tend to criticize him, like I tend to criticize what I've done more. And that's when I question stuff…I don't critically think about what Ray has done…I accept what he has done.

Sibyl seemed to feel free to criticize her own practice and to wallow in her own self doubts, but she could only allow herself to cautiously consider judging Ray's performance. Developing her professional judgment about a student's performance will be critical to her effectiveness as a teacher. Professional judgment does not necessarily lead to deficit thinking, but Sibyl seemed to believe that the two were closely linked, and therein lay her struggle.

Sibyl's opinions about school practice were also emotionally driven. Because much of the Reading Problems course focused on the principles used by *Guided Reading* (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996), which advocated the use of small

group reading instruction, Sibyl wrestled with the idea of ability grouping. While *Guided Reading* encouraged the use of flexible grouping patterns, participants often questioned how to group without tracking or labeling certain populations of students. Sybil questioned the school practice of labeling in her first journal entry.

> Labeling is SO dangerous and detrimental. I was labeled in high school and that broke me for a good long time. I can't imagine having a label from the beginning. I think people are just too lazy to work through problems and issues and they want to blame things on something bigger that can be "fixed" in an easy way. No child deserves to have backs turned on him/her.

Part of Sybil's fervor in relation to this topic stemmed from her experience of being labeled in high school, but in some part was personality related. Sybil demonstrated passion almost to the point of being manic. What she felt, she felt deeply. Enthusiasm about a topic can aid in the process of inquiry. Sybil tended to be one of the more reflective participants in this study. Her drive to question was often fueled by her zealous pursuit of topics that brushed close to her heart. In this excerpt above, Sybil blamed teachers for mislabeling students. Why does Sybil believe that teachers are lazy? Does this stem from her own school experience? She questioned whether teachers were looking for an easy fix. Again, it was easy to see Sybil's rage over perception of an injustice. However, Sybil tended to avoid looking at the problem from the teacher's perspective. Is labeling an easy fix? Does labeling really make educating students less work? Sybil obviously was aligning herself as an advocate for the students, but teachers will soon be her new peer group. Hopefully, at some point her experience will lead her to inquire about issues from both perspectives, student and teacher.

Another emotional element evident in her inquiry process was that Sybil seemed to physically feel what she was thinking about. In her second journal entry she described how she was feeling about assessment.

> The actual recording of assessment is what made me groan. I guess there is no easy way around needing to do that. And I agree that it is more beneficial to have daily or weekly assessment information to work from instead of trying to call back what happened six weeks ago and assess it. This whole teaching thing is about organization, I think. The more organized you are the better. Right now my head is not organized and it hurts to think. And there is a lot of new stuff going into it, and it is tired of being cluttered.

Sybil talked about groaning, hurting and being tired out from thinking. She was willing to consider the ideas being presented to her, but her thinking about them produced a physical as well as a cognitive reaction within her. She also believed that her teaching was more heavily influenced by the actual instructional experience than by her instructional planning. In her first interview, she said,

> There is a huge variety of problems and if I have my head geared in one way that the kid is going to be responding then I am not leaving it open to letting him respond the way he should respond or the way he would naturally respond. For me – in planning I like to have everything thoroughly planned so I understand what is happening but so that I don't have to plan for how he is going to respond because if he doesn't respond the way that I want him to do then I'm stuck. So I think it is partly like a personality thing because I am able to work with that and he is flexible - like that – so.

While Sybil believed that planning was important, she felt that rigid adherence to rigid plans could inhibit her from taking cues from and responding to the student. Sibyl's emotional, expressive nature seemed to be highly influential as she developed her understandings about teaching and learning.

SIBYL'S FUTURE PLANS

Sibyl will be returning to Chicago in the fall to work in the same school in which she did her student teaching. She will job share with her cooperating teacher in the same classroom, teaching the same grade. Toward the end of the semester, the school contacted Sibyl about returning as an Americorps volunteer. With little hesitation, despite all of the previous conflicting feelings she had about actually becoming a teacher, she eagerly accepted the position. Sibyl's feelings of insecurity seemed to be offset by her desire to live in closer proximity to her boyfriend. Accepting this position provided a housing and job opportunity that allowed her to further this personal relationship.

Case Study 4

Luke, a Knowing Inquirer

INQUIRING AS A KNOWER

Knowing sometimes hinders the inquiry process. This case study illustrates how knowing can interfere with one's ability to inquiry. Luke was a twenty-two year old fourth year teacher education student at Midwestern. The semester before his participation in this study, Luke completed his student teaching in a third grade classroom in a low socio-economic school that was predominantly African-American. The reading program used during his student teaching practicum was *Success For All.* Luke hated the structure of this program and the lack of emphasis on critical thinking skills. In our second interview, Luke described the influence *Success for All* has had on him.

> It (tutoring clinic) has made me appreciate being able to plan my own lessons a lot more and really getting into that. I'm not a big research person. It just doesn't strike me (laughing) – but it really forces me to think about processes that I know to be - you know to work…Does this match up with what I already know to be true – even if I am not going to the research. I've seen enough programs and seen what works – even if I haven't read all the research, I know there is proof that *Success for All* works. I know our (state test) scores came up. But again that is skills testing, not critical thinking.

This example shows Luke inquiring as a knower, his prevalent orientation throughout the semester. As he explored the question of *Success for All's* influence, he looked to his own experience as the basis for his beliefs. Although most would say that Luke's experience thus far had been quite limited, he believed that he has seen enough programs that he knew what would work and what would not. He continually rejected research, another example of his belief that he knew enough about teaching and no longer required the assistance of outside professional sources.

Luke was assigned to tutor a fifth grade, working class, poor Caucasian boy named Bo. While good-natured and well mannered, Bo was extremely shy. His verbal skills were particularly hard to evaluate as his shyness inhibited him from giving more than one word answers. Overall, Bo's reading abilities seemed to be at a higher level than his confidence. Although his reading level, and his ability to decode and self-correct were at an acceptable level for his grade, Bo did not consider himself to be a good reader. Bo's comprehension skills seemed the most limited, but were also hindered by his limited responses. It seemed that Bo may have been able to understand more then he let on, but assessment was difficult because he would most often respond with a yes or no answer and rarely would offer an explanation for his thinking even when prompted.

INQUIRING ABOUT TUTORING AS A KNOWER

Although a tutoring framework was provided to help guide the tutor's planning and instruction, Luke rarely developed his plans according to the frame. For example, Luke's third lesson plan used the lesson plan format, but his planned activities did not correspond to the goals of the tutoring components.

Figure 5.1 Lesson Plan/Reflection – Luke's Third Tutoring Session

Session #3	Lesson Plan	Reflection
Poetry Warm-Up	Pg 4 *The Dreamkeeper* What is the meaning?	Decoded well Meaning was too hard
Build-Up Reading	Discuss vocabulary from Ch. 1	Took too much time Maybe just write words we discuss
Guided Reading	Chapter 2 Assess first page	Did well – probably 97% accuracy, but meaning is tough so I think the book is appropriate
Word Work	Go back and look at vocabulary words in context. Discuss clues.	He's catching on to this idea of context clues, but definitely needs more work
Writing	Begin Journal What is the worst day you've ever had?	Didn't get to it

For build-up reading Luke planned to go over the vocabulary in Chapter 1 of the book they had been reading, although the goal of build-up reading was to read independent level texts. For guided reading, he planned to read Chapter 2 of the same book. The goal for guided reading was to work with instructional level text and target an instructional focus. Luke recorded that the text was at an independent level in his reflection; however due to the difficulty of comprehension, he believed the text was appropriate. More bothersome, however, was his lack of planning for an instructional focus. The point of guided reading is

not just to read a text, but to work on a skill or strategy related to the text. Word work consisted of looking at the vocabulary in Chapter 2 in context. The goal for word work was to allow students to manipulate patterns and sounds. Writing definitions for vocabulary words was not the kind of word study advocated by the tutoring framework.

Luke's planning was not consistent with any of the goals of the tutoring components. This seemed to be an indication of Luke relying on what he was already familiar with and determining effective practice based on his experience. He did not allow himself the opportunity to explore what the methods course was advocating as effective reading practice for struggling readers. As a knower, Luke felt comfortable manipulating the tutoring framework to serve his purpose. As a knower, Luke did not explore and experiment with the new ideas he was encountering in the reading methods course.

Another example of Luke privileging his own knowledge during tutoring was in his use of assessment. Luke disregarded the Informal Reading Inventory's protocol because he believed he already had an understanding of Bo's reading level. In his second interview, he said,

> I already knew the level he was supposed to be at from going through this stuff so I didn't go through any of the word level lists. We took his level test and he didn't do as well as I thought he would. The passage was dull. It was a factual passage. All of them were in the book. It was a different kind of reading. Instead of looking for meaning and characters, you are looking for facts, dates and what not. That is what the questions were like too. The first two

> he got – what the passage was about and what the main idea was, but then it started asking where – it was about boomerangs – where did it originate and stuff like that. He lost it. He got two out of the ten comprehension questions right.

Luke did not let Bo's poor performance on this test influence his thinking about Bo's reading abilities. Luke went on to defend his determination of Bo's level regardless of the assessment results. He felt it pointless to test Bo at a lower level because he believed there was no possibility that he would actually be reading instructionally at a lower level. Luke offered various excuses for Bo's poor performance – mainly in reference to his beliefs about the validity of the test itself. In Luke's thinking, Bo's poor performance proved that the test reported little information of value. If Luke knew the level, the test should have confirmed this. Since it did not, the test was not a valid assessment.

Instances of inquiry about material selection were often evident in the participants' talk. Luke's selection of materials was characterized by his knowing approach. Luke used one book for the majority of his tutoring sessions with Bo. In Luke's first interview, he discussed his text selection.

> Well I know that – well currently *Harry Potter* and *Lord of the Rings* and so many of those fantasy texts have been really popular. Also they are based on the lives of children in a dark context with um a language that is not quite the norm. If the language is normal, then we don't get quite away from ourselves, but if we start using some of that old English in that darker text it transports us a little bit farther I think from reality. And um so seeing this text fitting those areas, and also being one that I wanted to read myself, I thought it might be a good one to use.

Luke primarily looked to popular culture to inform his material selection decision-making. If a type of book was considered to be in vogue, Luke assumed that it would capture the interest of his tutee. He felt no need to justify his idea that "dark language" is able to transport readers to another place better than other kinds of texts. Whether Luke really believed this idea or whether he had mastered the art of articulating a groundless defense was unclear. In his second interview, he continued the discussion about his text selection.

> L: We found a book that we liked in the beginning and we stuck with it because I mean there is a lot of good literature that I would love to share with him and - yeah, but for the main content of the day we stuck with something that he really enjoys. I don't – rather than starting out with five minutes of what he likes and pushing him into whatever for the rest of the day. I push him for five minutes, and then put him into the book that he really likes. Like I said on the Garfield thing – he said that there was no way that he would read if he could go out and play, but he got two chapters done over spring break. I mean for him, I would say that was at least an hour and a half of reading – maybe two, two and a half hours that he did on his own.
> M: and he understood?
> L: and understood and um – before we started reading he didn't have any library books out. He wasn't reading anything for fun and he took this home and he read it. So that is progress.

Luke believed that Bo was highly motivated by the book he had chosen early on. Justifying his selection choice, he described Bo's reading behavior, focusing on the time Bo engaged with text outside of tutoring. My field notes of Bo's reading of that text reveal his difficulty with comprehension primarily due to

the unfamiliar vocabulary in the text. During tutoring sessions, Luke spent a great deal of time discussing the vocabulary and explaining the context to Bo. Luke assumed that Bo had good comprehension of the text, based on Bo's responses to Luke's questions about what happened in the book in the chapters Bo read over spring break. However, Luke indicated previously that he was reading the book for the first time along with Bo so it was unclear how Luke was able to evaluate Bo's meaning making on a text with which he himself was unfamiliar.

Luke's experience in the tutoring clinic helped him feel more confident in his abilities to work with struggling readers. In his third interview, Luke asserted that his confidence level was most influenced by his experience with the tutoring clinic.

> Teaching them is possible. I mean it is do-able. It is work, but it is do-able. I am a very idealistic person, but I have had my doubts about working with struggling readers just because of my knowledge and my background you know whatever. Seeing the quick progress of someone who is considered a bubble reader (students who do not pass standardized tests, but are close to the passing score) gives me a lot more confidence in my abilities.

Luke originally had some doubts about his ability to work with struggling readers as found in his fourth journal written just prior to his first tutoring session.

> Well I'm feeling as though I know very little about reading right now…for one of the first times in my educational career, I can honestly say that something seems daunting or overwhelming to me…I have to say that I'm nervous about the situation. I'm getting to learn so much, but will I remember it all when it comes time to teach…It is so easy to forget and just plunge through material to get it done

> sometimes. I guess though, this individual setting should help me to overcome that in a lot of ways. Wow, there's just so much to this, and I want to succeed. And not so much for myself, but for those I teach. I guess none of us are made or broken in one session though. ☺ It will come. I'm still a little nervous though.

The progress Bo made over the nine weeks helped Luke to overcome any lingering self-doubts. The source of Luke's initial doubt was attributed to his fear that his giftedness might make it difficult for him to relate to students who struggle. His use of the word "them" in the first sentence in the excerpt from his third interview (above) is bothersome, as it seemed to indicate that he still believed struggling readers are a group to be labeled. Although Luke was referencing his confidence, it seemed that his self-perception may continue to limit his ability to connect with his potential students.

INQUIRING ABOUT TEACHING AS A KNOWER

Having strong opinions about what he believed to be best practice, Luke often approached issues of classroom teaching with a distinct bent toward practical application. Luke's primary goal for class readings was to collect functional ideas that could be implemented in his future classroom. While reading the course text, *Guided Reading*, (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996) Luke questioned the authors' position in his second journal.

> I believe that Fountas and Pinnell emphasized reading time over enrichment activities to go along with stories. They said that enrichment is useful, but reading is key. While I

> agree in some ways, I do feel that enrichment is key to learning about reading outside of words. Only when we get our hands into a book along with our eyes does the books truly become a part of us. We can feel the setting and meet the characters when we begin to bring a story to life through activities.

Luke believed that readers were unable to feel the setting and meet the characters through simply reading the text. However, adult readers typically experience these aspects without the aid of enrichment. Luke's description of enrichment seemed to be an inauthentic way of experiencing texts: readers must do something with their hands, not just with their eyes. Luke never explained what kind of enrichment activities he was talking about, but went on to explain his thinking about the organization of these activities.

> One thought triggered in me while reading was to set up some kind of enrichment packet that students could choose from. I do think that children's first priority should be to learn to read because that will affect their capability in school and life in every aspect, but there is more to school and life than reading. I think if I were working with Guided Reading in my classroom, I would have a number of art, music, and other subject activities to supplement my reading. Students would be able to choose a certain number of projects or crafts, each worth a given point total to come up with a larger point total. This would give students choice and control in their learning and might fit individual needs better. Different point totals could be arranged for different levels of learners as well. I just think this would help students become more involved and interested in the stories they were reading.

Luke was more concerned with setting up an enrichment packet than he was in actually engaging students with texts even though many of the course

readings talked about how little time students actually spend engaged with text in many classrooms. Setting up and maintaining a system as Luke described would be very labor intensive. His approach invites a host of questions: What if one student works a long time on one project in depth and someone else hurriedly finishes several projects in order to accumulate just enough points to earn a decent grade? Might this kind of system send students the message that reading is not for real purposes, but just for getting points? Might not some students spend more time manipulating the system than truly engaging with the suggested projects as Luke may have hoped? Luke did not raise these questions. His inquiry prompted him to pose an idea, but did not provoke him to explore the issue at a deeper level. Perhaps Luke's inexperience limited his ability to consider the administrative issues involved in implementing an enrichment approach.

The course was designed to engage students with theoretical issues relating to reading: The students read, discussed, wrote responses. But Luke did not draw on theory to support his ideas. Rather, he supported his approach with belief statements about differentiation, student control and student choice. These could have been important beliefs to probe, but Luke's idea of enrichment packets explored these only at a cursory level. At this point, Luke's belief system did not lead him to critical analysis of proposed approaches.

Questioning the effectiveness of the advocated tutoring approach beyond the context of the tutoring clinic was a source of inquiry for Luke. Always

searching for practical ideas to implement in his future classroom, Luke questioned whether the method he was required to follow during tutoring sessions could effectively transfer to a classroom situation. In his second interview, he said

> How effective is this approach going to be with other students? I mean – it has been easy for me to see progress in Bo - now without doing the research - without going through some teacher's manual – to know what Bo needs and um – I'm not sure if that is my training at the college – student teaching or if that is just Bo – that he is easy to work with. Um – yeah I'm just wondering how that is going to translate in the future.

In his discussion of his effectiveness with Bo, Luke was able to speak quite confidently, referencing his own ability as the primary source of their progress. Luke's questioning in this excerpt was more about what influenced his ability to become so effective rather than whether he was effective. What Luke really seemed to be challenging was the tutoring format he was required to follow. His comment "without doing the research" seemed to confront the course requirement of research-based practice. The research to support each component in the tutoring framework was presented during the course. Tutors were instructed that if they varied from the tutoring framework, they would be required to support their instructional choices with research. This requirement was a source of annoyance for Luke because he believed he intuitively knew what would best serve Bo's needs. Luke seemed to view himself as a professional capable of being an effective teacher without the support of professional resources.

The use of guided reading within the tutoring framework and the reading of the text (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996) often triggered participants' inquiry about differentiation in classroom settings. When asked in his first interview, what questions came to his mind in thinking about tutoring, Luke talked specifically about differentiation.

> Um. I guess most of my questions are just – there is so much content to know and that is the area that I feel like - you know - I'm going to have the most challenges. Once I'm within an area, I'm pretty comfortable making adjustments and designing curriculum, but getting to know a new curriculum base and how to individualize that for students um there is just so many different needs I've experienced already and uh it feels like no matter how much I know, uh it is always inadequate to the needs of a couple of the students depending on the program and um I guess my question will always be you know in searching for ways to best – to best meet the students' needs rather than just letting it go for certain students.

What triggered this response? The original interview question asked him what he was questioning about tutoring. However, there was no mention of his tutee or any tutoring experience. It seemed that Luke was framing his questioning more around his student teaching experience the previous semester than allowing himself to think about and question his current teaching situation. My sense was that like many participants in their first interviews, Luke was mimicking the kind of talk that had been modeled by his professors throughout his teacher preparation program. Although Luke indicated that he would search for ways to help him differentiate, searching was not very characteristic of Luke's actions throughout

the semester. Luke did search for practical teaching ideas that he could easily incorporate into his practice, but the course of action Luke will take for his searching will be interesting as he has often discussed his rejection of research and rarely read professionally even when it was required of him.

EXPERIENCE AND KNOWING

Luke's personal experience was a major influence on his inquiry. An example can be found in his seventh journal entry. After reading an article assigned for class, Luke expressed how the information provided him with no new understandings based on his experience.

> For this week, I thought the article provided some great information for someone prior to student teaching or who has had a very sheltered role as a teacher, but I felt it contained little new knowledge for someone who has been through a diverse student teaching experience.

All participants came to the tutoring clinic with assumptions about struggling readers. The confirmation or incongruity between what they believed to be true and what they were experiencing often triggered participants' inquiry. Drawing on his substitute teaching and student teaching experiences, Luke felt confident going into the tutoring that his construction of struggling readers was accurate. However in the context of the tutoring clinic, Luke found his assumptions about struggling readers disconfirmed by his experience with Bo. In his third interview, he said,

> I expected Bo to be worse off. I had several who were (worse off) in my student teaching situation. The one thing that surprised me throughout tutoring is many struggling readers do enjoy reading, but say they don't because it embarrasses them to read at the level that they do in front of their peers. But deep down they actually do enjoy reading – yeah – that – that was a surprise.

Luke assumed that all struggling readers hated to read. This assumption was confirmed by all of his experiences thus far. Bo contradicted this understanding causing Luke to rethink his construction of struggling readers.

Luke seemed to privilege experience over all other ways of knowing. An example of this can be found in his third interview.

> M: When you think about this semester – what did you end up thinking the most about? Or describe how your thinking changed?
> L: I am a person who learns by doing and so nothing can match the tutoring. That alone helped me more than anything else. Readings and class work – I'll remember some of that, but just personally I don't take much from something unless I've done it.
> M: But even within tutoring – we sort of started out looking at assumptions, then assessment, then moving into more strategy work – was there an idea or something that pushed your thinking as you were tutoring?
> L: I believe much more so now that um – I believe whole-heartedly now in a whole language process rather than a skill based process because of the thinking skills that are required. And also looking at the different research that we did – I can see how the skill building works because we researched DISTAR and did some of that stuff – how that is great for education and looks good on test scores, but the research that I saw and the development that I saw in Bo just requires a more holistic process that requires their thinking and their communication - not their receiving how to do something specifically.

Luke seemed to discount all of the other learning activities in the course except for tutoring. Luke expressed his belief about what was truly important in teaching. Yet, an examination of his approach in tutoring Bo reveals little evidence of a holistic emphasis in his planning. Nor was there documentation from observation of his tutoring to support an emphasis on fostering Bo's communication and critical thinking skills. There was a disconnect between Luke's articulated beliefs and his actual practice. Luke believed that his thinking was impacted by his experience in the tutoring clinic; yet in his tutoring he did not explore new approaches or experiment within each of the research-based effective components.

Here again, it seemed that Luke was holding on to past ideas rather than applying new thinking to his current context. "Whole language" was never explicitly introduced, nor was it embedded in the framework of the course content. Tutors were asked to contextualize their instruction and focus on meaning making (approaches which are consistent with whole language instruction), but "whole language" per se was not part of the course content. Notice the polished nature of Luke's talk: there were no false starts, pauses, or tentative speech markers. This kind of talk is more characteristic of someone who is reporting what he already knows than someone who is wrestling with his sense-making.

Luke also privileged his own school experience when thinking about his present teaching context. When asked during his second interview what puzzled him about struggling readers, he responded:

> It is the mental thing – how the mind works – it is going to be an issue for me throughout my career. I mean I was part of the gifted program throughout my childhood. It just came easy – yeah - for me to relate directly to these students. I am seeing and I'm learning third person now and that is good, but it is always going to be a question for me. That's OK. Maybe it will push me to work with those folks.

There were many references to Luke's gifted and talented label throughout the data sources. This label seemed to give Luke a sense of identity that he continued to claim even though his public school experience was long over. Luke's perception of his giftedness seemed to push him to separate himself from his students. Because learning had been so easy for him, Luke believed that he would have a difficult time teaching students who were not so academically inclined, "those folks" as he calls them. Luke has already deficitly labeled his future students. His comments suggested that he expected to have some students whom he would view as different from himself, students who will require extra effort for him to be able to understand. Luke indicated that he preferred working with students whose minds worked in ways similar to his own.

Luke's speech patterns were more polished than is typical of inquiry expression. Even when he wasn't particularly making sense, Luke never paused or reflected on what he had just said. For example, "I am seeing and I'm learning

third person now and that is good." I think Luke was trying to communicate that he was learning about what it was like to struggle because of his work in the tutoring clinic. Watching Bo's struggle, Luke was learning what it was like to struggle and yet it seems highly unlikely that Luke never experienced an academic situation in which he struggled. In fact, one of his journal entries was all about his difficulty in learning to teach reading.

> So I'm glad I'm learning what I am, but again, for one of the first times in my educational career, I can honestly say that something seems daunting or overwhelming to me. Everything else has been common sense to me. I guess I just keep plugging away at it, but this is a new experience for me.

Because Luke had always believed that reading was such a natural process that could easily be picked up with a little practice, he was finding the complexity of the reading process overwhelming. He also had had little exposure to reading theory prior to the course and found the body of knowledge about reading to be daunting. This journal entry seemed very uncharacteristic of Luke. He rarely exposed his weaknesses or discussed self-doubts. Journals should be places to record such topics, but there must be a level of trust established. This was Luke's third journal entry. It seems unlikely that a high level of trust would be established so early in the semester. Perhaps Luke was testing the water to see what my reaction would be.

The two previous excerpts send two very different messages. In the first, Luke set himself apart from students who struggled; in the second, he admitted his

own struggle this semester. In the first quote, Luke was using his identity of being gifted to set himself apart, to put himself in a position of power, in a position as knower. In the second quote, Luke was allowing himself to be vulnerable. Perhaps however, he believed that the purpose of a journal was to express self-doubt and was writing it more as a teacher-pleasing attempt. Was Luke really struggling? This was the only instance in the data when Luke questioned his knowledge. Most of Luke's talk throughout the data sources conveyed an air of confidence.

Luke's Future Plans

Luke was the first participant to secure a teaching job. While he explored many job options (including teaching in far off states and working in business), Luke accepted a job in a capital city in the Midwest. He will teach third grade in a suburban, middle class, predominantly white school setting.

Chapter 6

Summary of the Findings, Implications, and Limitations of the Study

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to examine the nature of pre-service teachers' inquiry while they learned about and tutored struggling readers. Six participants' instances of inquiry (verbal expressions of wondering and sense-making) were identified in four data sources: audiotaped interviews, electronically submitted dialog journal entries, written tutoring lesson plans/reflections, and pre and post semester surveys.

Analysis of the data revealed that pre-service teachers, when prompted, have many inquiries about teaching and learning. Expressions of inquiry in this study fell into four major categories: 1) inquiring about assessment, 2) inquiring about students, 3) inquiring about relationships, and 4) inquiring about teaching. Case studies of four of the participants revealed striking differences in individual inquiry style (cautious, knowing, emotional, doubting) as well as in favored meaning-making acts (critiquing, challenging, questioning, reflecting, feeling, etc). Participants were often able to articulate their theoretical understandings, but had difficulty assimilating them into their practice. This suggested the need for

increased time for students to struggle with practical application of theoretical models.

There was evidence of a strong connection between pre-service teacher inquiry response format. The participants' perception of the kind of invitation each response format (interview, dialog journal entry, lesson plan/reflection) offered elicited different kinds of expressions of inquiry. Interviews elicited the greatest quantity of expressions of inquiry across all categories. Journal entries were heavy in challenging, connecting, reflecting, feeling, while lesson plans/reflections – written immediately after tutoring sessions-prompted more describing, positing, and wondering meaning-making acts suggesting the importance of face-to-face, dialogic interactions between teacher educators and pre-service teachers.

Differentiation was an issue that many pre-service teachers tried to make sense about during the semester. The intentional inquiry orientation of the reading course allowed me to model this concept. Each student inquiried uniquely (as illustrated in the four case studies) and I was able to tailor instruction to pre-service teachers' own questions and wonderings through the use of dialog journals and interviews.

Issues of professional identity development emerged from the data. All participants struggled with the questions of "Who do I want to be as a teacher?" and "How do I become the teacher I want to be?" As this was their last semester

in college, the upcoming shift of their roles from student to teacher elicited many expressions of inquiry, from issues of professional fit to how their own educational experiences were influencing their practice. Teacher education programs exist to develop teachers. Pre-service teachers naturally question their identity as teachers. It seems logical that by teaching them through the modeling of an inquiring stance, we may be developing inquiry-oriented professionals.

Discussion of Findings

Nature of Inquiry

Guiding Research Question: What is the nature of pre-service teachers' inquiry (wondering and sense-making) in the context of a Reading Problems course including a nine-week tutoring clinic working one-on-one with a struggling reader?

Much of the literature that describes the nature of inquiry examines the issue in relation to children (Duckworth, 1987; Eisner, 1991b; Lindfors, 1999; Mills & Donnelly, 2001). A contribution of this study is that it explores the nature of inquiry with pre-service teachers. There are studies examining how inquiry-based research projects have helped develop an inquirer's stance with pre-service teachers (Broaddus, 2000; Gitlin et al., 1999; Poetter, 2000), but none that tracked the types of inquiry expressed by pre-service teachers. While my findings describe characteristics of inquiry that teacher educators may assume that pre-service

teachers bring to the table, they also allow us to glimpse into the range of inquiry individuals express when presented with a context in which to explore their wonderings.

Expressions of inquiry in this study were categorized as: 1) inquiring about assessment, 2) inquiring about students, 3) inquiring about relationships, and 4) inquiring about teaching. The range of inquiries across these four categories, was striking, encompassing the practical (Am I selecting materials on my tutee's instructional level?) and theoretical (Is the approach I'm using effective for all kids?), the immediate (What poem should I read today?), and the timeless (Am I doing this right?), the specific (How do I prompt my tutee without just giving the word?), and the sweeping (How do you teach kids to read whose first language isn't English?), the distant (How can I differentiate my instruction for 20 kids in a regular classroom?), and the personal (Does my tutee like me?). Also striking was the range of distinctive inquiry styles across the four case studies: Poppy whose inquiry was cautious, timid, tentative; Natalie, whose inquiry was questioning, doubting, tenacious; Sybil whose inquiry was passionate and intensely emotionally; and Luke whose inquiry seemed oriented toward affirming or reinforcing the beliefs he already held. Noteworthy, too, is the range of meaning-making acts the participants expressed in their inquiry: they questions, wondered, critiqued, challenged, reflected, emoted, described, all toward the end of working through some sort of puzzlement or uncertainity.

The definition that I used to identify instances of inquiry was pulled together from the literature about children's inquiry (Lindfors, 1999; Mills & Donnelly, 2001). Inquiry was characterized by: 1) it is a language act; and 2) it is an act of sense-making; or 3) it is an expression of wondering. It is also important to note that participants were invited to inquire. Prompted inquiry in this study was scaffolded through one-on one inquiry-oriented interactions with me during interviews, through written inquiry-oriented interactions in their dialog journals and through the intentional inquiry-oriented frame of the Reading Problems course. A study of prompted spontaneous inquiry would most likely have resulted in different findings.

While I do believe people naturally inquire, I think our socialization and personal histories heavily influence how that inquiry is expressed. For example, Luke's inquiry style is similar to what Belenky et al (1986) describe as subjective knowing. His style is monologic, he looks to his own personal experience and belief as the source of understanding. As Luke tries to make sense, he questions ideas, but rarely questions himself. This style has served Luke well in accomplishing his educational goals. The educational system has even rewarded him with the label of "academically gifted" and has given him high grades for minimal effort. Luke's educational history seems to have significantly influenced his inquiry style.

This study is prompted by my belief that inquiry is closely associated with effective teaching practice (Duckworth, 1987; Eisner, 1991b) and that teacher inquirers help children to become empowered meaning makers (Gallas, 1995; Paley, 1997). The study contributes to the existing research literature by describing the expressions of inquiry by pre-service teachers as they try to make sense of their practice. It affirms that students do have questions (Dillon, 1981), but teacher educators must provide space for students to struggle with them. Pre-service teachers must have opportunities to share their wonderings with others, must be prompted to go beyond summarization and regurgitation of materials, must experience differentiated instruction as their unique inquiries are responded to if they are to develop an inquirer's stance – if they are to become inquiry-oriented professionals.

Disconnect Between Theory and Practice

The Reading Problems class tried to create a setting in which students had the opportunity to learn theory, but also to explore theory in their practice through the tutoring clinic. My study suggests that it requires substantial time for theory to become internalized so that it guides one's actual practice. Although participants were able to articulate their thinking about their theoretical beliefs, they often had difficulty applying these beliefs to their practice. The dialog journal entries and interviews were riddled with belief statements and comments about how course

readings were influencing their thinking, but the lesson plans/reflections never referenced their beliefs or theory. Because the lesson plans/reflections were tied to the tutoring context, I expected that this was where I would find participants connecting their present teaching experience to what they were thinking about theoretically. This did not happen; lesson plans/reflections did not reveal a theory/practice connection.

The case studies also indicated that participants were thinking about theory, but had difficulty putting their articulated beliefs into practice. One example can be found in Luke as he expressed his appreciation for the tutoring component in the Reading Problems class. Luke believed that the tutoring was a valuable opportunity for him to put his beliefs into practice. However, his lesson plans/reflections fail to document any exploration of new approaches or experimentation with the research-based components advocated. Luke could talk the talk, but failed to apply that to his tutoring practice.

Another example can be found in Natalie's case study where she clearly illustrates she knows the right questions to ask. When I asked her what she thought about after tutoring, Natalie said,

> What went well? What would I like to try again? What didn't go well? What I need to work on? I think about things that I found that she needs help with and how I can do that next time. Or the things that we did that she seemed to fly through and so ok I know now that we don't need to work on that anymore. (Natalie Interview 1)

These questions most likely had been modeled for her throughout her preparation program. She knew the right questions to ask, but these did not guide her tutoring; she did not apply these questions to her practice. Subsequent interviews revealed Natalie's difficulty in determining an instructional focus for her sessions with her tutee. What Natalie believed theoretically to be guiding questions for her instruction and what she was able to apply in her current tutoring context were disconnected.

Teacher educators often ask students to brainstorm instructional alternatives, only to be greeted by blank stares and few expressed options. Students are expected to naturally make connections. But they don't; they can't. While field-based practicums may be important in helping pre-service teachers connect theory and practice, they are just a beginning. Forging a meaningful connection requires time and experience.

Inquiry and Context

An interesting finding in this study was how pre-service teachers' inquiry was context driven. Participants were often able to articulate inquiries, but found it difficult to struggle with their questionings without a context in which to build from. As participants looked to the future, the issue of securing their first teaching position initiated many inquiries, but most participants seemed to wish to postpone answering their questions until they assumed the role of teacher. Many

instances of inquiry were context-specific, related to particular grade levels, populations, school, and policies. Perhaps at this stage of pre-service teacher education, teacher educators should be more concerned with assisting in question development to promote a teacher inquirer stance and less concerned with guiding the student toward answers.

The context of the tutoring clinic supported the participants' inquiry. Worthy and Prater's (1998) study of pre-service teachers and tutoring reported pre-service teachers' affirmation for opportunities: 1) to situate theory into practice, 2) to be supported by more knowledgeable others, 3) to develop relationships with a struggling reader, 4) to participate in a community of learners. The present study confirms these benefits of the tutoring experience. However, without the interviews and the dialog journal, many of the instances of inquiry uncovered would have remained hidden. The students in the Reading Problems course who were not part of the study were required to submit a journal entry weekly, but did not meet with me to explore their wonderings individually like the participants in this study did. The interview allowed participants to express their inquiry within a safe context with a more knowledgeable other and it allowed me to scaffold that inquiry process. Providing a field placement alone seemed insufficient in supporting their inquiry expression. The interviews support the importance of the four components offered by Olson (2000) to facilitate inquiry development with pre-service teachers: 1) process should emerge from an issue

transpiring from their own narrative knowledge, 2) oral or written comments from the professor must be made from an inquiry rather than judgmental perspective, 3) attentive listening, respect and authentic curiosity are essential components, 4) respectful responses that elicit new questions and new possibilities are needed to move students' thinking forward.

IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH

Two areas for future research are suggested by my study: 1) the relationship between the data sources and expressions of prompted inquiry evident in those sources, and 2) the development of pre-service teachers' professional discourse as they describe their tutees.

Relationship between Data Sources and Expression of Inquiry

The data sources used in this study seemed to influence the participants' level of inquiry. This became clear to me during the analysis of the dialog journals as compared to the participants' interviews and lesson plans/reflections. Participants' explored deeper questions in the journals than in the other two sources. They challenged authors. They reflected on how their educational experiences were influencing their thinking. They questioned school practices. Possibly the act of writing allowed the participants to be more contemplative than when they were asked to talk spontaneously during an interview. Did the act of writing allow the participants a space to explore their thinking– a way to separate

themselves from their thoughts by placing the words on a page. Many of the dialog journal entries were associated with the assigned course readings. This made me wonder about the influence of a third voice. Could the trio of my voice, the student's voice, and the author's voice have invited the participants to be more contemplative? I believe that this is indeed what happened. The dialog journal was a place for me to scaffold their thinking, ask probing questions, and extend their thinking. Their dialog journals are peppered with my response questions. My questions were intentionally framed to invite participants to dig more deeply into their own questions.

It was clear that pre-service teachers do have questions and are interested in probing them when invited to do so. This finding recommends that teacher educators ask more inquiry-oriented questions to elicit student-generated wonderings in the context of our methods courses. However, it is imperative that as students generate questions, teacher educators avoid the tendency to simply supply answers. Teacher educators' responses must model an inquiring stance for students to better understand inquiry as an orientation.

Like dialog journal entries, lesson plans/reflections were also written. However, the lesson plan format itself seemed to obstruct participants' recording of their wonderings (see Appendix F). While the format indicated a space in which to record reflections, participants used this primarily as a place to document specific observations about their tutees during their tutoring sessions, rather than

to reflect on their practice or their tutees' reading process. (Changes to the lesson plan format will be discussed more thoroughly later in this chapter.)

Also, time was a factor. Participants were required to complete their reflections prior to leaving the tutoring clinic. They typically wanted to leave immediately after tutoring which lessened their willingness to inquire into their practice. The lesson plans typically did not speak at all to participants' confidence or to their questions about tutoring, teaching, or thinking beyond about implications into their future practice. Perhaps the act of doing, lessened their desire to question their abilities, or think about bigger picture kind of issues, and encouraged them to focus more on practical details. Inquiry acts evident in lesson plans/reflections included: 1) positing instructional directions, 2) describing tutees, and 3) wondering about tutees' academic or behavioral response to their planning. An additional factor was that the lesson plans/reflections were directly tied to tutoring. Participants perceived them as a response to the immediate situation rather than as a place to reflect more broadly.

Interviews also provided a rich data source for documenting participants' inquiry. Talking extemporaneously about a subject elicited gut level inquiries. Interviews revealed what participants were thinking on the top of their head, perhaps a level of where their thinking was rather than where they wanted it to be. Written journal responses tended to include long-term issues, (ENL, retention, differentiation) whereas the interviews focused much more on their present

context (How do I find an instructional focus? How do I use assessment to help me plan? Am I doing this right?). The beauty of an interview is the opportunity to build on what is being said, moving in new directions and/or exploring multiple ideas about a single issue. At best, the interview allows the researcher to probe deeper into an area based on the participant's response. In my study, however, I found that the pre-service teachers were often not ready to offer alternatives nor did they have command of the professional discourse sometimes needed to dig deeper. They were willing to enter a dialog with me, but often relied heavily on me to guide the discussion. They were eager to learn, but had difficulty doing so without having someone to guide their inquiry.

Further research in the area of inquiry might explore the ways we allow pre-service teachers to voice their inquiries. Are there patterns in the kinds of (inquiry) responses that different types of formats elicit?

Development of Pre-Service Teachers' Talk about Students

Throughout the semester participants described their tutees. I found this surprising and intriguing. As I analyzed their talk, I was intrigued by the range of developmental levels exhibited in my participants' professional discourse, and surprised by the difference among participants' in their abilities to accurately and sensitively describe their tutees' behaviors. While all the participants would most likely say that professional discourse describing students should avoid

overgeneralizations and negative characterizations, some participants more aptly adopted these discourse codes into their own talk than others.

Further study is needed in documenting pre-service teachers' talk about students. What kinds of ways do they describe them? What kinds of descriptions characterize their talk? Do they describe attitudinal, behavioral, or instructional events? Is their talk positive or does it focus on deficit thinking? Answers to these questions could help pre-service teacher educators to structure coursework so as to assist students in developing professional language in which to frame their discussions about children and children's abilities.

IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

My study has reaffirmed my thinking about the importance of inquiry in teacher education programs. As the educational arena seems to become more and more preoccupied with right answers in the pursuit of better test scores, teacher educators need to become preoccupied with finding ways that pre-service teachers can explore their own wonderings. Experiencing the value of inquiry firsthand, pre-service teacher may become professionals who continue to explore their own questions in their classrooms. Providing this pre-service opportunity may be our best hope. Inquiry is the beginning – not an arrival. As we travel down the inquiry path, choices continue to unfold and expand. If our goal is to produce lifetime learners, then the point of our journey is to stay on the inquiry path. Four

areas to consider in teacher education emerged in this study: 1) differentiated instruction, 2) response format and the expression of inquiry, 3) changes in record documenting in the tutoring clinic, and 4) pre-service teacher identity development.

Inquiry and Differentiation

Inquiry is an individual process. Each of my participants inquired differently as described in the case studies. This individualization invites differentiation in teacher education. Structures such as dialog journals allow pre-service teachers to explore their own questions at their own pace. The drawback of such interactive structures is the intensive time allocation required of the professor. However, in my opinion, the advantages far outweighed the time investment. The dialog journal allowed me to "talk" to each of my students individually on a weekly basis. Since college courses meet for limited periods of time, relationships are often hard to foster. Dialog journals allowed me to build community through this avenue that was not limited by my instructional time.

Response Format and Expression of Inquiry

My findings suggest that there is a strong link between the response format and the expression of inquiry. For example, in the Inquiring as Teacher category, out of the 180 instances of inquiry, 92 units were from interviews, and 88 from journals (approximately 50% in each). No units appeared in lesson

plan/reflections. Obviously, participants did inquire/reflect as teachers beyond their immediate situation, but they did not do it in their lesson plan/reflections, apparently they understood these to be reflections about their tutoring experiences. The frame of the response format of the lesson plan/reflections shaped their inquiry. Every response format is framed and contextualized in some way. We would do well to consider carefully the ways that each format invites and constrains students' cognitive engagement. What specific response formats and combinations of response formats do we wish to provide within and across teacher education programs to foster inquiry-oriented professionals?

Out of the 903 total instances of inquiry across all formats, 575 (64%) came from interviews. The following table shows the percentage of instances of inquiries generated through participant interviews in the major categories:

Table 6.1 Percentages of Units from Interviews in Major Categories

Inquiring about Assessment	82%
Inquiring about Relationships	81%
Inquiring about Students	75%
Inquiring about Teaching	52%

These numbers strongly suggests the importance of face-to-face, student-instructor interactions in encouraging pre-service teacher inquiry. Interviews were dialogic. Participants would share their wonderings and I would gently, through the use of response questions, scaffold their inquiry in a way that I hoped would

invite them to explore their questions more deeply. This scaffolding seemed to assist participants' inquiry whatever the focus (assessment, relationship, students, teaching).

Building student-professor interviews into undergraduate methods courses means a considerable expenditure of time. Perhaps discussing the pre and post surveys in place of the first and last class would be an option. Despite the substantial amount of time and effort required to build such interviews into teacher education courses/programs, I submit that it is important to do so for these conversations model, guide, and foster inquiry.

Lesson Plan Format

The lack of inquiry instances in participants' lesson plans/reflections disappointed me. Lesson plans/reflections were mainly about tutoring instruction (skills and materials) and/or records of specific observations about the student. As I analyzed the lesson plans/reflections, I came to feel that I had done a poor job of constructing a lesson plan document that would encourage participants to be more reflective of their practice. Because I knew my students would be responsible for writing a case study at the end of the course documenting their tutee's progress during the tutoring clinic, I unfortunately stressed description to the detriment of reflection. I am revising the lesson plan format for future sections of this course. An additional column will be added. In one column, tutors will describe events, in

a second column, they will reflect on their practice. This way, there will be plenty of documentation to assist them in writing anecdotal information in support of their findings for their case study, but there will also be wonderings and questions to aid them in finding direction in their tutoring.

The column currently labeled *Next steps* will be changed to *Observations that lead me to adjust instruction in the next tutoring session in the following ways*. Many pre-service teachers either skipped writing in this *Next steps* section altogether, or else recorded minimally how their observations were influencing their next steps. Since this course specifically asked students to base their instruction on their observation of their tutee's individual needs, it seems that asking them to record their thinking will allow me to help them become more strategic in their instruction.

A further limitation was that the case study format in no place required students to include their wonderings. If I believe that wondering is important to the tutoring process, it seems that I must have ways to connect it with the major project required for the course. The problem with connecting it with the case study is that the focus of the paper is primarily on the tutee and the tutors' wonderings would encompass more than their inquiries about their tutee. Connecting tutor's wonderings to the case study limits the range of their inquiry; yet it still seems that I need to find a way to make more relevant connections between the tutoring practice and the course projects.

Inquiry and Pre-Service Teachers' Development of Professional Identity

Inquiry is at the heart of pre-service teachers' development of professional identity. All of my participants struggled with finding their place as a teacher. In one way or another, their expressed inquiries reflected the deeper question: "Who do I want to be as a teacher?" While some students struggled more with the question of what kind of teacher they wanted to become, others knew the kind of teacher they wanted to be, but wrestled with how to match their knowledge and performance with that picture. As they began to shift roles from student to teacher, they questioned everything from their fit with the profession to how their own educational experiences were influencing their practice.

Examples abound in the case studies. Sibyl's questioning of whether she wanted to be, or was qualified to be a teacher illustrates her struggle with professional identity:

> M: Are there questions that keep coming up for you as a teacher?
> S: Yeah, like should I be (laughing) Like that is a major question.
> M: Really – like when you are tutoring does that come up – like do I really want to do this?
> S: Well, not do I really want to do this, but am I really qualified to do this. Like, like, am I good enough to do this? (Interview 1)

> S: There is a lot of stuff out there and trying to sift through it all and try to make sense of it all and um- there is just a lot and it is like – what are the other programs that I am not hearing about that might really be working or what are some other strategies that might really be effective that

> maybe are being overlooked – yeah – I don't know. And I guess I don't feel like I fit into one of those things. Like I can take something from each thing that I learned about or each program or each um idea and develop it into my own way and I think that is kind of who it has to work because I'm not going to teach something that I can't believe in. Well I couldn't effectively teach something I don't believe in. (Interview 3)

Sibyl's identity development shifted from "Am I qualified to do this?" to questions of finding an instructional approach or "fit." She no longer wondered about being a teacher, but focused more on finding materials and strategies that would help her become the kind of teacher she wanted to be.

Across all three interviews, Natalie's doubting of her abilities indicates her struggle with professional identity development.

> N: It is so hard for me to pick up on what Marcia needs and how can I do that for 20? Yeah that is what I would like to know! (Interview 1)

> N: Just the fact that there are so many – like-I just feel overwhelmed – like I don't know what to do – like every teacher does things differently and there are so many programs and ideas that it seems like everybody just throws them together in a haphazard – not haphazard – I mean there is thought behind it. I don't know. It is so eclectic. I don't know. I don't know what I'm going to do. It seems like it depends of the school that they are in – like what they want you to do. I don't know. I just feel like I'm not going to know until I'm like a third year teacher and it is kind of scary. (Interview 2)

> N: Well – yeah. I'm totally stuck on that (differentiation) right now like I don't know what to do. Yeah like it is so easy to say you know – meet the needs of all kids, but how do you do that? (Interview 3)

Basic to Natalie's struggle with her professional identity was the problematizing and questioning of her role. The tentativeness of her language and abundant use of "I don't know" indicate her dedication to wrestle with her own questions. While the tone of Natalie's questions imply that she would be comforted by answers – right answers that would make teaching clear - she does not give up. She continues to question throughout the semester. The scaffolding of my questioning during the interviews may have aided her in this process. My hope was that the infusion of my inquiring stance – my modeling of questioning - would help my students develop their own inquiry orientation.

Luke shows how personal history shapes professional identity in this negative example of how he used his gifted label from elementary school to put himself above non-gifted students.

> I think one of the issues, one of the biggest issues I'm going to face when I start teaching is frustrations with bubble students or low-end students just because school has always been easy for me. (Interview 1)
>
> I mean I was part of the gifted program throughout my childhood. It just came easy – yeah - for me to relate directly to these students. I am seeing and I'm learning third person now and that is good, but it is always going to be a question for me. That's OK. Maybe it will push me to work with those folks. (Interview 2).
>
> L: I am a very idealistic person, but I have had my doubts about working with struggling readers just because of my knowledge and my background you know whatever. (Interview 3)

Across all three interviews, Luke felt it necessary to describe himself as gifted. It seems this label has become integral to his identity and is significantly influencing his professional development.

Professional identity development is a crucial component in the education of quality pre-service teachers. The reason teacher education programs exist is to develop teachers. Identity construction is a critical component of that development. Helping pre-service teachers struggle with issues of "professional fit" may help them determine their long-range goals. The pervaisveness of the identity issue led me to suspect that pre-service teachers naturally–inevitably-wonder about their professional identity. It seems that teacher education programs need to capitalize on the organic nature of this inquiry and structure opportunities in which students' wondering can be focused for further development. Assisting pre-service teachers to keep asking questions rather than seeking right answers is key to helping them shape their identity as teachers, as well as reflective practitioners (Schon, 1983).

LIMITATIONS

This study employed teacher research methodology, which asks teachers to explore their own questions in order to inform their own practice. The study is not generalizable, but the hope is that my findings may help others reflect a new on

their own practice. There were some limitations to this study that influenced the findings.

Gender

Out of the six participants in this study, only one was male. As I analyzed the data, I sometimes wondered how much of Luke's inquiry style could be attributed to his socialization as a male. For example, Luke's speech patterns rarely expressed any tentative language or hesitations. He did not pause or wander in his wonderings. His interview answers were forthright and most often confident. I described his inquiry style as that of a knower. How much of his communication could be attributed to his inquiry style and how much was influenced by his socialization as a male?

Class

All the participants in this study were white middle class pre-service teachers who were tutoring white low socio-economic students. When I chose Moses Elementary as the site in which to institute the tutoring clinic, I intended to allow my university students to have an opportunity to work with a more racially diverse population. This decision was based in the belief that the more pre-service teachers had opportunities to work with populations different from their own, the better equipped they would be to serve diverse populations in their own classrooms from a culturally sensitive perspective (Delgado-Gaitan, 1987; Delpit,

1995). The tutoring clinic enrolled nine Hispanic and seven white children. In the process of analyzing the data over the summer, I realized that I had unintentionally assigned all of the participants in this study to white children. This does not represent the diversity of most public school classrooms compositions.

Teacher as Researcher

In teacher research, a) researcher has an insider perspective; b) researchers mix theory and practice while teaching and researching within a learning community; c) researchers are pragmatic – they focus on real classroom problems that need exploration and explanation; d) researchers are intentional and systematic (Baumann & Duffy-Hester, 2000). Teacher research also plays out the semiotic relationship between the sociocultural and individual mental functioning (Wertsch, 1991), that is a basic tenet of Vygotsky. Meaning and mental functioning occur through the processes of internal and intrapsychological processing (Vygotsky, 1978). In other words, learning is mediated both through the social interaction with others and within the self. Herein lies the essential link between teaching and teacher research. "Teachers are perfectly positioned at the intersection between these two domains, the inner and the outer" (Hobson, 1988, p. 3). Working from both the outside in and the inside out, and constant negotiation between the inter and intrapersonal dimensions are inherent in the act

of teaching. Working in my own classroom, exploring my own questions, gave me the opportunity to work back and forth between the inside and the outside as I negotiated the roles of teacher and researcher.

The limitation of this is that as teacher and researcher my role was problematized. I assumed a dual stance and in practice it became difficult to decide when to stand back and record, or when to intervene and alter a situation (Lytle, 2000)). For example, I constantly felt torn about my interactions with Luke. As I would prepare my field notes or evaluate his lesson plans, I would become frustrated (as well as infuriated) with his obvious avoidance of any use of my suggested research-based approaches. As I would prepare for his upcoming interview, I would often think through how to tactfully steer him toward discovering his overconfidence and lack of reflective practice. Unfortunately, as each interview progressed, Luke's arrogance often left me feeling incapable of guiding our discussion. It seemed that for every question I could ask, Luke could manipulate it by concocting a groundless answer that he believed to be solidly defended. He provided an excellent negative case study example of an inquiring stance. As a teacher educator, I felt guilty for not confronting him. I believed a confrontation would have destroyed our relationship and would have minimally influenced his attitude. As a new professor in a new job, I opted to avoid conflict, which I do not believe is the option that would have served Luke best long-term. Finding ways to gently nudge students who "inquire as knowers" is something

with which all teacher educators struggle. Through reflection and further questioning, I hope to feel more confident in these types of interactions in the future.

Also as an insider/outsider, it was hard to identify when my reliance on self-knowledge clouded my analysis and when my examination may not have considered the wider context (Hammersley, 1993). However, my privileged emic stance and special knowledge (long-term understanding of setting, well-established relationships, etc.) also allowed me insights otherwise hidden (Lytle, 2000).

Appendices

Appendix A

PARENT LETTER FOR STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN TUTORING

January 15, 2001

To the parents of _____,

This year Goshen College's education department, in collaboration with Moses Elementary, will provide after-school tutoring in reading. College students enrolled in Educ. 406 – Reading Problems, and supervised by me will do the tutoring. This course is designed to prepare students to understand the literacy problems children may encounter and is focused on building knowledge about assessment and instruction. A tutoring clinic is embedded into the framework of this course to provide students in their teacher training with an opportunity to gather information and assess an elementary school age struggling reader, and subsequently plan and implement an individualized educational plan.

Your child's teacher has referred _____ for possible participation in the program.

The tutoring is free and will be held on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 3:10-4:00 p.m. January 29-April 11, 2002. The tutoring will take place at Moses so transportation will not be required. At the end of the tutoring, you will be provided a written case report detailing the assessments and instructional strategies used with your child. The tutor will schedule a conference with you to share the case report and answer any questions you might have. A copy of the case report will also be given to your child's teacher.

The key for this program to be successful is commitment. The college students will be planning individualized instruction for each of the students they tutor. The majority of their assessment for this course is related to tutoring. Therefore it is very important that the students being tutored attend every session and remain in the program until April. If you do not feel like you can make this kind of time commitment with us, please decline this invitation to participate. Poor attendance (more than 2 absences) will force us to discontinue tutoring with your child and offer the service to a child on the waiting list.

If you would like your child to be tutored, please sign the attached consent form. Your signature indicates that you are committed to this program and will make every effort to ensure your child's participation after-school every Tuesday and Thursday from January 29-April 11, 2002.

Thank you. If you have questions, please feel free to call me at my office (535-7442).

Sincerely,

Margie A. Mast,
Assistant Professor
Goshen College

TUTORING CONSENT FORM

Goshen College Reading Tutorial at Moses Elementary

I would like for my child to participate in the after-school tutorial at Moses Elementary from 3:10-4:00 on Tuesdays and Thursdays from January 29 – April 11, 2002. I understand that the tutoring is free of charge, but that my signature at the bottom of this form indicates my commitment to making sure my son/daughter will attend every tutoring session possible and will remain in the program until April 11, 2002.

_____ _____

Parent's Signature Child's Name

_____ _____

Date Child's Teacher / Grade

Appendix B

SYLLABUS

Education 406: Reading Problems
Spring 2002
Marg Mast
Office: CC 115D
Phone: 535-7442
Class Meeting: T, R 2:00-3:00
Tutoring Clinic: T, R, 3:00-4:00
Debriefing: T, R, 4:00-4:30

Course Description:

This course is designed to prepare students to understand the literacy problems children may encounter, and to analyze theories, principles, and philosophies of instruction created to ameliorate these difficulties. The course will focus on analysis of diverse learners from multiple perspectives for the purpose of building knowledge about assessment and pedagogy. A tutoring clinic is embedded into the framework of this course to provide students an opportunity to gather information and assess elementary school age struggling readers, and subsequently plan and implement an individualized educational plan. Critical analysis of instructional strategies and programs will also be discussed. This course's overall goal is to prepare students to become confident, student-centered, effective, problem-solving classroom reading teachers.

The syllabus for this course is based on the **Guiding Principles** of the Education Department at Goshen College. The Principles are listed below to make links between the Guiding Principles and the syllabus explicit.

At Goshen College we seek to graduate teachers who...

1.	Comprehend the content disciplines to be taught so as to draw relationships a) within disciplines, b) between disciplines, and c) to students' lives.
2.	Communicate effectively in a variety of sign systems: e.g. verbal, nonverbal, written, mathematical, and media communication.
3.	Build a learning community based on the diversity of students' backgrounds and the ways in which they learn by a) starting from each individual's strengths and cultural resources, b) sharing responsibility for teaching and learning, and c) advocating for alienated and powerless students.
4.	Flexibly employ a wide variety of teaching and evaluation strategies that enable students to make meaning of content disciplines.
5.	Manage a classroom effectively, incorporating principles of peacemaking, in a wide variety of settings.
6.	Sense a strong call to serve and to nurture students with patience and humor.
7.	Develop a sense of self as an educational facilitator and leader who continually reflects on her/his teaching in reference to her/his own guiding principles.
8.	Establish working and collegial relationships with schools, families, and community agencies to strengthen the learning environment.

Learning Intents:

1. Gain a better understanding of reading and writing processes and of the factors that may cause a learner to have difficulty with reading or with reading instruction.
2. Discuss the nature of students' reading/literacy difficulties
3. Develop familiarity with a variety of formal and informal evaluation strategies appropriate for groups and individuals and the ability to interpret and evaluate data from these assessments to design instruction.
4. Identify and plan appropriate instructional procedures and materials to meet the specific need of individual learners and be able to theoretically support this instruction.
5. Evaluate a child's current reading strengths and challenges, write a reader profile, design an instructional plan, implement an instructional program and write a case report.
6. Develop a sense of self as an educational facilitator who continually reflects on his/her teaching in reference to her/his own guiding principles.
7. Investigate reading/literacy problems from multiple perspectives.

Required Readings

- Cunningham, P. M., & Allington, R.L. (1999). *Classrooms that work: They can all read and write.* New York: Longman.

- Fountas, I. C., & Pinnell, G. S. (1996). *Guided reading: Good first teaching for all children*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Hesse, K. (1999) *Just Juice*. (Paperback)
- Other articles and chapters provided by the professor or on reserve in the library

- Optional or texts of potential interest:
- Cambourne, B. & Turbill, J. (1994). *Responsive Evaluation.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann
- Rhodes, L & Dudley-Marling, C. (1997). *Readers and writers with a difference: A holistic approach to teaching learning disabled and remedial students.* 2nd ed. Protsmouth, NH: Heinemann

Course Requirements

1. Keeping up with readings and reflective journal responses to those readings.
2. Successfully documenting your own learning through creation of a portfolio. Portfolio conferences with the instructor will take place at mid-term and the end of the semester
3. Assuming a professional stance with respect to class attendance, active involvement in class and in relating to the students you tutor and the students' families.
4. Tutoring twice a week. This includes evaluating the students' strengths and needs, writing reader profiles, planning an appropriate instructional program and writing case reports.
5. Creating and maintaining a Teaching Log (loose-leaf binder)
   This should include:
   Lesson plans that are done **BEFORE** each tutoring session. Form to be used for lesson plans will be provided on-line for you to download. Having a plan is critical for successful instruction. A copy of your lesson plan should be available while you are tutoring so that as I observe I can see the direction of your plan.
   Reflection – to be completed immediately **AFTER** each tutoring session and turned into me before leaving class. I will return them to you the following day in campus mail. I feel it is critical that you receive immediate feedback so that you have time to think, change course, etc. before your next tutoring session. Delayed feedback on lesson plans is my opinion – is somewhat worthless.

Keeping all of these materials together will help you chart your course by documenting the strengths and challenges of your student. This will also prove to be essential to the writing of your summative case study. All other documentation such as running records, interest inventories, mini word walls, etc. should be included in your log.

Student Data Section – This section should include your anecdotal records, written conversations you have with your student, writing samples, responses to books, records of projects you've worked on throughout the term. This documentation should prove useful to you and your student in seeing the student's progression and development over the semester.

6. Observing your students in other relevant settings

   Observe and take field notes in your student's classrooms during reading instruction sometime within the first two weeks of tutoring. Use your field notes to write an analytic memo summarizing your visit. Include this in your teaching log.

7. Writing Reports

   Complete a **reader profile** in which you synthesize all the information you know about your student as a reader and design appropriate instructional strategies.

   Final **case report** is due by **April 4** and needs to be discussed with the parents by **April 11**. A rough draft should be submitted to me no later than **March 28**, even though you will not be finished tutoring for the semester. You will need 4 copies of the final report – 1 for the school, 1 for the parents, 1 to be kept on file at the college and 1 for your files.

   Readers' Theatre Script – Create 1 readers' theatre script to use during tutoring. Book selection should be based on your student's independent reading level. Scripts will be posted on-line by **March 14**.

   Reading Process Report / Metagcognition Log

   Choose one of the readings during the term to write an essay that reflects on your reading process. You are not reflecting on the content of what you read, but on what you thought about and did as you read the article or chapter – your thinking about your thinking. This will be due **January 16**

8. Participating in an Inquiry Project

   Many commercial programs have inundated the country and our classrooms in an attempt to make reading instruction better in a prepackaged, one-size-fits all way. Becoming a critical consumer of these products is becoming increasingly complex as the market becomes saturated and school districts look for quick fixes in light of the increasing focus on high stakes assessment. You may choose to work as a small group, in pairs or individually to complete this assignment. Your project

will investigate a commercial program (such as Accelerated Reader, Success for All, DISTAR, Open Court, Reading Recovery etc.) You will look critically at the program from all sides and determine the positive and negative consequences of program participation. Your inquiry should use a variety of sources including published research studies, Internet sources, newspapers, interviews, commercial propaganda, etc. You should document your learning and participation in this project in your portfolio. There will be an in class presentation (approx. 30 minutes) to give you the opportunity to share your information with the other class participants. The only requirement is that there should be a 1-page handout (primarily bibliographic) for class members' future reference to be distributed during the presentation.

9. Reading Philosophy
   It is very important to examine our assumptions, attitudes and beliefs because they are what often drive our pedagogical decisions. Throughout the semester will discuss the forces that are shaping our choices and try to come to terms with what we really believe. In interview situations, you will most likely be asked to describe your reading program and defend your position. This exercise will help you to be able to answer confidently, as well as go into your first classroom knowing what you believe about good reading instruction. Throughout the semester I will give you prompts to help you explore this issue. You can respond to these in your reflective dialog journal and/or keep track of your thoughts in your portfolio. Recording your process and the changing shape of your ideas is extremely important for this assignment. The final class session will be a sharing of the journey of our reading philosophies. You may do this traditionally via a 3-5 page paper OR you can do an arts-based representation (poem, collage, reader's theatre, big book, song, dance, etc) of your understandings. Students who are willing to explore with this non-traditional evaluation form will be rewarded for their risk with highly inflated grades because I believe you will learn more from taking the risk and explaining your process than from writing a traditional paper. Everyone will be expected to share his or her process in a 10-minute presentation.

Evaluation

As this is a course in evaluation, diagnosis and assessment, it is only appropriate that the evaluation of each person in the course is a part of the learning process. You will have an opportunity to share your working portfolio at mid-term and at

the end of the semester as a way of documenting your learning in both the coursework and tutoring.

Your final grade will be determined by the following criteria:

30 points	Tutoring
	Lesson plans
	Teaching log
	Classroom observation
	Reader's Theatre Script
20 points	Reflective Dialog Journal
20 points	Reader Profiles and Case Reports
10 points	Inquiry Project
10 points	Reading Philosophy
5 points	Reading Process
5 points	Professionalism (includes attendance, punctuality and meeting deadlines)
100= total	(100-90= A, 89-80=B,79-70=C, 69-60=D)

Late work will result in the grade being dropped one letter grade for each day incomplete. After 3 days, the work will no longer be accepted. Work that is turned in on time will be returned with extensive comments in a timely manner. Work that is turned in late will be returned before the end of the semester with little, if any feedback. Deadline extensions can be granted at the professor's discretion in special circumstances. Absences may result in the lowering of your final grade.

SCHEDULE – EDUC 406

Date	Topic	Assignment due
January 10 Meet at GC	Introduction Definitions of reading Instructional Models Personal and theoretical beliefs about reading	No Assignment
January 15 Meet at GC	Related Factors (social, cultural, physiological, psychological, motivational) Assumptions about struggling readers	Allington: Ch. 1 Other: Klenk, L & Kibby, M. (2000) Re-Mediating reading difficulties: Appraising the past, reconciling the present, constructing the future. In M.L. Kamil, Mosenthal, P.B. Pearson, P.D. & Barr, R. (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research* (Vol. III). pp.667-690. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum on e-reserve. Polakow, V. 1993. *Lives on the Edge*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. pp131-147 on e-reserve.
January 17 Meet at GC	Tutoring components Observational strategies Teacher Research	Allington: Ch 2 Other: Tancock, S (1994). A literacy lesson framework for children with reading problems. *Reading Teacher*, 48 (2), 120-140 on e-reserve. Metacognition Log due
January 22 Meet at GC	Assessment	Fountas and Pinnell: Ch. 1,2 and 6
January 24 Start meeting at school	Running Records-mechanics Tour of school and resources available	Fountas and Pinnell: Ch 7 Other: Allen, J., Michalove, B., Shockley, B., & West, M. (1998). "I'm really worried about Joseph": Reducing the risks of literacy learning. In R. Allington (Ed.), *Teaching struggling readers: Articles from The Reading Teacher*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association on e-reserve.

January 29	Running Records-analysis	Fountas and Pinnell: Ch 12 Other: First day of tutoring Worthy, J. (1998). A matter of interest: Literature that hooks reluctant readers and keeps them reading. In R. Allington (Ed.), *Teaching Struggling Readers: Articles from The Reading Teacher*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association on e-reserve.
January 31	Guided reading Shared Reading Mini-lessons	Allington: Ch 3 Fountas and Pinnell: Ch. 3-4
February 5	Preparing the reader profile Reading the new book	Allington: Ch 9 Fountas and Pinnell: Ch 11
February 7	Using leveled books Leveling books Book Club – Just Juice	Fountas and Pinnell: Ch 9-10 Other: Complete Just Juice Reader Profile Due
February 12	Reading Miscue Inventory	Other: Goodman, K. (1973). Miscues: Windows on the reading process. In K.S. Goodman (Ed.), *Miscue Analysis: Applications to Reading Instruction* (pp.3-14). Urbana, IL: NCTE on e-reserve Rhodes, L.K., Nathenson-Mejia, S. (1998). Anecdotal records: A powerful tool for ongoing literacy assessment. In R. Allington (Ed.), *Teaching struggling readers: Articles from The Reading Teacher* (pp. 52-60). Newark, DE: International Reading Association on e-reserve.
February 14	Phonics Phonemic Awareness	Allington: Ch 5 Fountas and Pinnell: Ch 13 Other: Observe student in classroom

		Cunningham, P. M., & Cunningham, J. W. (1992). Making words: Enhancing the invented spelling- decoding connection. *Reading Teacher*, 46, 106-115 on e-reserve Yopp, H. K. (1998). Read-aloud books for developing phonemic awareness: An annotated bibliography. In R. Allington (Ed.), *Teaching struggling readers: Articles from The Reading Teacher* (pp. 217-225). Newark, DE: International Reading Association on e-reserve.
February 19	Assessing comprehension Think aloud, retelling, summarizing Vocabulary instruction	Allington: Ch 8 and 10 Other: Durkin, D. (1978/1979). What classroom observations reveal about reading comprehension instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 12, 481-533 on e-reserve.
February 21	Fluency Reader's Theater	Other: Rasinski, T.V. (1998). Fluency for everyone: incorporating fluency instruction in the classroom. In R. Allington (Ed.), *Teaching struggling readers: Articles from The Reading Teacher* (pp. 257-260). Newark, DE: International Reading Association on e-reserve. Rasinski, T.V. (2000) Speed does matter in reading. *Reading Teacher* 54 (2) 146-151 on e-reserve.
February 26	Mid-term Portfolio Conferences Class cancelled Tutoring on schedule	Finish portfolio reflections and prepare for conference
March 5	Midterm recess No class	No assignments
March 7	Midterm recess No class	No assignments
March 12	Word Recognition Word Identification	Other: Wiesendanger, K.D. & Bader, L.A. (1987) Teaching easily confused words: Timing makes the difference. *Reading Teacher*. Vol. 41. pp. 328-332 on e-reserve. Dahl, K.L. & Scharer, P.L. (2000) Phonics

		teaching and learning in whole language classrooms: New evidence from research. *Reading Teacher*. 53 (7) 584-594 on e-reserve.
March 14	The Reading/Writing connection	Allington: Ch 4 Other: Allington, R. L., & Cunningham, P. M. (2002). *Schools that work: Where all children read and write* (2nd ed. pp.41-64). Allyn and Bacon: Boston, MA on e-reserve. Readers' Theater script should be posted on-line
March 19	ESL	Other: Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1987) Traditions and transitions in the learning process of Mexican children: An ethnographic view. In G. Spindler & L. Spindler (Eds.) Interpretive ethnography of education: At home and abroad (pp.333-59). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoicates. Fitzgerald, J., Gracia, G.E., Jimenez, R.T., Barrera, R. (2000). How will bilingual/ESL programs in literacy change in the next millennium? *Reading Research Quarterly* 35 (4) 520-523 on e-reserve.
March 21	Family Literacy	Other: Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African-American children*. San Francisco, pp. 15-53. CA: Jossey-Bass on e-reserve. Speilman, J. (2001) The family photography project: "We will just read what the pictures tell us. *Reading Teacher*. 54 (8) 762-770 on e-reserve.
March 26	From 1-1 to the classroom	Allington: Ch 11 Fountas and Pinnell: Ch 5 and 8
March 28	Reading in the content areas	Allington: Ch 6 Other: Draft of case report due
April 2 Meet at GC	Presentation of Inquiry Projects	Other: Inquiry Presentations

April 4 Meet at GC	Presentation of Inquiry Projects	Other: Inquiry Presentations Final Case Reports Due
April 9	Multiple Ways of Knowing	Other: Eisner, E. (1997). Cognition and representation: A way to pursue the American Dream? *Phi Delta Kappan*. 78(5). 349-353 on e-reserve Carson, S.A. (1999) A veteran enters the reading wars: My journey. *Reading Teacher.* 53 (3) 212-223 on e-reserve.
April 11	Improving Classroom Instruction	Allington: Ch 7 Fountas and Pinnell: Ch 14-15 Other: Last day of tutoring/ Presentation Party Discuss case report with parents
April 16 Meet at GC	Reading Philosophies	Presentation of Reading Philosophies
April 18	Reading Days No class	No Assignment
April 23	Summative Portfolio Conferences No class	No Assignment

Appendix C

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM LETTER

What is the Nature of Pre-Service Teachers' Inquiry in the Context of Tutoring a Struggling Reader?

You are invited to participate in a study of pre-service teachers' inquiry. My name is Marg Mast and I am a graduate student at The University of Texas at Austin. This study is a dissertation research project. You are being asked to participate in the study because you are enrolled in a reading methods course with a tutoring component. If you participate, you will be one of approximately 6 people in the study.

If you decide to participate, the data will be collected from January 29 – April 24, 2002. Data sources will include interviews, surveys, field notes, lesson plan reflections, and journals. Throughout the time you are tutoring, I will schedule with you three interviews. These sessions will be audiotaped and transcribed. Surveys will be given during class two times (beginning and end of the semester). Field notes will be taken during two tutoring sessions prior to each of your three scheduled interviews. As part of your coursework, you will be

required to write and turn in to me lesson plan reflections after each tutoring session. These 20 lesson plans will be photocopied and used as data sources. In addition, as part of your course requirements, you will submit a weekly journal entry to me electronically. Your 12 journal entries will also be used as data sources in this study. The purpose of each of these data sources will help me through their analysis identify the focal phenomena of this study.

There are minimal risks to participation in this study. The only possible risk may come from accidental breach of confidentiality or from discomforts resulting from making evaluative statements about your inquiry. To reduce these risks, you will not be required to answer any questions that make you uncomfortable and you may discontinue this study at any time. To protect against a possible breach of confidentiality, all collected data will be stored in a secure place (a locked filing cabinet in my office). In addition, the audiotapes of your interviews will be heard only for research purposes by me and will be erased after they are transcribed. All material will be coded so that no personally identifying information is visible on them to insure confidentiality. Disadvantages to participation in this study include: 1) time outside of class must be made available for one-on-one interviews; 2) inquiry/wondering may bring up uncomfortable issues with which you will need to struggle; 3) issues of power, as I am the primary researcher and your professor, may arise blocking your ability to openly share your inquiries and we may need to work together on this issue of

the relationship. Advantages include: 1) an opportunity to deeply reflect within a community of inquiry 2) time to wonder; 3) individual attention from the instructor; 4) the fostering of an inquiry orientation that may possibly serve you well as an in-service teacher.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you, will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission. Your response will not be linked to your name in any written or verbal report of this research project.

CONSENT FORM

What is the Nature of Pre-Service Teachers' Inquiry in the Context of Tutoring a Struggling Reader?

Your decision to participate or to decide not to participate will not affect your present or future relationship with The University of Texas at Austin or Goshen College. Your decision will not affect your right to receive fair and appropriate instruction for the reading methods course in which you are enrolled. Declining to participate will not affect your grades, class standing or future relationships with your instructors.

If you have any questions about the study, please ask me. If you have any questions later, you may call me at 219-535-1001 or you may call my supervisor, Professor Jo Worthy at 512-471-4041. If you have any questions or concerns about your treatment as a research participant in this study, call Professor Clarke Burnham, Chair of The University of Texas at Austin Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Research Participants at 512-232-4383.

You will be given a copy of this consent form for your records.

You are making a decision whether or not to participate. Your signature below indicates that you have read the information provided above and have decided to participate in the study. If you later decide that you do not want to participate in the study, simply tell me. You may discontinue your participation in this study at any time.

_____
Printed Name of Participant

_____ _____
Signature of Participant Date

_____ _____
Signature of Investigator Date

Appendix D

READING DIFFICULTIES SURVEY

Name _____

A struggling reader is _____

Some students have difficulty reading

because_____

A good reader is _____

_____

Some students are good readers because _____

_____

A good reading teacher is_____

_____

Some teachers are better at teaching reading because _____

_____

_____

In tutoring a student, how important are the following factors (1=low, 4=high)
Descriptors are not inclusive, but just give possible topics to consider.

Student's background (places they've lived, ethnicity, SES, etc.)	1	2	3	4
Student's home life (who lives with them, resources in home etc.)	1	2	3	4
Student's school experiences (retention, discipline referrals, student grades, teacher's opinion, etc.)	1	2	3	4
Student's health information (speech, vision or hearing issues, developmental delays etc.)	1	2	3	4
Student's interests (what they like to do for fun, favorite subjects, opinions etc.)	1	2	3	4

Teaching Ability Confidence Levels in the following areas: (1=low, 4=high)

Diagnostic Assessment	1	2	3	4
Kidwatching	1	2	3	4
Running Records	1	2	3	4
Guided Reading	1	2	3	4
Leveling books	1	2	3	4
Comprehension	1	2	3	4
Fluency	1	2	3	4
Building Vocabulary	1	2	3	4
Word work or Making words	1	2	3	4
Phonics	1	2	3	4
Language Experience Approach	1	2	3	4
Poetry	1	2	3	4
Motivation	1	2	3	4
Reader's Theater	1	2	3	4
Spelling	1	2	3	4
Phonological Awareness	1	2	3	4
Time Management	1	2	3	4
Word Identification/Decoding	1	2	3	4
Writing	1	2	3	4

Discuss any experiences you have had with people who were having some difficulty with reading.

What questions do you have about tutoring struggling readers?

If you were offered a job tomorrow, how would you set up your reading program?

If you have finished student teaching, please describe the type of reading and writing program used in your classroom.

Appendix E

DIALOG JOURNAL ENTRY

Bold italized text indicates my written dialog with the student

Rebecca
January 15, 2002
The textbook *Classrooms that Work: They can All Read and Write* was a text that I had previously used in a different class. However, we were never asked to read the first chapter and I was surprised by much of the information found there. The chapter entitled "The Problem and Some Failed Solutions" was quite a surprise for me, especially after my most recent student teaching experience at Mary Daly, in Elkhart. It was surprising and humorous, because as the authors introduced the many, many "failed" solutions to teaching at-risk children to read, I thought back to how so many of those methods are still very present and used in dozens of elementary schools around the country. I was also interested as to how the authors revealed that so many of our struggling readers are in poverty and that the trend has just been repeating itself for decades. ***So why do you think this is? Why do we keep swinging back and forth? Why are failed solutions still so present? What were some of the failed solutions that you saw during student teaching that bothered you? Why did they bother you? Did they represent things that were contrary to your beliefs about teaching and learning? What surprised you most? Why was this most surprising? What did you find humorous? Why?*** Poverty. Through course of instruction here at Goshen, we have had numerous sessions on poverty, and Ruby Payne's book has been highly advocated as a way to understand children in poverty. Cunningham and Allington begin very pessimistically, but like I have always questioned and wanted to know - they address how some at-risk children have been quite successful in the classroom with the right scaffolding. The question that always arises for me and other teachers is "HOW!!?" Obviously, through this course we'll hopefully learn appropriate methods for teaching struggling readers. However, like our text suggests - there is *no* one way! (which makes it all the harder to figure out for us begininng teachers). ***This would be a great topic to explore at a deeper level. Where do you stand on the issue of methods? Do you think there is one right way? several right ways? What about the issue of being too scattered? If you are going in several different directions in the***

name of being eclectic, can you water stuff down and become too disorganized that you become just as ineffective as the one right way kind of teacher? what is it about what you believe about teaching and learning that makes you want one right way? are you nervous that you can't find the way that is best? do you think there can ever be one right answer about anything? This is an area that I struggle with personally. deep deep down I really would like everything to have one right answer. I have come to learn however, rarely is there one right answer for anything. this is also why I have such a hard time with standardized tests becoming the focus for instruction. I think it sends the wrong message to kids. it doesn't encourage us to look for multiple solutions or to value multiple perspectives. What I believe to be big T truth, may not be big T truth for you. Learning how to reconcile this is a huge undertaking and one that we rarely deal with educationally, personally or spiritually. Uncovering the underlying beliefs that drive your frustration for figuring out what the best way is out of a multitude of options could be very helpful to you. These are the kinds of things that I hope you will use this journal for.

In the Reading Difficulties survey that you disbursed, I asked about the controversy over what is the most important aspect of reading/learning to read. I questioned several of the methods that C&A shot down. I had to laugh, because they introduced - phonics, retention, tracking, etc. - as "old" solutions that were introduced years ago. Then, why are so many of these methods still around and very real in our classrooms? Obviously, no one has still found the "right" answers, it seems. ***Why do you think that is? What does the research seem to support this cyclical pattern? Why are old solutions still around? Are they oldies but goodies to you? What do you find the most offensive? What did C and A shoot down that you think is actually quite effective? Who instigates these solutions? Who really holds the power? The teachers? The school district? Principals? Researchers? Who do you believe and why? Who do you trust to be the most influential? Why? How do you mistrust and why? These are all really hard questions if you explore them deeply. Uncovering your assumptions however may serve you well as you begin thinking about what you want to do in your own classroom.***

I appreciated how the chapter ended on a more upbeat note, however. Instead of throwing more and more ideas out of what does *not* work, we'll now hopefully learn what *does* and then hopefully many of my questions will be answered.

Ch 2 looks much more at what they do think is good practice. ***Do you think it was ineffective to start the book with what doesn't work? Does that offend you at some level? Do you think all the fingerpointing could serve as a hook to draw people into thinking about different kinds of solutions? aren't there lots of negative aspects to teaching? do we focus on them too much? is there not enough attention to the positive? is there a need for a more positive bent in education? where is the negativity stemming from? how could the tide be***

turned? doesn't pointing out what's wrong help us reexamine our own practice and what we are doing that needs to be changed?
My advice would be to dig a little deeper. You brought up some excellent points that are worth exploring at a deeper level. I really hope that the purpose of this journal will be to help you really come to know what you believe and why so that you can confidently make decisions about teaching and learning as you begin your professional career. I can only help you dig as deeply as you will let me. Teaching and learning is very messy and complex. This journal gives you an opportunity to wonder and struggle about all those messy constraints. You may not come up with one answer – as we know there rarely is such a thing – but at least you will know a little more about what you believe and why you believe it.

Appendix F

LESSON PLAN

Session #	Lesson Plan	Reflection
Poetry Warm-Up		
Build-Up Reading		
Guided Reading		
Word Work		
Writing		
Read Aloud		
Next Steps:		

Appendix G

FIELD NOTES TRANSCRIPT

Natalie March 19, 2002
"Today I have something new." N had a tree that she had drawn on a piece of paper that had spec at the bottom by the roots. N explained that spec was a root and that they were going to make some words that use that root and put them in the branches. N prompted M to come up with a word with spec in it. M offered spectacles. N asked her what spectacles were and M knew that they were glasses. M made the word with magnetic letters. A then asked M to check her spelling of the word with the dictionary. "I remember you said you liked the dictionary" M got to spec and read down the list until she found spectacles. A then asked M to read the definition. M checked her spelling and changed some of the letters. A then prompted M to write the word on one of the branches. They then had a discussion about how an S on the end changes the definition of the word. With the S it is glasses, but without the S it is an event. N prompted M to think of a different word. M offered special. M made the word with magnetic letters and then N asked her to check her spelling, which was completely quickly since the dictionary was already on that page and she had found that word before when she was looking up spectacles. M did not need to change the spelling so she wrote the word on a branch. N asked M to come up with another word and told her she could use the dictionary if she wanted. M did use the dictionary to pick the word spectacular. N asked her for the meaning which M immediately responded with "great." N offered a sentence that used the word in context "If you were walking in the mountains you might see a spectacular view." while M made the words with the magnetic letters. N repeated the word several times and elongated her pronunciation of the different chunks to help M come up with the sounds represented in its spelling. N asked, "Is it right?" As M wrote the word on the tree, N told her that it would be a great word to use in her writing in class and that Mrs. H would be very impressed if she used it in her writing. N then prompted her by asking, "What if someone comes to your house and looks at how things are" M interjected "inspection" M then made the word with the letters and wrote it on a branch. They did not check the spelling with the dictionary. N then tried to get M to the word inspector by asking who is the person who comes to inspect, but M offered the word spectator. N talked about how that usually was a person observing a sports event and then they confirmed this by reading the definition in the dictionary. M then made the word with letters and wrote it in the branches.

N said, "I still want to know who comes to the house to inspect?" M said inspector, made it with the letters and then added it to a branch.

March 21, 2002
Natalie and M were back to making more spec words and adding them to the tree. With magnetic letters, M made s-p-e-c-t-I-c-a-l. N asked, "Is that how spectacles is spelled?" After a brief pause, N said, "Use what you know." After another pause N said, "Why don't you look it up in the dictionary and check your spelling and the definition. M reached for the dictionary and began thumbing through the pages. N asked, "Is S toward the beginning, middle, or the end?" As M got to the S pages, N prompted with s-p-o, s-p-e, s-p-e-c-t" as M looked through the pages. "You know you can always look at the last word" N said as she pointed out the relationship between the guidewords and the words on the page. "There it is!" M said as she located the word. M read the definition "amazing sight" M and N talked about the 4th of July which was part of their conversation during the last session as they discussed the definition. To prompt M on to another word N gave M a clue "What do you call a rainbow – the blank of the colors?" M did not get the clue. N moved on to a different clue. "What if you put the prefix re in front of spec? M immediately said respect. M and N discussed what part of speech respect was. M talked herself through the definition of verbs and decided that respect fit the definition as she made respect with the magnetic letters. N also talked about respect being an idea so that it also could be a noun. N then asked M how they could turn respect into an adjective. M is a very _____ person. M said respectable. M was adding letters as N said "I remember, didn't we talk about…a word you know that will help you figure out the ending. Didn't we do f-u-l words? M said respectful.
(I left to talk to the principal)
M made the word specter – this was a word off of a sheet that N had, but neither knew the definition. M looked the word up, but was unable to find it in the dictionary that N brought. M offered to look the word up in her dictionary, which was in her backpack. She found the word and read the definition "a ghost or something that bothers the mind" There was a discussion about this being a word that was new to them and also about how spec – to see with your eyes fits with the definition of ghost. M said you don't see ghosts.

Appendix H

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Possible questions used during the scheduled interviews include:

1. Did any new questions or wonderings come to mind?
2. When you were tutoring, were there any questions haunting you? What questions keep coming up for you week after week?
3. What did you find most memorable during your tutoring session?
4. What are you most curious about in relation to the student you are working with? In relation to your approach/teaching? In relation to your relationship with your student?
5. What puzzles you about working with a struggling reader?
6. Open question stems like, "I wonder… and Help me understand…" will be employed during interviews, opening opportunities for meaningful conversations. Blanks will be filled in with anecdotal notes taken from field notes by me during their tutoring session, from their lesson plan reflections, and/or from their dialog journals.

Appendix I

CATEGORY DEFINITIONS

Inquiry about Assessment

Category	Definition	Examples of units
Beliefs and Feelings about Assessment Code=A/BF	Units regarding the nature of what the participants believes(d) about assessment and/or particular feeling they had about assessment or assessment tools	Informal assessment takes less time and gives you more valuable information Running records tell you information that you wouldn't otherwise know.
Questioning Assessment Code = A/QA	Includes interrogatives, but not limited to this form. Includes inquiries related to participant's tutee as well as wonderings about assessment use in their future classrooms. Discusses: Tutor's understanding of how to use assessments to gain understandings of a student's abilities and in terms of helping to find focus for instruction. Tutor's confidence in the use and interpretation of assessment tools Tutor's ability to discuss inconsistencies, interferences, and/or criticism of assessment tools and/or theory in relation to assessment.	Participant gave an IRI but didn't follow the protocol. Participant blamed the test for the student not doing well on the assessment. Participant is not sure what to assess – never really thought about it.

Assessment Usage and Outcomes Code = A/O	This category includes discussion of the following areas: What assessments participant used within the context of tutoring. Why the participant used a particular assessment tool. The participant's interpretation of the assessment findings, including both long-term and short-term statements of how it describes their tutee. Participant's descriptions of the assessment process within the context of tutoring.	Participant gave word recognition assessment. Results haven't influenced tutoring, but probably should. I think I see his interests and strengths now – this will be helpful in tutoring.

Inquiring about Relationships

Inquiry about Relationships and Rapport Code=S/R	Units include observational statements regarding participant's interpretation of their rapport with tutee and/or about the tutoring relationship. Also includes statements about participant's understandings about the role of relationship in teaching situations.	Relationships with kids are easy Tutee lacks attachment to participant. Participant says she is unbothered by this lack of attachment
Parents/Culture/Home Influences Code=PHC	Includes discussion of the following: Assumptions about the role of the home in relation to a student's school success. Descriptive statements about the tutee's home or family. Questions participant's have about tutee's family.	I think students need literacy experience at home and asking parents to do that would not be asking too much. I found out tutee feels his dad doesn't like

	Discussion of the role that culture plays in relation to a student's school experience.	him since he has another kid with a new wife

Inquiry about Students

Questions about Students Code= S/QAS	This category includes curiosities, puzzlements, wondering statements or interrogatives exploring inquiries about the tutee's behavior and/or processing, and/or broader inquiries about kids in general.	Is tutee having fun? Participant wonders why tutee dislikes writing.
Assumptions about Students Code=S/A	Includes units regarding students in general based on participant's observations and concur with the participant's beliefs about students and/or teaching students.	Participant believed before tutoring that struggling readers were quiet and passive Participant was surprised that struggling readers enjoy reading.
Drawing Conclusions Code= S/DC	Includes units based on multiple observations occurring over a period of time that allows the participant to draw specific conclusions about their student.	Tutee is more expressive during tutoring now. Tutee's confidence improved.

<table>
<tr>
<td>Descriptions/Observations about Students within the Tutoring Context

Code = S/DB
S/DA</td>
<td>Units for this category fall into two subcategories determined by the following descriptors:
<table>
<tr><th>Academic</th><th>Behavioral</th></tr>
<tr><td>Observed strategies and or skills used by the tutee.
Statements about a tutee’s reading behavior
Attempted instructional approaches in relation to a tutee’s academic performance</td><td>Tutee’s interests
Tutee’s actions
Tutee’s motivation
Tutee’s willingness/ unwillingness to participate</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
<td>Academic
Tutee saw relationships on lego board, but I’m not so sure in his reading that he is making connections.

Tutee doesn’t stop tutor if he doesn’t know a word. Tutor is unsure as to why.

Behavior
He is active but I think he was hyper because he was uncomfortable

Tutee acts/interacts differently than most kids</td>
</tr>
</table>

Inquiry about Teaching

Teacher as Learner		
Questioning the Author Code=TL/QA	This category includes participant's wonderings based on particular assigned readings as required in the Reading Difficulties course. Participants try to reconcile what they believe to the author's presented idea and/or question their understanding of the assigned material.	How does this study (Teaching Easily Confused Words) teach students to think for themselves? Participant disagrees with Cunningham and Allington advocating for bigger blocks of time and less pull-outs because kids need to have breaks
Thinking about my Thinking Code=TL/TT	This category shares the following: What participant's are thinking about over the course of the semester How participant's thinking has changed over the course of the semester. What is influencing participant's thinking What participant's are learning/ed about their own processing?	I am constantly asking questions in my head while reading I think more about what I did then what my tutee did, but probably I should think about him.
Connecting Thinking to One's Own School Experience Code=TL/CTSL	This category includes units regarding participant's previous school and learning experiences that influence their present thinking about school and learning.	Participant can't remember how she learned to read – no one ever explained any strategies I learned with basals

Connecting Thinking to Student Teaching Code=TL/CTST	This category includes units in which participant's connect their thinking about their readings, course content and/or tutoring with their student teaching experience.	Participant knew student teaching students better than tutee because she was more in control of factors in student teaching then in tutoring I think student teaching has been helpful in organizing my thoughts.
Confidence / Insecurity Code=T/CI	This category includes units regarding participant's insecurity or confidence levels in their abilities as a teacher and/or tutor. Focuses primarily on participant's confidence in regard to their teaching performance, but also includes statements regarding their confidence in their knowledge base.	Participant questions if she did something wrong because student progress was so impressive. Participant doubted ability to work with struggling readers because tutor is gifted
Teacher as Questioner		
Questioning Classroom Management and Organization Code=TQ/MO	This category includes inquiries and concerns participant's have about organizing their classrooms and/or instruction. Also includes participant's inquiries regarding the use of effective classroom management.	Biggest concern about guided reading is management. Grouping is a hard one for me. I think it is situational.

Questioning Differentiation Code=TQ/D	This category specifically addresses participant's inquiries and concerns about how to meet the individual needs of the students they serve.	It feels impossible to meet each student's needs because they are on such varying levels. Easy to say to differentiate, but how do you do it?
Questioning One's Own Knowledge and Performance Code= TQ/QOK TQ/QOP	This category includes inquiries related to participant's expertise, knowledge base and abilities to perform teaching/tutoring responsibilities. Includes both positive statements and ones that reflect participant's shortcomings. Includes participant's questioning of what to do in specific situations demonstrating a questioning of what they know to be true and what they are unsure of how to handle based on their present knowledge and experience.	Student seemed bored – perhaps I should have stopped sooner. I'm learning so much, but will I be able to put it into practice How do you teach someone to comprehend something? What else can I incorporate into my teaching of reading?

Questioning Instructional Approaches Code=TQ/QIA	This category includes inquiries related to specific instructional strategies as well as general instructional practices. Includes tried approaches in tutoring that participant's now question effectiveness level. Also speaks to more general areas of instruction like what kind of instruction best serves certain populations of students. And what type of instruction best meets common public goals.	The teacher says read like you talk – maybe tutee thinks that means fast? Do certain students perform better than others on state tests depending on the kind of instruction they receive?
Questioning Teachers and or School Practices Code=TQ/TSP	This category includes inquiries related to what they have observed of individual classroom teachers, general beliefs and observations about teachers, and questions schools practices in terms of issues of equity and efficiency.	I think people are just too lazy to work through problems and they want to blame things so they label kids. If studies show retention doesn't work, why do schools keep doing it?

Teacher as Reading Tutor		
Inquiry about Skills / Strategies Code TT/S	Includes the following: What skills were targeted? What participant's think about targeted skill or reading behavior(s) What participant's are focusing on or will focus on or wished they focused on This category primarily focuses on the past tense – what participant's have done/tried.	I think writing about how the character is like tutee helps him relate to the story. Participant is focusing on when to use what strategy in tutoring
Posing Strategies Code=TT/PS	This category explores participant's suggestions and thinking about possible directions in which they are considering trying in their tutoring and/or classroom. While these are often posed in conjunction with an observation of a particular session, these are all future tense focusing primarily on what they are thinking about trying – not what they have already tried.	Participant is thinking about how to use the family photography project (article) next year in her classroom Had trouble identifying hidden word. I want to use a smaller word for word work next time
Inquiry about Materials Code=TT/M	This category explores the kinds of materials used and/or participant's consideration of materials, as well as thoughts about reading materials. Also discusses finding appropriate materials, and/or the need to modify material levels and/or how to use materials effectively.	Participant discusses struggle to find right text level. Participant discusses how she wishes she would have built in more choice in tutoring

Inquiry about Planning Code=TT/P	This category explores the following: How participants are planning? What participant's are thinking about while they are planning? What drives participants planning?	Participant thinks about: What went well? What would I try again? What didn't go well? What do I need to work on? Participant plans session by session and is going at tutee's pace.
Inquiry about Time Code=TT/T	This category includes the participants' interpretation of how time concerns and affects the process of tutoring.	We get a lot done in an hour. Participant struggles with having enough time during tutoring
Inquiry about Effectiveness Code=TT/E	Includes inquiries related to participant's ability to be effective in the tutoring situation. Also includes inquiries as to whether tutoring is effective for the tutee and the long/short term progress gained.	Is tutee learning anything? How effective is this approach (tutoring) with other students?

Beliefs about Reading and Reading Instruction Code=T/BSR	Includes units regarding participant's beliefs about reading, reading instruction and education in general as they grew out of the context of reading instruction. Includes discussion about specific reading programs as well as instructional approaches and understandings of learning theories.	Reading is the hardest to teach – no concrete way to teach it. Finding a focus when tutoring a primary student is easy. Sometimes you have to teach strategies that come naturally to good readers.

Appendix J

Clarification of Transcription Codes

Excerpts from interview transcripts are included in the discussion of this study's findings. The tone or volume used when words are spoken can change the meaning of the words themselves. Underlined portions of texts are followed by an explanation of how the participant spoke the words are denoted in parentheses. Clarifications of acronyms or pronoun references used by the participant are also denoted in parentheses. Three dots following a sentence indicates a skip in the transcript to a further section of the talk. The first letter of the participant's name indicates who was speaking. M was used for the interviewer.

Bibliography

Adams, M. J. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*. Cambridge, M: MIT Press.

Allen, J., Michalove, B., Shockley, B., & West, M. (1998). "I'm really worried about Joseph": Reducing the risks of literacy learning. In R. Allington (Ed.), *Teaching struggling readers: Articles from The Reading Teacher* . Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Allington, R. L. (2001). *What really matters for struggling readers*. New York: Longman.

Anderson, G. L., Herr, K., & Nihlen, A. S. (1994). *Studying your own school: an educator's guide to qualitative practitioner research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Apple, M. W. (1986). *Teachers and texts: a political ecomony of class and gender relations in education*. New York: Routledge & kegan Paul.

Baumann, J. F., & Duffy-Hester, A. M. (2001). Teacher-researcher methodology: Themes, variations, and possibilities. *The Reading Teacher, 54*(6), pp. 608-615.

Baumann, J. F., & Duffy-Hester, A. M. (2000). Making sense of classroom worlds: Methodology in teacher research. In M. L. Kamil, Mosenthal, P.B., Pearson, P.D., Barr, R. (Ed.), *Handbook of Reading Research* (Vol. III, pp. pp.77-98). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bear, D. R., Templeton, S., Invernizzi, M., & Johnston, F. (1996). *Words their way: Word study for phonics, vocabulary and spelling instruction*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind*. New York: Basic Books.

Berthoff, A. E. (1981). *The making of meaning: Metaphors, models, and maxims for writing teachers*. Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc.

Breidenstein, A., Liberatore, I., Lioi, T., Miro, E., Weber, S., & Stoeck, S. (2001). Outcomes of preservice teachers' qualitative research. *Clearing House, 74*(3), 141-144.

Broaddus, K. (2000). From peacemaker to advocate: A pre-service teacher's case study of an emergent reader. *Journal of Literacy Research, 32*(4), 571-597.

Cazden, C. B. (1988). *Classroom discourse*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Clay, M. M. (1993). *Reading recovery: a guidebook for teachers in training*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1993). *Inside/ outside: teacher research and knowledge*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1999). The teacher research movement: A decade later. *Educational Researcher, 28*(7), 15-25.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2000). The future of teacher education: Framing the questions that matter. *Teaching Education, 11*(1), p. 13-24.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1988). *Teachers as curriculum planners*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cunningham, P. M., & Allington, R. L. (1999). *Classrooms that work: They can all read and write.* New York: Longman.

Cunningham, P. M., & Cunningham, J. W. (1998). Making words: Enhancing the invented spelling-decoding connection. In R. Allington (Ed.), *Teaching struggling readers: Articles from The Reading Teacher*. Newark,DE: International Reading Association.

Dantonio, M., & Beisenherz, P. C. (2001). *Learning to question, questing to learn: Developing effective teacher questioning practices.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1987). Traditions and transitions in the learning process of Mexican children: An ethnographic view. In G. Spindler & L. Spindler (Eds.), *Interpretative ethnography of education: At home and abroad* (pp. 333-59). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other People's Children Cultural Conflict in the Classroom*. New York: The New Press.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience & education*. New York: Collier Books.

Dillon, J. T. (1981). A norm against student questions. *The Clearing House, 55*.

Dillon, J. T. (1988). *Questioning and teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Duckworth, E. (1987). *"The having of wonderful ideas" and other essays on teaching and learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Durkin, D. (1978/1979). What classroom observations reveal about reading comprehension instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly, 12*, 481-533.

Eisner, E. (1991a). *The enlightened eye*. New York: MacMillan.

Eisner, E. (1991b). What really counts in schools. *Educational Leadership, 48*(5), 10-11, 14, 17.

Elliot, J. (1991). *Action research for educational change*. Bristol, PA: Open University Press.

Fecho, B., & Lytle, S. L. (1993). Working it out: Collaboration as subject and method. In S. J. Hudelson & J. W. Lindfors (Eds.), *Delicate Balances* (pp. 125-141). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Fitzgerald, J. (2001). Can minimally trained college student volunteers help young at-risk children to read better? *Reading Research Quarterly, 36*(1), 28-47.

Fountas, I. C., & Pinnell, G. S. (1996). *Guided reading: Good first teaching for all children*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum Publishing Co.

Gallas, k. (1995). *Talking their way into science: Hearing children's questions and theories, responding with curricula*. New York, NY: Teachers college Press.

Garmston, R. J. (2000). Glad you asked. *National Staff Development Countil, 21*(1), 73-75.

Gitlin, A., Barlow, L., Burbank, M. D., Kauchak, D., & Stevens, T. (1999). Pre-service teachers' thinking on research: Implications for inquiry oriented teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 15*(7), p. 753-770.

Glasner, B., & A., Strauss. (1967). *Discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

Goswami, D., & Stillman, P. (1987). *Reclaiming the classroom: Teacher research as an agency for change*. Upper Monclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Hammersley, M. (Ed.). (1993). *Controversies in classroom research* (2nd ed.). Buckingham: Open University Press.

Henson, K. T. (1996). Teachers as researchers. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching*. New York: Macmillan.

Hobson, D. (1988). Beginning with the self: Using autogiography and journal writing in teacher research. In G. E. Burnaford, Fischer, J., Hobson, D. (Ed.), *Teachers doing research* . Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Invernizzi, M., Rosemary, C., Juel, C., & Richards, H. C. (1997). At-risk readers and community volunteers: a 3-year perspective. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 1*, 277-300.

Juel, C. (1996). What makes literacy tutoring effective? *Reading Research Quarterly, 31*, 268-289.

Kincheloe, J. L. (1991). *Teachers as researchers: Qualitative inquiry as a path to empowerment*. London: The Falmer Press.

Klenk, L., & Kibby, M. (2000). Re-Mediating reading difficulties: Appraising the past, reconciling the present, constructing the future. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research* (Vol. III, pp. 667-690). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African-American children*. San Fransciso, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, S. S. (2001). "A root out of dry ground?": Resolving the researcher/researched dilemma. In J. Zeni (Ed.), *Ethical issues in practitioner research* . New York: Teachers College Press.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lindfors, J. W. (1987). *Children's language and learning* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Lindfors, J. W. (1999). *Children's Inquiry: Using language to make sense of the world*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: a sociological study*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Lytle, S. (2000). Teacher research in the contact zone. In M. L. Kamil, Mosenthal, P.B., Pearson, P.D., Barr, R. (Ed.), *Handbook of Reading Research* (Vol. III, pp. pp. 691-718). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lesson: Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mills, H., & Donnelly, A. (Eds.). (2001). *From the ground up: creating a culture of inquiry*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Olson, M. R. (2000). Linking personal and professional knowledge of teaching practice through narrative inquiry. *Teacher Educator, 35*(4), 109-27.

Pajares, F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research, 62,* 307-332.

Paley, V. G. (1981). *Wally's stories*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Paley, V. G. (1997). *The girl with the brown crayon*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Palincsar, A. S. (1986). The role of dialogue in providing scaffolded instruction. *Educational Psychologist, 21*, 73-98.

Pearson, P. D. (1985). Changing the face of reading comprehension instruction. *The Reading Teacher, 38*, 724-738.

Poetter, T. S. (2000). Growing teacher inquiry: collaboration in a partner school. *Peabody Journal of Education, 75*(3), 161-176.

Polakow, V. (1993). *Lives on the Edge*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pyle, J. J. (1997). Socrates, the schools, and civility: The continuing war between inculcation and inquiry. *Journal of Law and Education, 26*(1), p 65-89.

Reagan, T. G., Case, C. W., & Brubacher, J. W. (2000). *Becoming a reflective educator* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Samuels, S. J. (1979). The method of repeated readings. *The Reading Teacher, 32*, 403-408.

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

Seifert, P. (1999). Inquiry in the Kindergarten. In J. W. Lindfors & J. S. Townsend (Eds.), *Teaching language arts: Learning through dialogue* (pp. 103-118). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Stanovich, K. E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly, 21*, 360-406.

Stenhouse, L. (1985). *Research as a basis for teaching: reading from the work of Lawrence Stenhouse*. London; Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books.

Tom, A. R. (1985). Inquiring into inquiry-oriented teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 36*(5), 35-44.

van den Berg, O. (2001). The ethics of accountability in action research. In J. Zeni (Ed.), *Ethical issues in practitioner research* (pp. pp. 83-91). New York: Teachers College Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wasik, B. (1998). Volunteer tutoring programs in reading: a review. *Reading Research Quarterly, 33*(3), 266-291.

Wells, G. (1986). *The meaning makers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Wertsch, J. V. (1991). A soiciocultural approach to socially shared cognition. In J. M. L. L. B. Resnick, & S. D. Teasley (Eds.) (Ed.), *Perspectives on socially shared cognition* (pp. pp. 85-100). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Wiesdendanger, K. D., & Bader, L. A. (1987). Teaching easily confused words: Timing makes the difference. *Reading Teacher, 41*, 328-332.

Worthy, J. (1998). A matter of interest: Literature that hooks reluctant readers and keeps them reading. In R. Allington (Ed.), *Teaching Struggling Readers: Articles from The Reading Teacher* . Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Worthy, J., & Prater, S. (1998). Learning on the job: Preservice teachers' perceptions of participating in a literacy tutorial program. In T. Shanahan & F. J. Rodriguez-Brown (Eds.), *National Reading Conference Yearbook* (Vol. 47, pp. 485-495). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Zeichner, K. (1996). Designing educative practicum experiences for prospective teachers. In K. Zeichner, S. Melnick, & M. L. Gomez (Eds.), *Currents of reform in preservice teacher education* (pp. 215-234). New York: Teachers College Press.

Zeichner, K., & Gore, J. (1990). Teacher socialization. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (Vol. 329-348,). New York: Macmillan.

Zeni, J. (Ed.). (2001). *Ethical issues in practitioner research*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Zutell, J., & Rasinski, T. (1989). Reading and spelling connections in thrid and fifth grade students. *Reading Psychology, 10*, 137-155.

Vita

Margie A. Mast was born in Kouts, Indiana on December 5, 1964, the daughter of Dorothy Reinhardt Mast and Raymond Mast. After completing her work at Kouts High School, Kouts, IN, in 1983, she entered Hesston College in Hesston, Kansas for one year. She transferred to Goshen College the following year and received the degree of Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education from Goshen College in April 1987. The following six years she was employed as an elementary school teacher in Demotte, IN and San Antonio, TX. In 1991, she entered a masters degree program at Our Lady of the Lake University in San Antonio, TX completing a M. Ed. with an emphasis in library science in August 1993. She spent seven years working as an elementary librarian in San Antonio, and then Austin. In the fall of 1999, she entered the Graduate School of the University of Texas at Austin to begin work on a doctorate in Language and Literacy Studies.

Permanent address: 906 E. Reynolds, Goshen, IN 46526
This dissertation was typed by the author.