Theses and Dissertations

Spring 2010

Becoming teachers: examining how preservice elementary teachers use language to construct professional identities, learn within relationships, and take risks in the classroom

Anne Swenson Ticknor
University of Iowa

BECOMING TEACHERS: EXAMINING HOW PRESERVICE
ELEMENTARY TEACHERS USE LANGUAGE TO
CONSTRUCT PROFESSIONAL IDENTITIES,
LEARN WITHIN RELATIONSHIPS,
AND TAKE RISKS IN THE CLASSROOM

by

Anne Swenson Ticknor

<u>An Abstract</u>

Of a thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree
in Teaching and Learning (Language, Literacy, and Culture) in
the Graduate College of
The University of Iowa

May 2010

Thesis Supervisor: Professor Kathryn F. Whitmore

This longitudinal qualitative study examined how four preservice elementary teachers used language to construct professional identities, learn within relationships, and take risks in the classroom during their final three semesters in teacher education coursework and field experiences. My female participants were former students of mine in the same section of Methods of Elementary School Reading and Language Arts. We developed rapport and established relationships with each other that revolved around our class experiences, including many critical discussions about teachers, teaching, and literacy. I employed feminist methods to maintain our established relationships by participating in conversations, meeting with small groups of participants, and developing shared meanings of teaching. An over arching question explored in conversations was how preservice teachers negotiated Discourses of teaching when coursework and field experiences offered new and often conflicting examples of teaching and teachers.

The primary data source was conversation transcripts. Secondary data sources included participant generated documents and researcher generated documents for triangulation purposes. Analysis was multi-layered and included content analysis using N*6 computer software and Discourse Analysis questions. Analysis yielded five overarching codes: Nonteacher Identities, Teacher Identities, Relationships with Others, Discourses of Teachers, and Discourses of Teaching. Further analysis included locating I-statements and we-statements to link language with identities and relationships, respectively. Agency Tracing was introduced to historically trace agency in longitudinal language data. These four preservice teachers negotiated nonteacher and teacher identities to construct productive professional identities, learned to become teachers while embedded in relationships during their teacher education coursework and field

experiences, and took risks during their culminating field experiences. This study reconceptualized agency to include five elements of rehearsals: hours of talk, supportive listeners, frustration, awareness of educational contexts, and appropriate timing to implement actions.

Abstract Approved: _____
                             Thesis Supervisor

                             _____
                             Title and Department

                             _____
                             Date

BECOMING TEACHERS: EXAMINING HOW PRESERVICE
ELEMENTARY TEACHERS USE LANGUAGE TO
CONSTRUCT PROFESSIONAL IDENTITIES,
LEARN WITHIN RELATIONSHIPS,
AND TAKE RISKS IN THE CLASSROOM

by

Anne Swenson Ticknor

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree
in Teaching and Learning (Language, Literacy, and Culture)
in the Graduate College of
The University of Iowa

May 2010

Thesis Supervisor: Professor Kathryn F. Whitmore

Graduate College
The University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

_____

PH.D. THESIS

_____

This is to certify that the Ph. D. thesis of

Anne Swenson Ticknor

has been approved by the Examining Committee
for the thesis requirement for the Doctor of
Philosophy degree in Teaching and Learning
(Language, Literacy, and Culture)
at the May 2010 graduation.

Thesis Committee: _____
                     Kathryn Whitmore, Thesis Supervisor

                     _____
                     Linda G. Fielding

                     _____
                     Ellen Herman

                     _____
                     Rachel Williams

                     _____
                     Aimee Carrillo Rowe

To Rob

Ideological becoming of a human being…is the process of
selectively assimilating the words of others

M.M. Bakhtin, The Dialogic Imagination

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My participants: the real women behind the characters of Ava, Katy, Mikayla, and Natasha. This dynamic group of women allowed me into their conversations and invited me to make sense of their becoming teachers. They challenged my thinking about what it means to become a teacher and through their words I was also able to make sense of my own becomings of a teacher educator, researcher, and writer.

My graduate school friends: Leslie Cavendish, Raquel Baker, Lindsay Laurich, Dr. Aimee Mapes, and Jen Teitle who listened to me during the ups and downs of graduate school, discussed my project, and kept me sane.

Mis Amigas: Mery, Nancy, Cathy, Sarah, and Ardrena who encouraged me to not only leave Las Vegas for graduate school in Iowa, but also insisted I stay in graduate school and get my degree for them.

My D-Bs: Aim, Chelle, Deb, Kate, and Darc who supported me by listening and keeping me grounded in realities outside the academy.

My family: My mom who supported me through her "of course you will" attitude; my dad who looked at me with pride and amazement; my brother who always pushed me to continue my education whether he knew it or not; my in-laws, Kathy and Roy, who never said a word when I spent hours in their basement working instead of playing cards; and most importantly, my husband Rob. Without his support I wouldn't have entertained the thought of graduate school. He believed in my aspirations, challenged me to be the woman I am, and took care of me when I wanted to quit.

My dissertation is about constructing identities, learning within relationships, and taking risks. So is my completion of it. Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I POSITIONING OF STUDY, THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK, AND
RELEVANT LITERATURE

Introductory Vignettes

The Grocery Store

As a young twenty-something single woman living in Las Vegas in the late 1990s, I struggled with my identity as an elementary teacher and was confronted with the reality of how dress can create an identity in a public space. As I was fumbling with using my new debit card at the grocery store check out counter, the woman behind me in line asked what grade I taught. At first I was confused by this question. I looked at her for a moment and wondered how she knew I was a teacher. And then I remembered. I looked down and saw what I was wearing: a wooden schoolhouse necklace, an ankle length denim skirt, and a printed apple turtleneck with matching appliquéd apple sweater. Oh, did I mention the glittery stickers on my chest, the lanyard around my neck, and the used Kleenex tucked into my sleeve? I smiled at her, and told her, "Fourth grade." As I quickly gathered my grocery bags, my mind began racing through all of the other outfits I could have worn to the grocery store and I began promising myself that I would never stop at the store on my way home from work again. At this moment, I had an identity crisis. I was conflicted by the desire of wanting to be identified as a teacher in my work environment, but not wanting to be assumed to be a teacher in a public environment. On one hand, I was committed to being seen by other teachers as a teacher, so I wore what I thought were teacher's clothes: a long denim skirt, a loose fitting blouse, flat and comfortable shoes, and minimal make-up to work. Since I did not look like many of the other teachers in my North Las Vegas elementary school, I tried hard to look like my vision of a teacher as it had been constructed through my lived experiences with multiple teachers and teacher educators in the Midwest. On the other hand, I was interested in being recognized not as a teacher, but as a young single woman living in Las Vegas. On nights out, I would wear clothes to reflect my vision of a young single woman living in Las Vegas: close fitting short skirts, low cut blouses, and knee high boots. These were clothes I did not think fit into the work place of an elementary classroom (Researcher Reflective Notes October 2007).

Drawing Teachers

During the fall semester of 2007 I taught Methods Elementary School Reading and Language Arts. This was the second time I had taught this particular course and it was the second time that all of my students were in their early twenties and female. Many of my students were from the northwest suburbs of a large Midwest city in a neighboring state or local small towns, which is also usual for the elementary education program. About two weeks into the semester, I asked my students to draw a picture of a teacher in their Writing Notebooks. We were just about to view a video of Debbie Miller, a prominent figure in the elementary education literacy literature. I wanted them to have a frame of reference for what a teacher looks like before seeing one who we would read

and view throughout the semester. Many of my students drew teachers who were dressed in oversized clothing, had fruit or numerical appliqués on their clothing, and had smiling faces. Many of the drawings included large desks and chalkboards. A few even included rulers, homework baskets, and apples on the desks. On the last day of class, we returned to these drawings and instead of drawing "a teacher," we drew ourselves as teachers. For many of my students, these drawing changed. Some drew themselves interacting with students, some drew pictures without a teacher figure included, and others drew themselves alone with labels describing their teacher qualities. One student, Mikayla, told me that she had tried to draw me. For some of my students, the images did not really change. There were drawings that still included rulers, shapeless clothing, chalkboards, and apples. For this group, it is possible, they still saw themselves as needing to fit an established image of teacher (Block A Reflective Lesson Plan Notes, December 2007).

Why Don't You Study Us?

In the Spring semester of 2008, one of my former students, Natasha, stopped by my office to pick up books that were ordered too late for the end of the fall semester. As we discussed how her semester was progressing, she asked me about mine. I told her I was getting ready for comprehensive exams. She then asked me about my projects. I talked about teacher identity and how I was interested in how practicing teachers constructed their identities as teachers. She asked if she could read one of my papers, and I said something along the lines of, "Oh, I don't know if you would be interested." She replied that of course she would be interested in reading what I thought about teacher identity and I babbled some reply about, "Oh you already know what I think! I spent a whole semester telling you about it in Block." Then she asked me what I might study for my dissertation. I told her I wasn't sure, but probably something about practicing teachers' identity construction. She replied, "Why don't you study us?" (Researcher Reflective Notes, January 2008).

As a young female elementary teacher attempting to reconcile conflicting discourses of "teacher," I spent the first few years of my teaching career wondering how I could fit into the discourse. For me, the identity of teacher seemed both fixed and unstable. It seemed fixed because I had many lived experiences of knowing teachers through years as a compulsory student, as the daughter of teachers, and as knowing teachers as family friends. But this teacher identity also seemed unstable. When I took my first teaching job as an elementary teacher in Las Vegas, I was confronted with the realization that the fixed identity of teacher was not so fixed. Or at least it was fixed in

another way. No longer was "teacher" defined as a white, middle class woman who wore shapeless clothing, minimal make-up and jewelry, comfortable shoes, smiled lovingly at children, had no body piercings, tattoos, or breast implants, and didn't drink or smoke. This was a new teacher identity that conflicted with how I had envisioned myself to be a teacher. As a novice teacher struggling to fit into the discourse of "teacher" I found myself questioning what "teacher" actually meant to me and to those who entered the profession. If I hadn't encountered a conflicting image of teacher, would I have fit into the fixed identity I had repeatedly encountered? Would I have modeled my appearance, my teaching practices, and my teaching beliefs around those middle class white female role models? Or would I have found a way to be challenged in a way that caused me to see my students, my colleagues, and myself as continual constructions of identities? In other words, how does an encounter with conflict make available a productive generative tension that allows agency in the construction of a teacher identity for a novice teacher?

Agency in teaching is crucial. Agency is "a way of positioning oneself so as to allow for new ways of being, new identities" (Lewis, Enciso, & Moje, 2007, p. 5), and it enables teachers to make teaching decisions in particular, in reading. In times of mandated curriculum that reflects "scientifically based research" as defined in the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation, novice and expert teachers need to have the ability to navigate these mandates when their teacher education program does not equip them to follow the "science of reading." In a study conducted by the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ), researchers collected on-line syllabi from 223 elementary education required reading courses to examine the degree to which the "science of reading" or the "five components of effective reading instruction are taught: phonemic

awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. These are the five necessary components of good reading instruction identified in the review of research by the National Reading Panel report released in 2000" (Walsh, Glaser, & Wilcox, 2006). The study found that most, all but 15%, failed to teach the five components of reading instruction, or "science of reading." In fact, the Midwest University failed to address any of the five components in their required reading courses for preservice elementary teachers. This is not surprising since the Methods Elementary Schools Reading course syllabus that I have taught for three semesters does not address the alleged "science of reading" at all. According to the study, the majority of teacher educators are failing to teach preservice elementary teachers the benefits of scientifically proven reading research. Instead, teacher educators are encouraging their preservice elementary teachers to adopt teaching philosophies based on their understanding of various methods presented in required reading courses. Based on the critiqued course syllabi, the authors offer this assessment, "How someone will teach reading is repeatedly cast as a personal decision to be decided by the aspiring teacher. All methods are presented as being equally valid and how one teaches reading is merely a decision of what works best for the individual teacher. These assertions contradict widespread, compelling evidence to the contrary" (Walsh, Glaser, & Wilcox, 2006, p. 30). For the authors of this study, there is only one way to teach reading and it must be learned in teacher education programs, which must be forced to comply with state and federal governments.

As an alternative, I suggest agency on the part of preservice teachers. "Agency lies in the improvisations that people create in response to particular situations" (Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner, & Cain, 1998, p. 279). Preservice teachers can use improvisations,

or in the moment actions, to make decisions when teacher education coursework and fieldwork classroom practices conflict. Danielewicz (2001) writes that preservice teachers "need to feel capable of actions as teachers, first and foremost, as motivation, to keep them invested in teaching when outside factors…cause them to question their sanity in choosing a profession as a teacher" (p. 162). She continues that, "Agency is always a possibility" (p. 163). For many preservice teachers, there is a fear of a mandated curriculum based on a singular view of reading, as suggested by the NCTQ study of on-line syllabi. Typically, preservice teachers' beginning perceptions of effective instruction (Ng, Nicholas, & Williams, 2010; Ryan & Healy, 2009), and consequently good teachers (Fajet, Bello, Leftwich, Mesler, & Shaver, 2005; Ng, Nicholas, & Williams, 2010), are based on lived experiences of being an elementary student, media reports of school failure and federal legislation, and tales of struggling students and uncaring teachers. These are cultural myths of what teaching is and how one might teach. But are these the only realities available for beginning teachers? As a preservice teacher enters the Elementary Teacher Education Program (ETEP) at Midwest University, s/he may have these images of teacher in mind. Through the process of taking education classes and working with children, these images begin to shift (Galman, 2009). In this study I explore my sense that shifting images are opportunities for agency and professional identity construction that allow preservice teachers to negotiate conflicting images of teaching and teachers to make room for their "personal decisions" to find "what works" for each preservice teacher in my study. Simply said, agency is becoming a teacher. How do we, as teacher educators, provide opportunities for shifts, dissonance, and tensions to make room for agency and teacher identity construction? And how do we, as

teacher educators, recognize our own histories of participation (Rogers, 2002; Rogers & Fuller, 2007) in the Discourse of "teacher" to recognize how we limit and allow possibilities for our students? How do preservice teachers take up opportunities for agency and identity construction, and what does it mean if they don't?

Teachers learn to be teachers by teaching and interacting with others who value and engage in the practices and discourses of "teacher" (Britzman, 2003) on a daily basis. Within our own and our students' histories of participation (Rogers, 2002; Rogers & Fuller, 2007), or past lived experiences as and with teachers, teacher identities are enacted and formed. The identity of teacher is not limited to those who enter the profession; the identity of teacher has been observed, judged, and critiqued by all who have been in a classroom. Teaching is a profession that everyone has access to on a regular basis without joining the profession. Therefore, before students decide to become teachers, they have already acquired a perception of what the identity of a teacher is (Fajet, Bello, Leftwich, Mesler, & Shaver, 2005). Through their teacher education program and their student teaching experience, this identity is revised (Britzman, 2003), but it is also influenced by stereotypes (Britzman, 1992b), popular culture (Weber & Mitchell, 2004), and interactions with others invested in the education community (Allen, 2009; Beck & Kosnik, 2001). Since the identity of teacher has been heavily influenced by familiar experiences and years of social interactions within educational settings, the existing teacher identity may be perceived to be stable and unavoidable to beginning teachers. Deborah Britzman posits that teacher identities develop through four competing chronologies of becoming: as a compulsory student, as a teacher education student, as a student teacher, and as a "newly arrived" (p. 70) classroom teacher. My study focuses on

the first three competing chronologies of the preservice teacher: as a compulsory student, as a teacher education student, and as a student teacher. More specifically, I investigate how preservice elementary teachers use language to negotiate the accompanying Discourses that compete, conflict, and provide opportunities for identity construction, learning within relationships, and agency as they "become" elementary teachers of reading.

Research Questions

1. How do four preservice elementary teachers use language to negotiate personal and professional borderland discourses to construct identities as teachers?

2. How does a confluence of relationships contribute to four preservice teachers learning to become teachers?

3. How is agency demonstrated in the language of four preservice teachers?

Study Overview

    This is a longitudinal qualitative study that examines how four preservice teachers the language to become teachers during their three final semester of the Elementary Teacher Education Program (ETEP) at Midwest University. I chose to work with former students because we had already begun critical discussions about discourses of teachers, teaching, and education. I met with each of my participants, Ava, Katy, Mikayla, and Natasha, individually and in small groups to engage in conversations about how each participant experienced and negotiating discourses of teachers and teaching when they conflicted and intersected in their final ETEP coursework and field experiences. To interpret my data I needed to develop a critical theoretical lens that would combine

identity, relationships, and agency as mediated through language and discourse. Critical sociocultural theory fit my need. I also conducted a cursory review of relevant literature to situate my study in the context of preservice teachers learning to become teachers. In each findings chapter I have included relevant literature that is more specific to the themes of my study. The following sections describe my critical sociocultural theory and the preservice literature.

Critical Sociocultural Theory

In *Reframing Sociocultural Research on Literacy*, nine educational researchers offer critiques and call for an amended view of sociocultural theory that makes power, identity, and agency more visible in literacy research. In chapter two, Moje and Lewis (2007) term this expanded view of sociocultural theory as "critical sociocultural theory" and combine activity theory, cultural studies, and critical discourse theories to understand "how discourse both shapes and is shaped by social processes and institutions" (p. 21) in education research. Each subsequent contributor to the volume uses sociocultural theory, highlights its weaknesses, and expands the theory by incorporating critical tenets of feminist theory, poststructural theory, and critical discourse analysis to examine the power relations within their particular educational setting and within the research process. Although each researcher takes up power in different ways, they conceptualize power "in the Foucauldian sense, as a field of relations that circulate in social networks rather than originating from some point of domination" (Lewis, Enciso, & Moje, 2007, p. 4). For each critical sociocultural researcher, language, or discourse, is seen as the primary mediating cultural tool in the social network of each research project. Critical sociocultural theory emerges as a framework to analyze how the dynamic relations

between words, actions, and social experiences, or histories, influence and impact

participants and researcher involved in literacy research. Thus, through the lens of

critical sociocultural theory, I investigate the roles of identity, relationships, and agency

evident in the language of preservice elementary literacy teachers and myself as they

learn to become elementary teachers and I learned to become an educational researcher.

Identity

> Identity is not a fixed 'thing', it is negotiated, open, shifting, ambiguous, the result
> of culturally available meanings and the open-ended, power-laden enactments of
> those meanings in everyday situations. (Kondo, 1990, p. 24)

In Dorrine Kondo's study of identity in the Japanese workplace, she was

confronted with her own shifting identity. She relates a moment when she does not

recognize herself in the reflective glass at the marketplace. For an instant, she thinks she

sees a Japanese housewife out for her afternoon shopping, when in fact it is a reflection

of herself, an American researcher. Kondo is not only surprised by her reflection, but

also by the disturbing thought that she does not recognize herself. Through the repeated

stylization of her body, her desire to fit in the community, her actions, and her words,

Kondo recognizes a shift in her identity. The culturally available meanings allow Kondo

to fit in to her surroundings, access to Japanese worker participants, a desire to not

disgrace her host family, and ultimately, morphed into someone she does not recognize.

Holland et al (1998) say that, "what we call identities remain dependent upon social

relations and material conditions. If these relations and material conditions change, they

must be 'answered', and old 'answers' about who one is may be undone" (p. 189).

Identities are negotiated as the influences of prior and current experiences conflict,

compete, and shift. These changes do not occur quickly though. For Kondo, her identity

changed slowly over many months of living, acting, and speaking as a Japanese woman.

Holland et al (1998) write,

> Forming an identity on intimate landscapes takes time, certainly months, often years. It takes (and makes) personal experience to organize a self around discourses and practices, with the aid of cultural resources and the behavioral prompting and verbal feedback of others…Conceiving oneself as an agent whose acts count in, and account for, the world cannot happen overnight (p. 285).

Identity construction does not occur in isolation. Identities in practice, or situated identities, are identities that exist in specific social, historical, and cultural contexts through interactions with others (Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner, & Cain, 1998). In these interactions and contexts, meaning is derived for ways of speaking, dressing, acting, and social positioning, including gender, race, ethnicity, and class. Meanings become contextualized in collectively imagined "'as if' worlds (that) are sociohistoric, contrived interpretations or imaginations that mediate behavior" of and for participants. Thus, figured worlds are "socially and culturally constructed realm(s) of interpretation in which particular characters and actors are recognized, significance is assigned to certain acts, and particular outcomes are valued over others" (Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner, & Cain, 1998, p. 52). In the example of the figured world of Alcoholics Anonymous (AA), Cain refers to the plastic tokens that signify sobriety as the same plastic tokens used as poker chips. Through the collective understanding in the figured world of AA, plastic tokens are revalued as significant to their members as symbols of sobriety, not as wagers in poker. Not only do physical items, such as plastic tokens, become revalued and understood by its members, so do words, behaviors, dress, and ways of interacting.

In the context of the ETEP, preservice teachers quickly become involved in the figured world of teaching. Preservice teachers are guided to participate in the new world

in particular ways. They are expected to read, write, and speak professional language, engage with children, and evaluate and assess themselves as becoming professional teachers. Their words and behaviors are revalued to reflect the collective meanings of "teaching" and "teacher". By engaging in the figured world of teaching, students take on the professional identity of a teacher and construct these identities with the culturally available tools. Instructors, curriculum, students, and the supportive community of the ETEP determine these ways and encourage preservice teachers to interpret teaching and teachers in new ways. Thus, "(t)he old conception of self…is weakened through a process of discrediting not only the old identit(ies) as such but also the figured world that (gave) it meaning" (Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner, & Cain, 1998, p. 73). As preservice teachers move from student identity to teacher identity, they must learn to negotiate the loss of one identity to gain a new interpretation of self and surroundings.

Relationships

Kenneth Gergen's (2009) theory of relationships posits that individuals are unbounded beings. Instead, Gergen conceptualizes individual as relational beings always embedded in relationships with others. Relationships may be temporary or long–term, but they are always plural, interconnected, and unavoidable. Gergen states that all meaning is created within relationships. In other words, all action is collaborative action and reciprocal to others' actions. Reading a book or writing a dissertation are all in response to someone else who may or may not be present. I read a book that the author expected someone to read and I write this dissertation with the expectation that my advisor will read it and offer revision suggestions. I then rewrite it and incorporate her suggestions. I repeat this cycle with the intent that the unknown reader will eventually

read and understand it. Meaningful action occurs with the knowledge that co-action is always in reciprocal response to someone else.

In the context of preservice teachers, relationships exist before entering the ETEP and develop through working with others who are invested in the education world. Relationships constructed before entering ETEP continue to influence decisions made within ETEP experiences. For instance, relationships with family members and their educational experiences may influence preservice teachers' perceptions of effective classroom practices. Relationships formed and developed through ETEP coursework and field experiences in particular also influence how a preservice teacher becomes a teacher. Gergen's view of all meaning as co-constructed within relationships was a central finding in my study due to the language preservice teachers used to describe engagements in imagined (i.e., university classroom demonstrations) and real (i.e., field experiences with school-aged students) rehearsals of teaching activities with their peers, instructors, supervisors, cooperating teachers, and school-aged students.

Although we are embedded in a confluence, or web, of relationships, not all are cemented, or bonded, relationships. Bonded relationships are "held to be those in which individuals are affectively fastened to one another" (p. 172), which produce investment in maintaining the bonded relationship. Gergen (2009) states that there are "at least three essential ingredients to the creation of bonds: negotiation, narration, and enchantment" (p. 173). Negotiation occurs through co-constructed realities, including the comfort, reliability, and trust, which accompany them. Narration is both a time investment and a verbal commitment to the relationship. In other words, bonding through narration occurs when the use of "we" is used to describe a relationship that has developed over time to

create a "we." The third ingredient is enchantment. Gergen describes enchantment as "the injection of value into the bonding unit" (p. 179). Although each preservice teacher constructed different bonded relationships, they bonded with each other, me, educational mentors, school-aged students, and individuals outside the realm of education. These relationships fostered productive professional identity construction and bolstered professional confidence to seek opportunities for agency in the classroom. In other words, preservice teachers learned to become teachers within relationships.

Agency

Holland and her colleagues (1998) view human agency as possible in two ways: improvisation and self-directed symbolizations. Improvisation occurs when confronted with unfamiliar social contexts, which allow the usual ways of interacting not to fit and prompt on-the-spot actions. These actions are creative, innovative, and imaginative. The dissonance forces a rupture, or break, from expected actions and creates opportunities for new actions. The second possibility for agency is self-directed symbolizations. This happens through play. Play is how ordinary objects, such as paper, are revalued into special objects, such as money. It is through imagining new worlds with refigured meanings for symbols to organize and manage objects, words, and ways of being. Human agency enables "the creation of new worlds and new identities and make us appreciate how figured (objectified) identities become important tools with which individuals and groups seek to manage one another and their own behavior" (Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner, & Cain, 1998, p. 281). By playing teacher in educational contexts, such as ETEP courses and field experiences, preservice teachers bolster their confidence

through imagined rehearsals (Goffman, 1963; Mead, 1934) with others invested in educational practices to take risks in their student teaching classrooms.

Much in the same way as Jazz players use improvisation to spontaneously create "fresh melodies over the continuously repeating cycle of chord changes of a tune" (Dowdell, 1998), agency by preservice teachers requires an acute awareness of the teaching context, or tune, and the instructional tools and strategies, or role of their instrument, to improvise. The preservice teachers in my study improvised in response to a rupture in the Discourses of Teachers and Teaching, which provided a generative tension to take a risk. Preservice teachers improvised through actions, or implementing instructional tools and strategies in their student teaching classroom, which had been rehearsed in previous educational contexts. Jazz improvisation occurs in a similar process, musicians must have a deep understanding of their instrument developed over many hours of rehearsals with others and confidence to take a risk by creating improvised solo variations. In the figured world of education, preservice teachers rehearse instructional tools and strategies in varied educational settings embedded in relationships with others who are invested in education to build professional confidence to take risks. My study focused on the necessary ruptures, or breaks, in preservice teachers' Discourses of Teachers and Teaching to provide generative tensions to take risks in their student teaching field experiences.

D/discourse

Language is used to create the world of activities, identities, and institutions around us (Gee, 2005). Gee uses an example of a committee meeting (activity), committee chair, members, facilitators (identities), and committees (institutions) to

illustrate how language works to build social meanings. A committee is usually called together to discuss something of importance to the committee, or larger institution it represents. Committee meetings usually involve various committee members and a committee chair who calls the meeting to order. The meeting follows an order, members use particular language, and exhibit behaviors they understand. Established "ways of acting, interacting, feeling, believing, valuing, and using various sorts of objects, symbols, tools, and technologies—to recognize yourself and others as meaning and meaningful in certain ways" (Gee, 2005, p. 7) are constructed through discourse.

Discourse encompasses the social and cultural ways that language is used to enact specific identities, to be recognized as the identity, and to engage in specific activities in meaningful practices. Gee distinguishes between little d/big D in discourse. He states that little d discourse involves the language-in-use that is recruited on site to enact identities and activities, while big D Discourse is the "non-language 'stuff'" (Gee, 2005, p. 7). Big D Discourse "involves a great deal more than 'just language'. It involves acting-interacting-thinking-valuing-talking-(sometimes writing-reading) in the 'appropriate way' with the 'appropriate' props at the 'appropriate' times in the 'appropriate' places" (Gee, 2005, p. 26). Preservice teachers construct identities that are appropriate to the Discourses of Teachers and Teaching through D/discourses. Given that I was interested in studying how preservice teachers use language to build identities, learn within relationships, and take risks, I provided opportunities for my research participants to use language in multiple in-depth conversations over the course of 16 months. "(B)uilding different identities in language always implicates different social languages, since it is in and through different social languages, as they are embedded in

different Discourses, that we enact, perform, and recognize different socially situated identities" (p. 147). Teacher identities are co-constructed in language exchanges, but also through the performance of the appropriate ways of being a teacher. These identities are recognizable when the performance is similar enough to previous performances of teachers. They are situated socially and culturally in the Discourse of teacher, and recognized as enacting teacher identities. In other contexts, or figured worlds, these ways of being or speaking hold different meanings, invoke different contexts, and enact different identities. Preservice teachers recruit language and non-language stuff to construct teacher identities situated in larger structures of discourse and practices.

Relevant Literature

> That is, learning to teach is not a mere matter of applying decontextualized skills or of mirroring predetermined images; it is time when one's past, present, and future are set in dynamic tension. Learning to teach—like teaching itself—is always the process of becoming: a time of formation and transformation, of scrutiny into what one is doing, and who one can become (Britzman, 2003, p. 31).

Becoming a teacher means taking up an identity that at times seems stable and fixed. Through the repeated experiences as students in compulsory education, students in teacher education courses, and field experiences, preservice teachers confront multiple conflicting discourses of what it means to be a teacher (Alsup, 2006; Britzman, 2003; Flores & Day, 2006; Larson & Phillips, 2005; Phelan, 2005; Weber & Mitchell, 2004). To inform my study on how preservice elementary teachers become teachers in ETEP coursework and field experiences, I reviewed relevant literature to situate my study in this body of work. It is my intention to highlight the interconnectedness of three elements of becoming a teacher: professional identity construction, learning within relationships, and agentic moves. Although the following studies do not necessarily use the terms

"identity," "relationship," or "agency," each study built my understanding of the critical

tenets of becoming a teacher.

I have divided the literature into three clusters based on the preservice teacher(s)

being studied: secondary English, general elementary, and elementary literacy. This

organizational scheme is useful in pinpointing the population of preservice teachers who

have been studied, the Teacher Education contexts, the methodological tools that have

been employed by researchers, and their conclusions. Since this is not meant to be an

exhaustive review of the literature, I present additional studies to situate each finding in

the body of work on preservice teachers. Although teacher identity is not a new topic,

Deborah Britzman's landmark study of preservice secondary English teachers introduced

preservice teacher identity to the field of Teacher Education. I begin this review here; it

is the study that introduced me to the world of preservice teacher identity, and it frames

much of my thinking about how one becomes a teacher.

Preservice Secondary English Teacher

In a seminal critical ethnography of preservice secondary English teachers,

Deborah Britzman (2003) asked the question: How are teaching selves constituted in

learning to teach? Britzman examined how two student teachers, Jamie Owl and Jack

August, navigated the cultural myths that permeated the Discourse of Teachers and

Teaching. Through extensive interviews with each student teacher, placement school

teachers and administrators, and teacher educators, Britzman asserted that teaching is a

dialogic relationship of discursive practices. She posited that teacher educators

incorporate opportunities for preservice teachers to raise questions about power and

desire in education before entering the teaching profession. Britzman's call for teacher

educators to facilitate identity construction, relationships among educational others, and agentic moves in teacher education classrooms highlights the importance of these aspects to becoming teachers.

Fifteen years after the first publication of *Practice Makes Practice*, Janet Alsup (2006) returned to two of Britzman's questions about teacher identity: What kinds of identities might be made available to teachers?; and, What kinds of knowledge, imagination, and ways of being would be desirable? Alsup adds a third question: What kinds of discourse can be facilitated during preservice teacher education to help new teachers most effectively use their knowledge and develop a professional identity? (p. 45). Alsup's qualitative study examined how teacher education coursework facilitates personal and professional identity understandings in preservice teachers. Through narrative research of 6 female preservice secondary English teachers who had been former students, Alsup traced the metaphors and discourses employed in oral and written assignments to narrate the tensions between their personal and professional identities. Alsup described these points of tensions as "borderland discourses," or "a transformative type of teacher identity discourse" (p. 6) that makes space for teachers' competing personal and professional discourses to bring about "increased metacognitive awareness and identity growth" (p. 9). Alsup asserted that borderland discourses provide necessary tensions for preservice teachers to become teachers "without giving up themselves" (p. 10). She concluded that teacher educators should facilitate opportunities for preservice teachers to engage in discussions about teaching and teachers to allow for dissonance.

Danielewicz (2001) studied how six preservice secondary English teachers used language to construct identities as teachers. By analyzing interviews, student teaching

observations, and Teacher Education coursework documents, she chronicled their journeys through Teacher Education coursework and field experiences over a three-year period. Danielewicz intermixed these findings with self-reflections of her own identity construction as a teacher and Teacher Educator. She concluded with ten principles for Teacher Education that develops teacher identities. These principles fall into two categories, structural and performative. The structural principles are general properties that characterize curriculum, such as dialogue, while performative principles concern what individuals do, such as agency. Taken together, these principles "constitute a pedagogy for identity development" (p. 139) in Teacher Education coursework and provided needed opportunities for preservice teachers to rehearse agentic moves in the classroom.

Heller, Wood, and Shawgo (2007) examined the impact of a language arts methods course on the field experience practices of one preservice teacher in a Professional Development School (PDS). Although the preservice teacher, Mr. Nathan, student taught in both a first grade classroom and an eighth grade classroom, the authors focused on the secondary experience. By examining course syllabi and reflective observation notes of Mr. Nathan teaching a poetry lesson, the authors posited that effective teachers are metacognitive about their teaching and encourage students to be motivated to learn. They also concluded that the partnerships between universities and PDS's provide opportunities for Teacher Educators and preservice teachers to move between practical classroom experiences and Teacher Education classrooms to build metacognitive skills about teaching within relationships with other educators.

The work on preservice secondary English teachers sheds light on the complex nature of identity construction, relationships with other educators, and agentic moves rehearsed in Teacher Education. This group of studies also identified researcher tools, such as longitudinal language data collection and participants as former students, to situate my study with previous work with preservice teachers. Although these studies fail to portray the intricate world of teaching elementary teachers encounter. I turn to literature on the preservice general elementary teacher to deepen my understanding of how preservice teachers might construct a teacher identity in their final three semesters of coursework and field experiences.

Preservice General Elementary Teacher

Phelan (2005) studied how an elementary preservice teacher's knowledge about teaching evolved through an inquiry based post-degree program. Lily entered the program with a view of knowledge as generalizable to all practical teaching experiences, but learned to fail by "letting go, losing one's balance, and losing certainty" (p. 355) to gain new understandings of teaching, which occur through uncomfortable moments of dissonance. By examining coursework documents and conducting interviews and classroom observations, Phelan advocated the importance of field experiences as opportunities for preservice teachers to learn to manage anxiety and fear in classroom experiences that do not fit with generalizable Teacher Education knowledge and allow for opportunities for agency.

Through a self-exploration of her own beginning university teaching career, Gratch (2000) examined how preservice elementary teachers responded to her approach to mentoring student teachers as a new Teacher Education faculty member. Gratch

explored her own identity construction in these roles to hypothesize about teaching and how teachers learning to construct themselves in Teacher Education coursework and field experiences. Gratch (2000) wrote, "In order to create the space for discourse, teachers must challenge the system which has defined them in ways which serve to reproduce that structure" (p. 125) to allow for agency as a social actor in the world of teaching and teachers. Gratch advocated including these opportunities in Teacher Education coursework and field experiences to encourage agentic moves by preservice elementary teachers.

Flores & Day (2006) explored how professional identities were shaped and reshaped during the first two years of teaching for fourteen teachers, eight of which were elementary. Through interviews, questionnaires, written narratives, and student feedback, the authors explored how workplace context impacted teacher identities. Data revealed that more negative contexts destabilized identities and teachers became more rule governed and less creative. The authors suggested teacher education programs can have more impact on positive teacher identities by allowing for more opportunities for preservice teachers to explore their personal biographies and possible future negative school contexts in an attempt to encourage professional identity building and agentic moves by new teachers.

Smagorinksy and his colleagues (2004) examined how one preservice teacher, Sharon, negotiated the tensions between her Teacher Education methods course, her student teaching school context, and her first teaching position when the philosophies of teaching and learning did not align. The authors analyzed interviews with Sharon, her cooperating teacher, her University supervisor, researcher field notes, student teaching

documents, and first year teaching documents to find that during Sharon's student teaching she was constrained in her teaching decisions and her identity as a teacher was restricted. When she entered her first teaching position she was not equipped to make independent teaching decisions, or agentic moves, for her students. The authors posit that productive tension found in constructivist approaches to teaching, as opposed to accommodation to more powerful environmental forces like a cooperating teacher, aid in constructing a productive teacher identity that withstands influential environmental forces in future teaching positions and build confidence for beginning teachers to take risks in the classroom.

This group of studies offered researcher tools, such as self-reflection, and conclusions, such as dissonance in teacher education as instrumental in professional identity construction, useful in the context of my study of preservice elementary teachers. Although the preservice general elementary teacher research allows windows into the world of the ETEP by highlighting the tensions that exist between methods courses and field experiences, the specific area of literacy and its multifaceted meanings in classroom practice is not addressed in this body of work.

Preservice Elementary Literacy Teacher

Shaw & Mahlios (2008) examined how preservice elementary teachers framed their language arts experiences and defined meaning for their students through metaphors of teaching and literacy. At the end of a Teacher Education literacy course, the authors analyzed the metaphors of fifty-two preservice teachers to reflect four general themes: sequence of knowledge and skill, parts that come together as a whole, foundation of life, and journey. They found that 44% of the preservice teachers used metaphors that

reflected the literacy course content and 56% employed metaphors that reflected their personal experience with education. The authors suggest using metaphors as a way to track change in preservice teacher beliefs of teaching, how teacher education course content impacts this change, and call for metaphors to "be a concrete and potent means to describe one's beliefs amidst the pendulum swings in the field" (p. 54) allowing opportunities for productive identity growth to bolster confidence in classroom.

Hoffman and his colleagues (2005) explored the qualities of eight elementary Teacher Education reading programs by following 101 first year elementary teacher graduates over a four year period. This group was compared to practicing teachers in the same school sites who were not recent graduates of the reading program. Researchers reported that reading program learning translated into teacher graduates' classroom literacy environment over years two and three of the study as evidenced in interviews and observations. Researchers concluded that reading programs that followed the International Reading Association (IRA) guidelines to provide preservice teachers with opportunities to make decisions, or agency, a variety of field experiences, a vision of literacy that includes good teaching and quality Teacher Education, resources to implement this vision, faculty with authority to adapt to student needs, a collaborative community between faculty, staff, and students, and continual assessment of students and program impacted teacher graduate literacy instructional decisions in the classroom.

Grisham (2000) studied the reading beliefs and practices of K-8 preservice teachers in literacy methods courses and student teaching in a school immersion Masters in Teacher Education program. Grisham analyzed interviews, video observations, field notes, and course assignments of 12 preservice teachers over a three-year period. She

purposefully selected the 12 white female participants based on their beginning autobiographies of reading and beliefs about reading. Grisham found that the metaphors preservice teachers used were not consistent with their teaching practices when the teaching context did not align with Teacher Education program. She concludes that a constructivist Teacher Education program does affect practice when preservice teachers are in school cultures that support a constructivist approach to teaching and learning, thus highlighting the importance of relationships in learning.

Larson and Phillips (2005) examined how one elementary preservice teacher, Claire, navigated the conflicting authoritative discourses of her Teacher Education Literacy courses and her student teaching placement school. The researchers used a poststructural feminist position to analyze the language Claire used in audio recorded meetings, observation notes, and e-mails to code for two distinct discourses of reading: federal policy (student teaching school) and comprehensive literacy (Teacher Education Literacy courses). They found that Claire oscillated between these two discourses of reading in her language to describe her classroom practices. The researchers also analyzed their own use of language in reflective researcher journals and meetings to tease out the implications of their influence in her discourse of reading. Larson and Phillips posit that Teacher Educators need to resist binaries in literacy courses and resist protecting preservice teachers from difficult decision making. Rather, teacher educators should teach critical literacy skills and provide opportunities for preservice teachers to collaborate and make meaning together. These implications will assist preservice teachers in making agentic literacy decisions in times of mandated curriculum.

Again, this group of studies offered researcher tools, such as discourse analysis, that were useful in my study. However, the research on preservice elementary literacy teacher identity, relationships, and agency is limited to examining the influence of literacy methods course content on student teaching, or beginning teaching, practices. It is not enough to view preservice teacher identity, relationships, and agency as byproducts of learning to teach, but it is a start to the hard work that is necessary for Teacher Educators and Teacher Researchers to implement the suggestions of the above authors.

Each author advocates the necessity of Teacher Education and Teacher Educators to provide contexts that allow for preservice teachers to wrestle with the conflicts and tensions in learning to teach and becoming teachers. Through qualitative methods, such as studying language in interviews and written documents used by preservice teachers, each researcher makes an argument that preservice teachers becoming teachers is worthy of study. These are the methods I used to implement in my study, but I took one step further. I used Discourse Analysis to examine the language-in-use of preservice teachers in multiple in-depth conversations. Following the lead of Larson and Phillips (2005) I employed a feminist stance to implicate myself and deconstruct the powerful discourses of literacy, teaching, and teacher in the Elementary Teacher Education Program (ETEP) at Midwest University and this project. Feminist methods also allowed me to wrestle with the established and bonded relationships between myself and my participants. Since this is not meant to be an exhaustive review of the available literature on preservice teacher identity, relationships, and agency I continue to review relevant literature in each findings chapter to inform the themes in my data. This literature review is meant to

situate my study within relevant literature and pinpoint how my study might add to this body of work.

CHAPTER II RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

This is a feminist qualitative study that uses discourse analysis to describe the language preservice teachers use to construct professional identities, learn within relationships, and take risks during their final three semesters of the Elementary Teacher Education Program (ETEP) coursework and field experiences at Midwest University. In this chapter, I first provide readers with a description of my multiple case studies design and orient my readers to my stance as a feminist qualitative researcher, to justify the extensive use of in-depth conversations, and to describe Discourse Analysis. I include a rationale for why I find feminist methods and Discourse Analysis useful in answering my particular research questions. Finally, I describe the design of my study including research context, research participants, coursework phases, data sources, data collection time line, and data analysis procedures.

Multiple Case Studies Design

This is a feminist qualitative study that used detailed case studies of research participants "to gain an in-depth understanding of the situation and meaning for those involved" (Merriam, 1998, p. 19) in becoming teachers. These cases provided a "rich, 'thick' description" (Merriam, 1998, p. 29) of the how and why of constructing productive teacher identities. Through theoretical sampling, "an evolving process guided by the emerging theory" (Merriam, 1998, p. 63), case studies were determined during data collection as reflective of the multi-layered meanings of becoming teachers. These case studies are representative of ETEP preservice teacher experiences and were informed by the bounded unit, or case, (Glesne, 2006; Merriam, 1998) of the ETEP at Midwest University. As themes and patterns emerged in the analysis of individual cases,

I looked for patterns across cases to strengthen the external validity (Merriam, 1998) of the findings in my study.

The Problem of Interviews

My study focused on how preservice elementary teachers recruit language to construct teacher identities, construct relationships, and take risks in the classroom, which necessitated the use of repeated language use as a primary data source. My first attempt to offer language opportunities was in interviews. However, the interview situation is a highly unnatural and unreal event that is staged, choreographed, and scripted with not only words, but the intentions of the participants—the researcher and the research participant. Glesne (2006) offers reassurance to qualitative researchers by stating "(i)nterviewing is a complex act" (p. 91) "driven by research purposes….and good data" (p.95). My study relied on language as data, and the quality of the data was dependent on repeated opportunities for language to be used over time during three semesters of ETEP coursework and field experiences. To study how language was used to construct an identity, depict learning relationships, and take risks, I quickly realized that interviews were not the method I had imagined and required reconfiguring my role as a researcher to include the feminist methodology as described in the following section.

Since the conclusion of Block A in the fall semester of 2007, Ava, Natasha, and I had occasionally met at local coffee shops to discuss their practicum field experiences. After receiving the necessary approval of the Midwest University Institutional Research Board (IRB) to conduct my dissertation study I scheduled my very first official interview with Ava and Natasha at a local restaurant near the Midwest University campus. Even though we had met previously, I envisioned this particular meeting to be a "interview" in

the traditional sense that I as researcher would ask questions or introduce topics based on

my research questions (see Appendix A for Initial Interview Guide) that my participants

would answer. Within minutes of meeting and talking, I learned that I was not the only

one who asked questions, nor was I the only one who introduced topics for discussion.

The "interview" I had carefully planned quickly evolved into a small group conversation

that I was invited to hear and sometimes participate.

One hour and twenty-five minutes into our first small group conversation,

Natasha stated, "I don't want to stop (our conversation)" (April 2, 2008) due to my need

to catch the last city bus and my naïve view of our "interview" requiring only one hour

(see Appendix B for Conversation Data by Participant Chart). In retrospect, I was held to

establishing myself as a particular kind of researcher that encompassed my emerging

view of what a researcher does, such as conduct interviews. I did not acknowledge the

importance of our bonded relationship and how it would affect my research methods or

the interactions between my participants and myself. As I stood to leave the restaurant,

Ava said to Natasha, "Maybe I should record us and give it to Anne" (April 2, 2008). As

much as our talk had turned into conversation, Ava signaled the importance of the audio-

recorder as representative of the conversation as data only if it was recorded.

> Foucault stated in his final interview that relationships of power exist,
>
> > in human relations, whatever they are—whether it be a question of
> > communicating verbally, as we are doing right now, or a question of a love
> > relationship, an institutional or economic relationship—power is always present:
> > I mean the relationships in which one wishes to direct the behavior of
> > another…these relationships of power are changeable relations, i.e., they can
> > modify themselves, they are not given once and for all (Fornet-Betancourt,
> > Becker, & Gomez-Muller, 1994, p. 11).

Foucault made a valid point of the importance of social dynamics existing in an interview; the researcher directs the responses of the participant by asking questions related to the topic of her study. For researchers who engage in qualitative research and use interview as a data source, it is unavoidable to ask questions of our participants. As researchers, our questions pertain to ourselves and our topic of study, while our participants answer questions according to their views, perceptions, and experiences in words analyzed by the researcher (Glesne, 2006). As a researcher, and as my participants' previous instructor, I was positioned in a powerful role. I had directed their learning for one semester, I had given them grades, and I had established myself as one with more experience and knowledge in the field of teaching. I was already a teacher; they were students hoping to become teachers.

Power is not without resistance. Power and resistance are not stagnant, but forces that are fluid and always moving between and through people. In the context of my study of identity enactments by preservice teachers, my situated identities as researcher, previous instructor, student teacher supervisor, white woman with similar experiences of upbringing, and former elementary teacher influenced my engagement as well as my participants' engagements in our conversations. Thus, resistance came in the form of talking at me or talking to each other instead of waiting for my questions or my responses. Jayati Lal (1996) explored the concept of resistance in interviews with her research participants. Lal reflexively wrote about her fieldwork experiences as a researcher conducting interviews in an Indian factory and problematized the "situated identity" (1996, p. 189) of herself as an Indian woman who lived in the United States and returned to India for her fieldwork. Lal wrote, "(t)he fact is that our subjects are often not

just responding to our agendas and to our questions, but they are also always engaged in actively shaping their presentations to suit their own agendas of how they wish to be represented" (p. 204). Katy echoed Lal's interpretation by stating in one of our last individual conversations, "I like thinking about what teaching means to me…this means something directly to me" (November 3, 2008). My investment in this research project was not the only investment: Katy, as well as my other participants, was invested in this research project in a way that did not allow for interviews and encouraged me to rethink how to become a qualitative researcher to include feminist methodology and Discourse Analysis.

Feminist Qualitative Research Methodology

As a qualitative researcher who quickly became committed to accounting for the power, agency, and identity enactments that exist in relationships between researchers and research participants (Glesne, 2006; Kirsch, 1999, 2005; Lal, 1996; Lather, 1991, 2000; St. Pierre & Pillow, 2000), I learned to employ a feminist stance in my research practices. Lather suggests that researchers have the possibility of "transforming our own practices so that our…work can be less toward positioning ourselves as masters of truth and justice and more toward creating a space where those directly involved can act and speak on their own behalf" (Lather, 1991, pp. 163-164). I engaged in deliberate research activities that accounted for my influences as a researcher, a Block A instructor, a University Student Teacher supervisor, a white woman living in the Midwest, and a former elementary teacher. Following the lead of critical and poststructural feminist educational researchers such as Britzman (2000), Butler (1990), Lather (1991), and St. Pierre & Pillow (2000), I continually interrogated my position in the research process,

attempted to be conscious of the way that language was used by me and the way language used me, and became increasingly aware of how I was implicated in what I critiqued (Lather, 1991) in my research practices. I engaged in activities that would increase my metacognitive awareness of my position by writing reflective field notes about my impressions of my participants and myself, asking my participants how they viewed me and my project, and resisting limiting identities as an uninvolved researcher. By constantly investigating my own contribution and investment in the object of my study, preservice elementary teachers becoming teachers, I hoped to make more possible the full reciprocity between researcher and researched that Lather (1991) calls for in emancipatory research. Full reciprocity involves interactive and dialogic interviews where both researcher and research participants self-disclose, collaborate between individuals and small groups of participants in interviews, and negotiate meanings in research design and practice. I quickly engaged in the first two practices since my participants had been students of mine and we had already established relationships that were conducive to self-disclosure and collaboration. The third practice, negotiating meanings of research design and practice, were not as easily practiced. As I discussed in the proceeding sections and throughout my findings chapters, establishing myself as a feminist researcher who was, and still is, unsure of the professional implications of engaging in research, I confronted multiple layers of my own uncertainties and insecurity when my professional and personal identities collided.

Since individual and small group conversations were my primary data source, I constantly considered my role as researcher in this context of known researcher and participants. Lather calls for a research design that is not researcher centered, but placed

somewhere between the researcher and the researched and their foreseen outcomes of the project (see Lather, 2000). The challenge, of course, as a feminist researcher was to recognize my own implications and invested interests in the research project. This required more than self-reflexivity by myself in the research project; it demanded that I be more accountable to the researched and less accountable to The Academy in which we "labor as intellectuals" (Lal, 1996, p. 206). As a qualitative researcher who studied language-in-use, I constantly examined my language use, its limits, and its possibilities in my research project to better account for my position as a feminist qualitative researcher in response to my participants' needs invested in this project. In each of my findings chapters I make a deliberate attempt to highlight my language usage in my study, and how I used language with my participants using Discourse Analysis tools. However, as I illuminate in each findings chapter, my language use and my multiple identities often fell short of the feminist methodology I hoped to emulate.

Discourse Analysis

Gee (2005) defines D/discourse analysis as a method for using tools of inquiry into "language-in-use" (discourse) and "non-language 'stuff' (Discourse)"(p. 7). Discourse consists of how people use language to make sense of socially constructed meanings about who we are and what we do in the social world. We use language and language uses us. We use language to build identities and representations of self to ourselves and to others. Language uses us by socially constructing selves that position us in relation to others and the powerful discourses in the social world. Discourse Analysis enabled me to investigate the language-in-use (Gee, 2005) employed by preservice teachers as they constructed professional identities, described relationships, and

contemplated teaching risks during small group and individual conversations. By considering how "(s)ocially situated identities are mutually co-constructed in interviews, just as much as they are in everyday conversations" (Gee, 2005, p. 139), Discourse Analysis afforded me the analytic lens to investigate my research participants', as well as my own, language-in-use during our conversations and investigate how we were using language to construct our identities in the here and now.

Context of Study

In the 2006-2007 academic year, I spent two semesters as a University Supervisor for Elementary Education Student Teachers. I observed preservice teachers planning and implementing methods from their ETEP courses. Each semester I was surprised when I encountered preservice teachers whose classroom practices contradicted their student teaching required narrative describing their philosophy of education. For example, after watching a first grade preservice teacher lead a small group literacy lesson exploring how the short /a/ sound works in certain words, I had a one-on-one conference with her about the lesson. As we talked about it, I told her that I had just read her required ePortfolio narrative about her Philosophy of Education. I asked her how this particular lesson fit with her Philosophy of Education. After a few moments of silence, she said she didn't know how it fit and she thought that it didn't fit. We spent much of the semester talking about how her philosophy of education could be implemented in her student teaching placement school practices.

The next semester, fall 2007, I returned to being an instructor of Methods Elementary School Language Arts and Methods Elementary School Reading (Block A) and taught a group of 17 white, female preservice teachers. I began the semester with a

plan to discuss how theory and practice fit together in teaching. During this particular

semester the Block A instructors used a new book by Stephanie Jones (2006) *Girls,*

Social Class, & Literacy. In this particular book, Jones worked with 8 young girls from

working class families in an urban Ohio elementary school. Jones discussed how the

literate identities of the girls, and herself as teacher, were affected in their interactions in

and outside of school. During the course of the semester, my students and I began

discussing how we, as teachers, are implicated in the work of elementary students

constructing literate identities. This discussion led to how they, as future teachers, were

constructing literate and professional identities for themselves in and outside the

classroom. From these initial discussions, we began sharing stories, writing memoirs of

experiences with teachers, and drawing pictures of what teachers and teaching meant to

them as future elementary literacy teachers. With Stephanie Jones as an initial guide into

thinking about the kinds of teachers they wanted to be, they branched off into their own

thinking about becoming "good teachers."   In their weekly field journals, they reflected

on their teaching practices by analyzing how their individual definitions of "good

teacher" were implemented in their work with children. In a continuous dialogue

between student and instructor, we consistently reflected on how they were individually

constructing identities as teachers who practiced their beliefs of what good teachers do

and say when working with children. Although the weekly field journals and the weekly

meetings with children were requisites of the course, students were encouraged and

guided by me, our class readings, and our discussions to try out relevant literacy methods

and practices with their child.   These decisions were then analyzed and discussed in both

weekly field journals and class discussions, thus providing us with opportunities to talk

about teaching literacy as experienced practices, not as future endeavors.   These discussions were the basis for my research questions, my former students were my research participants, and continuing these discussions in interviews was the medium to answer my research questions.

Research Participants

According to the "Status of the American Public School Teacher 2000-2001: Highlights" published by the National Education Association in November 2003, 79% of surveyed elementary teachers are female, 90% are white, and 23 % are novice teachers with less than 5 years of teaching experience. At Midwest University, the demographics of the ETEP are similar with the majority of its students being female and white. Many are from small Midwest communities in the state with a large population from a nearby large Midwest city. Most students are from the northwestern suburbs of this city and plan to return to their hometowns to teach. The demographics of Midwest University ETEP students provided me with a unique opportunity to select participants who represented the typical American elementary teaching force. In a similar fashion to Johnson's (2007) study of preservice teachers' initial views of equity, I took advantage of the Midwest University ETEP demographics to investigate my assumption that becoming a teacher is filled with dissonance and uncertainty even when the preservice teacher appears to seemingly fit into the Discourse of Teacher.

My study illustrates three sampling techniques: purposeful, convenience, and theoretical. The first two are discussed in the Research Participants section, and theoretical sampling has been introduced in the Multiple Case Studies Design and is discussed in detail in the Data Collection section. "Purposeful sampling is based on the

assumption that the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned" (Merriam, 1998, p. 61). Therefore, purposeful sampling was employed to select participants who were representative of the overall Midwest University ETEP population. In Spring 2008 I invited students who had been in my Fall 2007 section of Methods Elementary School Reading and Language Arts (Block A) to participate. Participants were purposefully selected from this course and section for two reasons. First this group of seventeen students was demographically representative of the ETEP population. They were white females aged 19-22 and lived in the Midwest for most of their lives. Each participant also reminded me of types of ETEP students I encounter in my work with preservice teachers at Midwest University. Out of the 17 students enrolled in my section of Block A, seven students indicated interest. However, only four students became active participants.

I saw Ava as a knowledge seeker. Ava was a studious, hard-working student who attended each Block A class even though she had mononucleosis for two weeks of the fall semester of 2007. She sacrificed her health for her acquired content knowledge, grades, and attendance record. Ava's mother was a special education teacher, and Ava planned to be an intermediate teacher near her parents' home community after graduation.

Katy saw herself as a future stay-at-home mother. She dated her high school boyfriend, who did not attend Midwest University, and intended to teach until she had children. She was a social student who was talkative in class discussions and wanted to be friends with everyone. She listened intently to both her instructors and her peers and

self-reflected on her own student learning experiences. Katy identified with struggling school-aged students and after graduation planned to work at the same private day camp where her mother worked.

I saw Mikayla as a laid back student who listened and participated in class activities, but rarely spoke in large group discussions. She often disagreed with her peers, but instead of voicing her opinions she remained silent. Mikayla went along with each method presented in class and viewed teaching as a job. She planned to relocate from her Midwest home state and teach wherever her fiancé found a job after he graduated from school.

Unlike the first three participants, Natasha was a late comer who didn't enter Midwest University expecting to be a teacher. She entered the ETEP after spending the majority of her college career pursuing another major in French. Natasha often spoke in large group settings and regularly opposed her peers' views by referring to her experiences outside the realm of elementary classrooms. She thought critically about methods presented in class and was insecure in her teaching practices due to her perceived inexperience in elementary classrooms (see Table 1 for Research Participant Demographics & Characterizations).

Table 1 Participant Demographics & Characterizations

Pseudonym	Age	Ethnicity	Religious Affiliation	Hometown	ETEP Characterization
Ava Mendon	21	White	Not disclosed	Northwest suburb of large Midwest city	Knowledge Seeker
Katy Marks	22	White	Jewish	Northwest suburb of large Midwest city	Future Stay-at-home Mother
Mikayla Sparks	22	White	Not Disclosed	Southeastern town in state of Midwest University	Laid Back
Natasha Labree	21	White	Eastern Orthodox Christian	Northwest suburb of large Midwest city	Late Comer

Second we had already begun conversations about teacher identity, how as future teachers the participants defined what it meant to be "good teachers," and how methods and practices learned in Block A fit or didn't fit into their individual definitions of "good teacher" (Fajet, Bello, Leftwich, Mesler, & Shaver, 2005). Since we had already established a trusting relationship, or rapport, based on conversations about teaching and teacher identity, purposeful sampling was a generative tool for rich and complex data collection. As Katy echoed this sentiment in one of our last individual conversations by stating, "Don't you think if you picked like three random people [our conversations] might be a little more formal and [the topic of becoming teachers] might be a little more sensitive?" (October 3, 2008).

Rapport, Relationships, and Power Relations

This sample set may also be viewed as a convenience sample since relationships were previously established. In the interest of conducting a feminist qualitative research

project that is aimed at involving the research participants as much as possible, I was drawn to the idea of working with previous students for two reasons. First, the ice had been broken between us and we had already established a relationship that including discussing our views as teachers about teaching. According to Glesne (2006) rapport is necessary in conducting qualitative research that uses interviews as a primary data source. Rapport is established through two distinct ways: time and fitting in. It takes time for research participants to share stories from their lives, to trust researchers with these stories, and to get to know the researcher as "an all-right sort of person" (p. 113). Many qualitative researchers spend countless hours attempting to develop a relationship with their research participants; for some researchers, it does not happen. This can limit access to participants with generative stories to share.

Building rapport, or a trusting relationship, is also based on the ability of the researcher to "fit in" (p. 110) the research setting. Glesne offers that fitting in can be achieved by adhering to locally constructed cultural norms, such as dress, behavior, and speech. As their former instructor, I had intentionally dressed, behaved, and spoken in ways that would build rapport with my students. For example, Katy told me that from the first day of class she knew I was someone she would like. She could tell that I was like them (Ethnographic Field Notes, June 2008). I had already established fitting in and being trusted as someone who cared about their stories and their lives. As a feminist researcher, establishing trusting and reciprocal relationships is important and crucial to conducting research that is committed to honor the voices of participants, to create opportunities for reciprocal learning, and to engage in practices for participants to change

the conditions of their lives (Kirsch, 1999, p. 3). More than rapport, I was interested in building and sustaining relationships that extend past the research project.

Research conducted in a way committed to building and sustaining relationships, calls into question power relations. Foucault (Fornet-Betancourt, Becker, & Gomez-Muller, 1994) conceptualized power and resistance as continuously oscillating in relationships between individuals. In the context of my research relationships, power and resistance circulated between researcher and participants, and participant and participant. For example, as the researcher who was ultimately responsible to make sense of my participants' words, I encountered expectations of my abilities as a researcher from my participants. In the following exchange, Natasha asked me what researcher activities I was engaging in and how I was interpreting the conversations with her, Katy, and Ava. I quickly established myself as busy with other graduate student activities, i.e., writing my proposal for research for my dissertation committee, and not yet engaged in the activities she found interesting: making sense of the participant conversations. As I began to notice her disappointment not only in her words, but her tone, increased pauses, and eye contact, I attempted to repair her view of my research activities by quickly stating that I have listened to the recordings.

> *Natasha: Are you doing anything with this yet, like listening and taking notes?*
>
> *Anne: I haven't done it yet. I've listened to some of it a few times. Right now I'm writing my first three chapters…that's what I've been doing. The data is on hold. I've listened to some of them right away…in July I'll start transcribing.*
>
> *Natasha: Yeah.*
>
> *Anne: Are you?*
>
> *Natasha: I'm just curious.*

> *Anne: I can talk about it. What?*
>
> *Natasha: Well you meet with me, and Katy Marks, and Ava, and I'm just thinking how anyone, not anyone, just about anyone, is a teacher and there is no teacher type. There's not a single one similar except gender maybe.*
>
> *Anne: That's interesting because that's not how I read it all.*
>
> *Natasha: That would just be daunting to me (Transcript, June 12, 2008).*

This excerpt also illustrates the occasional tension between Natasha and myself during the research project and how power and resistance oscillated between us. In my first turn, I alternate between engaging in Natasha's expected researcher activities and my actual activities. This is an attempt to position myself as a researcher in charge of my activities, and to include Natasha's interests in my researcher activities. When Natasha states, "I'm just thinking how anyone, not anyone, just about anyone, is a teacher and there is no teacher type. There's not a single one similar except gender maybe" she establishes her power in the project as a participant engaged in the research dialog and the power of her words I used as data. I quickly respond that I, the researcher, did not "read" the data in the same way. This is both resistance to Natasha's power, and establishment of myself as the most powerful player in this relationship. Natasha exhibited resistance in the last turn when she stated, "That would just be daunting to me" and opting out of the power play. Our conversation continued and Natasha reestablished her power by returning to her experiences with teacher identity to once again establish her position as a participant with experiences that serve as my data. Power relations continued to oscillate between my participants and myself and between my participants in each individual and small group conversations as represented in the above example.

Preservice Teacher Coursework Phases

Data collection occurred during my research participants' final three semesters of ETEP courses over 16 months. They experienced three courses, or phases, that were influential in constructing their teaching identities, particularly as teachers of reading, constructing relationships, and taking risks. These phases were:

1. Methods Elementary School Reading and Language Arts (Block A)
2. Elementary Education Methods Practicum (Practicum)
3. Elementary Education Student Teaching (Student Teaching)

Although the sequence of these three phases was not mandatory for all ETEP students, it was common for the preservice teachers in my study since each was seeking a literacy specialization. In the description of each phase that follows, I provide a description of how the phase was experienced by each preservice teacher and provide a paraphrased purpose statement from the official Midwest University ETEP documents. I have also included a definition of ePortfolio, which was a requisite of all the Teacher Education Programs.

Phase 1: Methods Elementary School Reading and Language Arts (Block A)

As previously stated, Ava, Katy, Mikayla, and Natasha were students in my section of Block A in the fall semester of 2007. During this 16-week course (see Table 2), we engaged in critical discussions of education and literacy instruction centered on our readings and experiences in educational settings.

Table 2 Methods Elementary School Reading and Language Arts (Block A)

ETEP Timeline	Anytime after Orientation to ETEP course
Course prerequisite	Admittance to the ETEP
Course time requirement	8:05-10:45 AM on Tuesday & Thursday for 16 week semester
Time spent with students	1 hour per week scheduled outside of class time (child study)
Course requirements	Weekly field journals about child study meetings, Identity Profile, Reading Profile, and Writing Profile of child study (profiles are assessments of child's interests, reading, and writing respectively)
Instructor	University faculty or staff member (during the fall 2007 semester the staff members were graduate students enrolled in the Language, Literacy, and Culture Ph. D. program)

One critical component of the course was to meet weekly for one hour with a school-aged child to implement instructional strategies learned in class, and to write reflectively about the meeting in a field journal. Each week I responded to their field journals to provide probing questions to foster reflective practices. For each participant, Block A represented a critical learning point in her ETEP experience. Many of my questions and our in-class discussions focused on teacher identity as well. We read *Girls, Social Class, and Literacy* (Jones, 2006) as a whole class text which served as a way into our discussions about professional identity. Katy recalled how our critical conversations bolstered her confidence as a teacher who could make effective instructional decisions. Katy stated,

> I always felt that I left Block A thinking about things. The class challenged me mentally: I really had to think, I wasn't going through the motions. It really made me think about what I really feel is right and what is wrong regardless of [what] others were saying. There were times when I would talk to Lanna or Bethany and I would get a strong feeling about something and I would be able to say I really don't think that and why. The conversation wasn't really over (Transcript, April 29, 2008).

Each of the preservice teachers shared similar experiences as memorable in constructing professional identities, learning within relationships with their peers, and ultimately, taking risks in their student teaching classrooms. Mikayla's memorable experience from Block A incorporated a conversation as well as work with her child study student, a second grade boy who came from a family of 10 siblings. Mikayla recalled a Block A conversation that discussed a recently aired VISA commercial that depicted New Orleans Saints football fans using their VISA cards to buy merchandise quickly, while non-Saints fans used cash to slowly purchase goods. We critically analyzed the commercial using Jones' (2006) three layers of critical literacy: power, positioning, and perspective. Mikayla stated, "The conversation I remember the most was the Saints VISA commercial. It really opened my eyes to a lot of things… I loved (the Jones) book, that's where the conversation stemmed from" (May 12, 2008). The Saints VISA commercial was a catalyst to use critical literacy to denormalize "normal" activities, such as reading beloved children's books with her child study student, Markell. Mikayla wrote in her weekly field journal,

> *I finished the session by reading to him <u>Alexander and the Terrible, Horrible, No Good, Very Bad Day</u>. When I decided to bring this book to Markell I thought he would really enjoy it because it was very funny, but I couldn't have been more wrong. As I began reading it, I thought to myself, "What was I thinking? This is a story about a middle to upper class white boy that has trivial things go wrong throughout his day and I am reading this to a lower class black boy that has 10 brothers and sisters stuck in a small house, a good teacher would have thought of this prior to reading this book to this individual. Markell didn't understand the book at all and didn't find it very funny. I was so disappointed in myself, but it was such a good learning experience for me. When choosing this book, all I thought about was how much I enjoyed it when we read it in class, I didn't think about the setting or characters. But, I know that times like this is what will help me grow into what I consider to be a good teacher, because I know that I will never make that same mistake again. I am disappointed that I didn't think about the Jones book before I decided to read this to Markell. Many times Jones stresses the importance of relating to your students' lives through literacy, which*

> *I seemed to let slip my mind completely. But like I said, this mistake will only make me a better teacher in the long run (Block A Field Journal, October 15, 2008).*

Mikayla's field journal excerpt is an example of how working with Markell was instrumental in constructing a professional identity, learning within relationships, and taking risks in her teaching. Mikayla's field journal represents the reflective learning experiences each preservice teacher engaged in during Block A.

The official purpose statement from my Block A syllabus echoed the intentionality of Katy and Mikayla's above experiences. It states,

> This course is designed to investigate how to plan, implement, and evaluate future language, literacy, and literature experiences in the elementary classroom to meet the needs of students intellectually, physically, socially, and emotionally in reading and language arts. Preservice teachers are expected to view literacy as a transactional process to make meaning from text (Whitmore & Ticknor, 2007).

One of the initial written assignments in my section of Block A was to write personal objectives for taking the class. As an instructor, I typically leave this assignment open for interpretation since I know we will revisit personal objectives at least twice during the semester. I also view this assignment as a way for each student to view the official course goals and choose the most relevant goals or add additional goals for her/himself. I present each participant's personal objectives to serve as an introduction to her Discourse of teaching when she began Block A, to serve as a marker of her changing beliefs, and how she envisioned her professional identity as a teacher.

Ava: I will…
- *Apply and develop a professional lens to the teaching of reading and language arts*
- *Construct an idea of what my classroom library should include*
- *Engage with and contribute to the classroom community*
- *Increase my understanding of writing skills*

- *Make a correlation between my theory and practice in regards to teaching reading and language arts (Block A Objectives, September 3, 2007).*

Katy: Course Objectives:
- *Develop an understanding of how to effectively teach elementary age children.*
- *Feel confident in both my teaching and communication abilities.*
- *Learn different lessons and activities for children K6.*
- *Understand my own views on teaching and being able to exude them in my classroom.*
- *Examine children's reading miscues and know when and how to appropriately fix them.*
- *Accept diversity in the classroom and learn how to professionally deal with social class issues.*
- *Strengthen my ability to work positively with others.*
- *Learn to involve parents in the learning process of their children.*
- *Create a warm and welcoming learning environment for myself and my students.*
- *Learn how to balance the role of teacher and friend (Block A Objectives, September 4, 2007).*

Mikayla: Personal Objectives
- *Learn the correct and most effective way to teach a child to read.*
- *Learn more about myself as a teacher/soon to be teacher.*
- *Begin to learn to look at work from a teacher's perspective.*
- *Learn something new about myself and classmates.*
- *Learn and correct any false assumption I may have about teaching in general (Block A Objectives, September 3, 2007).*

Natasha: Objectives:
- *Learn how to design quality lesson plans for language arts that are relevant/relatable for my students- not too challenging or too easy*
- *Learn effective ways to teach reading*
- *Be able to determine the reading, comprehension, and writing levels of my students and plan accordingly*
- *Learn how to keep reading and writing interesting and meaningful for my students (Block A Objectives, August 30, 2007).*

Phase 2: Elementary Education Methods Practicum Field Experience

The semester following Block A, each preservice teacher in my study was

enrolled in the practicum field experience since each participant was a literacy

specialization. The methods practicum is designed to follow the methods courses of the student's specialization. Each of my participants designated a literacy specialization, so her practicum followed her Block A courses. The practicum field experience is scheduled for the ETEP student to spend 8 hours a week in a nearby classroom with a cooperating teacher and supervised by a university supervisor, and another 2 hours per week in a classroom management seminar on the Midwest University campus (see Table 3).

Table 3 Elementary Education Methods Practicum Field Experience

ETEP Timeline	Semester directly preceding student teaching, coupled with methods courses not in area of specialization
Prerequisite	Application process, including past experiences with children
Course time requirement	8 hours per week in placement classroom, 2 hours per week of classroom management course, weekly meetings with supervisor & practicum peer group, 12 weeks in classroom, 3 weeks with practicum supervisor & university supervisor
Time spent with children	6 hours per week working with students (small or large group) in classroom activities, 2 hours for planning, observing, or conferencing with teachers or staff
Course requirements	Daily observation/reflection journal, 7 ePortfolio assignment categories, such as: student learning or planning instruction, instructional strategies, assessment, and reflection and professional development, weekly lesson observed by university staff supervisor
Supervisor	University faculty coordinator of practicum experience, University staff member with previous elementary classroom experience, Cooperating classroom teacher

In addition, most methods courses, like Block A, ETEP students participated in practicum-like field experiences, such as weekly hour-long meetings with a school aged child. Mikayla and Ava had additionally participated in a pilot program of a practicum field experience during their ETEP orientation course. This involved a 2 hour block of time once a week in a local classroom during a 10-week period. This practicum has now

been added to the orientation course as a requirement. Mikayla referenced her

involvement in the pilot practicum when she highlighted the importance of child study as

critical to continuing field experiences in a self-reflection in Block A. Mikayla reflected,

> *I was worried about going from having a practicum one semester, then to not having one, then having one again. But meeting with Markell each week has helped fill that void. I think that my time with Markell has helped me learn a lot about what it takes to become a good teacher and with this experience I think I will be more ready to go into my half day practicum next semester (Block A, Self-reflection, November 1, 2007).*

This excerpt referenced Mikayla's expectation that she would be "more ready to go into"

her half day practicum. Many of the preservice teachers referenced similar sentiments of

being prepared by previous ETEP experiences, such as child study, during small group

and individual conversations about practicum.

Each preservice teacher spent her 8-hour per week practicum experience in a

different local elementary school within 40 miles of the Midwest University campus (see

Table 4).

Table 4 Elementary Methods Practicum Field Experience Placement Locations for
Participants

Participant	Practicum Field Experience Placement Site
Ava	Rural small town (approximately 30 miles from Midwest University); lived in State City
Katy	Rural small town (approximately 30 miles from Midwest University): lived in State City
Mikayla	Local elementary in State City; lived in State City
Natasha	Local elementary in State City; lived in State City

Each preservice teacher referenced a pivotal learning experience from her

practicum field experience that influenced her identity, her relationships, and provided

opportunities to rehearse risktaking. Ava was placed in a kindergarten classroom in a school that served a rural community. During this field experience, Ava observed many complimentary teaching practices to those learned in her ETEP courses. Ava also experienced conflicting feelings of being and looking old enough to be in a classroom. Ava related that her practicum students were "baffled that I don't have kids and not married. (They ask), 'Why don't you have a husband?'" (May 1, 2008). This was also when Ava began speaking about students as "my kids" (May 1, 2008) when referring to her practicum students.

Katy also experienced a practicum field experience in a rural community, although she was placed in a fifth grade classroom, with a cooperating teacher who aligned with Katy's learned practices from Midwest University. Katy had originally viewed herself as a primary teacher, but after her upper elementary practicum experience, she stated,

> I had an epiphany this summer. I was really bothered by it for a while. I always wanted early education having worked with my mom at a private day camp each summer, but I worked with fifth grade in practicum. I wanted to apply (to work full-time at the day care) and couldn't [because] I realized I really like elementary kids (Transcript, August 21, 2008).

Katy's practicum experience bolstered her confidence as a professional teacher and influenced her ability to make effective teaching decisions about grade level and practices. Katy stated that in her practicum experience she was able to experience teachers collaboratively planning and "how real plans work" (April 29, 2008), as well as call into question what she had learned in ETEP courses as neutral teaching practices. Katy stated,

> We have this thing called guidance [and the] school counselor comes in once a week…and she was wearing a cross necklace. We learned that you weren't

supposed to…the teacher had kids coloring Easter pictures. My area is so Jewish you would never do it. It was weird that it is so normal. I would assume that since it is a Hispanic [community] it would be more normal. It rubbed me the wrong way, not that I camp, I wouldn't feel comfortable wearing a Jewish star necklace. It felt funny to me…I know I learned all this stuff (in ETEP classes) about not being able to do that but I know you also adapt to your school system (Transcript, April 29, 2008).
Natasha also encountered dissonance during her practicum field experience.

Natasha was placed in a local second grade classroom within the city limits of State City, where Midwest University is located. Natasha's cooperating teacher offered her personal and professional support when Natasha was cited for unprofessional behavior during her practicum field experience. When Natasha explained the situation to me, I was surprised since my experiences with Natasha would not have lead me to believe she would be cited as unprofessional. In Natasha's self-reflection, she wrote,

> *In class specifically, I think my professional engagement has improved. I'm not as confused as I was in the beginning of the semester, and while I'm still very curious and interested in and forming my personal beliefs about teaching, it's an informed curiosity; I feel like I'm getting it, and so now I'm starting to think about how I can do things effectively, and if I see a problem- I'm compelled to not just identify the problem, but do something about it. Sometimes, in class I imagine that our discussions and meetings are meetings that we'll have with our co-workers and administrators. I'm sure the two situations are very different, but it's the kind of scaffolding off of each other's ideas and opinions and questions that I hope is what happens when teachers get together to talk about curriculum, obstacles with certain students, and school-wide and/or community events, etc. (Block A Self-reflection, November 5, 2007)*

This example illustrates two themes in Natasha's language data, the first being professionalism as an "informed curiosity" and the second insecurity with the profession as "I hope is what happens when teacher get together." Both of these themes permeated Natasha's language about becoming a teacher. Natasha's practicum experiences called into question her expectations of education professionals, aides without teaching degrees, and insecurity about her own practices. Both professionalism and insecurity in the

profession manifested when Natasha was cited for unprofessional behavior during her

practicum field experience. Natasha was perceived as unprofessional when it appeared

she was unflexible and unwilling to accommodate a requested observation schedule

change. Natasha stated that this was not true, but she did not feel she should, or could,

argue with the coordinator of practicum field experiences. This event, and the mark on

her ETEP record, influenced Natasha's future interactions with her peers, her colleagues,

and her university supervisors. I have paraphrased the purpose statement from the

practicum field experience web page below.

> This field experience is designed to place preservice elementary teachers in
> elementary classrooms to observe, participate, and teach in their area of
> specialization. Typically preservice teachers are placed in a grade level not
> desired for student teaching ("Elementary education methods practicum").

Phase 3: Elementary Education Student Teaching Field Experience

The student teaching field experience is the culminating ETEP experience at

Midwest University (see Table 5).

Table 5 Elementary Education Student Teaching Field Experience

ETEP Timeline	Final semester in ETEP
Prerequisite	Application process and faculty approval
Course time requirement	7 hours per day 5 days per week, or the cooperating classroom teacher's schedule, for 14 weeks, preservice teachers with double placements (i.e., special education, early childhood, international placements) will spend 7 weeks in each setting, 3 2 ½ hour seminars with university staff supervisor
Time spent with children	Preservice teachers are expected to follow their cooperating teacher's schedule, with at least 2 weeks of head teaching (full classroom responsibilities)
Course Requirements	11 ePortfolio assignments categories, such as: teaching philosophy, diverse learners, learning environment, original unit, etc. and at least 8 lessons observed by university staff supervisor
Supervisor	University faculty coordinator of student teaching experience, University staff member with previous elementary classroom experience, Cooperating classroom teacher who is compensated by state law

Students at Midwest University have a variety of options for student teaching

placement schools due to partnerships with elementary schools nationally and

internationally. Ava, Katy, and Natasha chose to utilize Midwest University partnerships

and applied to student teach in elementary schools near their hometowns, which were

suburbs of a large Midwest city approximately 300 miles from State City. Ava also

applied to spend half of her student teaching field experience (8-weeks) in an Australian

elementary school. This both excited Ava and worried her. She was excited because she

had never been to Australia and saw the experience as a once in a lifetime event. She

was worried because she had many questions about the structure of her placement. For

instance, Ava stated, "Sometimes they move you around and I don't really want that…I

think I would get more, more comfortable head teaching. I don't know how I would head

teach very much if I was moving around" (June 17, 2008). Ava was a well-organized,

structured student and she anticipated these traits following her into her professional

identity (see Table 6).

Table 6 Elementary Student Teaching Field Placement Locations for Participants

Participant	Student Teaching Placement Location
Ava	Northwest suburb of large Midwest city (approximately 300 miles from Midwest University); lived with parents near placement community, & town in Southeast Australia; lived with host family in placement community
Katy	Northwest suburb of large Midwest city (approximately 300 miles from Midwest University); lived with parents near placement community
Mikayla	Northwest suburb of large Midwest city (approximately 300 miles from Midwest University); lived with parents near placement community
Natasha	Suburb of nearby Midwest city (approximately 50 miles from Midwest University); lived with fiancé near placement community

Each preservice teacher experienced dissonance during her student teaching field

experiences due to conflicting Discourses of Teachers and Teaching with their

cooperating teachers. Dissonance resulted in generative tension when their developing

professional identities intersecting with established teachers, like their cooperating

teachers, whose identities and teaching practices differed. Natasha struggled the most

with this conflict, and saw her relationship with her cooperating teacher as constraining

more than enabling her to take risks in her teaching. Much of this was due to the

practicum field experience "red flag" event when Natasha's behavior was called

unprofessional. Natasha was fearful of another blemish on her ETEP record, and stated,

"I check myself to be professional…we disagree, but she is a professional too" (April 28,

2008). By checking herself, Natasha also fed her insecurity within the profession of

teaching.

Katy and her cooperating teacher had many personality traits in common. One such trait was being bold. Katy stated, "I'm not shy and my teacher is as bold as they come" (October 1, 2008). This was important to Katy since she read this as support in her endeavors in the classroom and hoped to obtain a long-term substitute teaching position after student teaching. Katy stated, "She's got my back. Everyone is so nice here. I know they don't look at me like an equal because I'm not. I think they know everyone needs to go through this" (October 3, 2008). Katy's perception of her student teaching placement school as supportive bolstered her confidence and her construction of a professional identity.

Mikayla student taught in a suburb of a nearby city, just 40 miles north of State City. Mikayla's cooperating teacher was supportive of Mikayla's teaching decisions, so Mikayla took ownership of the classroom procedures quickly bolstering her professional confidence. After an observation in her student teaching placement classroom Mikayla stated,

> I really like my placement…we talk so much about professionalism. When it comes to working with other professionals, adults, it's a lot easier. They welcome me, see me as an equal…its kind of scary. She's been confident in me since day one, she's very complimentary to me, like she said to you, it's a lot to live up to. I am not afraid to take a step back [and reteach if needed] (Transcript, September 25, 2008).

Mikayla's placement offered her opportunities to construct a professional identity that fit neatly into the local education community. After her student teaching field experience ended, Mikayla substitute taught in the same district and eventually secured a full time teaching position. Mikayla credited her self-confidence as a teacher to her student teaching field experience and in particular the position her cooperating teacher placed her in to be confident and secure in her teaching decisions.

The following purpose statement was paraphrased from the Midwest University

student teaching field experience web page to read,

> The Elementary Education Student Teaching field experience is designed to place preservice teachers in a school site for purposes of becoming familiar with curricula, understanding and practicing instructional methods, developing classroom management techniques, and understanding the interactions of school personnel ("Student field experiences", 2009).

ePortfolio for Teacher Education Programs

As part of the ETEP experience at Midwest University, preservice teachers are

expected to create and maintain an electronic portfolio, or ePortfolio, of their ETEP work.

Each ETEP course and field experience has at least one ePortfolio assignment

requirement. For example, in Block A, each preservice teacher uploaded a culminating

project based on her weekly child study meetings. For the Methods Elementary Schools

Reading course, she uploaded a Reading Child Study, which was a reading assessment

based on conducting a Miscue Analysis and additional reading comprehension activities.

The child's reading behaviors were interpreted with course readings, discussions, and

experiences from class meetings. It was a substantial document that each preservice

teacher remembered as being somewhat intimidating due to the perception that it was a

real teaching activity, not a course paper. For example, during a small group

conversation with Katy and Natasha I voiced my frustrations with my current Block A

students and their fears of the Reading Child Study. Katy recalled,

> Block A is, everything is so new…like when you first start introducing (the Reading Child Study by stating): give me what you would do for a kid who couldn't read. Isn't there a recommendation section? If you care enough about it, which we did, you really think through it. I'm not saying I have all this experience but…my point is I think it's the first time we did in-depth stuff. For me, Block A, I loved other classes, but for me, this was more: what if I suggest something dumb? Maybe this would be a really stupid idea…what I'm saying is that I think that like just they (the current Block A students) need to know that its

not easy for anyone, people just want to do it and they can't just do it (Transcript, November 18, 2008).

As preservice teachers progressed through ETEP coursework and field experiences, they continued to upload more course assignments to their ePortfolio. During their practicum field experience and classroom management course, they uploaded 9 total documents: seven documents from their practicum field experience, including their philosophy of education narrative and 3 lesson plans, and two documents are from classroom management course, including a narrative of a learning environment plan. During their student teaching field experience, each preservice teacher uploaded 12 documents, including an original unit, which includes 5 lesson plans and a narrative of the importance of communication in the elementary classroom. The preservice teachers did not understand the purpose of the ePortfolio. For example, Ava stated, "I hate my ePortfolio because I think half the stuff we have to do is completely just for them (our instructors)" (May 1, 2008). This is a common statement by ETEP students. However, ePortfolios can be used as a reflective tool for teacher identity as Katy clearly stated when she said,

> [I reread] my very first standard, I don't know why I was reading this, I wrote I don't want to be like any teacher. Then I started thinking: what does that mean? Is there a bad teacher? What kind of teacher? Oh my god, I would never have written that now, but I did then" (Transcript, November 18, 2008).

The following purpose statement was paraphrased from the ePortfolio webpage,

> The ePortfolio is designed to document achievement on professional standards through a web-based portfolio. The collected instructional artifacts and performances are assigned in all Teacher Education courses. Students take a course on Technology in the Classroom in their first semester in teacher education where they are given web-space and training in managing the ePortfolio. From that point on, they will upload materials from their courses to the ePortfolio on a regular basis. Only assignments with a C- or higher are to be uploaded. Course

instructors audit student ePortfolios at the end of the course ("College of education teacher education program policies", 2009).

Data Sources

My primary data source was extensive and in-depth conversations with individual participants and with small groups of participants. Secondary data sources included relevant participant-produced data, such as ETEP coursework assignments, and researcher-generated documents, such as my ethnographic researcher journal. Language data from conversations were primarily used, although documents were also used, to establish "triangulation" of findings with multiple data sources (Denzin, 1978). Documents were viewed when their importance was either mentioned during participant conversations or my emerging questions in data analysis. Document data sources may also be viewed as "*theoretical sampling*" (Merriam, 1998, p. 63 italics original) since many of the documents, interviews with Elementary Education faculty, and observations were collected simultaneously with data analysis. Popularized by Glaser and Strauss (1967) in the context of grounded theory, researchers concurrently collect, code, and analyze data and make decisions of what data to collect next and from where. This strategy was useful in the context of my study because I was interested in collecting data that was deemed relevant by participants, not by outside observers. Participant perception of importance was a key factor in my document collection.

Conversations with Research Participants

Language-in-use was of primary interest in my study and conversations were the main source of data. Since both my research participants and I came to my study with a shared history of discussing teacher identity and reflective teaching practices, many of my planned questions were extensions of already initiated topics and based on my own

experiences as a beginning teacher (see Grocery Store vignette in Chapter 1). These topics included: views of teacher education coursework and field experiences, perceptions of teaching and teachers encountered, perceptions of self as teacher, influences on self-perceptions as teacher (see Appendix A for Initial Interview Guide). As stated, talks with participants quickly deviated from my original plan to "interview" each participant and evolved into conversations that stemmed from our Block A discussions and their current experiences with teaching. Topics included ETEP course experiences and field experiences, such as course instructors, grades, field experience classroom practices, and ETEP frustrations, as well as life outside the realm of ETEP, including boyfriends, part-time jobs, cooking, and local news events. Natasha echoed the importance of our talks being more conversational than a traditional interview (i.e., the researcher asks the questions and the participants answer the researchers questions). Natasha stated, "I think here you are getting more real [information] than [me worrying about], 'What am I supposed to say? How am I supposed to answer?' No, we get together, we have fun and you listen to what I have to say" (July 9, 2008).

As the conversations progressed over the course of the summer and fall of 2008, and participants were no longer on campus or engaging in the day-to-day activities of University life, I made arrangements to observe them in their student teaching classrooms and to meet in participant designated sites for conversations. Since I was committed to maintaining rapport and building relationships, I asked participants to select meeting sites. For Ava, Katy, and Natasha, we meet at a California Pizza Kitchen near their student teaching placement schools; Mikayla and I met at a Starbucks Coffee House near her home. All conversations were audio recorded and transcribed. Each participant had

access to her audio-recorded individual or small group conversation to review, clarify, and modify sections as needed, although Natasha was the only participant to mention listening to a recording.

Maintaining a stance as a feminist researcher who is dedicated to following Lather's (1991) vision of full reciprocity between researcher and research participant, I planned to participate in each conversation as fully as possible. This meant that I intended to be an active participant in the conversations, engage in dialogue, and maintain an "interactive, reciprocal self-disclosure" (Lather, 1991, p. 73) stance throughout and across each interview. However, this did not always happen due to the configuration of small group conversations which allowed for collaboration and meaning making between participants (Lather, 1991). Often times, I would silent or only add continuers during the small group conversations as my participants talked to each other. In individual conversations, I did take more conversational turns although many of these turns were short in length and served as affirmations, alignment, or continuers. The length and number of turns did depend on the participant and how many conversations we had. For example, when I first met with Mikayla our turns were near equal in number and in length. At our last meeting, my turns were shorter and less frequent. This is signaled in the following language excerpt when Mikayla stated she was "rambling" about how much she had learned during her student teaching field experience and I referenced our first conversation.

Mikayla: I just keep rambling.

*Anne: It's interesting since the first time we talked at [the coffee house in May] I felt like I had to keep asking question*s.

Mikayla: I know. I have so much to say. I never realized how much I would learn from this [student teaching] experience (Transcript, November 12, 2008).

Many of my questions had already been posed in Block A and when we met to talk my input served to confirm, align, or continue the conversations. This does not mean I did not ask questions, but the questions I asked were reactions to participant talk that was more sophisticated and nuanced than I could ever have imagined before entering into this project. The level of familiarity and intimacy between participants and myself resulted in rich generative language data that could not have been anticipated. However, this level of familiarity did not come without the price of frustration by both parties throughout data collection. Frustration manifested in boundary crossings, resistance, power displays, and disconnections (see Chapters 4-6 from examples).

Interviews with ETEP Faculty/Staff and Course and Meeting Observations

I interviewed Elementary Education faculty, including the Coordinator of Elementary Education Methods Practicum, Coordinator of Student Field Experiences (i.e., Elementary Education Student Teaching), Program Coordinator of Elementary Education, and Associate Dean of Teacher Education and Student Services. These interviews were occasionally audio-recorded, but none were transcribed. The interviews focused on the background of the ETEP, the views of the faculty member on the progression of the program, their particular emphasis within the program, and clarifying questions from collected data sources. I attended ETEP meetings, such as the Student Teaching Orientation and Job Placement Workshop, which preservice teachers indicated as important in their professional identity construction. After attending this meeting in the fall of 2008, Natasha and I discussed the presentation on dressing for an interview, in

which there were two presenters, one male and one female, representing local clothing stores. Both presenters stressed the importance of wearing a suit for interviews, however each presenter used language differently to convey a similar message. Natasha stated her disagreement with a suit as the only option. Instead, she agreed with the male presenter who advocated "personal style," Natasha stated,

> He was about personal opinion; she was there in a uniform. What's wrong with three inch heels?...I get no trampy heels, but if I can walk around in them…what's the big deal?…He said the suit doesn't get you the job, it's personal style…I would never choose to wear a suit, I wouldn't wear a sundress, but not a suit (Transcript, August 22, 2008).

In Block A, we discussed how dress could affect professional identity by altering your state of mind. Ava recalled this discussion when she stated, "I think clothes affect a lot though. I feel like if I wear sweatpants and a T-shirt everyday I would be sleepy" (June 17, 2008).

I also attended an ETEP course, Classroom Management, which is paired with the Elementary Education Methods Practicum field experience, deemed as an instrumental course in their becoming teachers. Each preservice teacher mentioned that I should observe this class. Katy stated, "If you were going to come to a class you should go to classroom management" (May 1, 2008). I did interview the instructor, a non-tenured instructor in ETEP, and I observed a whole group lecture during the fall semester of 2008. I chose to observe the course the semester after my participants had attended it because I did not want to pose a conflict of interest for either the instructor or my participants. All interviews and observations were used for triangulation purposes and notes were recorded in my ethnographic researcher journal.

Documents

Documents were collected as needed to triangulate findings from conversation transcripts. Triangulation establishes reliability and internal validity to confirm the emerging findings across multiple data sources in case studies. Documents "enrich what (we) see and hear by supporting, expanding, and challenging (our) portrayals and perceptions" (Glesne, 2006, p. 68); reviewing documents deepened my understanding of the preservice teachers' identity construction and negotiation of becoming teachers. Documents included research participant generated ETEP course assignments, or "physical material *already present* in the research setting" (Merriam, 1998, p. 118, italics original), and researcher generated written documents "to learn more about the situation, person, or event being investigated" (Merriam, 1998, p. 119). These documents included:

Research Participant Generated Documents

- Block A self-evaluations
- Block A Field journals
- Block A Personal Objectives
- ePortfolio Assignments
- Writer's Notebook entries or written notes (from field experiences)
- E-mail correspondence to me
- Text messages to me

Researcher Generated Documents

- Ethnographic field notes of classroom observations and interviews
- Notes on future conversation topics and emerging themes
- Reflective journal containing notes on ideas and assumptions of study
- E-mail correspondence to research participants
- Text messages to participants
- Lesson Plan reflections from Block A

Data Collection Timeline

My study investigated how preservice elementary teachers used language to construct teacher identities, learned within relationships, and take risks during the final three semesters of ETEP coursework and field experiences. This required that I collect data during these three semesters, or phases, and keep up with the pace of my research participants as they followed the timeline of the ETEP, graduated, and moved away from Midwest University (see Table 7).

Table 7 Data Collection Timeline

Time			Data Collection
Phase 1	Fall 2007	During Block A	Establish rapport; Block A Field Journals; Block A Self-evaluations; ePortfolio Assignments; Block A Lesson Plan Reflections
Phase 2	Spring 2008	During Practicum Experience	Maintain rapport; Initial conversations with Natasha, Katy, Ava, & Mikayla; Follow-up conversations with Natasha, Katy, & Ava; E-mail correspondence with all participants; Interview with Associate Dean; Student teaching placement meeting observation; ePortfolio Assignments; Ethnographic field notes of data; Reflective journal of study; Notes on future conversation topics and emerging themes
	Summer 2008	Before Student Teaching Experience	Maintain rapport; Small group and individual conversations with all participants; E-mail correspondence with each participant; Phone conversations with Natasha & Ava; ePortfolio Assignments; Ethnographic field notes of data; Reflective journal of study; Notes on future conversation topics and emerging themes
Phase 3	Fall 2008	During Student Teaching Experience	Maintain rapport; Small group and individual conversations with all participants; Student Teaching Classroom observation of each participant; E-mail correspondence with all participants; Phone conversations and text messages with Natasha, Ava, & Katy; Interviews with Coordinator of Practicum Experience and Classroom Management Instructor; Classroom Management Course observation; ePortfolio Assignments; Student teaching Orientation and Job Placement Workshop observation; Ethnographic field notes of data; Reflective journal of study; Notes on future conversation topics and emerging themes
	Winter 2009	After Student Teaching Experience	Maintain rapport; Small group conversation with Ava & Natasha; Interview with Coordinator of Student Teaching Experience; Ethnographic field notes of data; Reflective journal of study; Notes on emerging themes

Data Analysis

Language-in-use was at the heart of my study, which meant that data analysis

began with listening, transcribing, reading, and rereading language. Recursively reading

language data is unique in the sense that I, as the researcher, could hear my participants in

my head quite literally, as I listened to the recordings, and figuratively, as I read their

transcribed words. In a Bakhtinian sense, my ideological becoming as a researcher

encompassed the "process of selectively assimilating the words of others" (Bakhtin,

1981, p. 341) to become a researcher who studied language-in-use. As I listened,

transcribed, and read the words of my participants and myself I internalized our words as

"half-ours and half-someone else's…to reveal ever newer *ways to mean*" (Bakhtin, 1981,

pp. 345-346, italics original) through my research processes. I used a multi-layered

approach that included five layers, or passes through my data, to analyze my data (see

Table 8).

Table 8 Five Layered Data Analysis Method

Layer 1:	Content Analysis with N*6 computer software of all transcripts; My Research Questions Analysis as a guide (see Appendix C)	
Layer 2:	Discourse Analysis Questions Applied to Content Analysis; Triangulated with secondary documents (Researcher & Participant Generated); Yielded Five Significant Categories (see Appendix D)	
Layer 3:	Subcategory Discourse Analysis Questions (see Appendix C); Language Data Divided into Episodes by Topic/Theme	
Layer 4:	Coded for Productive Generative Tension Moments within each subcategory; Focus on each participant	
Layer 5:	Organizational Techniques Based on Above Analysis Questions; Each Chapter required different technique (see Appendix C)	
Chapter 4 Identity Questions (see Appendix C) Personal & Professional I-statements	Chapter 5 Relationship Questions (see Appendix C) Bonded we-statements of participants & researcher	Chapter 6 Discourse Model Questions (see Appendix C) Agency Tracing of risktaking & Stanzas of unfulfilled risks

Each individual and small group conversation was audio-recorded and

transcribed. Elinor Ochs states that "the transcript should reflect the particular

interests—the hypotheses to be examined—of the researcher…the transcriptions are the

researcher's data. What is on a transcript will influence and constrain what

generalizations emerge" (Ochs, 1979, pp. 44-45). What does not appear in the transcript will also influence the possibilities in data analysis. Ochs continues this thought by stating, "(a) more useful transcript is a more selective one. Selectively, then, is to be encouraged. But selectivity should not be random and implicit. Rather, the transcriber should be conscious of the filtering process" (p. 44). By constantly referring to my guiding research questions, the first layer of my analysis was content analysis (Merriam, 1998). I used N*6 computer software to code the conversation transcripts. Categories were assigned based on the emerging themes and patterns in the raw data sets. As data collection progressed, I continued to record reflective ethnographic field notes about emerging themes and patterns to be followed-up with participants, in documents and interviews with Elementary Education faculty members. I also continually looked for contradictions and tensions that did not fit the categories in the data sets by reviewing the entire data corpus with constant comparison methods (Glaser & Strauss, 1975).

The second layer of analysis was Discourse Analysis with conversation transcripts and selected documents. I used two of Gee's (2005) building tasks, "identities" and "relationships", and his inquiry tool, "Discourse models" to analyze the corpus of data. Gee states that "(w)e use language to get recognized as taking on a certain identity or role" (p. 11), "to build social relationships" (p. 12) and to build realities of the world. One way to build a reality of the world is through Discourse models. Discourse models are theories, or explanations, to make sense of the world. Gee states that Discourse models "need not be complete, fully formed, or consistent" (p. 85) due to accumulating lived experiences. Since I am interested in how preservice teachers use language over time to construct identities, learn within relationships, and take risks, I found Gee's

Discourse Analysis Questions, based on the above building tasks and inquiry tool, as useful in my language data analysis. The questions I used were:

1. What identities is this piece of language being used to enact?
2. What sort of relationships is this piece of language seeking to enact with others?
3. What Discourse models are relevant here?
4. Are there competing or conflicting Discourse models at play and whose interests are represented? (Gee, 2005)

This analysis yielded five significant categories: Teacher Identities, Nonteacher Identities, Relationships with Others, Discourses of Teachers and Discourses of Teaching. Each of these categories was further analyzed with more questions to reveal subcategories within each category (see Appendix D for Significant Category Outline). For example, in the Teacher Identities category, I asked: What cultural, historical, or social resources were used to develop these identities? How are these identities being enacted in talk, in written documents, in field experiences? How have these identities changed or remained constant? What identities are described as professional, and what identities are described as personal? This analysis revealed subcategories within the Teacher Identities category across cases, such as *Teacher Examples as Compulsory Students, Teacher Examples as Family Members, Teacher Examples as ETEP Students/Coursework, Teacher Examples as ETEP Students/Practicum Field Experience,* and *Teacher Examples as ETEP Students/Student Teaching Field Experience*. Language excerpts were then divided into episodes, or series of conversational turns representing the same topic or theme (Lewis & Ketter, 2004), to organize the entire data set. I used this organizational structure to further identify where professional identities, or Teacher Identities, stemmed. Within each subcategory, analysis revealed even more specific codes for specific preservice teachers, such as *Teachers as Organizers* (Ava), *Teachers as*

Knowledgeable (Katy), *Teachers as Classroom Managers* (Mikayla), and *Teachers as Moral Role Models* (Natasha) (see Appendix E for Specific Preservice Teacher Code Charts).

At this point, I selected the most telling or representative episodes to code for dissonance, or productive generative tension. Productive generative tension moments were identified as intersections of conflicting identities, relationships, or Discourse models. For example, in the Teacher Identities category I asked: Is there conflict, or "borderland discourse," between professional and personal identities? Each preservice teacher had unique moments of productive generative tension in her language data, which contributed to her increased awareness of her identity as a teacher, learning within relationships, and recognizing opportunities for agency. Once I identified moments of productive generative tension, I returned to the corpus of my language data with particular Discourse Analysis tools and techniques to examine how language was used to construct identities, depict relationships, and take risks. To explicate the link between language and identity enactments, I located I-statements (Gee, 2005) for each participant and for myself. Gee states that I-statements are used to build "socially situated identities in language" (p. 141) when referring to oneself in the first-person. In particular, I located I-statements that reflected narration of the self as a teacher (professional identities) and as a nonteacher (personal identities). Therefore, not all I-statements were included in this analysis. Further description of this analysis technique is presented in Chapter 4.

To examine the connection between language and relationships, in particular bonded relationships, I located we-statements made by each participant and myself in the language data. Similarly to I-statements, we-statements are declarative statements made

while involved in a group (Burr, 1990). Since I was interested in identifying only bonded relationships between participants and with me, I had to locate we-statements that fit two criteria beyond the use of "we:" signifies a relationship established over time in narration (Gergen, 2009) and the particular relationships between my participants and myself. This meant that not all we-statements were examples of bonded relationships nor were they representative of my participants or myself, so not all we-statements were included in this particular analysis. More details of this technique are presented in Chapter 5.

The final two analysis techniques also utilized Gee's methods of Discourse Analysis to examine connections between language and risktaking. The first was historically tracing language over time to locate proceeding excerpts on the same topic, or Discourse model. Although Gee does not discuss historical tracing through language, I used his definition of Discourse models to historically trace through the language data to organize excerpts into topical or thematic episodes. Much in the same way as Lewis and Ketter (2004) utilized episodes to organize their ethnographic language data, I too utilized my extensive knowledge of each preservice teacher to search her language data for recurrent themes and topics, or Discourse models. This inquiry tool I have labeled as Agency Tracing. Agency Tracing is similar to "Discourse Tracing" (LeGreco & Tracy, 2009) in two crucial ways: a case is identified as a rupture, or productive generative tension, in the language data which is organized chronologically to trace how Discourse is used over time. In the context of preservice teachers becoming teachers, I also identified productive generative tension in the language data, organized my data chronologically, and then traced the rehearsals of agency from the agentic act historically through the data. This method is described in more detail in Chapter 6.

The second strategy I used was stanzas. Stanzas are also organizational and based on my close connection to the data. Gee (2005) states that stanzas should be reflective of the researcher's knowledge about "the speaker's possible meanings, from whatever other sources (e.g., the larger context, other texts, interviews, ethnographic information)…to look more deeply into the text and make new guesses about themes and meaning" (p. 136). In this particular research study, my close proximity, intimate familiarity, and longitudinal data collection positioned me to utilize my extensive knowledge of my participants when organizing and analyzing their language use. In other words, because researchers bring their Discourse models to interpret the text of our participants to our data, we must be accountable for this influence. For this reason, my language was analyzed with the same techniques to make visible my roles in the language data and how I can be "as accountable for the research process as for the research product" (Bucholtz, 2000, p. 1462).

CHAPTER III RESEARCHER IDENTITIES, OPPORTUNITIES, & LIMITATIONS

As a former teacher who studies and educates preservice teachers, I found myself caught in between my identity as a researcher and my identity as a teacher. Whether I choose to "name (my) different identities, or overtly invoke them, they shape (my) ways of thinking, doing, and being in each context, and that in so doing they reconstitute the contexts themselves" (Orellana, 2007, p. 126). In other words, I was unable to leave my experiences, my actions, my words, and my identity as a teacher out of my work as a researcher who studied teachers. I came to this project with my history of participation as a teacher and a researcher that shaped the work that I was doing, the questions that I asked, and the perspective I had. I was not a neutral observer; I was invested in the research project and in the research process.

Researcher Investment

As a young, white, female who went to college to study economics, teaching was the farthest thought from my mind. I had grown up in a household that valued teachers (both of my parents had been secondary teachers before my birth) and I was sure that I was not interested in being one. Many of my parents' friends were teachers, my second grade teacher was my neighbor, and my father was on the school board. Throughout my years as an elementary and secondary student, I often watched the daily workings of my teachers without much regard for the work that they did. They were usually women and they usually knew my parents. I tried not to think about them too much. I had grown up with a definite image of what a teacher was and I was sure I did not fit that image.

Mid-way through my second year of college, I decided that I might be interested in teaching. Many of my friends were in the elementary education program and I was

looking for a change—whether it was a move to another college or university or an additional major. I decided to enroll in the introductory Teacher Education course and instantly knew it was good fit. All of a sudden, I became a good student. My GPA improved, the readings and projects made sense, and I was beginning to take a new interest in my future career. My lived experiences of observing and interacting with educators informed my learning about how to become a teacher.

In the culminating field experience of my teacher education program, I applied to be part of a technology-based grant that would place student teachers in two locations: Oelwein, Iowa, and Rock Point, Arizona. I was accepted and soon found myself teaching middle school students in Oelwein, Iowa. As I found myself struggling to make sense of how to be a teacher, I watched my cooperating teachers with a new interest. Instead of passively watching them "do their job," I began to critically analyze how they were acting, talking, and dressing like teachers. I also began to follow their leads. When the time came to move to Rock Point, Arizona, I was sad to leave behind the "teachers" I had begun to emulate. I was sure that I would carry forth these new ways of being to my next site, and I did. But I also found that these ways of being a teacher were not the only ways. Although most of the teachers were female, only a few were white and from the Midwest. Most of the teachers were Navajo, spoke Navajo fluently, and lived on the reservation where the school was located. I quickly found that my ways of being a teacher were not the only ways, or even the most effective ways, to enact the identity of teacher. It became clear that I was not a good teacher in this location. Nevertheless, I decided that I did not want to be a teacher in the Midwest, I wanted to be a teacher in the

United States Southwest, and so I applied to the Clark County School District in Las Vegas, Nevada, and was hired.

As I visited my new school and met my colleagues (I was one of 16 new teachers to my school), I quickly realized that my images of "teacher" were still not the only images available. Teachers were male and female (most were female though), from various locations across the world (mainly the United States and Latin America), spoke various languages, graduated from various teaching programs, were various shades of colors, and didn't wear the clothes I had started to wear (see Grocery Store vignette in Chapter 1). I wasn't sure what to do, how to act, or how to dress. I found myself resorting to images of teachers I had observed throughout my childhood, and found that this image did not work for me in this particular setting. I did not know how to be a teacher; I struggled with finding a professional identity, and I thought about leaving the profession. But I didn't leave. Instead, I considered the context and the available social meanings of teaching and teacher, and I began to construct myself as a "good teacher" in this particular context. It took time, and it took outside help before I recognized myself as a teacher, but it did happen. My educational becoming did not end with my classroom teaching experience. After completing my master's degree in curriculum and instruction, I decided that I wanted to pursue a doctorate degree. This meant that I would leave Las Vegas, move to State City to attend Midwest University, become an educational researcher and teacher educator, and learn new ways to enact "teacher" to students studying to become teachers.

Identity as Teacher Educator

In my first year of graduate school at Midwest University I was an instructor for Methods Elementary School Reading and Language Arts. Thinking back to how I arrived in a fourth grade classroom not knowing how to teach reading and writing, nor really understanding what reading and writing were, I made a conscious effort to make sure my teacher education students did not feel the same way. But this was tricky. I shared the current methods of reading and writing instruction, but I also provided theories of reading and writing as basic frameworks for instruction, regardless of the current trend.

In my second year of graduate school, I was given the job of an Elementary Education Student Teacher Supervisor. In this position I began to see where ETEP theories of reading and writing bumped into the current NCLB induced trends in literacy instruction in the schools. I was the only graduate student to be a supervisor; the other supervisors were retired elementary teachers. Many of the supervisors thought the student teachers were not prepared to teach reading since they did not know how to run a guided reading group, a local hallmark of NCLB legislated methods. I knew that my former preservice teachers had been exposed to guided reading; we had read a professional article, watched a video, and discussed the pros and cons of the approach. But we did not spend multiple hours learning this technique. We did spend countless hours reading about and discussing how students learn to read, what factors must be in place, how to find out what students are missing and how to teach them what they need. Again, returning to my first year as a classroom teacher, did I know how to do all of this, or was I just trained to use a particular method and lacked the professional identity and

confidence to make changes? Consequently I felt that I didn't know how to teach reading and writing in my first elementary classroom.

<p align="center">*Identity as Researcher*</p>

> We all write and speak from a particular place and time, from a history and a culture which is specific. What we say is always 'in context', *positioned* (Hall, 2003, pp. 234, italics original).

It is hard work to become an educational researcher who studies teachers. It is emotional, it is political, and it is stressful. Standing in this space of uncertainty makes certainty welcoming and reassuring. In an effort to make educational researchers more aware of their "relationships of power, identity, and agency in their research, including their own researcher positions, and the ways in which these elements shape the production of knowledge" (p. 9), Lewis, Enciso, and Moje (2007) explore the role of the researcher in literacy research. By engaging in a deliberate reflection as a researcher, I attempted to analyze how my position shapes the knowledge produced in the conversations with my participants.

Antonio Gramsci called for an "organic intellectual" in his *Prison Notebooks*. He insisted that, "Every social group…creates together with itself, organically…intellectuals which give it homogeneity and an awareness of its own function not only in the economic but also in the social and political fields" (Gramsci, 1971, p. 5). By viewing an educational researcher as an organic intellectual, one who has been produced within a particular social group through "active participation in practical life" (Gramsci, 1971, p. 10), the researcher becomes one who is researching from lived experiences and in turn, creating a bridge between researcher, research participant, and the research project. Aimee Carrillo Rowe (2008) writes,

> The question I pose is *why* the researcher is hailed by the relational configuration at work in any particular "field"—framed not merely as a site of intellectual interest, but rather *constitutive* of her becoming. It is to imagine our participants not merely as "subjects" (or objects) of study, but as allies. It is to imagine fieldwork *as* bridgework.

The bridgework Carrillo Rowe describes is in fact a bridge between the home (self) and the field (others) to build an alliance of understanding through each other. In a similar fashion to Carrillo Rowe, Lal suggests "plac[ing] the *researcher* at the center" (p. 206, italics original) of the research process, thus enabling a reflective stance by the researcher. If we, as researchers, become the center of our research projects, what might this mean for our work? Carrillo Rowe (2008) poses another hard question to researchers, "What is it we are seeking to recover in our own struggles with culture and identity…in their stories…what would we learn about ourselves?" (52). By placing herself into the ring with us as readers, she too is creating an alliance through her work and encouraging us to take up what she is naming as "fieldwork *as* bridgework." Finding our stories and making the connections explicit in our research allows for new possibilities in qualitative research methods and new possibilities in our work alongside our research subjects.

Opportunities to Become a Feminist Qualitative Researcher

My journey to become a feminist qualitative researcher who studies preservice teachers was not an easy course. I learned through lived experiences with my participants what and how emotional becoming a feminist researcher can be. I did not take the easy way out of this project. Instead of throwing my hands up in frustration when I found myself shutting down my participants and invalidating their experiences, I forged on in my quest. At times I wanted to give up and tell my participants to quit

talking so I could ask some questions, but I didn't. I found that if I sat still and listened

intently, they would allow me to listen to their experiences. Katy said, "The thing about

you is, you don't judge us. You want our real opinions" (October 3, 2008). As much as I

willed this to be true, it wasn't. I judged each of my participants and I judged myself. I

chose which experiences to tell and I designed a narrative research report that was based

on characters, settings, a plot and possible solutions (Holley & Colyar, 2009). At times,

turning my participants into characters was the only way I could proceed, so I could

pretend I wasn't creating a narrow definition of the multi-layered and multi-dimensional

women I had grown to know in complex, and often times, compromising ways.

When I asked each participant to tell me how she viewed me, each one fumbled

with this answer. For example, Katy asked, "What the hell do I call you?" (November

18, 2008) when filling out substitute teaching applications where I would be a reference.

Mikayla stated that our relationship "wasn't so uptight" (September 25, 2008), while

Katy, Ava, and Natasha tentatively called me a "friend." We met in social locations such

as restaurants to eat and talk. We would swear and drink as well. Although swearing and

drinking with research participants isn't unethical, it does call into question the traditional

roles of researcher and participant. According to Jay and Janschewitz (2008), the

politeness or acceptability of swearing is dependent on social factors such as physical

location, speaker-listener relationships, and gender. As previously stated, the participants

in my study were all female with similar demographic backgrounds as mine. We met in

social locations that bordered on social, not educational, contexts and our relationship had

moved from an instructor-student dichotomy to a complex relationship bordering on

friendship. Jay and Janschewitz assert that these contexts make swearing more likely,

and more socially acceptable. Drinking together also followed in the same footsteps, neither was an immediate or every time occurrence, but both were met without question from either party and served to blur the boundaries of traditional roles of researchers and participants.

Limitations of Study

As with all research, there are limitations to this study. Glesne (2006) states that it is the researcher's job to state the limitations to her study. Whether these be related to data, site, or participants that were unavailable or unknown or how the site or participant selection would not be transferable to other contexts, limitations are part of the research process. The stance that I take as a researcher enables the lens that is available for me to view my project. This means that I knowingly and unknowingly did not attend to particular issues. For example, I view identity as enacted through language, as socially constructed, and dependent on available culturally, historically, and socially accepted meanings. I do not view identity as stable or uniform, and I rejected such views in my study. I have also collected more data than can be reported in a single project. As large as a dissertation can be, I am still limited to which data to present and which data will not be presented. In the case of identity construction in particular, the temporality and plurality of identity enactments make it almost unreasonable to report on them at all. Nonetheless, I have made difficult researcher decisions to choose which identities to report and which identities will not be presented in this project. For instance, in Appendix E I have included specific codes for each preservice teacher even though I have not reported each code in this presentation of the data. Katy, for example, wrestled with a personal identity as an insecure student in the areas of math and spelling. Although I

have alluded to this personal identity in Chapter 4, I did not explore the tension between her personal identity and her professional identity as a teacher who gained confidence and knowledge through student teaching to impact her personal identity. By the end of her practicum and student teaching experiences, Katy had acquired enough intellectual confidence to view herself as a teacher who would teach math at all grade levels. Katy stated, "I thought I would be that teacher who would skip through math, but now I don't" (April 29, 2008).

By taking a stance as a feminist researcher I established myself as a researcher who is invested in the research project. This meant that I am more than curious, but deeply committed to this project; the questions that I ask, the participants I seek, and the theories I use all stem from my understandings of what counts as valuable research practices. By establishing a research relationship with participants that reflects this committed stance, I put my participants and myself at risk for establishing relationships that resemble friendship. Gesa Kirsch (2005) recounts a research project she conducted about women in academia as an example of unexpected friendliness. During an interview about academic writing, a participant compared her writing to her husband's scholarly writing style, work habits, and failing relationship. Although the initial question did not imply personal sharing between friends, the rapport that was established and the researcher's behavior as interested listener allowed for sharing to occur. Kirsch calls for researchers to "delineat(e) clear boundaries…so neither party unwittingly compromises expectations of friendship, confidentiality, and trust" (p. 2166) in the research relationship. In the context of my study, rapport was established through shared interests in teaching, similar histories of participation in education, and similar backgrounds.

Although I am not advocating shying away from friendship, I am acknowledging the risks that are associated with friendships that go from liking to not liking. For instance, in the context of my study, once data collection was completed conversations slowed and eventually stopped. As participants moved away and took jobs, our face-to-face contact, shared histories, and interests no longer continued. My role of researcher continued, but their role of participant did not. Along with a termination of friendship, there was loss, disappointment, and relief for both parties.

One such example of disappointment occurred when Natasha read my proposal for research, or the first three chapters of my dissertation. She told me she was excited to read it and asked me to send it to her. She quickly read it and then responded through a tense phone call that she had been most excited to read the sections on relationships and rapport. She initially felt disappointed, betrayed, and even manipulated that I had stated my intentional way of dress, speech, and acts to build rapport with her Block A class. She concluded that this was my project and she didn't want to read it until it was complete, if then. Natasha's reaction was paralyzing to me. Her disappointment and perhaps anger made me question my methods and my stance as a feminist researcher. Although I had read stories of feminist researchers' struggles and the emotional cost of implicating yourself in your research project, I imagined that my project would be different. I imagined that I would build bridges and each participant would be joyful, if not pleased, with how I had written about our work together. Instead, I couldn't write, I couldn't read, and I couldn't think about my project as I recovered from this blow to my emerging identity as a feminist researcher. I asked myself again how I could be so naïve

in my thinking. Ultimately, I recommitted to my project, to my participants, and their experiences as they became teachers while I also became an educational researcher.

Failures are opportunities to reframe our shortcomings and naiveté to try to be more transparent in our future projects. I learned from my bonded relationships with my participants, and I took risks in my becoming a feminist educational researcher. This project has taught me how and why feminist methods are crucial to answer the questions I pose, to build the relationships I am interested in maintaining in my research agenda, and ultimately, to be the teacher educator and researcher I envision. Failures become opportunities when failures are recognized and metacognitive awareness is heightened. They are not to be avoided; they are to be embraced in the research process.

Summary

My longitudinal qualitative study examined how preservice elementary teachers use language to construct teacher identities, learn within relationships, and take risks in classrooms in the final three semesters of Elementary Teacher Education Program (ETEP) coursework and field experiences. I employed a feminist stance in my research methods to examine language-in-use in multiple in-depth individual and small group conversations, research participant generated documents, and researcher generated documents. I used Discourse Analysis to tease apart the tensions and conflicts in learning to teach. The following chapter examines how each preservice teacher used language to negotiate borderland discourses when her personal and professional identities intersected during her final three semesters of ETEP coursework and field experiences. My analysis illuminates how the productive generative tensions between personal and professional

identities created opportunities for metacognitive growth and increase awareness while

becoming teachers.

CHAPTER IV PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL IDENTITIES: PRESERVICE
TEACHERS NEGOTIATE BORDERLAND DISCOURSES

*It was early May and Ava, Katy, and I sat on overstuffed chairs in a local coffee shop
near the university. I listened as they discussed their part-time jobs. Ava was a daycare
worker and Katy was an elementary after school program counselor. Ava related a story
from her practicum field experience where her job identity and her teaching identity
collide. "I work at a daycare and they are younger. A few of the day care kids go to Otto
[Elementary School]. At daycare there is a boy, Jimmy, who is a behavior problem. If he
were in my class at Otto, he wouldn't respect me as a teacher. Jimmy got into a fight with
a kindergartener in my class because he saw me in the hallway. Jimmy said, 'Hi Ava.'
And my kindergartener said, 'No, it's Ms. Mendon.' Jimmy said, 'No, it's Ava.' And I
thought, 'It's both.'" (Researcher's Ethnographic Field Notes and Transcript, May 1,
2008).*

For Ava, the opening vignette signifies the productive tension, or borderland

discourse (Alsup, 2006), between personal and professional identities as she negotiated

her Identities as a Teacher juxtaposed with her Identities as a Nonteacher. In her study of

preservice secondary English teachers, Alsup found that each preservice teacher

experienced tensions between personal and professional selves, or identities, during their

student teaching semester, which she named borderland discourse. Alsup (2006) wrote,

"borderland discourse is integrative discourse that allows the preservice teacher to

combine professional and personal selves and bring about positive transformations within

themselves as teachers, and to get even loftier, to education as a whole" (pp. 39-40).

Borderlands are representative of various identity positions that intersect and diverge

allowing ruptures that bring about increased metacognitive awareness of change and

identity growth. Alsup asserted that borderland discourses provide necessary productive

tensions for preservice teachers to become teachers "without giving up themselves" (p.

10). Working in the borderland does not come without emotional, cognitive, and

physical work for preservice teachers. For Ava, Katy, Mikayla, and Natasha language

was a primary tool for the productive tensions of borderland discourse, or reconciling personal and professional identities, to manifest in our conversations.

This chapter answers the question: How do four preservice teachers use language to negotiate personal and professional borderland discourses to construct identities as teachers? Critical sociocultural theory provides a lens to view identities as social constructs that occur in moment-to-moment interactions dependent on available relational, cultural, historical, and linguistic resources. I do not view identities as neat and tidy itemized lists of who one is or isn't. Instead, I argue that professional identities are plural, temporary, slippery, messy, contradictory, and full of tension with personal identities.

After a brief positioning of my study in the recent literature on borderland discourses in preservice and beginning teacher identity, this chapter is divided into two sections based on my data analysis methods. The first section begins with a brief recap of my content analysis methods to identify and locate borderland discourses in moments of language. I use Britzman's (2003) competing chronologies of becoming teachers as an organizational structure and as a way into interpreting such complex narratives of becoming teachers. This structure was useful to identify moments of rupture between personal and professional identities as professional experiences increased over time. In the second section of this chapter, I describe a deeper analysis technique of identifying I-statements as a Discourse Analysis tool to link language and identity enactments in borderland discourse during the culminating field experience of student teaching. My two-layer approach to data analysis provides a look at larger language excerpts as well as

individual statements to connect language with emotional, physical, and cognitive work of becoming teachers.

<center>*Border Work: Preservice and Beginning Teachers*</center>

Since Alsup's publication of *Teacher Identity Discourses* (2006) many educational researchers interested in teacher identity have used her notion of borderland discourses to analyze preservice and beginning teachers' identities (Chong & Low, 2009; Clarke, 2009; Johnson, 2007; Luehmann, 2009; MacGregor, 2009). Identity in education research is not a new topic (Britzman, 1992a, 2003; Danielewicz, 2001; Gratch, 2000; McCarthey, 2001; Rasmussen, 2006; Weber & Mitchell, 2004), but the serge in investigating how preservice and beginning teachers negotiate the tensions between personal and professional identities has gained recent attention (Clarke, 2009; Johnson, 2007; MacGregor, 2009; Smagorinsky, Cook, Moore, Jackson, & Fry, 2004; Zembylas, 2003). Personal identities include emotions, attitudes, actions, and behaviors that are not directly related to teaching. For example, in the opening vignette Ava viewed her job as a day care worker as her personal identity not her professional identity as a teacher. Even though both identities are associated with education, Ava separated these two identities and indicates their border is a source of tension. The focus of many identity studies has been on Secondary English teachers, but more recently science, math, and elementary teachers have become subjects of identity studies.

Methods of Analysis

Content analysis of the entire data set yielded descriptive codes that fell into five significant categories: Nonteacher Identities, Teacher Identities, Relationships with Others (see Chapter 5), Discourse of Teachers (see Chapter 6), and Discourses of

Teaching (see Chapter 6). This chapter explores Nonteacher Identities and Teacher

Identities, which I have defined as personal identities and professional identities

respectively. In the first section of this chapter, I employed Gee's (2005) building task of

identities as a starting point for my discourse analysis. Gee asked, "What identity or

identities is this piece of language being used to enact (i.e., get others to recognize as

operative)?" (p. 12). I found this question useful for two critical assumptions: each

preservice teacher used language to enact identities, and identity enactments use language

to be recognized by self and others. Recognition is a critical tenet to my understanding of

identity construction. Identity enactments must be recognized as "similar enough to other

performances to be recognizable. However, if it is different enough from what has gone

before, but still recognizable, it can simultaneously change and transform the Discourses"

(Gee, 2005, p. 27) of Teachers and Teaching, and ultimately influence Teacher Identity

construction by preservice teachers. I use longer language excerpts from the transcript

data to create a descriptive collection of preservice talk about borderland discourses, or

points of tension between Nonteacher and Teacher Identities. This approach provides me

an opportunity to paint a richer description of each preservice teacher in my study, as

well as a collective portrait of their experiences as they progressed through ETEP

coursework and field experiences. These excerpts in no way attempt to represent the

truth of becoming a teacher for any one of my participants; rather they serve as one

interpretation of how preservice teachers can use language to create images of borderland

discourses. As a researcher, I have determined which stories to tell, which order to

present them, and how to weave individual experiences into a connected web of meaning.

These decisions were based on my theoretical lens of what constitutes borderland

discourse, what language cues my participants used, and what patterns emerged as central themes within individual cases and across cases. All language examples could not be used, however I have attempted to include a powerful and generative sample to illustrate each theme of becoming a teacher.

I Guess I Do Know A Lot: Witnessing Teachers

In learning to teach, preservice teachers experience tensions between their personal identities, or their Nonteacher Identities, as they construct professional identities, or Teacher Identities. Britzman described "four chronologies of becoming teachers" (2003, p. 69) that are always competing in experiences that build knowledge of teachers and teaching. She defined these chronologies of becoming as compulsory students, teacher education students, student teachers, and newly arrived classroom teachers. For the purposes of my study, I have used Britzman's first three chronologies of becoming teachers to organize this chapter. Each chronology of becoming a teacher offers opportunities for borderland discourses to emerge since they lay the backdrop for personal identities as outsiders to the professional life of teachers who then become insiders to the profession. As preservice teachers build professional identities, these personal identities come into question, thus, creating productive tensions for metacognitive awareness and identity growth.

The first chronology of becoming a teacher begins as an observer of teacher activities while a compulsory student. Preservice teachers have already witnessed classroom activities and made judgments of teaching lives and responsibilities. Natasha referenced her years as a compulsory student when recounting stories from her second grade classroom and a beloved teacher. "I've e-mailed her. I wish I could see it now.

Looking back it seems like she made an effort to include everyone, I wonder if they liked her…I loved it but did anyone else?" (April 4, 2008). As Natasha began to consider herself as a teacher who is responsible for classroom activities, she also reflected on her experiences as a student in a community of learners. By asking if anyone else loved her perception of inclusive practices employed by her second grade teacher, Natasha considered her second grade classmates and their experiences in the same classroom as being different than her own. This caused an intersection between Natasha's personal identities as a student with her growing professional identity as teacher.

Many ETEP students enter the program with more than observed classroom experiences as compulsory students, many have also witnessed lived realities of family members engaged in the practice of teaching. Ava was one of these students. Her mother was a special education teacher during much of her life. Ava engaged in family discussions of education practices through her mother's experiences as a teacher, and also through the lived experiences of Ava's older sister. Her older sister had been diagnosed with a brain tumor at a young age and had been in special education classes throughout her education experience. Ava told me,

> I know my parents had to fight for a lot of it when she was younger, it's not like I know a lot about it; every transition was another fight: junior high to high school. I don't know, I guess I do know a lot from my mom about what happens, it's not bad teacher wise, just a struggle (Transcript, June 17, 2008).

These lived experiences impacted her view of teaching, teachers, and special education. Ava continued this topic in June by stating, "My sister was in special education. I think that's why I'm more comfortable with it." Ava signaled her lived experience as influential in her view of education, and in particular her comfort level with special

education. Katy also had family members involved in teaching: her cousin was a teacher and her mother worked at a private day care camp. Although Katy only referenced her cousin or mother on one occasion each, she did indicate that teaching strategies were topics of family discussions. In a small group conversation on August 21, 2008, Katy stated, "My aunt thinks I should do what my cousin did: 'All set? You bet' [as a whole group attention getter]" when discussing possible management ideas. Britzman does not explicitly list experience with family members as teachers as a chronology of becoming a teacher, however, it does provide an historical, cultural, and linguistic resource when preservice teachers become teachers. This is a view of teaching and teachers that many compulsory students, only Ava and Katy in my study, may not experience, but it does impact personal subjectivities when building professional identities.

Behind the Scenes: Playing Teacher

Personal identities as compulsory students become fragmented when preservice teachers are privy to what Katy described as "behind the scenes" (April 8, 2008) teaching practices during teacher education course experiences. Britzman labeled teacher education student experiences as the second chronology of becoming a teacher. Teacher education programs are designed to guide newcomers into the profession of teaching by playing teacher in hypothetical situations during their methods courses. ETEP students do not participate in the daily activities of teachers in elementary classrooms, instead they are expected to pretend to be a teacher by planning and presenting lesson plans in university classrooms to their peers, working one-on-one with elementary aged students in schools, and partner teaching short lessons in local elementary classrooms in various

methods courses. Instructors, curriculum, students, and the supportive community of

ETEP determine these ways of playing teacher through language and by example.

One specific way students in teacher education programs interact with "behind the

scenes" activities is through lesson planning. In ETEP method courses preservice

teachers learn to write lesson plans with their peers and individually. ETEP instructors

and course curriculum materials guide preservice teachers through the steps of planning

for instruction for hypothetical elementary students. Mikayla noted her disconnect

between being a student in a classroom observing teachers teach and becoming a teacher

responsible for planning classroom activities in the following language excerpt.

> Another thing that scared me is, my expectations were that teachers had it easier, maybe it was when I was in school, going into it…I thought it wouldn't be a big deal, no work, I'll do fine…I didn't know teachers had to write lesson plans, I don't know what I thought. That was the beginning of wow, not because I thought it would be easy, it was a big deal. How could I have been so naïve to think no lesson plans? But you never saw them (Transcript, May 13, 2008).

Mikayla's narrative signals the unknown active role of teacher activities by connecting

the planning of lessons with the lessons she engaged in as a student. This became a

disconnect due to Mikayla's perception that teachers did not write lesson plans because

she had never observed lesson plans as a compulsory student. As an ETEP student, she

was privy to the behind the scenes of lesson planning.

Katy also discussed lesson plans in methods courses as new information.

> [Foundations of Education] was such a cool class; I learned so much. I would like to take it again it would be helpful now, Block was the same way. After you know what your role is going to be, it helps to wrap your mind around it. I thought there would be all methods classes instead we were learning about what you can and can't do…whether you're a science or social studies major you should have to take [Block A]. Before everything seems so abstract…it was hard taking a math or art class and write lessons incorporating math with language arts and I don't know what language arts really is. Like my lessons for art, I can do it

now, but it was so hard for me. Like what is a lesson plan? (Transcript, April 29, 2008).

Katy referenced the disconnect she experienced between her subject area methods courses as well as learning to write lesson plans. She mentioned incorporating language arts into math curriculum before she felt comfortable with a working definition of language arts. The insecurity Katy experienced was common across each preservice teacher. Expectations to play teacher before feeling like a teacher creates tension, insecurity, and possibly a false sense of confidence.

Half a Teacher: Supervised Teacher

The third chronology of becoming a teacher is time spent in the field (Britzman, 2003), or in an elementary classroom interacting with daily classroom activities. At Midwest University, most ETEP students interact with school-aged students during each ETEP Methods course. These interactions range from a few classroom hours over the course of the semester to 1 hour per week one-on-one tutoring sessions during a 16-week semester. In the final semesters of the ETEP experience, students spend two multi-hour semesters in classrooms, which are named "field experiences." The first semester is a practicum field experience, which is taken with a full course load prior to the semester of student teaching. During the practicum field experience ETEP students are placed in nearby elementary schools for 8 hours a week to observe a classroom teacher (cooperating teacher), plan and teach at least 1 lesson per week that is observed by a University supervisor, and participate in classroom activities. Mikayla's practicum was a pivotal experience for her in creating a professional identity. Near the end of her placement she told me,

I do [feel like a teacher]. Little things like Ms. Sparks. It is reality to me. I always felt young, now I'm in the role, they can't hang on me, little things like that…I am [comfortable]. The first week I wasn't. The first week I came home and I said, "I don't want to be a teacher, I screwed up." Now I think I could do it for a long time. Being in the classroom is one thing; I had to accept the change too. Here I am in the role of teacher and no longer friend. I don't know if I was ready for it or accepted it…Once I started really working with the kids is when I really felt I can handle this, I can do this. It's like I had to prove to myself. A few classroom management [strategies] worked and lesson plans that didn't. It taught me I could save myself from it when it didn't work: think on my toes. I don't know if I thought I couldn't do it, but until I did it I didn't know. Now I could go into any classroom and do it and that's huge (Transcript, May 13, 2008).

Mikayla's narrative is indicative of a productive tension in developing a professional identity as a teacher. She acknowledged a change in behavior as well as a change in perception by elementary aged students. In Mikayla's personal identity, she worked as a camp counselor and a day care provider. Although each job was education related, she noted that her role in the classroom provided tension as she became metacognitive of her professional identity growth.

Ava's practicum field experience was in a kindergarten classroom. She related a similar experience in perception by her kindergarten practicum students when they referred to her as "half a teacher."

My practicum students started talking about me being a teacher. [My] cooperating teacher refers to me as a teacher. [One kid says] "She's not a teacher, she's half a teacher. She's a teacher and she's learning" (Transcript, June 17, 2008).

Ava's student's observation was related to her dual identities as a teacher in a kindergarten classroom and as a university student. Since Ava spent 8 hours in the classroom, the kindergarten students perceived her as a teacher, but they also knew she left their classroom to attend university teacher education classes.

Each preservice teacher worked in a part-time job during her college career. Mikayla, Ava, and Katy worked in education related fields. Mikayla worked as a camp

counselor and day care provider in the summers, Ava worked at a daycare during the

school year and summers, and Katy worked as an after school counselor at an elementary

school during the school year and at a day camp in the summers. Although these jobs

have similar characteristics as elementary school classrooms, each preservice teacher

defined their work life as Nonteacher identities. For example, Mikayla shared a story

from her summer camp counselor job, which illustrated the distinction between her

personal identity as a camp counselor and her professional identity as a teacher.

> I didn't think I did anything wrong, but my director likes to call people out in
> front of all of us. She said, "You need to know teachers don't talk like that." And
> I said, "I'm not a teacher right now, I'm a camp counselor" (Transcript, August
> 21, 2008).

The lines between personal identities at work and professional identities as teachers

became blurred as time in elementary classrooms progressed and each preservice teacher

took on more responsibilities in the classroom. Instead of playing teachers, they were

interacting in the daily life of teachers and teaching.

It's Going to be Fine: Student Teachers

At Midwest University most student teachers spend 16 weeks in a single

classroom. This is not the case if, like Ava, a preservice teacher has an endorsement in

special education or if she has applied to student teach at an international site. Ava

student taught for 8 weeks near her suburban U.S. mid-west hometown and 8 weeks in

Australia. This brought unique factors into Ava's student teaching experience: miles

from familiar surroundings, friends, and family. Ava told me on June 17, 2008,

> The principal from Australia is e-mailing me. He wrote about general information
> about school and town. At first I was freaking out about it and thought about
> going into Emily [because] it's not what I expected [it] to be. I requested
> Melbourne, one of the biggest cities. I'm in a town still considered as a suburb,
> but way, way out there. [It's] described as rural. Now I'm fine. I've never lived

anywhere rural ever. It's going to be different enough without more. It's going to be fine.

Ava's fears of unfamiliar surroundings brought added tensions into her student teaching experience that exceeded the typical tension of learning how to teach in an elementary classroom. She was also confronted with relocating to an international location, living with a host family, and learning to teach in an international elementary classroom. Another fear that Ava expressed was the possibility that she would not have one cooperating teacher, or a homeroom teaching location, but would move around to other classrooms and grade levels. Ava stated, "Dr. Langer said that sometimes they move you around and I don't really want that…I think I would get more comfortable head teaching. I don't know how I would head teach very much if I was moving around" (June 17, 2008).

For each preservice teacher in my study, student teaching was a culminating experience in her undergraduate university experience. Their personal subjectivities as college students consisted of living in apartments many miles away from home, in charge of their daily schedules, and to varying degrees financially responsible. Natasha, Ava, and Katy each applied for special student teaching sites near their family homes, which meant each would live at home again. Natasha and Katy were both excited for the chance to live with their parents and siblings because it meant family dinners and conversations. Ava was not as excited to return home. As she stated on June 17, 2008,

> I am looking forward to seeing my friends and my parents are fine. It's just annoying almost [when they ask] "Where are you going?" "When are you coming back?" "Will you be home for dinner?" It's not like they care how late…or she'll call [and ask] "Are you going to be home for dinner?" [I think] "Mom, leave me alone." Just stuff like that. I'll feel bad if I'm laying around on Saturday. In my own apartment I could do whatever I want.

This is a common fear for many university students returning to live in their family home.

The sense of independence while living without daily supervision from family members

related to Ava's conflict in defining herself as an adult. Later in the same June

conversation, Ava stated,

> Katy and I were talking the other day [that] we don't feel like adults. I'll be 22 in
> a month and that's not young, that's an adult. Kids see me as an adult…I think I
> still feel like I'm 18 and I just went to college. I think that is part of why I am so
> freaked out. I'm down here, I've had my four years, and that just seems so
> different, you know? Definitely a college graduate is an adult (Transcript, June
> 17, 2008).

The perception of elementary aged children viewing her as an adult and graduating from

college influenced her professional identity by providing a tension with her personal

identity as a university student. Ava's identity as a student was changing as she

contemplated leaving Midwest University, living with her parents, and spending each day

in an elementary classroom.

Identity Enactments in I-statements

Since I am interested in how preservice teachers use language to construct

identities to negotiate the productive tension between personal and professional identities,

I returned to Gee's Discourse Analysis methods. To further illuminate the link between

language and identity enactments, I employed Gee's tool of analysis to locate "I-

statements" in each transcript. Gee defined I-statements as socially situated language to

build identities by referring to oneself in the first-person as "I" followed by a predicate.

The five types are affective, cognitive, state and action, ability and constraint, and

achievement statements. The I-statements below illustrate examples from my data to

define each of the five types of I-statements. For example, Natasha stated, "I want to

scream." Her I-statement is an affective I-statement because "I" is followed by a

predicate indicative of desiring or liking. In another example, Ava declared, "I talked

with my parents," which is an example of an action I-statement since "I" is followed by

the action verb "talked." Here are examples of each type of I-statement made by the

preservice teachers and myself:

Affective	*I want to scream (Natasha)* *I like my management style (Mikayla)* *I love children's books (Katy)* *I want to hear what you have to say (Anne)*
Cognitive	*I thought he looked great too (Natasha)* *I guess this is what happens when you work with a bunch of women (Mikayla)* *I think you all talk about all the things I was wondering about (Anne)*
State and Action	*I am excited (Natasha)* *I talked with my parents (Ava)* *I changed in the car (Katy)* *I wrote about (sticky notes) in my proposal and my advisor asked me about it today (Anne)*
Ability & constraint	*I don't want her letter of recommendation (Natasha)* *I had to redo mine (Natasha)* *I couldn't get over the laptop and projector (Anne)*
Achievement	*I learned so much (Mikayla)* *I know I am doing fine (Ava)* *I learned a lot (Katy)* *I did figure out quickly if you assign it, you have to grade it (Anne)*

There were 3,315 total I-statements. This includes I-statements made by each

preservice teacher and myself throughout the duration of data collection. For purposes of

this chapter, I have included I-statements uttered during the student teaching semester

since I was interested in the intersection of personal and professional identities. My

analysis revealed that this intersection was most visible during the student teaching

semester. To analyze how preservice teachers use language to negotiate borderland

discourses to construct professional identities as teachers, I coded all 3, 515 I-statements as one of the five types. This report focuses on affective, cognitive, and state and action I-statements to support my belief that the productive tensions in borderland discourses require attitudinal, emotional, and physical work as evidenced in language. Analysis of ability and constraint and achievement I-statements will not be presented in this report of my research. My I-statement investigation offered a deeper analysis of each preservice teacher's language to build socially situated identities as teachers and to connect identity construction with affect, cognition, state and action in language moments representative of borderland discourse.

The following section is organized by preservice teacher. For each participant, I provide a small set of representative examples from each I-statement category and briefly describe the I-statement examples. I end this chapter with typical I-statements from my own language in each category to maintain my stance as an active, reciprocal participant in my study and to highlight points of my borderland discourse.

Natasha: I'm a Square Peg in a Round Hole

Natasha frequently conveyed to me a strong feeling that she did not fit into the typical ETEP student population. She viewed her pre-admission work with elementary aged students as not "mainstream" since she had not worked at a daycare, after school program, or a summer camp. Natasha voiced her frustration with not fitting into a traditional education setting. She often spoke of applying to charter schools or children's hospitals as a tutor instead of an elementary school. She said that a charter school would "need someone different inside" (July 9, 2008), and she believed she was different inside than her perception of typical elementary teachers.

Natasha applied to student teach in an elementary school near her family home in a northwest suburb of a large Midwest city. She planned to live with her parents and work at a nearby restaurant in the evenings as a waitress. In many of our talks, Natasha referenced her interest in cooking and restaurant work; it served as a source of personal pride and as a release from Natasha's perceived constraints of teaching. In a conversation before student teaching began, Natasha told me, "My demeanor I can change and I don't feel like I have the option as a teacher: I have to be this ideal person. As a server I can do my job" (July 9, 2008). Much of Natasha's personal identity was connected to food and restaurant work. She viewed teaching as a profession where there were certain expectations to act, talk, and appear, but not while serving food. In the same July conversation, Natasha stated that as a teacher "I have to hide things. I don't hide from my tables." This theme of difference was evidenced in Natasha's I-statements below.

Affective	*I just feel like I'll shed a skin every time. I'll put a coat on or off every time I go in the school.* *I don't want to ever joke about what my kids can't do…I never want to talk about the kids like that.*
Cognitive	*I think I want to be such a different teacher [than Karen].* *I know I can be a good teacher with a filter.*
State and Action	*I'm tired of going through the motions [as a student teacher].* *If I keep telling myself [it will be fine], it will be.*

Natasha's I-statements conveyed alienation in her student teaching placement school and, in particular, her teaching perspective. She stated, "I'm a square peg in a round hole" (October 2, 2008) in reference to her teaching stance as different from her cooperating teacher Karen. Many times in our conversations Natasha voiced her

opposing views to Karen's teaching practices and attitude toward students. Throughout

Natasha's student teaching experience, she became frustrated with her daily interactions,

or lack of, with Karen. In a conversation on August 22, 2008, Natasha told me, "The first

day she said, 'You must be so nervous because you haven't said anything all day.' And

it's because I don't know what to say. I was nervous of how she would talk to the kids."

This statement is indicative of many of Natasha's frustrations with Karen. In the above I-

statements, the final example, "If I keep telling myself [it will be fine], it will be," was a

response to my comment that she repeatedly said, "It's fine" when she spoke of her

student teaching experience.

Ava: I Need Routines

Ava often described herself as needing routines, organization, and structure to feel

secure and comfortable. These qualities were evidenced in her Nonteacher Identities and

in her Teacher Identities. For example, in one of Ava's reflective field journals for Block

A, she wrote about how she planned for routine, organization, and structure in her weekly

child study meetings by preparing two different lesson plans. She wrote,

> *I came today with 2 different plans. One for if I was going to continue my work with Donald and another for if I was going to be starting with another child. I ended up working with another child, Deseraa (sp?) [sic], who is the same girl I worked with last week. I talked with Emma (the child study location supervisor) and she said that I would be working with her instead of Donald for the remainder of child study. In a way, I was really disappointed by this because I was still trying to work out a way to connect and work better with Donald (Block A Field Journal, October 9, 2007).*

Ava prided herself as a competent student who worked hard in her ETEP coursework,

and she expected her instructors to be equally competent. She expected her ETEP

instructors to be knowledgeable in the content they taught and to model desirable

teaching practices. In a conversation on May 1, 2008, Ava told me her view on the Classroom Management course she was just finishing.

> I feel like she's (instructor) not helping me do anything I didn't already know what to do. Even if she talks about managing…a classroom look around your own classroom. People are talking [and] sleeping…if you…made your class engaging and did something worth my time [I would pay attention].

The high expectations Ava held for her university instructors transferred toward her expectations for her university supervisor, Alice, during student teaching. On October 1, 2008, Ava stated, "Her job should be to get me to think about myself…that's what it should be: prompting me to think about my teaching." Ava spoke of the unprofessional standards of her university supervisor by stating that Alice did not return phone calls or e-mails in a timely manner. One of the expectations for student teachers was to be observed teaching a lesson every 5-10 days throughout the semester. Ava imagined Alice to be on time to observe her classroom lessons, which she wasn't, and for Alice to ask her self-reflective questions about her teaching practices, which she didn't. Ava was disappointed in Alice's performance as a student teacher supervisor.

Ava set high expectations for herself in her teaching as well. In the first and last I-statements listed below, Ava referenced her insecurity with a social studies unit she taught in her student teaching placement. The unit focused on the geographic regions of the United States, and it was not an area of strength for Ava. She spoke of spending many evenings studying the content so she could teach it the following afternoon. Afternoons became a dreaded time of day, thus Ava sacrificed creativity for content knowledge.

Affective   *I feel like I don't have any time to be creative. I am spending so much time on the content, no time for great ideas.*

I need a routine so the kids need a routine.

Cognitive	*I know I am doing fine [in student teaching placement]. I don't know how I would head teach very much if I was moving around.*
State and Action	*I am distracted [by too many decorations on the walls] and I don't get distracted. I am always so nervous at the end of the day because I don't know what I am doing [when teaching social studies].*

Katy: I am Immature Sometimes

Katy frequently referred to herself as not being an adult. Much of her talk referenced incidents in her field experiences that coincided with this view. During a conversation on November 18, 2008, Katy shared a funny student story from her first grade student teaching classroom. She stated, "I didn't know if I should laugh. I feel really bad but I am immature sometimes. My teacher was in the room and I didn't know what to do". In previous conversations, during her practicum field experience, Katy related similar stories about immaturity and uncertainty about laughing with her students. On May 1, 2008, Katy told me,

> [In my] cooperating teacher's read aloud [book it] said [you] shouldn't read this if adults are around. [My cooperating teacher said], "Ms. Marks picked it out and she's a grown up." They said, "No, she's not." I said, "No, I'm not"...My cooperating teacher read, "They will make out just fine" and some kids giggled. They're in fifth grade. She talked to them and I almost giggled too. So what am I?...there are times where I feel like a teacher, an authoritative figure. I battle with who I am and fitting that into "teacher." I don't think I fit just into the authoritative role. I think I have a hard time with relationships, friendships, mentoring. I knew that would be hard.

Katy's perception of maturity as evidenced in laughing created tension between personal identities and professional identities. Katy struggled to reconcile her Nonteacher Identity

as an after school counselor who "hangs out with the kids" and her Teacher Identity that

doesn't hang out with kids. Katy's I-statements below illustrate this tension.

Affective	*I want to babysit the kids. [An adult is] more how I feel I have to act not how I see myself.* *I love going to work each day [and eating] lunch with kids.*
Cognitive	*I think I will always be [like a big kid].* *I know they don't look at me like an equal because I'm not.* *I think they know everyone needs to go through [student teaching].*
State and Action	*I am [nervous] until I get up there [to teach].* *I had to convince myself that I was right.*

Another theme evidenced in Katy's I-statements was her unease as a student

teacher. This was not unique to Katy, all of the preservice teachers in my study conveyed

insecurity with their teaching practices during their field experiences. Katy's unease was

unique because it was tied to her view of herself as not an adult and related to her

insecurities as a student. During Katy's university experiences, such as Block A, Katy

referenced her own learning about reading and writing as critical in building a Teacher

Identity. For example, in a self-evaluation written in Block A, Katy wrote,

> *It seems ironic that many of the concepts we are learning in class I am partaking in as a student in Block A. I am able to make text-self, text- text and text-world connects during discussions and through outside work. To further my previous statement, I find that many of my classes feed off each other, and therefore can connect what I learn in Block A to the other courses I am taking, ultimately bettering my knowledge of reading and writing. I strongly believe I am learning first hand the value of reading for a purpose. The activities we do in class and the supplemental reading can help me as a teacher in so many ways that not participating, in my opinion, would only hider my confidence and awareness as a future teacher (Block A Self-evaluation, November 5, 2007).*

This example demonstrates Katy's interest in understanding literacy methods by

practicing them herself, as well as building her "confidence and awareness as a future

teacher", which was partly due to Katy's self-perception as a poor student in the areas of math and spelling. On April 29, 2008, Katy stated, "I told [my ETEP math instructor] I thought I would be that teacher who would skip through math, but now I don't. Especially [in the] younger grades, I really get those concepts." In an earlier conversation about her practicum field experience, Katy told me, "Fifth grade is hard because of my own insecurity of spelling" (April 8, 2008). Katy's unease and insecurity with her perceived academic deficiency influenced her Teacher Identity.

Mikayla: I Like to Get Work Done

Mikayla described herself as a hard worker. Many of our conversations revolved around working and productivity (see I-statements below). On August 21, 2008, Mikayla stated, "I like to get work done" when describing her first few days in her student teaching placement school. This self-description was not unique to Mikayla; all of the preservice teachers categorized themselves as hard workers in their personal and professional identities. Mikayla's self-description was unusual because she was the only preservice teacher to discuss money related to her university degree, expected teacher pay, and job security in the education profession. This could be due to many factors; the most possible is that Mikayla did not live with her parents during her student teaching field experience. Instead, she lived with her fiancé, which suggested that she was more financially independent than the other preservice teachers in my study. Mikayla and I did not directly discuss her financial situation, but many of her statements about her teaching were related to money. In a conversation on November 12, 2008, Mikayla told me,

> He's (university supervisor) very rushed, I feel like he wants to get out of there more than he wants to talk…I think I am paying enough money that if I want 45 minutes of your time, I should get it…I am paying the university thousands of dollars and I want 30 minutes of someone's time.

In this excerpt, Mikayla identified herself as paying her own tuition. She also signaled her expectation of how her money should be spent by the university: time to conference with her university supervisor after an observed lesson. Mikayla's professional identity as a teacher is tied to her stance on hard work.

Affective	*I don't want to restrict who I am, but I still want to carry myself in a professional manner.* *I want to be a teacher for the kids now, not job ease and stability.*
Cognitive	*I thought school was like my school and that isn't true.* *I think they could not have two specials a day; that's the teacher in me.*
State and Action	*I came in from day one, not soft, but as an authority figure.* *I want to get things done.* *I'm okay with [the workload], thinking I'll make 30 thousand and spending way too much time at my job.*

As Mikayla progressed through the ETEP field experiences, she noted key learning experiences that changed her views of teaching, teachers, and schools. For instance, Mikayla noted that her initial impressions of her future school and classroom would be similar to her own classroom and school as a student. Mikayla noted that, "it's an eye opener and I wanted to have it before I got into the classroom. I guess I was closed minded before. I thought [school] was the way [my school] was" (May 13, 2008). This statement represents a key theme for Mikayla. Many of her representative I-statements focus on change from previous observed knowledge to present experienced knowledge in teaching.

Personal and Professional Selves

Language is used by us as well as uses us. I-statements link language to identity enactments by examining how language is used to position oneself in social situations mediated through talk. For each preservice teacher in my study, language was used to convey emotions, values, beliefs, actions, attitudes, and stances about teaching and as professional teachers. The above I-statements signaled productive tension, or moments of borderland discourse, during their culminating field experiences. The above I-statement examples fit into two distinct themes: Professionalism and Teacher Reflection.

Do I Wear a Bikini?: Defining Professionalism

In a conversation on June 12, 2008, Natasha told me she was planning to meet her practicum cooperating teacher, Laura, and her children at the local public pool. She was wondering what bathing suit to wear when she asked me, "Do I wear a bikini? Is that professional?" One common theme for all preservice teachers in my study was the tension between beliefs of personal and professional behaviors, which manifested itself in discussions centered on professionalism. Although each preservice teacher defined professionalism in various ways (i.e., not chewing gum, wearing appropriate clothing, respecting confidentiality of students, age and experience, etc.), each preservice teacher wrestled with finding ways to merge personal and professional identities in her definition of professionalism.

In the vignette that opens this chapter, Ava described the tension she felt between her personal identity as a day care provider and her professional identity as a practicum student learning to become a teacher. This tension was mediated through language, specifically her name. In many elementary classrooms it is typical for students to call

their teachers by a prefix such as Miss, Ms., Mrs., or Mr., while in a day care setting, the typical reference is the first name of the adult. For Ava, "Ms. Mendon" represented her professional identity and "Ava" represented her personal identity. She concluded that she was both Ms. Mendon and Ava at once in an attempt to merge the two seemingly different identities. Natasha referenced a similar situation when she stated, "I know (the students) are not talking to me as Natasha but they are talking to me as a preservice teacher." Mikayla echoed a similar statement when I asked if she felt like a teacher. She responded, "I do [because of] little things like Ms. Sparks. It is reality to me."

Katy and Mikayla signaled the tension between nonteacher and teacher identities through the description of actions by teacher colleagues in their field placement schools. Katy referenced not being a professional equal because she was a student teacher while Mikayla stated, "they don't treat me as a student teacher" causing her to feel like a teacher. Both Mikayla and Katy signal the tension between professional and personal selves through their use of affective I-statements. Katy echoed Ava's opening vignette when she stated, "it's more how I feel I have to act not how I see myself." Mikayla stated, "I don't want to restrict who I am, but I still want to carry myself in a professional manner." For each of these preservice teachers, the metacognitive awareness of their professional identities increased as other professionals perceived, or recognized, them as teachers.

Teaching is Such a Big Deal: Professional Reflection

While discussing her views of teaching and herself as a teacher entering the profession, Natasha told me, "Teaching is such a big deal, if I can be a good teacher I should be there and I don't want to burn out" (August 22, 2008). Professional reflection

was another common theme across each preservice teacher's language data. For the preservice teachers in my study, professional reflection occurred in two ways: at an institutional level, and at an individual level. As their student teaching semester progressed, tensions mounted between professional and personal identities as teachers. At the individual level, each preservice teacher used I-statements to position herself as a certain type of teacher. For example, Natasha positioned herself as a teacher who doesn't joke about her students and who bases her teaching strategies on the needs of her students. Ava positioned herself as a teacher who needed content knowledge at the risk of losing creativity and self-reflection to improve her teaching techniques.

At the institutional level of reflection, each preservice teacher used I-statements to signal her stance on specific teacher examples and the institution as a whole. For example, Katy used I-statements to state her belief that her cooperating teacher was "missing the knowledge part" in her classroom practices. Mikayla used I-statements to signal her increased awareness of the day-to-day work of teachers. It was the behind the scenes of teaching that allowed opportunities for reflection on the profession of teaching and as teachers. For each preservice teacher, moments of borderland discourse occurred as she reflected on her perceived knowledge of teachers and teaching. Knowledge changed as they engaged in the daily lives of teachers and became insiders to the teaching profession. Their teaching practices mimicked other teachers as well as expanded what counted as being a teacher. As others recognized them as teachers and they recognized themselves as teachers, the edges between the borders of Nonteacher and Teacher Identities blurred.

My I-statement: Border Crossing

Maintaining my commitment to feminist qualitative research and bridgework between researcher and participants, I analyzed my own use of I-statements in our small group and individual conversations. I used I-statements in three distinct ways: to align with preservice teachers, to recall past conversations or experiences, and to identify as an elementary teacher, a Block A instructor, a student teacher supervisor, and as a student nearing graduation. I have grouped representative I-statements below by category.

Affective	*I don't want [our meetings] to be an inconvenience.* *I felt that way too because [clothes] put me in a different* *state of mind which is what [my students] didn't like.*
Cognitive	*I don't know if it gets easier or not. I keep thinking it will.* *I should know [how many siblings Ava has].*
State and Action	*I was sad coming today and thinking I wasn't starting* *school.* *I taught sixth grade for student teaching.*

I used I-statements to position myself as relatable to their experiences of teaching and change. For example, in a conversation with Ava on June 17, 2008, I stated that "I don't know if it gets easier or not" when discussing transitioning from living in State City to living at home with her family. Although I was not in the same situation, I related my experiences as moving from one state to another state to attend graduate school. Throughout our in-depth conversations, I found myself using language to tell a parallel story to my participants' stories. Many of my statements echoed doubts, uncertainties, and insecurities I also experienced during data collection. Although I was not finishing my undergraduate teacher education degree, I was at a critical point in my doctoral program: dissertation data collection and writing. I too was uncertain, filled with doubt, and insecure when my emerging professional identity as a feminist qualitative researcher

intersected with my non-researcher identities as teacher educator and elementary teacher and my personal identity. For example, during a small group conversation with Mikayla, Ava, and Katy on August 21, 2008, I stated, "I was sad coming today and thinking I wasn't starting school." Mikayla, Ava, and Katy were in State City for a student teacher orientation meeting and they were beginning their school year. I, on the other hand, was not. I had been assigned to teach during the second half of the semester. This was the first fall semester I hadn't begun school in over 30 years. I had been a compulsory student, a teacher education student, a student teacher, a classroom teacher, a district and state literacy specialist, and a graduate student for the majority of my life. August 2008, I did not start teaching or taking classes, and I felt lost.

I also used language, I-statements in particular, to build relationships with each preservice teacher as well as my participants as a collective group. My goal during our in-depth conversations was to align myself with their views and acknowledge their perceptions as valid and useful. This was not always the case during data collection. During two distinct conversations with Natasha, I disconnected with her and invalidated her perceptions of teaching, her cooperating teacher, and her experiences in her student teaching placement school. In a conversation on April 4, 2008, Natasha voiced her frustrations with moving to her hometown, Whorton, which she perceived as a conservative community, and not fit her increasingly critical lens as a teacher. In the following exchange Natasha shared her frustrations and worry that she wouldn't be recognized as a "good teacher" in this environment.

> *Anne: I think that's the question. No matter what, there are different people with different views. I think about my first classes of students. I want to find them and see if they are okay. If not, is it because of me? Probably not.*

Natasha: That's what I am afraid of in Whorton: never being seen as a good teacher because I know that I am. I feel like I am on my way. [Whorton is] not me. Can't you look outside [of your community]? There's a place for me, it's not fair for those kids. I feel like I am working really, really hard and it's relative. I feel like I am working really hard, I would work harder if I needed to be, I'm afraid people won't see that.

Anne: Or they will see it or read it differently. I think everyone is doing the best they can.

Natasha: That's funny. Ava said the same thing.

Anne: You're trying to do your best according to your definition of best.

This exchange resulted in my successful shut down of Natasha on the topic she wanted to discuss: her frustration of returning to a conservative community after living for multiple years in a university town and developing a critical outlook on life. Instead of bolstering her confidence, affirming her beliefs by aligning with her or simply listening to her frustrations, I disconnected from her by advising her to be less critical of others' experiences and views. In other words, my professional identities of teacher, mentor, and researcher intersected and resulted in negative tension with Natasha. My statement "I think everyone is doing the best they can" limited Natasha's ability to continue the topic discussion of her choice. Although the typed words do not convey the nonverbal signals Natasha gave me, my field notes and the audio recording of this conversation add another layer of meaning to the transcript. Natasha's statement "That's funny. Ava said the same thing" was said slowly, her eye contact shifted away from me, and her intonation was flat. Each of these non-language cues signaled disappointment that both Ava and I were unsupportive of Natasha's perception of Whorton and its educational community. Our lack of support furthered Natasha's self-perception of being a "square peg in a round hole" and not fitting in to her placement school and community.

Another example of my failure to build bridges between my participants and myself occurred during a conversation on August 22, 2008 with Natasha. Natasha spoke at length about the negative qualities of her cooperating teacher in her student teaching placement school. I quickly replied, "I'm afraid that you might miss some of the good things she is doing. There's got to be something there since all of these people are saying she's great. Even if it's test scores, but that's something to learn." Natasha quickly started listing positive qualities of her cooperating teacher in response to my comment. This is another example of disconnect. Instead of encouraging Natasha to tell me about her feelings, doubts, and experiences, I instructed her to list positive qualities of her cooperating teacher. As with the preceding example of disconnect with Natasha, my field notes and audio recording of our conversation offer a deeper understanding of the exchange that the transcript cannot. After our conversation I recorded my reflective field notes. I wrote, *"This is Natasha's perception of her experiences, not your opportunity to mentor her"* (Ethnographic Field Notes, August 22, 2008). This was not the only time I wrote a similar comment in my field notes after talking with Natasha; after many of our conversations I was disappointed in my identity enactments as unsolicited mentor, student teaching supervisor, and advisor to Natasha. This disappointment stemmed from my quest to establish myself as a feminist qualitative researcher who listened sympathetically and did not question her participant's perceptions of their experiences. In both examples of disconnect with Natasha, I view each of these moments as tensions between my emerging and established professional identities and my personal identity. As a teacher educator I am invested in Natasha's learning experiences, developing teacher identities, and mediating her experiences with conflict. As a past elementary

teacher, I am tied to the realization that when closely watched my daily teaching activities fall short. And as an educational researcher, I am invested in improving educational experiences. These are three examples of professional identities that were in tension with my personal identity as optimistic and hopeful that learning experiences occur every day.

Chapter Summary

The data presented in this chapter suggests that preservice teachers encounter productive tension when borderland discourses of Teacher and Nonteacher Identities intersect. Analysis also suggests that such productive tensions should not be avoided. Each preservice teacher used language, including I-statements, to engage in the borderwork necessary to construct individual Teacher Identities. I too wrestled with my own borders as I negotiated my situated identities as instructor, elementary teacher, student teacher supervisor, educational researcher, and confidant. However, constructing identities through negotiation of internal borders is not an individual process. Borders exist outside individuals necessitating negotiation to occur in contexts with available social, cultural, and historical resources accessed within relationships with others. With this, I turn my analytical lens to investigate how preservice teachers learn to become teachers embedded in a confluence of relationships with others.

CHAPTER V LEARNING TO BECOME TEACHERS WITHIN A CONFLUENCE OF
RELATIONSHIPS

> *Mikayla and I met at a coffee shop near her student teaching placement school. It
> was mid-November and she was nearing the end of her field experience in a
> fourth grade classroom. We met to discuss her teaching experiences, her plans
> after she completed her student teaching, and graduation from Midwest
> University. Mikayla stated, "What I thought would be hard is the easiest. It's all
> the stuff that comes along with teaching that I never thought about: the little
> things never crossed my mind. It's the best way to learn…I never realized how
> much I would learn from this experience, I didn't. It's six years of school packed
> into a few months" (*Researcher's Ethnographic Field Notes and Transcript,
> November 12, 2008).

In the opening vignette, Mikayla signals the importance of learning the day-to-day

happenings of teaching by participating in the figured world of education. Holland and

her colleagues (1998) describe a figured world as a collectively and socially constructed

world of recognized actors, significant words and actions, and valued outcomes that are

meaningful to those involved in the reality of the figured world. Thus, the figured world

of education becomes a practiced and participated in activity for those who are invested

in the reality of teaching. Preservice teachers learning to become teachers seek

opportunities to engage in teacher-like activities that form and shape the figured world of

education by teaching them the words, actions, and meanings valued by the existing

members. In other words, newcomers learn to become teachers by old-timers who are

invested in the daily practice of teaching. Moje and Lewis (2007) argue that learning

> both involves and requires participation in something….what makes learning so
> complex—and more than just participation—is that people bring their histories of
> participation to bear on each new act or moment of participating….(it) goes
> beyond the moment of participation to constitute a history and to shape a future
> act of participating (p. 16).

In the figured world of education, preservice teachers already have histories of

participation in educational settings and with education professionals. Their educational

histories complicate the ways in which they engage in teacher education coursework and field experiences. As discussed in Chapter 4, years as compulsory students in academic settings and interactions with familiar teachers shape future participation in the figured world of education. As compulsory students, preservice teachers view the milieu of the classroom environment as a member of the community engaged in the actions and words of teachers. They are embedded in the relationships that converge to create the figured world of education. But as compulsory students, they are only privy to the outside view of how teaching happens to them as students. Teacher education experiences, such as Mikayla referred to in her reflection on her student teaching field experience, encourage preservice teachers to participate in the discourse community of education as a teacher.

This chapter answers the question: How does a confluence of relationships contribute to four preservice teachers learning to become teachers? I argue that learning to become teachers is complicated by relationships. In other words, preservice teachers are embedded in a matrix of relationships that enable and constrain their learning during teacher education coursework and field experiences. The preservice teachers in my study were influenced through words, actions, silences, and gestures while learning to become teachers in specific ways through their embedded relationships and co-action, or collaborative action (Gergen, 2009), with others. I begin this chapter with a theoretical discussion of relationships and their impact on learning. I continue with my analysis methods for this chapter, including a collection of short language excerpts to demonstrate talk of relationships by one preservice teacher, Natasha. Analysis of all four preservice teachers was conducted, however I chose to focus on Natasha's language examples to provide a deeper look at the complexity of the tensions between new and existing

relationships during her final two teaching field experiences. As a researcher, I decided that I would not be able to provide this deeper look if I focused on all four participants. The intersection of Natasha's relationships influenced her views of teaching, teachers, and education resulting in her discontent as a teacher. The next section includes a collection of "we-statements" to illustrate the collaborative learning between the participants and signify the complexity of their relationship with each other within and across my study. I conclude with a self-reflection of my own talk with my participants, representing the confluence, or intersection, of my multiple relationships as a former instructor, researcher, former elementary teacher, Midwest University student, and white woman living in State City.

Relationships: The Unbounded Being

Learning is social. Learners work together to create meaning from activities. Meaning is constructed through coordinated action with others. Gergen (2009) states, "To act intelligibly at all is to participate in relationship…all meaningful action is co-action" (p. 39). Individuals are unbounded beings; instead they are always in relationship with others. In other words, Gergen argues that all actions and words are embedded in relationships with others to construct meaning through inter-animation. Whether physically present or absent, individuals are always working to create meaning through relationships with others. Gergen uses the example of baseball to illustrate how individual actions are embedded in relationships to create meaning. One individual throwing a ball becomes baseball when a mitt, bags lain in the shape of a diamond, other individuals wearing mitts, and a bat are involved. The presence of these coordinated actions and individuals constitute baseball. In the context of preservice teachers learning

to become teachers, actions (i.e., reading aloud) and words (i.e., "least restrictive environment") are embedded in the relationship of education. Many of these activities are learned through observations as compulsory students, while others are learned through participation and interaction in teacher education courses and field experiences. For example, Ava shared an instructional activity she learned about in ETEP but didn't observe as a compulsory student, "I don't think our teachers read to us in the upper grades, the librarians maybe" (August 21, 2008). Katy, on another occasion, noted, "In class we learned least restrictive environment is best" (November 18, 2008). Findings presented in this chapter reveal how preservice teachers learn to become teachers within a confluence, or web, of relationships. Preservice teachers' actions were continuously being shaped through co-construction of meaning with others.

Learning within relationships is not a new topic in educational research. Many researchers have studied how individuals learn in groups such as communities of practice (Wenger, 1998), figured worlds (Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner, & Cain, 1998), affinity groups (Gee, 2003) or affinity spaces (Gee, 2004), and discourse communities (Gee, 2005). Educational researchers have taken up the notion of social groups to examine how students and teachers learn with others with similar attributes or interests. For example, Alvermann & Heron (2001) used the notion of affinity groups to examine how a similar interested group of individuals who participated in on-line discussions of the Japanese Anime *Dragonball Z* to engage a disinterested reader in critical literacy practices. In another example, Fecho and his colleagues (Fecho, Graham, & Hudson-Ross, 2005) used the concept of figured worlds to investigate how teacher educators and teacher researchers co-constructed, collaborated, and modified views of teaching, research, and

learning within a larger research community. Each of these studies, as well as many

additional studies employing communities of practice (Darling-Hammond *&*

McLaughlin, 1995; Little, 2002; Sachs, 2001) or discourse communities (Carter, 1993;

Edens & Gallini, 2000), offered generative models of how teachers and preservice

teachers learn within groups with similar interests, expectations, and agendas. However,

I chose to use Gergen's definition of relationships to highlight the matrix of relationships

that preservice teachers simultaneously engaged in at any given moment. This

framework offers a glimpse into the complexity of negotiating competing and often times

conflicting relationships to become a teacher.

Methods of Analysis

My content analysis of the entire data set yielded five major codes: Nonteacher

Identities (see Chapter 4), Teacher Identities (see Chapter 4), Relationships with Others

(Chapter 5), Discourse of Teachers (see Chapter 6), and Discourses of Teaching (see

Chapter 6). This chapter focuses on Relationships with Others. I define relationships

with others as talk about another person or persons as evidenced in repeated talk. I

continued my content analysis of the language data in the Relationship with Others (see

Appendix D) code to reveal two significant sub-categories of Relationships: Learning

Outside ETEP and Learning Within ETEP. Simply stated, the Learning Outside ETEP

category included family members, friends, and past teachers not connected to ETEP

experiences. For example, Katy routinely referred to her boyfriend as a relationship

outside of ETEP. Katy stated,

> I was stressed out planning…Donny and I got into a huge fight. Donny's like,
> "You can't get this stressed out. Your teacher doesn't get this stressed out." [I
> said], "Come on she's been teaching for like 20 years." [He said], "You always
> do really well." [I said], "It's because I plan for it. [If] I don't feel like teaching

I'm affecting 20 kids. If you don't, you just don't make as much money that day." I was really stressed out (Transcript, November 18, 2008).

Donny worked in business near Katy's hometown. In Donny's profession, if he decided not to work hard one day, his consequence was making less money. In Katy's future profession of education, the consequences were not less money, but students missing out on their learning. Even though Donny and Katy disconnected about the consequences of less time and stress commitment in their chosen professions, Donny's influence on Katy's learning was evident in her repeated talk about him. She referred to him in our conversations and signaled his importance in her decision-making as she learned to become a teacher. The category of Learning Within ETEP included university instructors, teacher education peers, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, field experience administrators and staff, and elementary aged students in field experiences.

To further explicate the link between language-in-use and relationships, I employed another building task question: "What sort of relationship or relationships is this piece of language seeking to enact with others (present or not)?" (Gee, 2005, p. 12) to pinpoint moments of generative tension or intersections of confluent relationships. These moments are represented in Natasha's language examples and signal influential moments of learning within and across relationships, or relational groups. Although not all preservice teachers talked as frequently about the same type of Relationships with Others, the themes described below represent the influence of relationships in learning to teach more so than the particular relational group.

To further investigate the relationships my participants discussed, I located examples of participant talk that included the pronoun "we" to signal relationships that had been cemented or bonded. Gergen states that cemented, or bonded relationships, are

signaled by the pronoun "we" in language use. "We" signals alignment and investment in the relationship through narration. However, "we" must be supported by time spent in the relationship to build a "we" worthy of a bonded relationship. Simply stated, I needed to triangulate the use of "we" to determine if the relationship being described was in fact bonded. This examination led me to pay close attention to how my participants used "we" to talk about the relationship bond between themselves as participants. We-statements, therefore, are similar to Gee's I-statements as described and used in Chapter 4, but they include the pronoun "we" as the subject. Burr (1990) defines we-statements in his work with families as "declarative sentences that try to locate tendencies, patterns, problems, thoughts, feelings, or other experiences in a relationship or a group" (p. 267). He further explains that we-statements are used to indicate joint investment in a situation and maintain emotional closeness. Thus, a relationship is signified in "we-statements," however, I was interested in only bonded relationships in this section of this chapter. Not all we-statements were representational of bondedness. Similar to Chapter 4, I have included we-statements for each preservice teacher that represented bonded relationships. We-statements are grouped by Relationship categories instead of predicate used since this chapter is focused on Relationships with Others.

<div align="center">*Natasha*</div>

In many of our small group and individual conversations Natasha described the influence of her family on her education. She was the first daughter to complete college and she took this achievement seriously. She spoke admiringly of her father's immigration to the United States and his value of education. Natasha also routinely referred to herself as an outsider to the more typical ETEP stories of time spent

volunteering in classrooms and family members as educators. Natasha did not have these experiences and often described herself as a "rebel" or a "square peg in a round hole." Due to her perspective of being an atypical ETEP student, she discredited her multiple month experience as an English teacher in a French elementary school. Her feelings of being outside the normal ETEP student experiences contributed to her strongly held views of teachers as professionals and students as capable, even when she encountered differing opinions. This emerging stance was evidenced in Natasha's final self-reflection as a Block A student. Natasha indicated that she too had come to think of herself as a professional teacher who viewed students as capable and credited her child study student Jose as bolstering her confidence as an "educator." Natasha wrote,

> *We did what he wanted, and because I was flexible, he was willing to do a few things that may not have been his preferred activities- either way, our time was productive, student-centered, and gave me some guidance and information to use in planning for the next meeting, or the next step. These are all things we've been reading and talking about, done by professional teachers who have had so much more experience in the field than I have, and I'm always worried about being able to meet the benchmark, and do the things they, as effective, reflective teachers- in the end (of this semester). I realize that not only am I capable of doing those things, but I want to continue and meet and help each new student as enthused as I am now, having this new insight and confidence after my invaluable time spent during my child study….In my gut, being able to take note of how far I've come in becoming an educator…(just being able to say that with confidence, me, an educator) I feel that I deserve an A (Block A Self-evaluation, December, 12, 2007).*

In the following section, I offer four examples of how Natasha learned to become a teacher within relationships that existed before she entered ETEP and two influential relationships she entered during her field experiences, practicum and student teaching.

Learning with Others Outside of ETEP: Family and Religion

Natasha's family was influential in her learning to become a teacher. She took learning seriously and often referred to her parents as co-learners in her university education. On April 28, 2008, Natasha shared, "I feel like my education is not just for me. I share things with them (my parents). The three of us get into arguments." Natasha's relationship with her family, her father in particular, was tight-knit and influential in her teaching decisions. She valued his upbringing, which included immigrating to the United States from Eastern Europe and learning English as a child. She felt fortunate and proud to be his daughter and spoke affectionately of him by routinely calling him "Papa" in our discussions. Partially due to Natasha's relationship with her parents, she applied to student teach near her parents and live in their apartment. Natasha was "excited to come home and live with them. I like to cook for them [and] go to church" (April 4, 2008).

Natasha's religious beliefs were also an important influence in her daily life. She continued to participate in major holiday celebrations with her family and retained a tightly knit relationship with her church community. During a conversation on August 22, 2008, Natasha told me about a late night meeting involving her mother and a particular member of her church who was also an educator in her student teaching placement school district. She related, "I sit next to him [in church]…On Easter we get out of church at like 2:30 AM, my mom had me talk to him…he asks me interview questions." Although Natasha knew this man's profession, she did not expect to engage in an educational interview conversation during a religious celebration. The merging of two seemingly distinct figured worlds result in a confluence of relationships.

In another example from Natasha's narratives, she described the tension she experienced when the relationships of her family, church, and student teaching placement site intersected. In the following narrative, Natasha related the conflict she perceived while engaged in a frank discussion with her parents, their priest and his wife, and a woman sitting at a nearby table. Natasha viewed this tension as related to her cooperating teacher Karen's perception that Sanderson Elementary "ears are everywhere." Natasha shared,

> Our priest and his wife live in the same apartments as my parents. It's two towers and they live in the next one. We were sitting at Caribou Coffee having a really liberal conversation, liberal for where we live. We're just really comfortable with him…we're sitting outside venting [and] there's this lady. And I was referring to how she (cooperating teacher Karen) talks about apartment kids and ELL kids and I was saying, "I'm an apartment kid and my dad would have been an ELL kid." We were talking about that and we started talking about race and signs in America and this lady's face was like [shocked]…and I don't know who this lady is but Karen says Sanderson [Elementary] ears are everywhere…don't let this [turn] into another red flag situation. Please don't let this come back to bite me" (Transcript, August 22, 2008).

In this narrative, Natasha's fear of being overhead and reported to her cooperating teacher stemmed from an incident in her practicum field experience. During her practicum placement, Natasha stated, "The week before spring break I got red flagged for professionalism" (April 4, 2008). At Midwest University "red flagged" is a term used to describe a form completed by faculty or staff addressing areas of concern for students in ETEP. These areas may include academic and intellectual characteristics, professional behavior, professional dispositions, and/or additional areas such as illness, depression, or substance abuse. In Natasha's case, she was "red flagged" due to a miscommunication about an observation. Natasha confided, "I was really embarrassed and terrified" (April

4, 2008). These feelings influenced many of Natasha's future actions and interactions with Karen and her University Supervisor Alice during her student teaching semester.

Learning Within ETEP: Field Experience Students and Teachers

Moje and Lewis (2007) posit that "learning is always situated within discourse communities or is about gaining access to communities" (p. 17). Discourse communities are defined as groups of people "not only face-to-face…but also ideational groupings across time and space" (Moje & Lewis, 2007, p. 16) used to access specific ways of acting, talking, or thinking. In other words, discourse communities are similar to Gee's notion of "'big D' Discourse" (Gee, 2005, p. 7) in which one participates in a certain way to be seen as a certain member of a group. For example, during a small group conversation with Ava and Mikayla on August 21, 2008, Katy stated, "whatever education did to me, I love children's books" in response to a discussion about beginning of the year preparations for their student teaching placements. The conversation continued with a critique of their cooperating teachers' classroom libraries, or lack of, the quality of the books, and their opinions about maintaining a classroom library in one's classroom. Each preservice teacher adamantly stated an individual classroom library was important in her future classroom and each was taking steps to procure books by asking for gift certificates to local bookstores and purchasing used books at garage sales. The discourse community of teacher as defined, or perceived to be defined, by ETEP coursework and field experiences was attributed as the reason for their positive stance on individual classroom libraries. Preservice teachers in ETEP learn to value items (i.e., children's books), words (i.e., "classroom libraries"), and actions (i.e., procuring

children's books) as they enter into the discourse community of teachers and learn to construct relationships as teachers.

Discourse communities of teachers are created before and during each ETEP course and field experience. Preservice teachers enter the ETEP already knowing that the discourse community of teacher exists since they have observed teachers as compulsory students (Britzman, 2003). They have already made decisions about who teachers are and what teachers do through constant observation and participation in classrooms. These lived experiences of teachers influence how preservice teachers define teaching and how teachers act and talk. In Weber and Mitchell's (2004) study of teacher image perceptions they found that people in educational and noneducational settings view teacher images similarly. Both groups rely heavily on media and popular culture to stabilize a "teacher" image. During the first class meeting of the fall semester of 2007 when the preservice teachers in this study were enrolled in my section of Block A, I asked each student to draw an image of a teacher. Many of the preservice teachers' drawings also relied heavily on stabilized images of "teachers" as portrayed in the media and popular culture mediums. They often included a large teacher's desk, a chalkboard with an alphabet frieze above it, a female teacher dressed in brightly colored clothing standing at the front of the room, and apples. On the final day of class, I instructed each preservice teacher to draw herself as a teacher then compare it to the first day drawing (Researcher Block A Reflective Notes). Some of the drawings did not alter while particular items took on new meanings. For example, Natasha told me, "I think of the pictures we drew [of teachers]…In my picture I drew the teacher holding the books but it wasn't the basal. I guess when I drew it I didn't realize the identity implied in the image"

(August 22, 2008). In this quote, Natasha compared the picture she drew of herself as a teacher holding trade books with the described image of her cooperating teacher Karen holding the basal. Natasha had previously informed me that she was adamantly opposed to the stabilized image of Karen as tied to the basal teacher's manual, and yet she remembered how the stabilized image in her own drawing portrayed a teacher holding a book in her arm. Although she viewed the teaching philosophies as contradictory, she acknowledged the similarity in the images and the relationships implied in the images.

Field Experience Student: Tommy

During Natasha's practicum field experience, she worked closely with a second grade boy named Tommy. The relationship she built with Tommy became influential when it intersected with her relationships with literacy and special education. Tommy was being pulled out of his classroom for additional reading support by a Reading Recovery teacher as well as working individually with Natasha on classroom reading activities. In one particular conversation, Natasha discussed her frustrations with Tommy's reading progress, her frustrations with the reading methods being used to instruct him, and his teachers' expectations for reading success. Natasha stated,

> He really struggles with the phonics thing…I'm just curious how much they want them to retell these books. Even if I was reading that book I couldn't retell each page. He's not getting it. I am satisfied with his retellings. I didn't even think about it…I get the fluency part: rereading [a] book. What's the point of rereading when not retelling? (Transcript, April 11, 2008)

In this example, Natasha was relating her frustrations with Tommy's fluency and retelling scores on an assessment tool used by her practicum school. Her perception was that Tommy was retelling a text with enough accuracy to comprehend the text, although his scores were not high enough to move to the next level. Tommy ultimately was

referred to special education for further evaluation, which frustrated Natasha. She stated, "I feel guilty about Tommy that he's going to leave and I won't have helped" (April 4, 2008). Natasha consistently worried about Tommy's lack of progress during her practicum field experience. She routinely discussed her work with him and her feelings of guilt mixed with pride. For example, Natasha shared, "I met his mom too…[my cooperating teacher said], 'This is Natasha; she works with Tommy.' He smiles. I almost cried. You think how much time we have with kids and we have no time" (April 28, 2008). The relationship Natasha built with Tommy informed many of Natasha's future teaching practices in literacy.

Field Experience Teachers: Karen

The preservice teachers in my study experienced tension when the methods they had learned in ETEP coursework were not emulated in their field experience classrooms. This was the case for Natasha. Her cooperating teacher during her student teaching field experience was a six-year veteran third grade teacher named Karen. Natasha's first impression of Karen was made via e-mail correspondence. Natasha stated, "She gave me her phone number and e-mail. I was really excited because she was a reading specialist and seems energetic. I'm excited" (July 9, 2008). Natasha anticipated a close working relationship with Karen that would include similar views on literacy instruction. Quickly after meeting Karen in person Natasha's views changed. On August 22, 2008, Natasha returned to State City to attend a student teaching workshop at Midwest University. After the meeting, Natasha and I met to discuss her first few days at her school placement. Natasha revealed,

> I thought I would be able to do more, and now I am not thinking that so
> much….The first day she said, "You must be so nervous because you haven't said

anything all day." And it's because I don't know what to say. I was nervous of how she would talk to the kids….she talks at me, at them. I just don't have any thing to say to her. I'm not comfortable asking her questions, I'm not comfortable asking her for advice because I don't want to be a teacher like her. I'm not interested.

The sentiments and frustrations voiced in this example carried through Natasha's student teaching semester. She continually referred to Karen's "condescending tone" as a point of tension as well as her consistent unease. Much of Natasha's views were related to the seemingly separate teaching philosophy Karen enacted. Natasha viewed Karen as "running a teacher centered classroom, not student centered" which Natasha envisioned herself enacting in her future classroom (see above Block A Self-evaluation excerpt). Nonetheless, Natasha's relationship with Karen impacted her learning to become a teacher. Often times Natasha would share a solidified view of teaching practices based solely on an opposing view of Karen's methods. For example, Natasha stated, "I don't know why I want so bad to be Whole Language. You (Karen) say it's bad, so I'm all about it" (August 22, 2008).

At the end of Natasha's student teaching field experience, she was hired to be a long-term substitute teacher for another third grade teacher, Chloe, on maternity leave. Natasha was both excited and nervous for the substitute teacher position. She stated,

I'm worried I am going to bring too much of Karen into the classroom…I'm worried I'm not going to be enough for the kids. They love Chloe…I'm excited… now I feel like I'm not doing what Karen wants me to do and I feel like I am failing and now I'm sort of worried…now it's a feeling of sort of not being enough, but I want to be (Transcript, November 18, 2008).

Natasha's relationship with Karen influenced her feelings of being a good teacher who is competent, knowledgeable, and able to teach as a long-term substitute. Layers of

miscommunication and doubt complicated Natasha's relationship with Karen. When Natasha's student teaching school principal Eric informed her that she had gotten the job, she shared, "Karen hugged me, we hugged, we haven't hugged…He said he had gotten a good recommendation from Karen and everyone else on the team" (November 18, 2008). Despite Natasha's opposing views of Karen's teaching philosophy and her interpretation of Karen's "condescending tone," Karen gave Natasha a good recommendation and helped secure her first long-term substitute teaching position.

Bonded Learning: Negotiation, Narrative, and Enchantment

Learning does not occur in isolation. Whether others are physically present or not, the ideational presence of a relationship influences and facilitates learning. Gergen (2009) asserts that three essential elements are required to cement relationships to create a bond between collaborators: negotiation, narration, and enchantment. Negotiation is the "co-creation of shared realities, and the comfort, reliability, and trust that accompany them" (p. 175). In other words, negotiation requires that relationships be bonded only when realities are co-constructed and valued by its members. The preservice teachers in my study bonded their relationships with each other by negotiating a shared reality, which occurred through three shared ETEP experiences mediated through language: Block A course discussions, other ETEP course experiences, and small group conversations as research participants. For example, Katy and Ava discussed the format of the discussions in Block A by comparing our discussions to those about larger topics like abortion.

> *Katy: I do give credit to you for setting up a classroom where it was okay to disagree. I think being able to do that helps the conversation and people. I know there were times were I disagreed, but I never felt like it hindered my relationships.*

Ava: Right.

Katy: Being able to really, really [discuss]. Like talking about one side of abortion. You never see both sides of it.

Ava: That's really important. That's where I'm like, oh I didn't see it that way, but I'm not sure my position has changed (Transcript, May 1, 2008).

This statement is an example of the relationship bond built through conversations through shared experiences, or realities, in learning. It is also an example of alignment and validation of shared ideas, values, and views that transferred to teaching. Ava established herself as invested in Katy's reality and the trust that accompanies it in a bonded relationship to disagree.

The second essential element in relationship bonding is narration. Narration is represented in two ways: the use of "we" in talk and time spent together to establish "we" use. This required me as researcher to recursively read we-statements in the data to establish the needed time spent to establish if the relationship was actually bonded by narration. For example, Ava and I discussed the differences she experienced between the time she spent with her student teaching discussion group and the time she spent with the other participants in my study. Ava explained that in our small group conversations they were able to

> bounce ideas off each other like what Natasha and Katy and I can do. [My student teaching discussion group is] more structured and it's less comfortable because only half the girls in the room I was good friends with. And everyone we know, but we didn't live at Linson [Hall] together" (Transcript, October 3, 2008).

In this example, Ava referred to the bonded relationship between Katy, Natasha, Mikayla, and herself through their long hours of living together in the education building,

participating in ETEP experiences on the Midwest University campus, and the continued conversations as research participants. However, Ava illustrated how she was not in a bonded relationship with the other "girls in the room" because she had not "live(d)" together at Linson Hall. In other words, Ava clearly highlighted the time commitment needed to establish a "we" through narration in a bonded relationship.

The final essential element in bonding a relationship is enchantment. Gergen describes enchantment as a co-construction of value, or worth, in the relationship by those involved. On June 12, 2008, Natasha stated, "Ava and I have some great conversations." This quote exemplifies the value of "great conversations" as co-constructed between Ava and Natasha. In the case of the preservice teachers involved in my study, bonding occurred over various moments during their ETEP experience, which began as a collective group in Block A. Their bonded relationships with particular members of the group continued to be cemented through small group conversations in my study. Gergen asserts that enchantment can occur rapidly if the conditions are supportive. Gergen uses the analogy of soldiers in battle. Although my participants were not soldiers involved in a life or death struggle, they did encounter dissonance that supported rapid enchantment in small group conversations. Each preservice teacher used affirming statements to align and support each other as well as refer to each other when not present. For example, Natasha referenced Katy, and Natasha's pride in their relationship, during an individual conversation with me. Natasha related, "I was so proud of Katy; I wanted to cry. I want to be in her school. I think she would make me a better teacher" (October 2, 2008). To be in a bonded relationship negotiation, narration, and enchantment are needed.

Bonded Relationships in Language: We-Statements

Language is a central tool in learning to become a teacher and cementing a relationship. Preservice teachers make meaning through language and relationships. We-statements are statements that use "we" to indicate a collective subject. Each preservice teacher used we-statements to signify relationships with others during her ETEP coursework and field experiences. "We" was used to indicate relationships with cooperating teachers, ETEP peers, friends and family members, and participants in my study. This section will only examine we-statements indicative of participants in my study since I am interesting in the relationships among and across the preservice teachers in my study. The following section is organized by each preservice teacher, which includes a collection of representative we-statements signifying bonded relationships with other preservice teachers, and a closer examination of the preservice teachers' negotiation, narration, and enchantment within this particular relationship.

Katy: We Are All Friends

Katy valued talk in her relationships with others. She viewed talk as an essential element to negotiate her bonded relationships with the other preservice teachers. On October 3, 2008, Katy described how our small group conversations influenced her learning to become a teacher. She stated, "I like to talk. I like others' point of view." This statement was typical for Katy to make through the course of our conversations. She regularly referred to our Block A conversations as influential in her learning to rely on herself as a teacher who could make sound decisions that may go against opposing opinions. In the following language example, Katy recalled the many conversations in Block A that contributed to her feeling secure in having a different opinion than her peers

or her instructor. In Katy's final self-evaluation for Block A, she wrote, "*I participate in discussions by questioning the readings and expressing my own opinions" (Block A Self-evaluation, December 14, 2007).* Katy continued to remember our Block A discussions as crucial in solidifying her professional confidence as a teacher when she stated,

> I know your class was based on our opinions. Classroom Management is her opinion only. I think I learned more in one day in Block when we discussed classroom management than in the whole [Classroom Management] class (Transcript, April 8, 2008).

Narration is another element in bonded relationships. In the above example, Katy indicates time spent together with other preservice teachers to solidify a time commitment essential to live the narrative of a bonded relationship. Gergen (2009) states that, "(i)f bonding is to be sustained, the narrative achievement of 'we' must be accompanied by relevant action…For many people, time is one of the most important demonstrations of bonding" (p. 179). Narration also requires that the pronoun "we" be used in language to bond a relationship. In the following examples of we-statements, Katy signals a bonded relationship with Ava, Natasha, and Mikayla through her use of negotiation (i.e., "friendship", "friends") and narration (i.e., "we", "haven't see each other for months").

> *Natasha's a prime example. We're not on the same page on a lot of our views but it never hindered our friendship.*
>
> *We (Mikayla, Ava, and I) haven't seen each other for months so it (the excitement to talk about student teaching) is all building up.*
>
> *We (Natasha, Ava, and I) are all friends.*

Each of these we-statements also demonstrates enchantment. Gergen asserts that enchantment involves co-constructed value in the bonded relationship. Often times, value includes emotional expression. Katy's above we-statements indicate a co-

constructed value in the bonded relationship by using the phrase "on the same page."

These we-statements indicate emotions, as well. Although Katy did not say "excitement"

in her statement, the smile on her face, the animated tone of her voice, and the hugs that

were exchanged during the recordings of the conversations convey enchantment with the

preservice teachers not evident in the typed version of the transcript.

Natasha: I Want To Do Things We Can Talk About

Natasha intensely struggled to define herself as a teacher during data collection.

She consistently used language to describe her insecurities as an elementary teacher.

Bonded relationships with preservice teachers were essential as she wrestled with

merging her seemingly conflicting relationships and identities (See Chapter 4). Natasha

often made statements about feeling like an outsider in her ETEP coursework, her

suburban hometown, and her field experiences. For example in an individual

conversation with me on April 28, 2008, Natasha shared, "I'm tired of feeling like, I feel

like I am really different and want to live somewhere where I'm not so weird." These

feelings of being "really different" followed Natasha into her student teaching field

experience and as she lived at her parents' home during this time. Bonded relationships

with other preservice teachers became influential and important during Natasha's feelings

of insecurity as a teacher.

Natasha negotiated bonded relationships by aligning herself ideologically with

preservice teachers becoming teachers. The following we-statements illustrate how

Natasha negotiated these relationships by co-constructing shared realities of becoming

teachers. Natasha used words such as "focused" to demonstrate this reality. Although

Gergen states that negotiation needs a co-constructed reality between participants,

Natasha was more intensely involved in "defining [herself] as [a] teacher" than any of the other preservice teachers. My analysis reveals that this is tied to Natasha's Discourses of Teachers and Teaching being tightly wound around the notion that "good" teachers always act in the best social, cultural, and political interests of students. Natasha did not observe these actions consistently in her field experiences, thus rendering an impossible ideal teacher and disillusionment of the teaching profession in general (see Chapter 6). Nevertheless, Natasha bonded her relationship with preservice teachers through comfort, trust, and co-constructed realities of their student teaching experiences. Narration was achieved in a similar fashion as Katy, through time spent together in Block A and other ETEP coursework as well as time spent in small group conversations. On October 3, 2008, Natasha shared that she explicitly thought about our small group conversations by stating, "knowing we're going to meet gets me thinking about what to share." This statement also indicates Natasha's use of "we" to include her investment through narration in a bonded relationship with other preservice teachers, as do the following examples of we-statements.

> *I want to do things that we (Katy, Ava, and I) can talk about.*

> *We (Ava, Katy, and I) geek out about teacher wonderment, even though we know you outside of class.*

> *We (Katy, Ava, and I)'re so focused on defining ourselves as teachers.*

The above examples also illustrate enchantment. Natasha expressed her emotions by stating that "we geek out" about knowing me outside of an instructor role and her desire to "do things that we can talk about" in our small group conversations. The second statement referred to Natasha's insecurity and frustrations with her student teaching

placement. These frustrations were voiced in our individual and small group

conversations. Each preservice teacher and myself were invested in Natasha's reality and

shared her emotional responses to her situation. On October 3, 2008, Ava asked me

about my observation in Natasha's classroom. When I asked if she was worried about

Natasha, Ava replied, "She just seems so upset each time I talk with her. Last time we

talked it sounded like she wasn't teaching." Ava's statement signals enchantment

through Natasha's emotional expressions in their conversations and the co-constructed

value in their bonded relationship.

Ava: We Started Thinking Differently

Ava valued relationships with people she could trust to respect her organized

ways. Ava prided herself on her ability to be and stay organized as well as her

expectations for support from others. In an individual conversation with me on June 17,

2008, Ava referenced her expectations of trust in a bonded relationship when she said,

> I love post its…it's what I use to write in my books even if it's my book and I
> know I'm keeping it…I don't want to take them out. I would want to look at
> them. Natasha has my Debbie Miller book. I don't know why, I don't just write
> in [my books]. If Natasha took them all out, which she would never do, I don't
> know what I would do.

Ava described negotiation in a bonded relationship with Natasha by trusting her to not

remove Ava's post-it notes in a borrowed book. Ava indicates the co-construction of a

shared reality where Ava makes reading notes on post-it notes and lends books to her

friends who value this practice. Narration in Ava's bonded relationship with preservice

teachers is achieved through time spent together in ETEP courses. Ava referenced the

extensive amount of time she spent with the other preservice teachers when she stated,

"Everyone we know but we didn't live at Linsen [Hall] together" (October 3, 2008). This

statement referred to Ava's peers who were in ETEP and student teaching at the same time she was, but were not in a bonded relationship with her. The following we-statements represent negotiation and narration through words such as, "like Katy said" and "we."

> *Like Katy said, we (Katy, Natasha, and I) have so much to say.*
>
> *We (Natasha and I) started thinking differently...now we haven't really talked.*
>
> *We (Katy and I) are good students, we are moving forward.*

Enchantment is also evident in Ava's we-statements. The emotional value of these bonded relationships is highlighted in the second example. This statement is in direct relation to the falling out that Gergen cautions can occur in bonded relationships. Gergen (2009) states that "suppression is highly intensified in the process of bonding" (p. 181). In the context of Ava and Natasha's relationship, suppression came in the form of seeing and talking less often during their field experiences. The falling out occurred during practicum field experience when Natasha encountered Tommy. As previously stated in this chapter, Natasha was upset that Tommy was referred to special education services. However, when she shared this concern with Ava, Ava was not concerned. As I discussed in Chapter 4, Ava's compulsory student experiences included a mother who taught special education classes and a sister who attended special education classes. Ava and Natasha had opposing viewpoints that were difficult to reconcile in person. So, they began to talk through me. When I would talk to Natasha, she would ask about Ava. When I talked to Ava, she would ask about Natasha. I became a conduit to maintain their bonded relationship.

Mikayla: We Were Quiet

Mikayla was laid back in her approach to teaching and she aligned herself with the preservice teachers' views when we met in a group. When I would meet with Mikayla individually, she would tell me that she did not actually agree. On May 13, 2008, Mikayla recalled the conversations in our Block A class by stating, "That's what was good about Block [A], everyone has different opinions. Even though I didn't agree with half of them." It was common for Mikayla to share her dissenting opinions with me during individual conversations, but not in small group conversations. For example, in the one small group conversation Mikayla attended, Katy, Ava, and Mikayla were discussing teacher dress. Mikayla used me as an example of professional dress. Mikayla stated that I usually wore a skirt to teach Block A, and Katy replied, "For me I wouldn't do a skirt but…" and Mikayla quickly replied, "I didn't mean necessarily a skirt" (August 21, 2008). This exchange is an example of narration, as are the listed we-statements below, but they are not examples of negotiation and enchantment. Narration is demonstrated in the use of "we" and the time spent together during our 16-week semester of weekly five hour classes in Block A implied in the following statements.

> *After the first week we (Block A students) were pretty well into it [class discussions].*
>
> *We (Block A students) were quiet.*
>
> *We (Block A students) rolled out of bed [and didn't dress up for class].*

Analysis revealed that Mikayla's relationships with other preservice teachers was not a bonded relationship. I believe this was due to one crucial factor: not enough time to establish narration.

Mikayla met only once in a small group conversation, which was mostly attributed to logistical factors. During her practicum field experience, Mikayla and I were unable to schedule an individual or small group conversation due to schedule conflicts. We were also unable to meet through the summer. Mikayla did meet for a small group conversation at the beginning of the fall 2008 semester due to a required student teaching meeting at Midwest University campus. However, Mikayla student taught in a nearby suburb 45 miles from State City. Ava, Katy, and Natasha student taught in suburbs over 300 miles from State City. Logistically speaking, Mikayla was unable to co-construct realities to build trust, reliability, and comfort required for negotiation. She was also unable to co-create the shared value and emotional connection needed for enchantment.

Researcher and Participant Relationships: Bonding Across Power Lines

As stated above, Block A was an influential experience for both my participants and myself. It provided the avenue to my dissertation by defining research questions, providing participants, and establishing relationships. After the course ended, the relationships built with Ava, Natasha, and Katy continued. Often times one, or more than one, would stop by my office to say hello or ask a question. As these chance meetings continued to occur, Ava, Natasha and I began to plan meetings at coffee shops. We would meet to discuss their experiences during practicum field experience and talk about teaching. Gradually, these conversations turned into my dissertation data and I began to meet regularly with Katy and eventually with Mikayla, as they each became participants. Through regular conversations I was able to construct bonded relationships with each preservice teacher. This caused our initial relationships to change and the power relations

to shift. Foucault stated in his final interview that relationships of power exist, "in human relations, whatever they are…power is always present: I mean the relationships in which one wishes to direct the behavior of another" (Fornet-Betancourt, Becker, & Gomez-Muller, 1994, p. 11). The shift in power relations faltered as my identities as an instructor who evaluated students to researcher who studied participants to friend who listened to friends blurred the boundaries between seemingly distinct identities. For Foucault when there is power, there is also resistance. Foucault posited that "in the relations of power, there is necessarily the possibility of resistance" (Fornet-Betancourt, Becker, & Gomez-Muller, 1994, p. 12). Power and resistance are not stagnant, but are forces that are fluid and always moving between and through people. The following examples of conversation between the preservice teachers and myself illustrate not only bonded relationships, but also the dynamic flows of power and resistance.

Negotiation and Narration: We Had Some Good Ones

As previously stated, negotiation and narration are essential elements in bonding a relationship. Since the preservice teachers were previously students in my section of Block A, we had already established a co-constructed reality of literacy teaching through a semester long course that met for five hours a week. Time was spent together in the university classroom to establish the trust, comfort, and reliability needed to have critical conversations about education and literacy instruction. Not all of these conversations were easy. For instance, Katy, Ava, and I recalled a heated Block A discussion about teacher dress. According to my Block A lesson plan reflections, we began talking about sexiness in female clothing choice and what was appropriate to wear to an interview, in a classroom, or at the bar. Natasha and Katy sat with their backs against each other each

day in class. As their instructor I noticed this, especially when topics emerged that each

had a distinctly different view. In this particular Block A conversation, they adamantly

disagreed. Katy viewed sexy clothes as appealing to wear to the bar and liked the

attention she gleaned from wearing them. Natasha viewed sexy, or revealing, clothes as

never appropriate. Ironically, Katy's daily uniform consisted of sweatpants and

Natasha's daily clothing was trendy. Both preservice teachers agreed they would not

wear a suit for an interview. The following exchange recalled this heated conversation.

> *Katy: I felt very comfortable counteracting [with Natasha in Block A discussions].*

> *Ava: That's what I remembered about Block A.*

> *Katy: The clothes.*

> *Ava: What?*

> *Katy: The day about the clothes.*

> *Ava: Yeah it was that.*

> *Anne: As an instructor, it was interesting because you had your backs to each other, but talking to each other.*

> *Ava: We all walked out and we were fine (Transcript, May 1, 2008).*

At first glance, this excerpt may appear to be an example of an unbonded relationship

when, in fact, it was bonded. Katy's first statement that she "felt very comfortable

counteracting" signaled the investment in the shared reality, which Ava affirms.

Narration is achieved through the use of "we" and the implied time spent establishing a

"we" through repeated and memorable conversations that challenged and engaged Katy

and Ava. Although Natasha is not present in this conversation, she has been inserted as a

participant in the memory, which further serves to establish a bonded relationship

between Ava, Katy, and Natasha. My role is positioned as an outsider and an observer, which after consulting my Block A lesson plan reflections, I was in that particular conversation.

In an individual conversation with Mikayla during her practicum experience, she recalled a meaningful conversation from Block A where I was a participant in the bonded relationship. We read *Girls, Social Class, and Literacy* (Jones, 2006) as a class to situate our discussions of identity and literacy. In Jones's book she takes a critical literacy stance in her teaching to problematize stereotypes of working poor students and communities. Jones provided a way in to talk critically about social class, education, and society. For many of the Block A students, like Mikayla, this was a memorable experience because it marked one of the first times Mikayla had critically reflected on her future classroom and her future students, such as Markell (see Block A in Chapter 2).

> *Mikayla: The conversation I remember the most was the Saints VISA commercial. It really opened my eyes to a lot of things.*
>
> *Anne: We had some good ones. I remember that one. For me it was the Jones book.*
>
> *Mikayla: I loved that book! That's where the conversation stemmed from. Coming in Block A was one of my first big ones (methods courses). Reading that book scared me at first. It's necessary, better than all kids will be alike. Instead look at it from the view of her, so much more meaningful instead of flowers grew by the window.*
>
> *Anne: What was scary?*
>
> *Mikayla: I thought school was like my school and that isn't true. It's an eye opener and I wanted to have it before I got into the classroom. I guess I was closed-minded before. I thought it was the way it was. Reading the book opened my eyes to a lot (Transcript, May 13, 2008).*

This excerpt also demonstrates narration in a bonded relationship. Through our whole group conversations about critical literacy, weekly face-to-face class time, and weekly written assignments both Mikayla and I spent the necessary time to establish a "we" in narration. I included myself in the Block A discussions as a participant instead of distancing myself as the instructor.

Enchantment: All of You Are So Interested in This Project

Enchantment is the third element in a bonded relationship. Enchantment includes co-constructed value in the relationship and often, emotional expressions. As previously stated, value in the relationship with my participants was partly established in Block A. Value increased through our continued meetings to discuss teacher identity and teaching experiences. Value was also evidenced in language through repeated references to my dissertation study and interest from each participant. Below is an example of Katy's interest and investment in my dissertation study as well as enchantment. The words "hope," "need," "loyalty," and "admire" signify enchantment.

> *Katy: I just hope we are giving you what you need.*
>
> *Anne: All of you are so interested in this project. It's great.*
>
> *Katy: Part of it is that we talked so much about being a good teacher in Block A. My feelings have changed. I know the three of us feel a loyalty to you. We admire you, we admire what you do, [and] what you teach. We value your opinions so I think having that like connection helps too (Transcript, October 3, 2008).*

This excerpt also calls attention to the blurred boundaries in feminist research relationships. As researchers we do not know what agendas our participants bring to the study context, but it is clear in Katy's statement that she was invested in the bonded relationships within and across the study. Her value of the relationships she built with me

and the other preservice teachers influenced her desire to participate in my study. By claiming a "loyalty" to me and placing "value" on my opinions, she signaled the power relations in our relationship. I represented an instructor, a mentor, and an experienced elementary teacher. Katy also stated her resistance by stating, "My feelings have changed." This statement was related to her ETEP coursework and field experiences since the conclusion of Block A. As discussed in Chapter 4, Katy's experiences as a teacher education student and student teacher influenced her views of teaching and teachers.

Chapter Summary

This chapter examined how preservice teachers become teachers by learning within relationships with others. Analysis suggests that intersecting relationships provided generative tension needed to produce learning moments. Learning within relationships was mediated through language used by preservice teachers. This language included the use of we-statements to signal bonded relationships. My language use was also analyzed to reveal how I learned to become a feminist researcher in this project. However, examining learning moments within relationships does not account for the dynamics of how learning is rehearsed and contemplated, and followed through with action. The supportive community of bonded relationships, and the confidence gained through these relationships lay the groundwork, but they do not tease apart the tensions that exist when conflicting Discourses intersect in educational contexts. When Discourse borders intersect, opportunities for agency exist. The next chapter will examine agency in the student teaching field experience classroom. I conceptualize agency as an

opportunity to take a risk and implement action that has been rehearsed and contemplated with others in educational contexts.

CHAPTER VI RECOGNIZING RISKS: AGENCY BY PRESERVICE TEACHERS IN
THE STUDENT TEACHING CLASSROOM

> *So I was telling my mom I am teaching with all of [my cooperating teacher's]*
> *stuff. How will I know if I am a good teacher? I'm not doing it now, so when I*
> *get into my own classroom I will sink. How will I know where to start? I have all*
> *these students that need different things. How will I know when too much is too*
> *much? I'm not going to know all this, maybe I'm not supposed to do this, maybe*
> *I'm not as creative as she is. She's still planning the day. Even though she's not*
> *creative, she's planning the day. She says Social Studies and mapping and my*
> *mind goes to, "How?" Before I am thinking "how," she already has something*
> *different than we did before. It's scary, and they get and love it. And I'm afraid*
> *they're not going to get it and love it with me (Transcript, October 2, 2008).*

Natasha uttered these concerns about knowing if she was a good teacher midway

into her student teaching field experience. Natasha's fears and questions of her

capabilities as a teacher came to a critical crossroad as she completed her student

teaching field experience. For many preservice teachers, the fear of not becoming a

"good teacher" manifests during the student teaching field experience (Fajet, Bello,

Leftwich, Mesler, & Shaver, 2005; Ng, Nicholas, & Williams, 2010). In Natasha's case,

she felt that the example of "teacher" performed by her cooperating teacher in her student

teaching placement school did not match-up to her Discourse of Teacher expectations.

Although the example frustrated Natasha, she was motivated to become a good teacher

through increased awareness of the educational context, repeated rehearsals, and

experiences with others in educational settings.

This chapter answers the question: How is agency demonstrated in the language

of four preservice teachers? I argue that risk taking, or agency, is intertwined in

identities, relationships and lived experiences, which can be traced through previous

moments of talk. In other words, I argue that agency is not an unexpected reaction or

isolated individual act, but a risk that has been contemplated and rehearsed over time through experiences with others. Critical sociocultural theory (Moje & Lewis, 2007) frames agency as "the strategic making and remaking of selves, identities, activities, relationships, cultural tools and resources, and histories, as embedded within relationships of power. At times, but not always, the relations of power themselves are disrupted and remade" (p. 18). In the context of preservice teachers becoming teachers this means that agency is related to remaking a professional identity to include Discourses of Teachers and Teaching by building relationships with teacher colleagues and using teaching materials. Simply said, agency is becoming a teacher.

This chapter begins by situating my study within the recent literature examining how preservice teachers demonstrate agency, or risk taking. I then describe my analysis methods for this chapter, Agency Tracing, and includes a definition of Discourse models and Discourse. I continue with language excerpts from moments when each preservice teacher took risks and trace the history of each moment of agency through language to earlier times in ETEP. I include examples of risks that were not fulfilled due to influential power relations with cooperating teachers. The chapter concludes by analyzing how my participants took risks with me as their former instructor and mentor.

Agency by Preservice Teachers

Teacher agency is not a new topic of study (Agee, 1997; Lasky, 2005; Pignatelli, 1993), and more recently educational researchers have broadened their spectrum to include preservice teacher agency during teacher education and field experiences (Ebby, 2000; Galman, 2009; Gurvitch & Metzler, 2009; Lloyd, 2007). Each study examined how preservice teachers demonstrated agency in classroom contexts to design curriculum

(Ebby, 2000; Lloyd, 2007) or take cognitive leaps when confronted with dissonance in educational beliefs (Galman, 2009). For example, Galman (2009) examined how 34 preservice elementary and secondary teachers negotiated dissonance in their university coursework experiences through story telling. Galman analyzed how preservice teachers constructed professional identities through "imaginative rehearsal" (Goffman, 1963; Mead, 1934) as teachers and reshaped their identities in response to new experiences and dissonance during teacher education coursework. Galman argued that dissonance is critical in teacher education coursework since it provides the catalyst for preservice teachers to take cognitive leaps and risks in becoming teachers. In another study, Ebby (2000) analyzed how 3 preservice teachers integrated coursework learning with field experience practices in mathematics curriculum to construct teacher identities. Ebby posited that teacher education methods courses and field experiences need to provide opportunities for preservice teachers to encounter dissonance, reflect on self practices, and offer opportunities for agency. Lloyd (2007) also studied preservice teacher agency in the context of mathematics curriculum. Lloyd examined how one preservice teacher negotiated a rigid curriculum by incorporating deliberate choices to implement her own teaching goals and interests. Lloyd argued that teacher education courses should provide opportunities for preservice teachers to adapt and design lessons as a strategic compromise to curriculum mandates.

Each study offered a view of preservice teacher agency that included opportunities to encounter dissonance, play teacher through "imaginative rehearsals" of teaching, and modify instructional strategies and tools to align more closely with personal goals in teacher education experiences. These are critical tenets that my data analysis

supports. However, the data led me to expand preservice teacher agency to highlight the importance of rehearsing classroom activities, such as imaginative rehearsals of classroom practices, to bolster professional identities through relationships with others that resulted in confidence and rehearsals of risktaking, such as implementing instructional tools and strategies, in the student teaching classroom. Thus, agency becomes a risk that requires rehearsals and contemplation of actions in specific social contexts utilizing the available social, cultural, and historical resources (Lasky, 2005). In the context of my study, preservice teachers took risks when they recognized opportunities to alter existing classroom practices that conflicted with their Discourses of Teachers and Teaching in their student teaching classrooms. The risk was a purposeful and thoughtful choice to act. Each example of risktaking I present in this chapter had been rehearsed, either by imaginative rehearsals in ETEP coursework, observed practices as a compulsory student or a teacher education student, or in conversations; they occurred with instructors, peers, and students. Each lived experience, or rehearsal, bolstered preservice teachers' professional confidence when considering possible options and outcomes of their actions before taking a risk.

An analogy to jazz improvisation is useful when conceptualizing my view of agency. Often small jazz groups do not read sheet music, thus appearing to create music on the spot, or impromptu. However, jazz musicians do not create music from thin air; instead, they use their acute awareness of the musical genre, their knowledge of the other jazz players, and their knowledge of the instruments' capabilities to create a fresh melody over chord changes of a known tune. Preservice teachers enact a similar improvisational style by using their emerging understanding of the educational context, or subject being

taught, and integrate their knowledge of the students with effective instructional tools or strategies. My nuanced view of agency aligns with Pignatelli's Foucauldain read of teacher agency. Pignatelli (1993) argues for teachers to create an alternate truth about themselves to acknowledge how teachers, students, and education are critically engaged and constituted within regimes of truth. This view of teacher agency suggests that within power relations, teachers make inventive responses to contested and problematic circumstances. Thus, agency, or risktaking, becomes an informed response in a recognized opportunity to take action.

Methods of Analysis

As previously stated in Chapters 4 and 5, my content analysis of the entire data set yielded five major codes: Nonteacher Identities (see Chapter 4), Teacher Identities (see Chapter 4), Relationships with Others (see Chapter 5), Discourses of Teachers, and Discourses of Teaching. This chapter focuses on Discourses of Teachers and Discourses of Teaching. I continued to employ Gee's work to inquire into how preservice teachers used language to reveal subcategories of Discourse models. Gee (2005) defines Discourse models as "the largely unconscious theories we hold that help us make sense of texts and the world …we tend to act on these assumptions unless something clearly tells us that we are facing an exception" (p. 71). In the context of my study, Discourse models are how preservice teachers talked about teachers and teaching in the "big D" Discourse way Gee described. Discourse encompasses ways of acting and talking that include perceptions of educational identities and activities developed through educational experiences. Discourse models influenced preservice teachers' own identities and practices in the figured world of education.

The questions I used were: What cultural, historical, or social resources were used to develop these Discourse models? How are these Discourse models being espoused in talk, written documents, and field experiences? How have these Discourse models been influenced by professional identities or relationships with others? This analysis revealed similar themes for both Discourses of Teachers and Teaching categories include: Lived Experiences Before Entering ETEP (i.e., informed by experiences as compulsory students), Lived Experiences During ETEP Coursework (i.e., informed by instructors in methods courses), and Lived Experiences During ETEP Field Experiences (i.e., informed by colleagues in practicum). These themes are similar to Britzman's (2003) first three chronologies of becoming a teacher as discussed in Chapter 4. I have chosen to contextualize my category names since my study examines how a particular group of preservice elementary teachers have constructed Discourses of Teachers and Teaching within the particular context of Midwest University. Although there may be similarities between the lived experiences of the preservice teachers in my study and preservice teachers in other contexts, I do not wish to generalize. I have also chosen to not use the term "chronology" in my categories since chronology denotes a linear time order; instead I have found my categories are recursive and intersect. Multiple lived experiences influenced preservice teachers to take risks in a similar fashion as the matrix of their relationships impacted their learning (see Chapter 5). In other words, lived experiences were not confined to a time order.

Within each theme of Lived Experience, analysis revealed similar codes for each Discourse category. For example, within the category of Lived Experiences Before ETEP, *Family members as teachers* was a theme in both Discourse of Teaching and

Discourse of Teachers categories. However, in the Lived Experiences During ETEP

Field Experiences *Teaching aides as nonteachers* was a code in the Discourse of

Teaching category, but not in Discourse of Teachers category. This was due to the

understanding that the preservice teachers worked with teaching aides who were defined

as "not a teacher." This is evidenced in Natasha's statement to me on April 4, 2008, "I

went to a resource teacher, not a teacher, but (the aide who) works the most with the

special education kids. I'm surprised that she doesn't have an education background."

I continued my analysis to locate dissonance, or moments of resistance, in the

transcripts by looking for tensions between Discourses of Teaching or Teachers. I found

Gee's questions about Discourse models to be useful in this analysis. In particular I used,

"Are there differences here between the Discourse model that are affecting espoused

beliefs and those that are affecting actual actions and practices?" and "Are there

competing or conflicting Discourse models at play?" (Gee, 2005, p. 93) to locate

resistance. Often resistance was accompanied by descriptions of action or expressions of

emotion and desire. I identified these moments as opportunities of fulfilled risk, or

agentic moves. I then used discourse analysis to historically trace each example of

fulfilled risk through the data to locate moments of tension about the same topic, or

episodes (Lewis & Ketter, 2004) in previous transcripts. Within each episode I organized

the language data chronologically from the most recent to the oldest. Then I reread the

data as a set to locate the particular language used to trace agency rehearsals. This is

method of analysis I have labeled Agency Tracing. An episode of Agency Tracing is

presented to trace an example of risktaking for each preservice teacher.

Risky Business: Preservice Teachers Demonstrating Agency

Each preservice teacher demonstrated agency during her ETEP coursework and practicum field experience. However, I decided to only share language excerpts that illustrate risktaking during the student teaching field experience. This is due to two researcher decisions. The first decision was methodological. Since I was interested in historically tracing how risktaking is contemplated and rehearsed through experiences with others, I needed to be able to locate preceding language excerpts in my data. Student teaching was the culminating ETEP experience for each preservice teacher and the starting point for analysis. The second decision was theoretical. I assumed that risktaking requires thoughtful observations and rehearsal over time. This assumption is based on my conceptualization of agency as risktaking, not as unrehearsed reactions to unexpected events. Holland and her colleagues (1998) offer a definition of agency that includes improvisation as impromptu responses to unexpected events in which no set response is in place. Agency, in this view, does not account for the acute awareness and understanding of context fostered over time to recognize an opportunity for action driven by a need for change. My view of agency does. I view agency as a conscious decision made in a recognized opportunity to make a change that has been practiced with others in similar situations. This nuanced view of agency allows possibilities for remaking identities, relationships, and relations of power (Moje & Lewis, 2007) in Discourses of Teachers and Teaching. It is my intention to present agency, or risktaking, as an increased awareness and understanding of the educational context linked to an intentional act. In the context of student teaching field experiences, preservice teachers have collaboratively rehearsed actions in theoretical (i.e., university coursework) and practical

(i.e., preceding field experience) settings to build an awareness and understanding of educational contexts and classroom practices that more align with their Discourses of Teachers and Teaching.

I organized the following section by individual preservice teachers and an episode of her risktaking. I begin by situating the location of the student teaching field placement in geographic and associative proximity to Midwest University. In my analysis I found that close ties to the university did influence how risks were contemplated. Then I situate the risktaking event in the student teaching field experience, present the risk, and trace the rehearsals and contemplation of the risk through the language excerpts. Each excerpt is underlined to illuminate the risktaking and rehearsals. Finally, I discuss the risktaking event and the preceding rehearsals.

Katy: Model Everything

Katy student taught in a first grade classroom near her hometown approximately 300 miles from State City. Although she was not in close proximity to her university peers and instructors, she still had connections to Midwest University. The secretary in the front office had a daughter who attended Midwest University, and there were alumni in the school building. This comforted Katy and she felt connected to her university learning and life at Midwest University. Katy had repeatedly described herself as someone who "need(s) to learn" (August 21, 2008). This stance translated into her willingness to learn from her cooperating teachers and elementary students during field experiences; her university supervisors, ETEP peers, and university instructors during her ETEP coursework; and her family and friends outside ETEP. She was excited to be in a first grade classroom in the community where her father had lived as a child. Katy stated,

I love it (my placement school). My dad grew up here; it used to be all Jewish. Now parents say they go to Jewish schools. Only one Jewish boy now, there's a lot of Pakistani students. I love it. [Diversity is] open, not an issue. I like being Jewish (Transcript, October 3, 2008).

Katy was eager and interested in learning from her student teaching cooperating teacher in particular. However, Katy's excitement waned during her student teaching experience for one particular reason: she felt that her cooperating teacher was "missing the knowledge part" (October 1, 2008) in her literacy instructional practices resulting in reduced student engagement. For Katy, "the knowledge part" meant that the activity needed to be connected to student interests and allowed for student choice. This both bothered Katy and led her to implement instructional practices, such as participating in classroom activities intended for children, to engage her students. Simply said, Katy took a risk and used language to describe it. Katy recognized an opportunity for taking a risk, daily written responses to books, and she implemented an action, writing a book response while her students wrote a book response. This was a risk because Katy departed from the normal routine in the classroom (Excerpt 1) and made an informed instructional decision to adapt classroom procedures to more closely align with her Discourses of Teachers and Teaching. Katy's Discourses of Teachers included, *Teachers who model activities and expectations, make learning connections with students, care about their students' lives inside and outside school, are creative and fun in classroom practices, get students' attention, and are reflective*. Katy's Discourses of Teaching included, *classroom practices should be modeled, motivating and engaging to students, reflective of students' interests, be hands-on and interactive, and incorporate student choice*.

The first language excerpt below illustrates Katy's recognized opportunity to take a risk and her actions. I have underlined what I have identified as the risk and the action

in Excerpt 1. The subsequent language excerpts (2-8) trace the risk historically through

the language data. Each trace in the language is underlined to highlight the rehearsal and

the contemplation.

1. *I try really hard to model everything. They read a book, then write a response [and] one day I tried it. <u>I wrote when they did and they all noticed</u>. They think it's so cool…I know my teacher has been teaching for a long time and she does a ton of great things, but I feel like if she would do some of the stuff with the kids they would care more (Transcript, November 18, 2008).*

2. *I am going to have to switch it up. She doesn't do anything to get their attention; <u>I want to start something</u> (Transcript, October 1, 2008)*

3. *<u>I had a really good practicum teacher</u>, [she] graduated from Midwest University, just like we learned (Transcript, October 1, 2008).*

4. *[My practicum cooperating teacher read aloud] should have been taped; she was so good at it. <u>She can make any book interesting to those kids</u> (Transcript, August 21, 2008).*

5. *First of all I'm not saying you need to think about everything, but <u>she put no thought into it</u>. There's no place to sit on, no separate carpet space. It just bothers me…it's really bothering me (Transcript, August 21, 2008)*

6. *I have learned more in that class (Block A) in general because you turned everything back on us. You asked, "What does that mean to you?" It really helps. <u>Instead of not agreeing, I think about why</u> (Transcript, April 8, 2008)*

7. *Honestly, participating in class comes naturally because I find the material we are learning fascinating. With that being said, I complete all my reading and think critically about the ideas being presented to me. While reading I often ask myself questions such as: <u>Do I agree? Do I disagree? How does this fit into my idea of a "good teacher" or How can I use/change this activity?</u>(Block A self-evaluation, November 5, 2007)*

8. *<u>Understand my own views on teaching and being able to exude them in my classroom</u> (Block A Personal Objectives, September 4, 2007)*

Instead of watching her students write a book response, Katy engaged in the

practice of writing a book response, thus modeling her interest and motivating her

students. Katy's Discourse of Teachers included *Teachers get students' attention*; Katy

determined this was possible by modeling a routine classroom activity, which aligned

with her Discourse of Teaching, *classroom practices should model activities and*

expectations. Katy experienced dissonance when her Discourses of Teachers and

Teaching intersected and conflicted with the observed practices of her cooperating

teacher. Excerpt 2 illustrates Katy's frustration with her cooperating teacher's existing

classroom practices. This example also served as a rehearsal of Katy's ideas since Ava,

Natasha, and I were present. Natasha had just shared an example of a lesson she taught

and her cooperating teacher's reaction that the students had been too talkative. Katy

replied, "At least they are excited about what they are doing". Katy's Discourse of

Teachers included *Teachers are creativ*e and her Discourse of Teaching included

classroom practices are reflective of students' interests. Neither of these Discourses was

observed in Katy's classroom. In the same small group conversation with Ava, Natasha

and I, Katy recalled her practicum cooperating teacher (Excerpt 3) as implementing

practices that aligned with Katy's Discourses of Teachers and Teaching, and served as

rehearsals of how to get students' attention. One such practice was read aloud (Excerpt

4). Katy viewed her practicum cooperating teacher's read aloud to be good because it

was interesting to her students.

Excerpt 5 illustrates Katy's dissatisfaction with her student teacher's room

arrangement and how students' interest, activities, and attention could be piqued through

classroom environment. Katy's frustration was voiced during another small group

conversation with Mikayla, Ava, and myself. Katy had asked Ava what she didn't like

about her student teaching placement classroom. Ava shared that the first day wasn't

planned how she would have planned it. Katy responded with Excerpt 5. Excerpts 6-8

all illustrate Katy's rehearsal of critically thinking about classroom practices in Block A. She credited me for "turn(ing) everything back on us" to encourage critical thinking and why certain instructional strategies or tools may or may not be effective (Excerpt 6). Excerpts 7 and 8 were written assignments Katy completed in Block A, a self-evaluation about participation in class and her first week personal goals for the course respectively. Due to critically thinking about classroom practices and if they "fit into" Katy's "idea of a 'good teacher,'" she contemplated the risk, to get her students' attention, and followed through with the action, to write with her students. Katy's risktaking had been rehearsed with others, Block A peers, practicum cooperating teacher, and myself, which bolstered Katy's confidence to take the risk and implement a new classroom practice, writing with her students, that aligned with her Discourses of Teachers and Teaching.

Natasha: Research Backed Instructional Practices

Natasha also student taught in a community near her parents' home approximately 300 miles from State City. She too lived with her parents (see Chapter 5) during her student teaching field experience. Unlike Katy, Natasha did not have university ties at her student teaching placement school. This contributed to Natasha's feelings of insecurity (see Chapter 4) in her teaching practices when they did not align with her cooperating teacher's teaching practices. As discussed in previous chapters, Natasha disconnected with her cooperating teacher during student teaching due to conflicting Discourses of Teachers and Teaching. One such area was literacy instruction. Natasha viewed her cooperating teacher's literacy instruction as worksheet based, not tied into students' interests, and unchallenging. Natasha stated that her cooperating teacher was "underestimating what (the students) can do" (August 22, 2008) signaling a disconnect in

Natasha's Discourse of Teaching. Natasha's Discourses of Teachers included, *Teachers challenge their students to think critically*, *implement Whole Language strategies, are classroom researchers, do meaningful work, encourage student diversity, and view students as having assets.*   Natasha's Discourses of Teaching included, *classroom practices should be open-ended for student reflection, incorporate student interests with real-world learning, based on classroom research, include opportunities for student talk, should reflect ETEP learning, and be open-ended for student interpretation.*

Natasha took a risk and implemented reading response journals, a literacy instructional tool, to challenge her second grade students in her student teaching classroom. Similar to Katy's risktaking, Natasha made a purposeful decision to alter the existing literacy practices in her student teaching classroom. The following 5 Excerpts are language excerpts from the data. The first excerpt is Natasha's action that constituted a risktaking event. The underlined portions highlight the opportunity and the risk respectively. The subsequent excerpts (Excerpts 2-5) are the historical traces in Natasha's language. Each excerpt has an underlined portion, which signals the rehearsal of the risk.

1. *Right now they have a workbook [where they practice] trace and slant. <u>Instead of doing that three days a week, why not write?</u> That's why I got the reading response notebooks…I didn't ask her (cooperating teacher) <u>I just said I was making response journals.</u> She said okay….[response journals are] research backed…I was reading the S & S book and they gave all the students a notebook. I had them (students) make them…right now they have a workbook [where they practice cursive writing through] trace and slant, instead of doing that three days a week, why not write? That's why I got the reading response notebooks (Transcript, October 2, 2008).*

2. *What I loved about practicum [was the] first book [of the day] was somehow related to science or social studies…<u>I am reading that whole language book you gave me. I never realized how politically charged it is</u>. The same day she (Karen) said, "The reason my son didn't read is because of Whole Language." [A]*

teacher [was] cleaning out books. I swiped a Whole Language book. Laura (practicum cooperating teacher) was doing all of that (Transcript, October 2, 2008).

3. *It's like research in the classroom. It's not formal, though it sounds formal when I read all these (Transcript, July 9, 2008).*

4. *I believe that the use of authentic literary materials, such as reading something interesting from the newspaper in the morning, or something authentic to their world- such as material related to their other subjects of study. In general, an overall holistic approach to language, and the overall curriculum allows students to discover those multiple levels of meaning, and for me as the teacher to use our time and their literacy skills more efficiently (Block A Reading Profile, November 15, 2007).*

5. *I definitely look critically at what my teachers, the public school teachers I work with, and those I read about do; I'm still very nervous, and worried, that I'm not going to be able to deal with the everyday challenges of teaching, which is probably not going to change, nor should it. I anticipated that we would have to write a lesson plan, like other methods classes I've taken; I'm thankful that we haven't been doing that because I feel that our work is so much more meaningful because of the way we approach it and learn to apply it. And we are learning to create lessons, mini-lessons, larger, more detailed lessons, times for whole language vs. phonetics focused, etc. so it's just not putting it into the form we've used before (Block A self-evaluation, November 2, 2007).*

Natasha recognized an opportunity for agency based on her need to engage her students in real-world literacy practices. Instead of continuing to implement low-level workbooks to practice letter formation that didn't engage her students, Natasha took a risk by implementing a new literacy instructional tool, reading response notebooks. Natasha understood that for classroom practices to be deemed valuable in her student teaching classroom, they needed to be backed by research, and reading response notebooks was one such practice. Natasha had learned about reading response notebooks during Block A (Harvey & Goudvis, 2000; Miller, 2002; Routman, 2003; Sibberson & Szymusiak, 2003) and had used them in her weekly child study meetings. In current education mandate times, many educators have adopted "scientifically based" research

practices, which has been narrowly defined by the No Child Left Behind Act as quantitative studies with random and control groups (For more details see Feuer & Towne, 2002). Natasha perceived her cooperating teacher's definition of research to be closely aligned with the NCLB act. However, Natasha's emerging definition of research was not; Excerpts 1 and 4 illustrate Natasha's preference for classroom research to support classroom practices, such as the Sibberson and Szymusiak text, *Still Learning to Read*, read in Block A. Natasha's definition of research as nonrandomized qualitative methods including classroom research, fit into her Discourses of Teachers and Teaching. Natasha viewed *Teachers as classroom researchers* as a Discourse of Teachers, as well as *classroom practices based on classroom research* as a Discourse of Teaching (Example 1 & 4). Natasha merged these two Discourses when she implemented reading response notebooks.

Whole Language, a research-supported theory, was a site of contention for Natasha. In her ETEP courses, specifically Block A, she was introduced to Whole Language as a theoretical approach to literacy instruction. The critical tenets of Whole Language, in particular accessing student interests and implementing real world literacy practices in classroom settings, resonated with Natasha's Discourses of Teachers, *Teachers implement Whole Language strategies*, and Teaching, *activities incorporate student interests with real-world learning*, as signaled in Examples 3 & 5. Natasha referenced her practicum cooperating teacher as aligned with these Discourses, and noted her practicum classroom as a site for rehearsals through observation. Natasha's weekly child study meetings in Block A were noted as rehearsals through practice. Excerpt 5 also illustrates Natasha's experiences in Block A as closely aligned with her Discourses

of Teachers, *Teachers do meaningful work*, and Teaching, *classroom practices should reflect ETEP learning*. Natasha's encounter with resistance to practices she deemed valuable led her to recognize an opportunity to take a risk and implement reading response notebooks in her student teaching classroom.

Ava: Organized Student Papers

Ava student taught in two distinct geographic locations: the United States Midwest and Southern Australia. Ava's U.S. placement was similar to both Katy and Natasha's placement: near her hometown, approximately 300 miles from Midwest University, and she lived at her parents' home. As previously discussed in Chapter 4, Ava experienced mixed feelings about her living arrangements. She appreciated the financial and domestic support of her family, but valued the privacy to lay "around on Saturday" and "do whatever [she] want(ed)" in her own apartment (June 17, 2008) without the pressure of parental expectations. Like Natasha, Ava did not have connections to her university peers and staff members at her placement school.

In Ava's U.S. student teaching placement she taught a social studies unit which explored the geographical regions of the United States. As discussed in Chapter 4, Ava was insecure about the social studies content and felt that she was "always so nervous at the end of the day because I don't know what I am doing [when I teach social studies]" (October 1, 2008). The nervousness and insecurity stemmed from "prepping so much" (October 1, 2008) for each social studies lesson, which provided an opportunity for Ava to take a risk. Ava's Discourses of Teachers included, *Teachers are knowledgeable, are organized and structured, have routines, possess content knowledge, and professional.*

Ava's Discourses of Teaching included *classroom practices should be creative, aimed to increase student knowledge, are organized, and establish routines.*

Ava's Discourses of Teachers and Teaching intersected with her own professional identity as a teacher, *Teacher as organizer.* Instead of feeling organized, secure in her content knowledge, and comfortable while teaching, Ava experienced nervousness and discomfort. Ava decided to take a risk by implementing an instructional tool, a souvenir scrapbook, so her students could organize the information learned in each region. The following episode is a historical tracing through Ava's language data of her risktaking. The first excerpt names the opportunity, social studies is uncomfortable to teach, and the action, scrapbooks, constituting the risk. The subsequent excerpts are underlined to trace her risk through rehearsals and contemplation.

1. *Social studies is the <u>most uncomfortable to teach</u>...and it's the last thing for me to start teaching...Do you want to see their <u>scrapbooks</u>? I really like these and they can keep it. <u>It's organized,</u> not a pile of papers (Transcript, October 3, 2008).*

2. *Well, she gave me something, a binder, [with a] class list, schedule (and) you know how <u>all my notebooks are all the same</u>...I'm getting used to it...<u>I need a routine so the kids need a routine</u> (Transcript, August 21, 2008).*

3. *I have to say <u>I am way too organized</u>...(my ETEP peers are) highly, highly organized (due to) juggling everything (Transcript, May 1, 2008)*

4. *It's really unorganized; we basically have three binders...we can't combine it ourselves (because) it would be more disorganized. I don't think it would help. Like in classroom management, when I used to follow along, I would say, "Where are we?" She would giggle and say, "I change (the Power Point presentation) from year to year, but I leave (the course packet) the same." <u>For my brain I need to go in an order.</u> You're not going in any order (Transcript, May 1, 2008).*

5. *Along those lines, I believe it to be very crucial to a smooth running classroom to have set routines for the day-to-day and week-to-week classroom activities. I think the schedule for the day and week should be displayed in a place easily accessible to all students. <u>I personally find it helpful to know what to expect for my day. It helps me to organize my thoughts and my goals for the day.</u> I think this goes for the majority of my students as well. It will also aid them in further developing their*

self-management skills because they will be responsible for following the pre-determined schedule. (Practicum Learning Environment Plan ePortfolio, May 2008)

6.   *I think it would also be more beneficial to my learning to spend more time on the readings and go through them better and study them more. <u>The time commitment is just not something I can do really though.</u> I wish sometimes that Block was the only class I was taking and <u>I could focus my attention</u> on only it and not my other classes and everything else. I would definitely be getting a lot more out of it that way (Block A self-evaluation, November 2, 2007).*

As with risks taken by Katy and Natasha, Ava took a risk by implementing an instructional strategy, scrapbooks, that aligned with her Discourses of Teachers, *Teachers are organized, structured, and have routines*, and Discourse of Teaching, *classroom practices are organized*. Also similar to Katy and Natasha, Ava's risktaking was rehearsed and contemplated through experiences with others in her ETEP coursework and field experiences. In particular, Ava had rehearsed organizational strategies as an ETEP student (Excerpts 3, 4, & 6) in her coursework and field experiences (Excerpts 2 & 5). One organizational strategy Ava had rehearsed in her practicum field experience classroom was a daily schedule, or a routine. Ava found this to be an important strategy for herself as a teacher, "to know what to expect for (the) day" and "organize (her) thoughts and (her) goals for the day," as well as for her "students" to self-manage their own thoughts and goals. As previously stated, Ava was placed in a kindergarten classroom for her practicum field experience. Typically, kindergarten classrooms post icons and words to facilitate reading the schedule. Ava's classroom was no different. The schedule served Ava's professional identity, *Teachers as organizer,* and aligned with her Discourses of Teachers, *Teachers are organized, structured, and have routines*, which did not offer the generative tension, or an opportunity, for Ava to take a risk.

However, Ava did find the necessary generative tension in her student teaching field experience classroom.

Ava's cooperating teacher had a sports themed room. This meant that many of the room decorations were sports-related. This bothered Ava for two reasons: she found the decorations distracting and she wanted student resources on the walls not decorations. After I observed Ava teach a social studies lesson, we discussed her classroom placement. Ava stated, "She really likes sports stuff. I think there is something to be said about a clean looking room with things up that are used as resources, not decorations" (October 3, 2008). Ava had described her placement classroom as having "stuff all over the walls and I am distracted and I don't get distracted" (August 21, 2008). She had shared this with Katy, Mikayla, and me during a discussion of what they would do differently in their student teaching field experience classrooms. Ava was not able to redecorate, or remove the wall decorations, in her student teaching classroom; however, she was able to implement scrapbooks to organize student papers when she taught social studies. By contemplating the risk of implementing an organizational strategy, scrapbooks, Ava took a risk to gain confidence, security, and alignment with her professional identity.

Mikayla: Working Efficiently

Unlike Katy, Natasha, and Ava, Mikayla student taught approximately 45 miles from Midwest University. She drove to the university campus for student teaching seminars, to use the university computer lab, and to visit friends. Many of her colleagues at her placement school were Midwest University graduates, so Mikayla's ties to the university were strong both geographically and professionally. Also unlike Katy,

Natasha, and Ava, Mikayla did not live with her parents during her student teaching field experience; instead she lived with her fiancé. Mikayla's geographic and financial independence may have contributed to her Discourse of Teachers, *Teachers spend too much time at their jobs*, and Discourse of Teaching, *classroom practices should efficiently use student work time*, as a profession where its employees are paid low salaries and spend "too much time" working. During Mikayla's practicum field experience she referred to teaching as "work" and a "job" in which she would earn a salary. This was unique to Mikayla in the language data. Mikayla reflected, "just realizing how much work it's going to be. But I'm okay with it, thinking I'll make 30 thousand and spending way too much time at my job" (May 13, 2008). Although Mikayla stated that she was "okay with it," she wasn't. Later in the same conversation, Mikayla stated, "My (practicum) cooperating teacher is swamped in paperwork. She says, 'Mikayla, it never ends.' She spends hours at school and I don't see myself doing that. You have to have a life outside of work." Mikayla's Discourse of Teaching as a "job" intersected with her Discourse of Teachers having "a life outside of work." This intersection provided a generative tension and an opportunity for Mikayla to take a risk and implement a timer during student independent work time. Mikayla decided that if she was to work efficiently in the classroom, so would her students. The way Mikayla took a risk was to set a timer, and her opportunity, "kids being slow," is highlighted in the first example. The subsequent examples trace Mikayla's rehearsals and contemplation of her risktaking with others. I have underlined the key phrase(s) in each excerpt to highlight the rehearsal and/or contemplation was described in her language data.

1. *I push these kids. I push them to their limits…<u>I can't get everything done because my kids work so slow. I set the timer</u>…one of my biggest challenges is the kids*

being slow they are obsessed with perfect cursive and not what we are doing [and] some [are] dilly dallying around (Transcript, November 12, 2008).

2. *Lastly, learning should be of upmost [sic] importance. Students who are disruptive in the classroom need to realize that there will be consequences, as their actions are unacceptable. It is important to figure out a management technique that works for the students as well as for the teacher. With a successful management strategy in play, the students will learn an abundance of material. When a positive learning environment is intact the students' will understand how important learning is to their teacher, there for [sic] may hold a higher regard for learning themselves (Learning Environment Narrative from Student Teaching, October 2008).*

3. *I think if I came in the spring they (the students) wouldn't know how I work. Coming in fall semester I can implement my plan where this is how it is from the beginning (Transcript, May 13, 2008).*

4. *It is very important to me to make learning fun. I want to make sure that in my classroom work/learning does not become a chore. I know that it is unrealistic to believe that everything in the classroom will be fun, but I think I can use my creativity positively in my classroom (Classroom Management Learning Environment, May 2008).*

5. *In my spare time you can usually find me planning my wedding. I am getting married in June and am getting a good start on the wedding plans (Parent Letter sent home in Student Teaching Placement, August 2008).*

6. *I like to get work done…as a teacher you need to learn how to cut back. [I'm] not willing to give up my life to do extras (Transcript, August 21, 2008).*

7. *Markell (child study student) keeps a writers notebook and many weeks I try to let him guide what we are going to be doing, as long as we are able to stay on task for the majority of time (Block A self-evaluation November 5, 2007).*

Mikayla took a risk by implementing a time management strategy, setting a timer, to ensure her students worked quickly during their independent work time. Like the preceding examples of risks taken by Katy, Natasha, and Ava, Mikayla had contemplated and rehearsed this risk with others. Unlike the preceding examples, Mikayla did not rehearse her risktaking with her practicum cooperating teacher by observing a similar technique or theoretical stance. However, her practicum field experience laid the

groundwork for her contemplation of efficiently using class time, which was crucial in her professional identity, *Teachers as having a life outside of work*, and ultimately her risk. Additional Discourses of Teachers for Mikayla included, *Teachers are classroom managers, grab students' attention, and are team players*. Mikayla's Discourses of Teaching included, *classroom practices should be hands-on, supplementary to core curriculum, and balance learning with fun*. Mikayla's upcoming wedding (Excerpt 5) also influenced her stance on efficient use of class time and her desire to have a "life outside of work." Instead of rehearsing her risk with her practicum cooperating teacher, Mikayla rehearsed her risk with a school-aged student (Excerpt 7), additional participants (Excerpt 6), and with me (Excerpt 3) in our small group conversations. Based on Mikayla's combined experiences as an ETEP student and a future bride, she was committed to developing classroom practices that enabled her to not spend hours at her job, as both of her field experience cooperating teachers did. Mikayla recognized this need, and took a risk to implement a strategy that would encourage her students to work quickly.

Preservice teacher agency manifested itself as implementing strategies and tools in student teaching field experiences. Each of the risks taken by the preservice teachers in my study was rehearsed through experiences when they were ETEP students in their coursework and field experiences. The rehearsals included talking, practicing, reading, and observing strategies or tools that aligned with their professional identities as teachers and promoted confidence for future actions. By rehearsing with others, preservice teachers contemplated the need for action and enabled them to recognize an opportunity

to take a risk. However, not all risktaking opportunities were followed through with action. These risks were unfulfilled.

Unfulfilled Risks: Power Relations with Cooperating Teachers

The preservice teachers in my study rehearsed and contemplated risks without fulfilling them. Two such examples, as described below, were related to power relations between preservice teachers and their cooperating teachers. In both instances, the preservice teachers decided to not follow through with their actions because they perceived their cooperating teacher to have something they wanted: teaching positions. In other words, preservice teachers perceived their cooperating teachers as essential in their quest to obtain full-time teaching positions after student teaching.

Natasha's unfulfilled risk occurred at the end of her student teaching field experience when she declined to write a negative evaluation of her cooperating teacher. As in the preceding examples of risks that were taken by preservice teachers, Natasha's unfulfilled risk can be traced through her language data. Unlike the preceding examples, I have organized the following language excerpts into stanzas to highlight how each preservice teacher "shaped her meanings" and "the meanings [I am] attributing to the text" (Gee, 2005, p. 136) to examine unfulfilled risks. I have also named each stanza, which is bolded above the stanza, to highlight the stanza topic focus and to serve as the language trace. Throughout Natasha's student teaching field experience, she repeatedly spoke of the many disconnects she encountered with her cooperating teacher. Natasha was vocal about her dissatisfaction in her placement classroom with regards to the tension she experienced when her Discourse of Teachers, such as *Teachers work for students*, and Discourses of Teaching, such as *activities incorporate student interests with*

real-world learning, clashed with her cooperating teacher's perceived Discourses of

Teachers and Teaching. Although these intersections offered Natasha many

opportunities for risktaking, she did not always take full action. One such instance was at

the conclusion of Natasha's student teaching field experience. A requirement of Midwest

University student teachers is to evaluate their cooperating teacher. This gave the

coordinator of field experiences an opportunity to view student teacher feedback and to

consider future placements in classrooms. The following stanzas illustrate and trace

Natasha's risk. The first stanza describes Natasha's risk and her final decision not to take

action, writing a negative evaluation. The subsequent stanzas illustrate Natasha's

rehearsals and contemplation with me during an individual conversation after I observed

a lesson in her student teaching classroom placement.

I Think I Have Gotten My Message Across
What am I going to do about it?
I'm not going to give her a bad recommendation.
I think I've gotten my message across.
I told [the assistant coordinator of field experiences],
[and my university supervisor] knows too (Transcript, November 18, 2008).

I Don't Want to Complain
I don't want to complain.
Even though we are different,
I won't give her a bad review.
I don't think she's a bad teacher,
kind of I do.
If she had someone else from Block A,
they may have loved her.

Who Am I?
Who am I to say she's a bad teacher?
I'm still learning.
She's not not doing her job.

We're Different Teachers
We're different teachers
and we do things differently.
It's an example of things I don't want to do.

I Know She Sees the Differences
She's doing her best
and that's all I can ask.
And yeah, she's doing her best,
and it's different than my best.
I know she sees the differences.
She's on her higher soapbox.

It Will Be Fine in the End
It's fine, yeah, I don't know.
I don't know. It's fine.
It will be in the end.
I will look back,
My mom says, "You can't have all good experiences."

My Way Is Not the Best
Even though it's practice for me,
it's not for [the students].
This is their third grade.
We have to get our jobs done.
That's why I am frustrated;
my way is not the best (Transcript, October 2, 2008).

This was an unfulfilled risk because Natasha declined to take the action of writing a negative evaluation. Instead of writing a "bad recommendation," Natasha decided to verbally share her dissatisfaction with the assistant coordinator of field experiences and her university supervisor. Although Natasha's decision to verbally share her frustrations was a risk, it did not make the same impact as a written evaluation. This decision was related to Natasha's upcoming long-term substitute teaching position in a neighboring classroom. Natasha knew that she would continue to work with her cooperating teacher in grade level and school meetings, and she did not want to risk the possible negative outcomes of a written evaluation.

Katy also decided against action when presented with an opportunity to take a risk in her student teaching placement classroom. Katy had the opportunity to reject a lesson plan that conflicted with her Discourses of Teachers and Teaching. Instead of taking action by declining the activity suggestion, Katy taught the lesson. The stanzas below represent Katy's opportunity to take a risk, her actions, and her frustration with herself as a teacher. I have not included additional excerpts to trace the language historically since earlier in this chapter I have presented Katy's dissatisfaction with her cooperating teacher's "missing the knowledge part" in activity selection.

It Wasn't a Fun Project
She gave me some thing,
an activity.
I thought it wasn't a fun project.
I could come up with something better.

Just Do It
She said, "The kids love it.
Just do it."
So I did.
And I kept getting "uh" from the kids.

It Made Me Feel Bad
It made me feel bad.
[There was] no [student] choice.
[The] kids said, "It's too hard."

I Was Mad At Myself For Doing It
In the end [the projects] looked terrible,
I didn't like it.
I was mad at myself for doing it.

We Processed the Activity
I brought them all together,
we processed [the activity].

Why Did I Have to Listen to Her?
Why did I have to listen to her?
I knew it wouldn't be any good (Transcript, November 18, 2008).

Like Natasha, this was an unfulfilled risk due to Katy's choice to implement an activity her cooperating teacher chose that she disapproved. However, Katy did take a risk by processing the activity failure with her students to incorporate her Discourses of Teachers, *Teachers are reflective* and *Teachers are creative*, and Discourses of Teaching, *activities incorporate student interests* and *activities include student choice*. Katy acquiesced to implement the activity due to her perception that her cooperating teacher could be a potential co-worker. Katy's cooperating teacher indicated that Katy would be a candidate for an upcoming long-term substitute teaching position. Katy replied, "That would be my ideal situation. What can I do?" (November 18, 2008). The potential for future employment was the reason Katy felt that she had to listen to her cooperating teacher's suggestion to "Just do [the activity]." Katy's interest in securing a long-term substitute teaching position in her student teaching field experience placement school influenced her decision to accept her cooperating teacher's activity suggestion, even though the activity choice conflicted with her Discourses of Teachers and Teaching.

Both Natasha's and Katy's decisions to not act on risktaking opportunities were related to the relations of power in the student teacher-cooperating teacher relationship. Each example illustrates how Natasha and Katy viewed risktaking, such as written negative evaluations and activity suggestions, as related to possible future repercussions. For Natasha, she wanted her long-term substitute teaching position to be a beneficial experience for herself and her students. Maintaining the appearance of a collegial working relationship was one way to achieve this end. Katy also viewed her cooperating teacher as a potential co-worker who could possibly influence her chances of future employment. However, Katy did not receive a long-term substitute position.

Risk Taking With Me as an Instructor and a Mentor

Each preservice teacher also took risks with me. This particular kind of risktaking was tricky since I represented many identities, such as, former Block A instructor, former elementary teacher, current researcher, older woman, and supportive mentor. In many of these identities, I was in a powerful position that may have resulted in more unfulfilled risks than completed actions. Because of the complexity of my identities, risktaking occurred most frequently later in the data collection time period. For example, during a small group conversation with Natasha and me, Katy described an instructional method called "turtle speak" that was utilized in her student teaching placement school as a decoding strategy. Students were to stretch out each letter sound, like a slow moving turtle, so that a student would read "cat" as "c…..a……t….." (each period represents a stretching of the letter sound). At first Katy was "weirded out" by this practice because she remembered our Block A conversations as against sounding out letters in words as an effective reading strategy. Ava, Natasha, Katy and I had discussed Whole Language practices learned in Block A, but they had not observed in their student teaching classrooms, hence Katy brought up the topic in our conversation.

> *Katy: We do this whole turtle speak. At first I was a little weirded out cause in Block A it was: don't sound out, don't sound out.*
>
> *Anne: You can. It just can't be all you do.*
>
> *Katy: Right…I see it working for some kids, but what's wrong with a kid looking at a book?*
>
> *Anne: Yeah that's totally not Whole Language. Why not read words in context?*
>
> *Katy: Right, it was interesting to see the other side (Transcript, October 3, 2008).*

This exchange between Katy and I illustrates Katy's risktaking with me as her former Block A instructor. The risktaking action was to point out that the "other side" of Whole Language practices was not explicitly presented in Block A. Katy's remembrance of effective reading strategies included meaning-based practices that did not include "turtle speak" or sounding out words. I quickly reminded her, and established my identity as her former Block A instructor, that sounding out is a valid strategy when decoding unknown words. This exchange also highlights Katy's rehearsal of "the other side" of Whole Language practices as observed in her student teaching field experience classroom. Katy also contemplated that "turtle speak," or sounding out words, could be an effective reading strategy because she had seen "it working for some kids."

Another example of risktaking with me occurred during my last small group conversation with Natasha and Katy. This risk occurred when Natasha resisted my advice about obtaining a reference letter from her student teaching placement school principal by changing the topic. Natasha shared her long-term substitute job offer and the details of the interview process with Katy and me. Katy talked about preparing for interviews by organizing her resume, collecting references, and writing her cover letter. Natasha continued the conversation by discussing her conflicted feelings about the long-term substitute teaching position at her student teaching placement school in Whorton, a conservative community, due to her perception that she didn't "fit there."

> *Natasha: I feel bad I don't want the job. I want the sub job, not a full time job. I don't fit there.*
>
> *Anne: You know what you should do, is ask the principal for a reference after the long term job.*
>
> *Natasha: Before I was thinking about charter schools.*

Katy: You want private don't you?

Natasha: Part of public school, there are private schools I want to check out. Public school is like the city; it's a machine. I don't know private schools seem a little more liberal, not liberal more freedom. Not religious [private schools] (Transcript, November 18, 2008).

This exchange is an example of risktaking because both Katy and Natasha implemented the action of shutting down my suggestion of getting a reference from the principal; in fact, they ignored my suggestion altogether. Instead, they wanted to discuss why Natasha was interested in applying to charter and private schools. Their conversation continued in the direction of applying for licensure, state license test taking, and ePortfolio assignments before I was re-included in the conversation when Katy asked me about job process timelines. My silence lasted almost four minutes. Although small group conversations typically did include long stretches of my silence, I read this as risktaking since I was shut out of the conversation after I had made a suggestion that I had thought contributed to the conversation. I was wrong. This is another example of how the power shifted between the participants in my study and myself as their former instructor and mentor as they gained confidence within their relationships and constructed identities as teachers.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter I have offered a nuance view of preservice teacher agency as risktaking. Risktaking is agentic actions that have been rehearsed and contemplated within relationships with others invested in education. Each rehearsal involved constructing a productive teacher identity to include observed and practiced teaching practices reflective of individual and collective Discourses of Teachers and Teaching. Contemplation of risks occurred through talk and experiences within learning

relationships to bolster the confidence required to act, which I have traced historically through the language data with Agency Tracing. However, not all risks were fulfilled due to power relations in the perceived dichotomy of preservice teacher and teacher resulting in frustration and dissatisfaction with self and others. Shift in power relations with me did offer opportunities to exercise agency and finetune productive professional identities as teachers.

CHAPTER VII CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This was a longitudinal qualitative study that examined how four preservice

elementary teachers used language to construct professional identities, learn within

relationships, and take risks in the classroom during their final three semesters in teacher

education coursework and field experiences. I began this study with three central research

questions:

1. How do four preservice elementary teachers use language to negotiate personal and professional borderland discourses to construct identities as teachers?

2. How does a confluence of relationships contribute to four preservice teachers learning to become teachers?

3. How is agency demonstrated in the language of four preservice teachers?

Each of my female participants was a former student of mine in the same section

of Methods of Elementary School Reading and Language Arts where we developed

rapport and established relationships with each other that revolved around our class

experiences, including many critical discussions about teachers, teaching, and literacy. I

employed feminist methods to maintain our established relationships by continuing my

participation in conversations and meeting with small groups of participants to develop

shared meanings of teaching. One over arching question that our conversations explored

was how preservice teachers negotiated conflicting Discourses of teaching when

coursework and field experiences offered new examples of teaching and teachers. We

discussed how these examples influenced each participant's definition of becoming a

"good teacher."

Over the course of 16 months, I met with each participant individually and in small groups. Each conversation was audio-recorded and transcribed and additional language examples, such as written teacher education course assignments, were collected and analyzed. My analysis included a content analysis using N*6 computer software and a multi-layered approach that combined my research questions with Gee's (2005) building tasks of identities and relationships and inquiry tool of Discourse models questions to further analyze the language data. This analysis yielded five overarching codes: Nonteacher Identities (Chapter 4), Teacher Identities (Chapter 4), Relationships with Others (Chapter 5), Discourses of Teachers (Chapter 6), and Discourses of Teaching (Chapter 6). I continued to employ several of Gee's Discourse Analysis techniques, including locating I-statements to link identity with language, and stanzas to organize particular excerpts of language. I also introduced Agency Tracing to reconceptualize agency as rehearsed through previous moments of talk. Analysis of my data indicate that my participants used language to negotiate conflicting Discourses of good teachers, effective classroom practices, and theories of education throughout their ETEP coursework and field experiences. Each participant used language to indicate that constructing productive professional identities and learning within bonded relationships bolstered their confidence as they negotiated conflicting discourses in ETEP coursework and field experiences. Language was also used to rehearse agency and to recognize risktaking opportunities in the student teaching classroom. Participants relied on the support of their peers and me, in bonded relationships, during our small group or individual conversations to contemplate risks and to make decisions whether or not actions would be taken to change the existing classroom practices. Analysis also

revealed that the existing definition of agency needs to be reconceptualized to account for the elements of rehearsals evidence by each participant. The first element of rehearsal is talk. The participants in my study rehearsed agency by talking with their peers and me in conversations about teaching. These conversations served as self-reflection of individual teaching practices and as encouragement to other participants. Often times, participants would refer to past conversations as inspirational and build professional confidence. For example, Natasha stated that Katy was a teacher inspiration to her and would "make me a better teacher" if they taught in the same school.

A closely related second element of rehearsal is supportive listening. Each participant utilized the individual and small group conversations as sounding boards to contemplate risks and reflect on classroom practices. During our small group and individual conversations participants would share influential classroom events and critically analyze these events within the supportive community of interested listeners. In individual conversations I served as the supportive listener, while in small group conversations each of the participants would listen and encourage the other talk.

The third element of rehearsal is frustration. Each preservice teacher experienced dissonance to the point of frustration while in her student teaching classroom. Observed classroom practices that did not align with her Discourses of Teachers and Teaching propelled each participant to rehearse risks. Instead of passively accepting these practices, each preservice teacher made a deliberate decision to implement classroom practices to better align with her Discourses of Teachers and Teaching. These decisions had been rehearsed through talk with supportive listeners who encouraged her to take action.

The fourth element of rehearsal is awareness of the educational context. Each participant recognized an opportunity for action due to her awareness of the classroom context, her perception of the privileged practices at her placement site, and the power relations in her classroom. Participants rehearsed practices that aligned with her Discourses of Teachers and Teaching in ETEP course and field experiences. These practices served to increase their awareness of what constituted effective teaching practices in elementary classrooms.

The final element of rehearsal is appropriate timing. After careful observation in student teaching classrooms, participants recognized opportunities to implement her actions. Appropriate timing enabled participant actions to produce desirable, successful, and effective classroom practice change that better aligned with her Discourses of Teachers and Teaching. Timing is also central in determining if risks are fulfilled with actions.

In the current context of federal curriculum mandates related to No Child Left Behind legislation, teacher reflection and decision making is constrained. Agency conceptualized as rehearsed is crucial to preservice teachers when encountering limiting restrictions of what constitutes effective teaching. This conceptualization of agency posits that agency is not random, nor reactive to unexpected events. Instead, I conceptualize agency as thoughtful, deliberate, and preconceived as evidenced in the language of my participants.

Recently, each participant shared that she continued to contemplate the meaning of "good teacher" in her current professional life. The "becoming" of a teacher was not seamless, nor did it end after graduating from Midwest University, receiving her teaching

license, and working as a teacher. The following section revisits each participant and her current teacher becomings.

<center>*Participants Revisited*</center>

This section revisits the women who made this study possible: Ava, Katy, Mikayla, and Natasha. As the study came to a close and participant talk ended, I was left to reflect on the hours and hours of talk. This quickly became a daunting task as I struggled to disconnect myself from the real women in this study and turn each woman into a character who I could analyze and examine in her becoming a teacher. As previously stated, this process took many months, and ultimately, a severing of relationships. Partly this was due to moving away, limited interaction possibilities, and busy schedules. I believe there was also relief on both sides, as well as disappointment that the data collection portion of the project ended and conversations stopped. However, the characterization of how these four women negotiated conflicting Discourses of teaching will continue to remind teacher educators and educational researchers how powerful this process can be. This section continues with a brief recap of each participant and her current teaching activities and the relationships we built through our many hours of talk.

Ava

Ava entered the ETEP program with a wealth of personal knowledge about teachers and teaching. Her mother was a special education teacher and her older sister had been in special education classes her entire school career. Ava's lived experiences influenced how she defined teaching, what she expected from teachers, and how she envisioned herself as a teacher. Ava's expectations for teachers were high, as they were

for herself as an ETEP student. Ava described herself as highly organized, and prided herself on her work ethic. In fact, during her Block A semester with me, she had mono but came to class each day. Ava refused to stay home because it would alter her routine. During the summer of 2008, State City was flooded, as was much of the Midwest, and Ava's daycare job closed for five days. Ava stated that when they called to inform her, she replied, "What am I supposed to do for five days? It completely threw me off. What am I going to do?" (June 17, 2008). Ava's need for routines, structure, and organization carried into her professional identity, and lead to her risk taking action in her student teaching classroom. When confronted with insecurity as she taught a Social Studies unit on United States geography, Ava implemented a souvenir scrapbook to organize the student papers they collected during the unit. Ava's risk taking action aligned with her professional identity and positioned her as a confident teacher once again.

Ava is currently not teaching full-time. At the end of her Australian student teaching field placement, she traveled through Australia for several weeks with other United States student teachers she met at her host school. When she returned to the United States and to her parents' home, she substitute taught in nearby school districts including the school where she had student taught. At the end of the school year, Ava's United States cooperating teacher encouraged her to apply for a vacancy in her student teaching school district. Ava did, but with much hesitation. She called me for a reference and explained that she wasn't overly interested in the position. It didn't seem like the right fit for her. Ava did apply, but she didn't get the full-time teaching position. Instead, Ava continued to substitute teach and work at the local hardware store she had

worked as a high school student on nights and weekends. She is currently contemplating returning to school for additional teaching endorsements.

Katy

Katy too entered the ETEP as knowledgeable about teaching, although her knowledge stemmed from working summers at an early childhood private day camp with her mother. Katy never spoke of her mother being a teacher however. Katy originally viewed herself as an early childhood teacher until her practicum experience in a fifth grade classroom. Katy stated,

> I always wanted early education and have worked with my mom at a private day camp each summer. I worked with fifth grade in practicum and I wanted to apply [full-time] to the day camp and couldn't. I realized I really like elementary kids (Transcript, August 21, 2008).

Katy had described herself as a big kid and immature because she enjoyed hanging out with the students she worked with in her job as an after school counselor at a local elementary school. These casual engagements with school-aged children offered Katy a conflicting image of herself as a teacher. Katy stated, "I think I have a hard time with relationships, friendships, mentoring. I knew that would be hard" (May 1, 2008). However, during Katy's student teaching she constructed a productive professional identity that balanced relationships with her students.

During Katy's student teaching, she applied for a long-term substitute position at her placement school. She did not get it, but she did continue to substitute teach in the surrounding areas of her parents' home, teach a Saturday morning class for gifted and talented students, and late in the spring semester she secured a long-term substitute position in her student teaching school district. Katy was disappointed in the limited

meeting times for the Saturday morning class since it lessened her ability to create a

classroom community and get to know her students. This bothered Katy since

relationship building was both a strength and an enjoyment for her. Currently, Katy is in

another long-term substitute position in a school district near her parents' house. Eight

days after entering the classroom, Katy completed report cards and lead parent-teacher

conferences. She says that more than ever she is reflecting on her teacher identity and

what teaching means to her. At this time, she has not married Donny.

Mikayla

Mikayla entered the ETEP as a laid back student who described herself as "in

high school I would tend to lead the group, but now [my ETEP peers] overpower me.

They are more of a Type A than I am" (November 12, 2008). Mikayla's comparable

laidback attitude transferred into her professional identity through her ease with

curriculum mandates and quiet acceptance of her student teaching classroom practices.

However, Mikayla was not satisfied with her cooperating teacher's amount of additional

time spent at school. Mikayla implemented a time management strategy in her student

teaching classroom to instill quick work habits in her student. Mikayla decided that if she

wanted to become a teacher, then she would implement classroom practices that would

allow her to have a life outside the classroom. Her personal life included planning a

wedding and negotiating the challenges of living outside her parents' home.

Mikayla's professional identity fit well within the Discourse of Teaching in her

student teaching placement school district. Soon after Mikayla's student teaching

experience, she worked as a substitute teacher and secured a full-time teaching position

for the following school year teaching in a Special Education Autism Middle School

classroom. Mikayla was the only preservice teacher in my study to actively pursue and secure a full-time teaching position. During the last individual conversation I had with Mikayla she discussed her plans, and asked my advice, for applying for full-time teaching positions in the surrounding areas near her student teaching placement school district. As previously stated in the findings chapter, Mikayla consistently spoke of her becoming a teacher as related to obtaining a full-time teaching position and earning a salary. Mikayla also married her fiancé during the summer of 2009.

Natasha

Natasha described herself as not having the same preservice teacher classroom experiences as her ETEP peers, due to her perceived limited time in classrooms as a volunteer or visiting a family member who teaches. This self-description contributed to Natasha consistently positioning herself as different than her peers, her teaching colleagues, and her parents' home community. Natasha negotiated her perceived differences to construct a professional identity that weaved her father's experiences as a school-aged immigrant with her own accomplishments as the only member in her family to complete college to view all students as capable learners. Natasha's professional identity conflicted with her student teaching cooperating teacher's classroom practices, which led to Natasha's implementation of an instructional strategy that allowed all students to be successful. Natasha also negotiated her seemingly conflicting identities as a server in local restaurants during her university coursework and field experiences and as a teacher. In a recent e-mail from Natasha, she suggested that she has found a way to integrate each identity in her daily life as a part-time substitute teacher and a full-time server by applying her "teaching experience" even as she trains peers in a restaurant.

As with all of the preservice teachers, Natasha substitute taught after her student teaching field experience ended. Although, Natasha had secured a long-term substitute position at her placement school before her student teaching experience ended. This served as both a source of pleasure and of disappointment. Natasha was relieved to be paid to work as a teacher and excited to work in a classroom, which more closely aligned with her Discourse of Teaching. However, Natasha was also disappointed to be working in her parents' home community and with her cooperating teacher since the position was in the same grade level. Natasha also continued to work at a local restaurant and eventually moved out of her parents' home to live with her older sister in the city, work in an up-scale restaurant, and volunteer in cooking schools and a private religious elementary school. Eventually, the volunteer hours turned into paid substitute positions at the elementary school. Natasha continues to balance serving, substitute teaching, and volunteering in local cooking schools.

Relationships through Conversations

Each of the preservice teachers credits our conversations as bolstering her professional confidence through self-reflection, constructing shared realities, and negotiating the constraints of learning to teach in another teacher's classroom. The relationships built and sustained through Block A laid the foundation for bonded relationships during their practicum and student teaching field experiences. By meeting together to process ideas, each preservice teacher contemplated and rehearsed agentic actions within our conversations. When I asked each preservice teacher to describe our meetings, as they would describe them to someone outside our group, each woman had similar yet different responses. Below I present each of their answers.

Mikayla: You can't call it talking. My chit chat with future teachers…[I see our meetings as] a time for me to tell you how teaching is going and the transition is going….before you were definitely my past instructor. Now you're someone I can share my experiences with (Transcript, September 25, 2008).

Ava: I tell people that you are doing your dissertation and…we're helping you do it, kind of. You're studying us. Then my mom or (my cooperating teacher) asks me what kinds of questions you ask, and I say, "We just talk. She doesn't need to ask any questions. We just talk about our experiences and stuff." Or to my physical therapist, she's near my age, [asks and I say], "I'm just going out with friends to talk about school." For us it's nice to talk about it with each other to see what Natasha and Katy are doing and also to get your, like I was talking about last night, your prompting questions (Transcript, October 3, 2008).

Katy: We feed off of each other. I was telling my sister, she's in regular classes and raising her had and wanting to talk, and in education everyone is like that. It's like a family talking. It's natural; we're all friends. It's a great way to learn and keep in touch. I have always liked school and I like to talk. I like other points of view. I think if it were just me, I would talk more at you I wouldn't get to reflect as much….I'm comfortable around you, I value your opinion, and I think having you around helps [when thinking about identity] (Transcript, October 3, 2008).

Natasha: I told my parents my teacher was coming and they think (my cooperating teacher) is coming. I tell them, "No, Anne was my teacher and she's doing this study and we're meeting with her and she is sort of a friend and there was a time when it's not so teacher centered." I don't know. It's three girls and we're meeting. It's helpful; it changes. Not changes, broadens my perspective and gets me thinking about it. And knowing we're going to meet gets me thinking about what to share and what questions will she ask and how does it pertain to my identity….The more we talk about it, it's helpful [to know] you're not the only one making a mistake. I think it's motivational too. I want to do things that we can talk about….none of us have an outlet. We could call each other, but to really talk with each other. It's a good source for thinking and saying it helps (Transcript, October 1, 2008)

In Mikayla's answer her perspective was geared toward her interactions with me since she participated in only one small group conversation. Mikayla also signaled my changing role and the informality of our conversations as "chit chat" when she states "you can't call it talking." In each of Ava, Katy, and Natasha responses, each referred to the other, and me, as resources when contemplating their experiences. For each

preservice teacher I represented multiple educational identities that focused our conversations to be both "teacher centered" and more personal identities to allow for conversations about nonteacher topics, such as food, boyfriends, and living arrangements. I did not represent solely an instructor or mentor, my role changed into a friend-like listener. The multiplicity of my identities and the confluence of our relationships both enabled generative data collection and limited it.

Implications

My study suggests implications for teacher educators, educational researchers, and researchers in general. The following section describes implications gleaned from the findings of my study. In the teacher educator section, I describe university teaching practices deemed effective by my participants. The educational research section describes recommendations for continued research projects based on unanswered questions from my study. The final section, researchers outside education, describes research implications that can be applied outside the realm of education.

Teacher Educators

Teacher educators who teach methods courses or coordinate teacher education programs can provide opportunities for preservice teachers to rehearse actions, contemplate their effectiveness, recognize opportunities for agency, and bolster preservice teacher confidence. Each of the following implications is designed to encourage preservice teachers to construct productive professional identities, build learning relationships, and recognize opportunities for agency in the classroom. Each of these implications requires that teacher educators take risks in their own classrooms for the benefit of encouraging self-reflection and risk taking by preservice teachers.

The first implication from my study is that teacher educators design coursework and field experiences to ensure that preservice teachers encounter dissonance while they are constructing professional identities. By providing opportunities to encounter dissonance in teacher education programs (Alsup, 2006; Galman, 2009), teacher educators can offer support to preservice teachers that foster professional confidence through in-class engagements with conflicting theories of education. Dissonant theories of education encourage preservice teachers to take a professional stance on topics that will directly affect their classroom practices. One way to encourage dissonance is through discussions of conflicting theories. Discussions can occur in university coursework, in small group discussions with field experience supervisors, or as informal talks throughout each ETEP experience. Teacher educators can begin discussions by encouraging self-reflection by students and themselves of student learning experiences as compulsory students (Fajet, Bello, Leftwich, Mesler, & Shaver, 2005; Ryan & Healy, 2009), reading professional articles, viewing or engaging in classroom practices, and critically examining theories associated with each experience. Teacher educators can use these experiences as a starting place to analyze varying Discourses of teaching in the university classroom, engage in critical examinations of practices, and form personal and collective understandings. However, this implication requires teacher educators to be open to student interpretations that may or may not conflict with their own Discourses. As evidenced in my study with examples of disconnect with Natasha and Katy, this is not an easy practice to implement. Nonetheless, teacher educators should take the risk of disconnect and encourage their students to construct individual and collective class meanings of effective classroom practices in their university programs. Katy made this

point when she stated that as a preservice teacher she, and her peers, wanted to be

immersed in the theoretical and practical discussions of education throughout her ETEP

experiences. She stated, "We want to be immersed in these things. I respected that we

were able to do that in (Block A)…and be able to back it up [as teachers]" (May 1, 2008).

Being able to "back it up" was noted by each preservice teacher as a critical element in

developing the professional confidence needed to implement agentic actions in the

classroom and construct a productive professional identity. In a recent e-mail from Katy,

she reiterated the importance of professional confidence in her daily activities as a long-

term classroom substitute as she continued to think about her teacher identity. Katy

wrote,

> *As I update my resume, tweak my philosophy, and administer ISAT tests I*
> *continue to go back to the discussions from both class and our other time*
> *together. The one thing I think about everyday is making sure I am confident with*
> *what I am teaching and how I am teaching it so I can defend my position to*
> *anyone, whether it be parents, kids or faculty….The most important thing was that*
> *we respected you, and you pushed us to think about teaching and what it meant to*
> *us (E-mail, March 2, 2010).*

A similar second recommendation for teacher educators is to establish a caring

and trusting environment that allows for students to disagree with their peers without

arguing or hurt feelings. This requires teacher educators to create a bonded learning

community that overcomes the obstacles of university life. Often times university

courses are short meeting periods that span over the course of several weeks intermixed

with additional student and teacher courses. In the case of seminars or small discussion

groups during field experiences, the meeting times may be less frequent, but meet for a

longer period of time. Either way, creating a bonded group of learners who engage in

building a shared reality of teaching is difficult in the university setting. It requires time,

shared experiences, and trust to bond a relationship (Gergen, 2009). One way to ensure bonding occurs is by making relationship building an immediate focus in the university classroom. The construction of a positive bonded learning community is a crucial element for preservice teachers to build professional confidence and construct individual understandings of teaching. For example, Katy and Ava related that a safe community was essential in a university classroom to encourage students to disagree about big topics in a constructive manner. All four preservice teachers took an additional literacy methods course, Reading and Writing Processes; however, Katy, Ava, and Natasha were in the same section of the course. Instead of an environment where each side of a topic was critically analyzed in a productive manner, Ava noted that this particular course environment was not conducive to disagreement, especially between Natasha and another student. Ava stated, "In Reading and Writing Processes we do have debates. Instead of being constructive, it gets mean. Natasha and another student were really going at it" (May 1, 2008). If preservice teachers are to construct professional identities in university coursework and field experiences, they need opportunities to challenge their own beliefs as teachers and receive feedback that fosters professional confidence.

A third implication gleaned from my study of preservice teachers is the need to increase awareness and understanding of educational contexts, so preservice teachers can recognize opportunities for agency in the classroom. Recognition of opportunities to act is a combination of increased awareness and understanding of educational contexts and professional confidence. For preservice teachers, this is a difficult combination to achieve if not fostered and supported by teacher educators who engage in the above practices. Teacher educators have opportunities to engage preservice teachers in activities

specifically designed to increase metacognitive awareness of educational contexts,

classroom practices, and recognize opportunities for agency. One way to develop these

skills is through dialogic discussion of modeled university teaching practices in methods

courses. This requires a reflective teacher educator who is able to accept and encourage

critical analysis of his/her own teaching practices. In my own teacher education

experiences in Block A, I intentionally modeled classroom practices that my students

read about in professional articles, observed in field experiences, and perhaps even

experienced as compulsory students. I use a three-pronged approach to model each

practice: explain what I will model by connecting the practice to their reading, I model

the practice, then I invite my students to process the pros and cons of the approach. For

example, when I introduce the reading instructional approach of shared reading in class,

my students have already read a chapter about shared reading (Fisher, 1998). I briefly

explain that I will model shared reading with the same material choice as in the reading, a

repetitive text all can see or big book, that my university students will join in with the

reading as the school-aged student do in the professional reading, and then we will

discuss the pros and cons of the approach. The final discussion usually entails

clarification of the approach including appropriate grade level, number of students,

material choices, and teacher decisions. I also model variations (i.e., overhead example

of more difficult text) of the approach and to elicit more responses from my students.

The final step of the demonstration ends with a request that each student attempt to

rehearse this approach with their child study student. My intention is that the modeled

approach and request for students to try it with a school-aged student offers preservice

teachers an opportunity to contemplate how a practice works by asking me questions

about my teaching decisions, observing the practice with the intention of using it, and processing the pros and cons of the approach when attempted on their own. However, like my first implication, this implication can also be a risk teacher educators are not comfortable taking.

The final implication for teacher educators is to provide opportunities for preservice teachers to rehearse agency through supervisory conferences after field experience observations. One way to foster agency rehearsal is for supervisors to view teaching as an emotional and critical endeavor. This requires university supervisors to listen to preservice teachers critically reflect on classroom practices observed and implemented during field experiences. In a similar fashion as the first two implications, supervisors must be willing to support preservice teachers' emerging theories of effective teaching practices and extend these theories with open-ended questions, such as, "What do you observe the teacher/students doing?", "What bothers you about this educational context?", "What do you think about the classroom practices?" These types of questions position the preservice teacher as being knowledgeable about educational practices and contexts, allow opportunities for preservice teachers to critically reflect and analyze classroom practices that may not be effective, and consider possible agentic moves to implement practices that are more aligned with emerging Discourses of Teachers and Teaching. This technique is not possible without the above tenets of self-reflective teacher educators and established supportive relationships that encourage reflection and critique by preservice teachers.

Educational Researchers

My study affords implications to educational researchers due to the many unanswered questions I am left pondering. My first unanswered question revolves around the participant demographics of my study. As white females in their early twenties, each participant fit within the national demographics of elementary teachers ("Status of the American public school teacher", 2003). I found this demographic group to be useful for a variety of reasons, including established relationships and representation of Midwest University ETEP population, but I wonder how preservice teachers who do not fit the majority demographics of elementary teachers use language to construct professional identities, learn within relationships, and take risks. This question is related to a recent comment made to me by one of my current elementary student teachers. When I asked each student teacher to share what s/he was most excited about in student teaching, he said he was most excited about being placed in an elementary classroom with a male cooperating teacher. He told me that he had not yet experienced a male elementary teacher in his ETEP field experiences. It would seem that having a same gendered cooperating teacher would be influential in his construction of a productive professional identity since the majority of United States elementary teachers include white females in their early twenties. Natasha reiterated this fact when she stated, "there's not a single (teacher type) similar except gender maybe" (June 12, 2008). Because all four preservice teachers in my study were women working with female cooperating teachers and a female researcher, gender was not a visible influence in their construction of a productive professional identity. How did my multiple identities limit

and enable the identities, relationships, and risks of my participants? How would these be different with participants who did not look or act like me?

Another unanswered question I am left wondering is how non-volunteers experienced becoming teachers in their final three semesters of coursework and field experiences. This question is connected to my unrelenting wonderment of who didn't volunteer and why they choose not to volunteer. I often assumed it was related to my above questions about how my multiple identities mirrored my participants'. Natasha also wondered about who didn't volunteer. The following exchange occurred during an individual conversation with Natasha. Natasha had just shared stories of other Block A students, participants and non-participants, as examples of who she would like to work with in a school and my recent researcher activities. As previously stated, each of my participants was invested in my research project and my research activities. The following exchange highlights Natasha's investment not only in participating in my study through her talk, but also her interest in recruiting additional participants who were "so different" than her. In particular, Natasha was interested in Megan's decision not to participate in my study.

> *Natasha: Who's different? I'm sure there is black to my white. Who's that? I think I should talk to Anne. I think that we are so different.*
>
> *Anne: Who?*
>
> *Natasha: Megan. I think she should talk to you. We're so different.*
>
> *Anne: That's a limitation to the study. If you do force someone to talk to you, is that useful? You never get truth, but something.*
>
> *Natasha: Whatever they show you.*
>
> *Anne: I would like to talk to people who are not volunteering. That's interesting as well. Who's not volunteering from Block A (Transcript, June 12, 2008).*

I too am intrigued by Megan's experiences of becoming a teacher, and wonder if her

experiences were similar or markedly different than the women in my study. I know that

she took similar ETEP courses because Natasha spoke of their shared course experiences.

However, I do not know how she encountered, interpreted, or negotiated conflicting

Discourses of teaching. Perhaps she didn't encounter conflicting Discourses of teaching.

And if she didn't, what does that mean? Does it mean she was not agentic and did not

take risks in the classroom? Does it mean that she didn't become a teacher? Are teachers

only ETEP students who encounter dissonance and take risks in their student teaching

classrooms? These are questions left unanswered, but I am interested in investigating in

future research projects.

I am also interested in investigating how preservice teachers define "becoming

teachers." The findings from my study suggest that becoming a teacher might mean

recognizing oneself as a teacher or as someone who teaches classroom lessons each day.

Mid-way through her student teaching semester, Natasha stated,

> Katy, Ava and I are so focused on defining ourselves as a teacher. We're so
> focused on that, but what is teacher? What is that one thing keeping us from
> finding it? We're all doing different things….but we're so focused on being a
> teacher. These people are people first, and it's just a job. We're, "We just taught
> a lesson." It's what they do everyday (Transcript, October 2, 2008).

In a recent e-mail from Natasha, she stated that she was no longer scared about not being

in a classroom full-time as she was during her student teaching field experience. Instead,

Natasha defined herself as a teacher even though she did not practice teaching daily in an

elementary classroom. Natasha worked in a restaurant full-time and substitute taught

part-time, and still defined herself as a teacher. Natasha wrote,

I think that was the scariest thing for me after student teaching—what if i [sic] don't want to be a regular classroom teacher...will i [sic] be doing a disservice to myself and to students? But now, even though i [sic] play with the idea of having my own classroom, i [sic] have used my teaching experience, and the type of teacher i [sic] want to be, or already am :)..and just have yet to hone those skill sets..that I'm not scared anymore...i [sic] know that i [sic] will use it one way or another, and even as i [sic] train peers in the restaurant, in my head, i [sic] find parallels to how this situation might arise in a classroom, or how could i [sic] have explained a process better (E-mail, February 24, 2010).

My study findings would support Natasha's reflection that being a teacher has much to do with recognizing oneself as a teacher, as well as being confident that one is a teacher. A full-time teaching position does not make one become a teacher; rather, it is a cognitive process of ideological becoming (Bakhtin, 1981) that constructs a teacher identity. So, where does teacher begin and end? Does one always remain a teacher? These are more questions I ponder as I consider my own identities and investments in this project. Am I a teacher? Will I always remain a teacher even though I now teach teachers? How does my student population affect my professional identity?

Researchers Outside of Education

My study also affords implications for researchers who study language and researchers in general. Findings from my longitudinal study of language call attention to the roles of language and time in redefining agency. Had I conducted a study which consisted of data collection over a few weeks, Agency Tracing through language would not have been possible. Because I chose to work with former students and had access to their ETEP written coursework over an extended period of time I was privy to how agency is rehearsed, contemplated, and enacted through language. This is an important finding for qualitative researchers who study agency because it illuminates how agency is not only on-the-spot reactions to unfamiliar events (Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner, &

Cain, 1998). Instead, findings from my longitudinal study illuminate that agency is a deliberate act that has been rehearsed through language and experiences. If researchers design studies that incorporate historical language data, agency can be traced as premeditated decisions to act or not act when opportunities present themselves.

An implication for researchers in general is a call to problematize our own investment in the research process and product. How we, as researchers, arrive at our research questions, find our participants, and implement our methods is heavily tied to our own investments and identities within the project, and ultimately the product of our research, the knowledge constructed through our researcher lens. My research study calls attention to the need for researchers to implicate themselves in their projects. If I had not known my participants, my project would not have yielded the wealth of language data I accessed. I would have spent countless hours building rapport and gaining access to their trust, and I may not have yielded such generative data. If I had not participated in our conversations as an interested listener, I also would not have gained access to the intimate details of how these particular women became teachers. As Katy stated in one of our individual conversations, research with unknown participants and unknown researchers makes data collection "a little more formal and it might be a little more sensitive" (October 3, 2008).

Another advantage to working with known participants is the multiple identities that I enacted during data collection. In a small group conversation with Natasha, Ava and Katy signaled my role as their former instructor and representative of their current self-reflective practices. The following exchange occurred between Ava and Katy when Ava declared that her supervisor's feedback wasn't what she wanted. Instead, Ava

wanted her supervisor to urge her to self-reflect on her own teaching in a similar manner

as I had during our Block A conversations. Ava suggested that I continue to act as an

internal mentor in her self-reflective teaching practices. For Ava, this caused frustration

with her supervisor's method of "feedback" that was more focused on what teaching

strategies she used and less on continuing a self-reflective stance about her teaching.

> *Ava: We want your input.*
>
> *Anne: Really? Like what? I don't want to be like your supervisor.*
>
> *Ava: You'll never be my supervisor….Your feedback isn't really feedback. It gets us thinking about what we are doing [as teachers].*
>
> *Katy: The thing about you is you value our views. You turned it around onto us so we would figure it out and you were fine with it.*
>
> *Ava: It should be about me and my teaching. (My supervisor) should be getting me to think about my teaching…her job should be to get me to think about myself, that's what you do. I hear stuff that you say in my head all the time (Transcript, October 1, 2008).*

If I had not been invested in the research subject, how my participants' became teachers,

or able to enact multiple identities then I would not have had access to this conversation.

However, my investment and identities in the project not only encouraged my

participants to have deep conversations, I was also credited with instilling the practice of

self-reflection as their former instructor. The multiple identities I enacted in my study

allowed me access, but it also limited access because I was seen as, "friend, teacher,

Anne" (Natasha, November 18, 2008). What specific limits I cannot know, but as I have

written in earlier chapters, my multiple identities caused friction for both my participants

and me. I do not advocate shying away from researcher investment; in fact, I do not

imagine that is possible in the research process. I do, however, advocate for researchers

to fine-tune their self-awareness to make visible the multiple identities and investments they bring to their research projects. This implication shadows calls for researcher transparency in critical sociocultural theory (Lewis, Enciso, & Moje, 2007) and building feminist alliances across power lines through bridgework (Carrillo Rowe, 2008) in cultural studies projects.

In Conclusion

In this study, I have examined the language used by four female preservice elementary teachers as they became teachers during the final three semesters of their ETEP coursework and field experiences. Not surprisingly their language indicates that becoming a teacher is not a seamless process from ETEP into the work force as a practicing teacher. Each preservice teacher encountered moments of conflicting Discourses of what good teachers do and say, and each preservice teacher took a risk by altering existing classroom practices in their student teaching classrooms. The analysis illuminates the need for teacher educators to examine their own practices to ensure that university teacher education programs provide opportunities for preservice teachers to construct professional identities and bonded relationships that enable risktaking in the classroom. Productive professional identities bolstered moments of dissonance in ETEP experiences and prepared each participant to recognize opportunities for agency, or risktaking. Through bonded relationships, participants and I acted as mediators for each other to rehearse risks. We talked for hours, acted as supportive listeners to each other, shared frustrations of existing classroom practices, fine-tuned our understanding of educational contexts, and learned to recognize appropriate timing to implement our actions. Analysis offered a nuanced definition of agency as a thoughtful and deliberate

decision when traced through my longitudinal language data. Thus, agency emerged as

rehearsed actions that result in thoughtful decisions to act in recognized opportunities of

dissonance.

APPENDIX A INITIAL INTERVIEW GUIDE

Guiding questions for each interview:

What are your views of elementary teachers?

What has influenced these views (i.e., teacher education program)?

What experiences in the teacher education program specifically influenced your views of teaching and teachers?

What teacher education artifacts/course assignments are memorable to you? Why

Tell me about your practicum/student teaching experiences.

Tell me how these experiences contributed to your views of teaching and teachers?

Do you see yourself as a teacher? Why?

What other influences would you name as significant in your views of teaching and teachers?

What kind of a teacher do you hope to be?

What is your philosophy of education?

APPENDIX B CONVERSATION DATA BY PARTICIPANT CHART

Participant	Conversation Format (IC=individual; SGC=small group)	Total Time Spent Talking with Participant
Ava	2 IC; 5 SGC	8 hours 48 minutes
Katy	4 IC; 4 SGC	9 hours 28 minutes
Mikayla	3 IC; 1 SGC	4 hours 58 minutes
Natasha	7 IC; 3 SGC	17 hours 24 minutes*

*Natasha and I met the most frequently at her request and the duration of each of our meetings was longer.

16 Individual Conversations; 6 Small Group Conversations; 22 total conversations

Total conversation time: 40 hours 38 minutes

APPENDIX C LAYERED DATA ANALYSIS METHOD

Layer 1: Content Analysis of all Transcripts with My Research Questions & N*6 Software
1. How do four preservice elementary teachers use language to negotiate personal professional borderland discourses to construct identities as teachers?
2. How does a confluence of relationships contribute to four preservice teachers learning to become teachers?
3. How is agency demonstrated in the language of four preservice teachers?

Layer 2: Discourse Analysis Questions Applied to Content Analysis & Triangulation with Researcher and Participant generated documents
1. What identities is this piece of language being used to enact?
2. What sort of relationships is this piece of language seeking to enact with others?
3. What Discourse models are relevant here?
4. Are there competing or conflicting Discourse models at play and whose interests are represented? (Gee, 2005)

Layer 3: Subcategory Discourse Analysis Questions within Each Category
Identities:
1. What cultural, historical, or social resources were used to develop these identities?
2. How are these identities being enacted in talk, in written documents, in field experiences?
3. How have these identities changed or remained constant?
4. What identities are described as professional, and what identities are described as personal?
Relationships:
1. How are relationships built?
2. How are relationships described as important?
3. What relationships are bonded?
Risks:
1. How have Discourse models been produced?
2. What constitutes a risk?
3. What risks result in action or unfulfilled?

Layer 4: Productive Generative Tension Questions within each Category
Identities:
1. Is there conflict, or "borderland discourse," between professional and personal identities?
2. What metacognitive growth results?
Relationships:
1. Is there conflict between relationships?
2. How do bonded relationships foster learning?
Risks:
1. Is there conflict between Discourse models?
2. Where are the tracings of the risk (rehearsals & contemplation)?

Layer 5: Organizational Techniques Based on Above Analysis for Each Chapter

Chapter 4:

1. Located I-statements (personal and professional) for participants and myself (3,315 total)
2. Coded as 1 of 5 types of I-statements (affective, cognitive, state and action, ability and constraint, or achievement)

Chapter 5:

1. Located we-statements for participants and myself (272 total)
2. Coded for "bonded" relationships ("we" + time spent) between participants and myself

Chapter 6:

1. Organize language into episodes of risk to trace rehearsals and contemplation
2. Organized language into stanzas to trace unfilled risks

APPENDIX D SIGNIFICANT CATEGORY OUTLINE

Teacher (Professional) Identities
1   Field Experience Requirements
        a. ePortfolio
        b. Observations
        c. Seminars
2   Field Experience Practices
        a. Lesson planning
        b. Teaching strategies
        c. Classroom management
        d. Last name use
3   Cooperating Teacher Talk
        a. About students
        b. About teaching

Nonteacher (Personal) Identities
1   Education Related
        a. College student
        b. Part-time/summer job
                i. Daycare worker
                ii. Camp counselor
                iii. Day camp counselor
                iv. Afterschool counselor
2   Noneducation Related
        a. Family member
        b. Friend outside ETEP
        c. Age
        d. First name use
        e. Religion
        f. Part-time jobs
                i. Babysitter
                ii. Server
                iii. Hardware Clerk

Relationships with Others
1   Outside ETEP Experiences
        a. Family
        b. Friends
        c. Religious Community
2   Within ETEP Experiences
        a. Block A peers
        b. Me
        c. Participants
        d. ETEP peers
        e. ETEP faculty/staff

      f. Field experiences
- i. Cooperating teachers
- ii. Colleagues at placement schools
- iii. School-aged students
- iv. University supervisors
- v. Administrators

Discourses of Teachers

1 ETEP Coursework Sources
    a. Faculty/staff instructors
    b. Me
    c. Curriculum Topics
- i. Professional readings
- ii. Professional videos

2 ETEP Field Experience Sources
    a. Cooperating teachers
    b. Colleagues at placement school
    c. Administrators as placement school
    d. University supervisors

3 Outside ETEP Experience Sources
    a. Compulsory students
    b. Family members as educators
    c. Popular culture
    d. Media reports
    e. Family friends as educators

Discourses of Teaching

1 ETEP Coursework Experience Sources
    a. Faculty/staff
    b. Me
    c. Curriculum Topics
- i. Professional readings
- ii. Professional videos
- iii. Written assignment
- iv. School-aged student interactions

2 ETEP Field Experience Sources
    a. Cooperating teachers
    b. Colleagues at placement school
    c. Administrators at placement school
    d. University supervisors
    e. Aides
    f. School-aged student interactions

3 Outside ETEP Sources
    a. Compulsory students
    b. Family members
- i. Educators

        ii. Noneducators

c. Friends

        i. Educators

        ii. Noneducators

d. Popular culture

e. Media reports

APPENDIX E SPECFIC PRESERVICE TEACHER CODE CHARTS

Table E 1 Ava Code Chart

Professional (teacher) Identities	Organized materials Daily routines Structured activities Knowledgeable about content Colorful wardrobe Dress professionally Perceives self by others as lacking professional knowledge
Personal (nonteacher) Identities	Perceived self as young Organized with materials Focused student Daycare worker Hardware store clerk Knowledge seeker
Relationships with Others	Family: mom, sisters Participants: Natasha & Katy ETEP peers: Block A & others ETEP Faculty/staff: Me & Instructors CTs: Practicum & Student Teaching Colleagues: Practicum & Student Teaching University supervisor: Practicum & Student Teaching
Discourses of Teaching	Daily routines to provide structure and ownership Increase student knowledge of content Classroom management Organized activities and materials Wall resources for students, not decorations
Discourses of Teachers	Possess content knowledge Creative in planning Professional mannerisms: on time and organized Organizers of classroom and students

Table E 2 Katy Code Chart

Professional (teacher) Identities	Knowledgeable about content, activities, and student interests Neutral, non religious Dress clothes Wears jeans Perceives self by others as lacking professional knowledge
Personal (nonteacher) Identities	Talker in person and e-mail Nurturing Notices small stuff: haircuts, clothes, etc. Kid-like actions Perceived as young Insecurities as student Wears sweat pants daily Day camp counselor Afterschool counselor Religious Future stay-at-home mother
Relationships with Others	Family: parents & younger sister Boyfriend Participants: Ava & Natasha ETEP peers: Block A & others ETEP faculty/staff: Me, Instructors, & Supervisors CTs: Practicum & Student Teaching Colleagues: Practicum & Student Teaching Administrators: Student Teaching
Discourses of Teaching	Model activities for students Explicit purposes for activities that are connected Motivate students by engaging student interests & choices Hands on activities Fun activities that engage students
Discourses of Teachers	Make connections about knowledge and purpose for kids Fun: engage in activities in and out of classroom with kids Caring Creative Reflective about teaching practices Collaborative student work on walls Wall décor must have student known purposes

Table E 3 Mikayla Code Chart

Professional (teacher) Identities	Time keeper during student work time Efficient in paperwork requirement Likes to get work done Not emotionally attached to students Teachers are workers Life outside work Not a babysitter Team player, quietly dissenting
Personal (nonteacher) Identities	Laid back, not as Type A as other ETEP peers Babysitter of young children Camp counselor Engaged and planning wedding Quietly goes along with the flow
Relationships with Others	CTs: Practicum & Student Teaching University supervisor: Practicum & Student Teaching Scholl-aged students: Practicum & Student Teaching ETEP faculty/staff: Me & Instructors Colleagues: Practicum & Student Teaching ETEP peers: Block A & others
Discourses of Teaching	Grab student attention through science or social studies Hands-on activities Supplement core curriculum Effective classroom management techniques Independent student work time for completing work Activities should be useful in real life
Discourses of Teachers	Too much time at job Paid small salaries Teaching is a job Teachers have it easy Cliquey like high school because of women in profession Collaboration with other teachers

Table E 4 Natasha Code Chart

Professional (teacher) Identities	Conservative acting Neutral, non religious Moral obligation to work as a teacher Engages in meaningful work Whole Language believer
Personal (nonteacher) Identities	Liberal acting and thinking Religious Server in restaurant Body tattoos Critical thinker Atypical ETEP experiences First major French; second major education
Relationships with Others	Family: parents, sisters Church: pastor, specific members Participants: Ava & Katy ETEP peers: Block A, Megan, & others in program ETEP Faculty/staff: Me & Instructors CTs: Practicum & Student Teaching Colleagues/administrators: Practicum & Student Teaching Aides: Practicum & Student Teaching University supervisor: Practicum & Student Teaching Struggling students: Practicum & Student Teaching
Discourses of Teaching	Whole language tenets: student interest, real world practices, & build on student assets Student talk in activities Promote critical thinking in students Open-ended activities
Discourses of Teachers	Reflective in practices: teaching and student interactions Moral role model Student centered, not teacher centered classroom and activities Nurturer to students Encourager of students

REFERENCES

Agee, J. (1997). Readers becoming teachers of literature. *Journal of Literacy Research, 29*(3), 397-431.

Allen, J. M. (2009). Valuing practice over theory: How beginning teachers re-orient their practice in the transition from the university to the workplace. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*, 647-654.

Alsup, J. (2006). *Teacher identity discourses: Negotiating personal and professional spaces*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Alvermann, D. E., & Heron, A. H. (2001). Literacy identity work: Playing to learn with popular media. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 45*(2), 118-122.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Beck, C., & Kosnik, C. (2001). From cohort to community in a preservice teacher education program. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 925-948.

Britzman, D. P. (1992a). Structures of feeling in curriculum and teaching. *Theory into Practice, 31*(3), 252-258.

Britzman, D. P. (1992b). The terrible problem of knowing thyself: Toward a poststructural account of teacher identity. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 9*(3), 23-46.

Britzman, D. P. (2000). "The question of belief": Writing poststructural ethnography. In E. A. St. Pierre & W. S. Pillow (Eds.), *Working the Ruins: Feminist Poststructural Theory and Methods in Education* (pp. 27-40). New York: Routledge.

Britzman, D. P. (2003). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach* (2 ed.). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Bucholtz, M. (2000). The politics of transcription. *Journal of Pragmatics, 32*, 1439-1465.

Burr, W., R. (1990). Beyond I-Statements in Family Communication. *Family Relations, 39*(3), 266-273.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.

Carrillo Rowe, A. (2008). *Power lines: On the subject of feminist alliances*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.

Carter, K. (1993). The place of story in the study of teaching and teacher education. *Educational Reseacher, 22*(1), 5-12+18.

Chong, S., & Low, E.-L. (2009). Why I want to teach and how I feel about teaching--formation of teacher identity from pre-service to the beginning teacher phase. *Educational Research, Policy, Practice, 8*, 59-72.

Clarke, M. (2009). The ethico-politics of teacher identity. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 41*(2), 185-200.

College of education teacher education program policies. (2009). Retrieved April 20, 2008, from http://www.education.uiowa.edu/tess/policy/tepstandards.html

Danielewicz, J. (2001). *Teaching selves: Identity, pedagogy, and teacher education*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1995). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 76*(8), 597-604.

Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Dowdell, D. C. (1998). A passion for jazz. Retrieved February 15, 2010, from http://www.apassion4jazz.net/improvisation.html

Ebby, C. B. (2000). Learning to teach mathematics differently: The interaction between coursework and fieldwork for preservice teachers. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education, 3*, 69-97.

Edens, K. M., & Gallini, J. K. (2000). Developing a discourse community of preservice teachers in a technology-mediated context. *The Teacher Educator, 35*(4), 64-82.

Elementary education methods practicum. (2009). Retrieved April 20, 2008, from http://www.uiowa.edu/~c07e174/description.html

Fajet, W., Bello, M., Leftwich, S. A., Mesler, J. L., & Shaver, A., N. (2005). Pre-service teachers' perceptions in beginning education classes. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 717-727.

Fecho, B., Graham, P., & Hudson-Ross, S. (2005). Appreciating the wobble: Teacher research, professional development, and figured worlds. *English Education, 37*(3), 174-199.

Feuer, M., & Towne, L. (2002). *The logic and the basic principles of scientific based research*. Retrieved February 24, 2010. from http://ed.gov/nclb/methods/whatworks/research/page_pg4.html.

Fisher, B. (1998). *Joyful learning in kindergarten*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Flores, M. A., & Day, C. (2006). Contexts which shape and reshape new teachers' identities: A multi-perspective study. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22*, 219-232.

Fornet-Betancourt, R., Becker, H., & Gomez-Muller, A. (1994). The ethic of care for the self as a practice of freedom: An interview with Michel Foucault on January 20, 1984 (J. D. Gauthier, Trans.). In J. Bernauer & D. Rasmussen (Eds.), *The final Foucault* (pp. 1-20). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Publisher.

Galman, S. (2009). Doth the lady protest too much? Pre-service teachers and the experience of dissonance as a catalyst for development. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*, 468-481.

Gee, J. P. (2003). *What video games have to teach us about learning and literacy*. New York: Palgrave/Macmillan.

Gee, J. P. (2004). *Situated language and learning: A critique of traditional schooling*. New York: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2005). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (2 ed.). London: Routledge.

Gergen, K. J. (2009). *Relational Being: Beyond self and community*. New York, New York: Oxford Press.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1975). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming Qualitative Researchers: An Introduction* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. New York: J. Aronson.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. New York: International Publishers.

Gratch, A. (2000). Becoming teacher: Student teaching in identity construction. *Teaching Education, 11*(1), 119-126.

Grisham, D. L. (2000). Connecting theoretical conceptions of reading to practice: A longitudinal study of elementary school teachers. *Reading Psychology, 21*, 145-170.

Gurvitch, R., & Metzler, M. W. (2009). The effects of laboratory-based and field-based practicum experience on pre-service teachers' self-efficacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*, 437-443.

Hall, S. (2003). Cultural identity and diaspora. In J. Evans Braziel & A. Mannur (Eds.), *Theorizing diaspora*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Harvey, S., & Goudvis, A. (2000). *Strategies that work: Teaching comprehension to enhance understanding*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.

Heller, M. F., Wood, N. J., & Shawgo, M. (2007). Teaching and learning language arts: From campus to classroom and back again. *The Journal of Educational Research, 100*(4), 226-234.

Hoffman, J., Roller, C. M., Maloch, B., Sailors, M., Duffy, G., Beretvas, S. N., et al. (2005). Teachers' preparation to teach reading and their experiences and practices in the first three years of teaching. *The Elementary School Journal, 105*(3), 267-287.

Holland, D., Lachicotte, W., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Holley, K. A., & Colyar, J. (2009). Rethinking texts: Narrative and the construction of qualitative research. *Educational Reseacher, 38*(9), 680-686.

Jay, T., & Janschewitz, K. (2008). The pragmatics of swearing. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behavior, Culture, 4*(2), 267-288.

Johnson, A. S. (2007). An ethics of access: Using life history to trace preservice teachers' initial viewpoints on teaching for equity. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(4), 299-314.

Jones, S. (2006). *Girls, social class, and literacy: What teachers can do to make a difference*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Kirsch, G. E. (1999). *Ethical Dilemmas in Feminist Research: The Politics of Location, Interpretation, and Publication*. New York: State University of New York.

Kirsch, G. E. (2005). Friendship, friendliness, and feminist fieldwork. *Signs, 30*(4).

Kondo, D. K. (1990). *Crafting selves: Power, gender, and discourses of identity in a Japanese workplace*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lal, J. (1996). Situating locations: The politics of self, identity, and 'other' in living and writing text. In D. Wolf (Ed.), *Dilemmas in feminist fieldwork* (pp. 185-214). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Larson, M. L., & Phillips, D. K. (2005). Becoming of teacher of literacy: The struggle between authoritative discourses. *Teaching Education, 16*(4), 311-323.

Lasky, S. (2005). A sociocultural approach to understanding teacher identity, agency and professional vulnerability in a context of secondary school reform. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 899-916.

Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern*. New York: Routledge.

Lather, P. (2000). Drawing the line at angels: Working the ruins of feminist ethnography. In E. A. St. Pierre & W. S. Pillow (Eds.), *Working the Ruins: Feminist Poststructural Theory and Methods in Education* (pp. 284-312). New York Routledge.

LeGreco, M., & Tracy, S. J. (2009). Discourse tracing as qualitative practice. *Qualitative Inquiry, 15*(9), 1516-1543.

Lewis, C., Enciso, P., & Moje, E. B. (2007). *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy: Identity, agency, and power*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Lewis, C., & Ketter, J. (2004). Learning as social interaction: Interdiscursivity in a teacher and researcher study group. In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Little, J. W. (2002). Locating learning in teachers' communities of practice: Opening up problems of analysis in records of everyday work. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 18*, 917-946.

Lloyd, G. M. (2007). Strategic compromise a student teacher's design of kindergarten mathematics instruction in a high-stakes testing climate. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(4), 328-347.

Luehmann, A. L. (2009). Accessing resources for identity development by urban students and teachers: Foregrounding context. *Cultural Studies of Science Education, 4*, 51-66.

MacGregor, D. (2009). *Identity formation--Influences that shape beginning teachers' professional identity--Crossing the border from pre-service to in-service teacher*. Paper presented at the Conference Name|. Retrieved Access Date|. from URL|.

McCarthey, S. J. (2001). Identity construction in elementary readers and writers. *Reading Research Quarterly, 36*(2), 122-151.

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self and society: From the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, D. (2002). *Reading with meaning: Teaching comprehension in the primary grades*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.

Moje, E. B., & Lewis, C. (2007). Examining opportunities to learn literacy: The role of critical sociocultural literacy research. In C. Lewis, P. Enciso & E. B. Moje (Eds.), *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy: Identity, agency, and power*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ng, W., Nicholas, H., & Williams, A. (2010). School experience influences on pre-service teachers' evolving beliefs about effective teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*, 278-289.

Ochs, E. (1979). Transcription as theory. In E. Ochs & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Developmental Pragmatics* (pp. 43-72). New York: Academic Press.

Orellana, M. F. (2007). Moving words and worlds: Reflections from "the middle". In C. Lewis, P. Enciso & E. B. Moje (Eds.), *Reframing sociocultural research on literacy: Identity, agency, and power*. Mahweh, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Phelan, A. M. (2005). A fall from (someone else's) certainty: Recovering practical wisdom in teacher education. *Canadian Journal of Education, 28*(3), 339-358.

Pignatelli, F. (1993). What can I do? Foucault on freedom and the question of teacher agency. *Educational Theory, 43*(4), 411-532.

Rasmussen, M. L. (2006). *Becoming subjects: Sexualities and secondary schooling*. New York: Routledge.

Rogers, R. (2002). Between contexts: A critical discourse analysis of family literacy, discursive practices, and literate subjectivities. *Reading Research Quarterly, 37*(3), 248-277.

Rogers, R., & Fuller, C. (2007). "As if you heard it from your momma:" Redesigning histories of participation with literacy education in an adult education class. In C. Lewis, P. Enciso & E. B. Moje (Eds.), *Reframing Sociocultural Research on Literacy: Identity, Agency, and Power*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Routman, R. (2003). *Reading essentials: The specifics you need to teach reading well*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Ryan, M., & Healy, A. (2009). It's not all about school: Ways of disrupting pre-service teachers' perceptions of pedagogy and communication. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*, 424-429.

Sachs, J. (2001). Teacher professional identity: Competing discourses, competing outcomes. *Journal of Education Policy, 16*(2), 149-161.

Sibberson, F., & Szymusiak, K. (2003). *Still Learning to Read*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.

Smagorinsky, P., Cook, L. S., Moore, C., Jackson, A. Y., & Fry, P. G. (2004). Tensions in learning to teach: Accommodation and the development of a teaching identity. *Journal of Teacher Education, 55*(8), 8-24.

St. Pierre, E. A., & Pillow, W. S. (Eds.). (2000). *Working the Ruins: Feminist Poststructural Theory and Methods in Education*. New York: Routledge.

Status of the American public school teacher. (2003).   Retrieved April 20, 2008, from http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/statushighlights.pdf

Student field experiences. (2009).   Retrieved April 20, 2008, from http://www.education.uiowa.edu/tess/sfe/InfoForStudents.htm

Walsh, K., Glaser, D., & Wilcox, D. D. (2006). What educaiton schools are teaching about reading and what elementary teachers aren't learning [Electronic Version]. Retrieved May 2008 from http://www.nctq.org/p/docs/nctq_reading_study_app.pdf.

Weber, S., & Mitchell, C. (2004). *That's funny, you don't look like a teacher: Interrogating images and identity in popular culture*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Whitmore, K. F., & Ticknor, A. S. (2007). Block A Handbook: University of Iowa.

Zembylas, M. (2003). Interrogating "teacher identity": Emotion, resistance, and self-formation. *Educational Theory, 53*(1), 107-127.