TENSIONS IN LEARNING TO TEACH: THE ROLES OF COMMUNITIES, MENTOR TEACHERS, AND TEACHER EDUCATORS IN PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' DEVELOPING CONCEPTIONS OF TEACHING

by

MEGHAN E. BARNES

(Under the Direction of Peter Smagorinsky)

ABSTRACT

In this study, I inquire into the tensions experienced by pre-service teachers (PSTs) as they develop conceptions of teaching during their formal teacher education and associated field-based experiences. Data for this study was collected at a large public university in the Southeastern United States as pre-service English Language Arts (ELA) teachers engaged in a Community Inquiry Project (CIP) meant to introduce them to the local communities as part of their teacher education coursework. The study is organized into three manuscripts.

In the first manuscript I draw on theories of place-conscious pedagogies, funds of knowledge, and teacher identity development to inquire into pre-service ELA teachers' developing conceptions of community as they engaged in the CIP. Findings suggest that PSTs' experiences with communities and schools growing up could limit their understanding of reciprocity between communities and schools as teachers, and their potential to take a funds of knowledge approach to teaching.

In the second manuscript I draw on theoretical approaches to teacher identity development and care in teaching as I inquire into the ways that one PST's personal experiences

with and expectations for teaching conflicted with those of his Mentor Teacher during student teaching, potentially contributing to the PST's choice to leave teaching altogether. Findings suggest that teacher educators should encourage PSTs to reflect on their expectations of the mentor relationship and to interrogate their own expectations and definitions of care as they complete student teaching.

In the third manuscript I take the stance of a teacher-researcher to analyze the specific documents and tasks used to introduce PSTs to the CIP. I draw on sociocultural approaches to teacher development and literature on experiential education in teacher education to provide a background for the CIP and respective study and offer critical whiteness studies as an appropriate lens through which to analyze the various elements of the CIP. Findings suggest that the CIP limited PSTs' characterizations of community, understandings of sociocultural approaches to learning, relationships to the community, and perceptions of the role of community in teaching.

INDEX WORDS: teacher development, experiential learning, sociocultural theory, teacher education, community literacy

TENSIONS IN LEARNING TO TEACH: THE ROLES OF COMMUNITIES, MENTOR TEACHERS, AND TEACHER EDUCATORS IN PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' DEVELOPING CONCEPTIONS OF TEACHING

by

MEGHAN E. BARNES

BA, The University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, 2007

MAT, The University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, 2008

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2017

TENSIONS IN LEARNING TO TEACH: THE ROLES OF COMMUNITIES, MENTOR TEACHERS, AND TEACHER EDUCATORS IN PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' DEVELOPING CONCEPTIONS OF TEACHING

by

MEGHAN E. BARNES

Major Professor:	Peter Smagorinsky
Committee:	Kathryn Roulston
	Kevin Burke

Electronic Version Approved:

Suzanne Barbour
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2017

DEDICATION

To a dad who always asks the questions I don't want to answer, a mom who challenges me to always see the good in people, a younger sister I'd like to become when I grow up, and a dog who has seen me at my worst and somehow loves me anyways.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I could never have done this on my own. Every person who has touched my life has in some way shaped this dissertation, and for all of them I'm thankful. In particular, I want to acknowledge the following folks.

Peter Smagorinsky, my academic pop, who helped me develop a pretty thick skin over the past few years, pushed me to think harder, and taught me that the secret to being a productive writer is to "just write."

Kevin Burke whose energy, enthusiasm, criticality, and innovative thinking about communities and schools has pushed me to seek out new possibilities for research and teaching.

Kathy Roulston who would listen to me chatter away about my ideas and then recommend a book that helped me turn that chatter into something that made sense, and eventually turned into a dissertation.

All the pre-service teachers who gave time they didn't have to talk to me about what they were learning and experiencing during teacher education.

Stephanie Shelton and Michelle Falter who taught me how to be a doctoral student, how to do research, how to write, how to teach, how to present, and how to be sane. And who always had a coat for me when I was cold.

Kevin Sweat for listening, encouraging, patience, and laughter when I needed it most.

My friends who listened to me, gave me feedback, and otherwise put up with me for the past four years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Introduction to Context

Teachers learn how to teach and practice teaching within a series of "nested and interconnected milieus" (Clandinin, J. Huber, M. Huber, Murphy, Orr, Pearce, & Steeves, 2006, p. 29). These interconnected contexts include teachers' personal practical knowledge, or their own sense of who they are as a teacher and person, and the professional knowledge landscape, the broader contexts of education that include administrators, policy-makers, parents, as well as historical and social factors, among others.

Often the "interconnected milieus" can be tense spaces for pre-service and novice teachers, in particular, as they are pushed and pulled in multiple and often conflicting directions. While not singularly influential (Barnes & Smagorinsky, 2016; Smagorinsky & Barnes, 2014), the apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975), the years teachers spend in classrooms as students themselves, plays a central role in the development of the teacher's personal practical knowledge and the expectations they have of their students, schools, and teaching. Those experiences pre-service teachers (PSTs) bring with them from the apprenticeship of observation may contribute to singular approaches to teaching that may serve some students better than others (Sleeter, 2008). Teachers must negotiate their apprenticeship of observation, their own personal goals for teaching, and the perceived needs of their students into a professional knowledge landscape that is often guided by the work and priorities of policy- and test-makers, school and district-based administrators, and community members, including parents.

In this dissertation, my aim was to inquire into the tensions among PSTs' experiences both before and during teacher education, PSTs' expectations of teacher education, PSTs' developing conceptions of teaching, and my own experiences as a teacher, teacher educator, and researcher. I begin this introduction by providing an overview of the landscape of U. S. schools and then provide a brief literature review of the ways that teacher education programs are trying to prepare PSTs to work in U. S. schools. Next, I discuss the problem that shaped my research as well as the underpinning theoretical and conceptual frameworks of the study. I drew on these frameworks to design a research methodology that allowed me to inquire into the specific research questions I developed to address the aforementioned problem. Finally, I provide an overview of each of the three manuscripts that make up this dissertation.

Landscape of Schools

Over the past 25 years, the demographics of public school teachers have held relatively steady—with 70% of public school teachers reported to be female and 86.9% White in 1987, and 76.3% female and 81.9% White in 2013 (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2013). Similarly, the vast majority of college Education majors and teacher education faculty are monolingual middle-class White women (Carnevale, Strohl, & Melton, 2011; NCES, 2009; Sleeter, 2008). However, the demographics of practicing and pre-service teachers are hardly representative of U. S. PreK-12 student populations (Banks, 2006). PreK-12 classrooms in the U. S. are becoming increasingly minoritized—a term intended to signify the ways that "minority" status is a social construction that is conferred on individuals (Benitez, 2010).

The NCES reported in 2014 that students enrolled in PreK-12th grade were approximately 52% White, 16% Black, and 24% Hispanic. These numbers, however, are not expected to remain stable. Instead, "The percentage of students who are White is projected to be less than 50 percent

beginning in 2014 and to continue to decline" (NCES, 2014), with an increasing population of Hispanic students entering U. S. classrooms (NCES, 2009). As the gap between the demographics of teachers and PreK-12 students continues to increase, it is becoming increasingly important that teacher education programs prepare PSTs to work with minoritized populations of students and to consider the community when developing lessons and curriculum.

Literature Review: Preparing Teachers for U. S. Schools

Teacher education research suggests a number of ways PSTs can be prepared to work with minoritized populations of students. In addition to recruiting more teachers of color to the profession (Gomez, 1996; Haberman, 1991; Larkin & Sleeter, 1995; Sleeter, 2001; Zeichner, Grant, Gay, Gillette, Valli, & Villegas, 1998), research indicates that developing an overarching vision of teacher education that is guided by the goals of multiculturalism (Florio-Ruane, 2001; Gomez, 1996; Goodlad, 1990; Haddix, 2008; Larkin & Sleeter, 1995; New, 1995; Sleeter, 2001; Zeichner et al., 1998) as well as increased opportunities for experiential learning (Burant & Kirby, 2002; Cooper, Beare, & Thorman, 1990; Haddix, 2015; Hallman & Burdick, 2001; Kinloch, 2009; Larkin & Sleeter, 1995; Murrell, 1992; Sleeter, 2001; Kinloch & Smagorinsky, 2014; Zeichner, 2012; Zeichner et al., 1998) and a focus on relationship-building (among PSTs, students, and families) (Burant & Kirby, 2002; Hallman & Burdick, 2011; Kaufman, 2004) may provide the types of preparation that PSTs need.

Very few of the above-mentioned studies inquired into the particular experiences of PSTs before they entered into their teacher education coursework, especially coursework that was explicitly concerned with PSTs' developing conceptions of the roles that communities play in schools. Instead, many of the studies reviewed here move from generalized conceptions of PSTs based on demographic data to the presentation of various methods that could be used to recruit,

prepare, and support a teaching force who could work with current populations of students and who recognize students' outside of school communities to be influential in teaching English Language Arts (ELA).

Statement of the Problem

My review of literature suggests that theory and research have only minimally and indirectly attended to PSTs' conceptions of the role of community in teaching 6-12 ELA. Instead, PSTs are portrayed as a generally homogeneous and insular group with (a) similar personal experiences, (b) limited knowledge of minoritized groups, and (c) few experiences with and considerations of community until they enter teacher education. The literature further suggests that teacher education programs structured around a multicultural framework and that incorporate opportunities for experiential learning have the potential to "make up for" PSTs' exiguous experiences, knowledge, and considerations of community.

The above portrayal of PSTs and teacher education are problematic for four primary reasons. First, the promotion of a singular view of PSTs exacerbates the notion that to be White is to be culture-less. Second, attaching assumptions to PSTs, particularly when those PSTs are largely White, middle-class, women, reifies *White vs. other* mentalities where "other" experiences are always placed in opposition and understood in relation to the experiences and beliefs of an elusive and homogenous "White" experience. This practice of othering contributes to the simultaneous erasure and silencing of both intra- and inter-group differences. Finally, the presentation of teacher education programs as solely responsible for preparing PSTs to work with minoritized groups of students is overly simplistic and myopic, ignorant of the myriad other experiences preceding teacher education and also experienced simultaneously during their teacher preparation (Barnes & Smagorinsky, 2016).

In undertaking data collection, analysis, and the subsequent writing for this research, I was specifically interested in learning about pre-service ELA teachers' developing conceptions of community as they engaged in a Community Inquiry Project (CIP) meant to introduce them to the local communities as part of their teacher education coursework. I now turn to the theoretical and conceptual frameworks informing this study and the overarching methodology, before providing an overview of the study (including its evolution and data collection methods) and detailing each of the three articles that will make up the dissertation.

Theoretical and Conceptual Frameworks

In this study I am concerned with PSTs' developing conception of what it means to teach ELA and the role communities play in planning and leading instruction. I approach this inquiry from the understanding that PSTs' perceptions of themselves as teachers, of the community, and of the relationship between teachers and communities are in a constant state of development. I draw on theoretical and conceptual frameworks that recognize meaning-making, learning, and development to occur over time and through diverse interactions. Specifically, I draw from sociocultural theory (Luria, 1981; Vygotsky, 1933/1935, 1978) to consider learning and development as occurring over time and informed by a combination of inter- and intra-personal interactions. I also draw on theories of teacher identity development (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995; Clandinin, et al., 2006) to consider how novice teachers develop a concept of teaching amidst competing contextual and personal factors.

Sociocultural Theory

Vygotsky's (1933/1935, 1978) sociocultural approach to learning and development relies on three premises: (1) "it is possible to understand many aspects of mental functioning only if one understands their origin and the transitions they have undergone" (Wertsch, 1991, p. 19), (2)

"higher mental functioning in the individual derives from social life" (p. 19), and (3) "human action, on both the social and individual planes, is mediated by tools and signs" (p. 19). A tool, then, has "no generalized meaning or function apart from specific social activities which render it 'useful' and which it in turn shapes" (Gee, 1992, p. 37). In other words, learning and development are socially-mediated and occur over time.

For Vygotsky, it is only through the use of meditational tools that individuals develop and learn. The meditational tool with which Vygotsky was most concerned was speech. Speech, specifically, is introduced in social interactions and may lead to more rational thought when the interaction is with a more knowledgeable other (Van der Veer, 2007). Such a view of speech "implies that all higher mental processes originate in social interaction" (Van der Veer, 2007, p. 63), in the space Vygotsky termed the zone of proximal development (ZPD).

Teacher Identity Development

In my research, I am specifically interested in the ways that novice teachers develop and learn. I draw on Clandinin and Connelly (1995) to consider the ways that teachers develop a personal practical knowledge of teaching (their conceptions about teaching based on personal experiences in schools as students) within a professional knowledge landscape (the educational, political, social, and cultural contexts that shape education) (Clandinin et al., 2006).

Clandinin et al. (2006) acknowledge that the teacher's personal practical knowledge represents "a dialectic between the personal and social" (p. 6). The apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975), those experiences PSTs have as students in schools themselves, is particularly influential in the development of the PST's personal practical knowledge. Clandinin et al. (2006) also recognize the teacher's personal practical knowledge as nested within the professional knowledge landscape, which includes the "the relational, temporal, and shifting nature of school

contexts" (p. 6). As teachers move across in- and out-of-school spaces, their personal practical knowledge comes into contact with the professional knowledge landscape. Often these points of contact are sites of tension as teachers struggle to "maintain a sense of continuity with the dominant stories of school" (p. 7) that shape the professional knowledge landscape.

For Clandinin and Connelly (1995), the professional knowledge landscape may shape novice teachers' developing conceptions of teaching. Although a PST may enter teacher education with a conception of the type of teacher they will be—caring, social justice-minded, or challenging, for instance—this conception may not "fit" within the professional knowledge landscape they experience and learn about during teacher education. When these conceptions of teaching compete, PSTs may find themselves at crisis points (Clandinin et al., 2006; Kerby, 1991). In this dissertation, I inquire into PSTS' personal practical knowledge before and during teacher education and the professional knowledge landscape (as constructed by teacher education, K-12 schools, mentor teachers, etc.) to consider how PSTs navigate crisis points while learning to teach and the ways that teacher educators can better support them through this process.

Research Questions

My inquiry into pre-service teacher development is guided by the following research questions:

1. How did pre-service teachers' personal life experiences and experiences during teacher education inform their understanding of community and of teaching while completing the Community Inquiry Project?
2. How did one pre-service teachers' personal experiences with and expectations for teaching bump up against those of his mentor teacher during student teaching? In what

ways might these tensions have contributed to the student teacher's choice to discontinue student teaching?

3. As the teacher educator, what did I intend to convey to students regarding the purpose and structure of the Community Inquiry Project? In what ways did the pre-service teachers orient to the tasks included in the Community Inquiry Project?

This dissertation is organized into three manuscripts, each one aimed at addressing one of the above research questions. In what follows, I discuss the overarching methodology guiding my design of the dissertation study, and then the particular data collection methods and participants involved in the research. Finally, I provide a brief overview of the full dissertation.

Method

Data collection and analysis processes were informed by my theoretical frameworks and were designed to allow me to consider participants as implicated in an ongoing process of identity-construction (Reissman, 2008; Yuval-Davis, 2010). The conception of identity as context-dependent, amenable to change over time, and recursive (Josselson, 2011) align with sociocultural understandings of the development of mind as social, mediated, and flexible (Van der Veer, 2007; Vygotsky, 1978).

Data Collection

Data collection occurred over a two-year period in the undergraduate English Education program at The University of Georgia and inquired into the experiences of two groups of PSTs as they completed various course-based tasks meant to engage them with the community as part of their teacher preparation. The evolution of this Community Inquiry Project (CIP) and subsequent research, which are reviewed in the individual articles of this dissertation, were rooted in sociocultural approaches to learning and development and recognized learning to be an

ongoing process (Bakhtin, 1981; Vygotsky, 1933/1935, 1978), for both the PSTs and the researcher. The data corpus for this study is presented in table 1.

Table 1. CIP data corpus.

CIP Year One	CIP Year Two
Community Concept Map	Text PhotoVoice
Focus Group Discussions	Focus Group Discussions
Blog Reflections	Blog Reflections
Multimodal Tour	Lesson Plan Analysis & Rationale
	Multimodal Tour
	One-on-One Interviews

Data Analysis

Data analysis was both generative and recursive. Specifically, I followed a process of thematic coding (Braun & Clarke, 2006) to conduct my analysis. Although the particular methods varied from chapter to chapter, I present my general process of thematic coding here. To familiarize myself with the data, I began by transcribing and organizing all data chronologically. I then identified which datum to analyze for each chapter in the dissertation and focused on one chapter at a time. I began data analysis for the first chapter by reading all of the data chronologically from the first datum collected in the study to the last. As I read the data, I made notes that were guided by my research questions.

After reading through all of the data and noting my initial impressions, I began generating, and subsequently modifying, codes (Tuckett, 2005). I then sorted the codes into broader categories (Braun & Clarke, 2006). After coding the data corpus, I reviewed the codes and categories—refining both to determine which codes did and did not "fit" within particular categories and to tabulate the relative frequencies with which the different codes were used. Finally, I searched for themes across the data and ultimately developed overarching themes. I followed this same process of thematic coding for each of the chapters in this dissertation.

Quality of Study

Various steps were taken to ensure the quality of this study. First, multiple data points were collected and analyzed in order to triangulate the findings presented in each chapter (Seale & Silverman, 1997). For instance, in the third chapter I analyzed pre- and post-study surveys, one-on-one interviews, and various reflections as I inquired into one PSTs' experiences with his mentor teacher during student teaching. Second, all interview data was recorded as objectively and comprehensively as possible, although I do recognized that every form of data collection is a form of interpretation and has inherent bias. Further, all transcribed data was shared with participants as a form of member-checking. Third, I challenge common criticisms that qualitative researchers cherry-pick anecdotes from their data that support their claims, by "Supporting generalizations by counts of events" (Seale & Silverman, 1997, p. 380). Showing frequencies (through "counts of events") allowed me to demonstrate that findings were a common occurrence (or not) across the data. Finally, "Presenting simple counts of events can help readers gain a sense of how representative and widespread particular instances are" (Seale & Silverman, 1997, p. 380). I also attended to the issue of representativeness through participant-selection. For instance, in chapter 2 I demonstrate that the participants in my study were representative of pre-service and novice teachers in the U. S. (at least in terms of race and gender demographics). Although the purpose of qualitative research is not to arrive at generalizeable knowledge, the findings from this dissertation could have implications for other teacher educators in the U. S.

Structure of the Dissertation

This dissertation is written in a manuscript style—consisting of three manuscripts that will be submitted to academic journals. Opportunities for community-engaged work in teacher education are increasingly important as the demographics of practicing and pre-service teachers

(PSTs) and those of students entering U. S. PreK-12th grade each year continue to diverge (Chang, Anagnostopoulos, & Omae, 2011; Hogan, 2006; Moss, 2008). In chapter two I draw on theories of place-conscious pedagogies (Gruenewald, 2003), funds of knowledge (González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005; Moll & González, 1994), and teacher identity development (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995) to inquire into pre-service English Language Arts teachers' developing conceptions of community as they engaged in the CIP, meant to introduce them to the local communities as part of their teacher education coursework. Findings from this study suggest that PSTs' experiences with communities and schools growing up could limit their understanding of reciprocity between communities and schools as teachers, and their potential to take a funds of knowledge approach to teaching. The findings from this study could have implications for the ways that teacher educators incorporate opportunities for experiential learning via community-based projects into their programs. In particular, I argue for practices in teacher education in which teacher educators, PSTs, and community partners explicitly and regularly discuss, re-define, and challenge the concept of reciprocity in community-engaged projects. This chapter will be submitted to *Teaching and Teacher Education*.

In chapter three, I recognize that pre-service and novice teacher attrition has commonly been linked to a variety of individual (e.g., burnout, resilience, personal demographics) and contextual (e.g., student issues, poverty rates, salary, professional development, teacher education) factors (Schaefer, Long, & Clandinin, 2012). However, those teachers who were enrolled in a formal teacher education program with a required practicum component and who had supportive and empathic mentors during teacher education are far less likely to leave teaching, suggesting that teacher preparation does play a role in teacher retention (Buchanan, Prescott, Schuck, Aubusson, & Burke, 2013; Darling-Hammond, Berry, & Thoreson, 2001;

Gilpin, 2011; Schuck, 2003). In this chapter I draw on theoretical approaches to teacher identity development (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Vygotsky, 1978) and care in teaching (Noddings, 1984) as I inquire into the ways that one PST's personal experiences with and expectations for teaching bumped up against those of his Mentor Teacher during student teaching, potentially contributing to the PST's choice to leave teaching altogether. Findings from this study suggest that teacher educators should encourage PSTs to reflect on their expectations of the mentor relationship and to interrogate their own expectations of and definitions of care as they complete student teaching. This chapter will be submitted to *Teaching Education*.

In chapter four, I reflect on and problematize the reasons for and methods through which I incorporated an opportunity for experiential learning, via the CIP, into my own teaching. I take the stance of a teacher-researcher to closely analyze the specific documents and tasks used to introduce PSTs to the CIP. I draw on sociocultural approaches to teacher development (Smagorinsky, 2013; Vygotsky, 1978) and literature on experiential education in teacher education (Anderson, Swick, & Yff, 2001; Donnell & Harper, 2005; Imig, 2001; Kinloch & Smagorinsky, 2014; Sleeter, 2001, 2008) to provide a background for the CIP and respective study and offer critical whiteness studies (Berchini, 2014, 2016; Haviland, 2008; Jupp, Berry, & Lensmire, 2016; Lensmire & Snaza, 2010; Marx, 2003) as an appropriate lens through which to analyze the various elements of the CIP. Findings from this study suggest that the CIP limited PSTs' characterizations of community, understandings of sociocultural approaches to learning, relationships to the community, and perceptions of the role of community in teaching. I draw on these findings to suggest that teacher educators share their reflective practices with PSTs and regularly inquire into the diverse experiences of the PSTs themselves to better prepare PSTs to

inquire into and draw on knowledge of communities as they work with diverse populations of students. This chapter will be submitted to *Studying Teacher Education*.

In chapter five I look across chapters two through four to consider PSTs' developing conceptions of teaching and of the role of community in teaching ELA as they participate in community-engaged teacher education work. Overall, I find that PSTs experience tension between their own perceptions of teaching and those of teacher educators, mentor teachers, and community members as they move through the various course- and field-based components of teacher education. In chapter five I offer modeling, reflection, and inquiry as three tools that teacher educators could use to help PSTs navigate the tensions they experience in teacher education.

References

Anderson, J. B., Swick, K. J., & Yff, J. (Eds.). (2001). *Service-learning in teacher education: Enhancing the growth of new teachers, their students, and communities*. New York, NY: American Associations of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Austin, TX: The University of Texas Press.

Banks, J. A. (2006). *Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum, and teaching* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson Education.

Barnes, M. E., & Smagorinsky, P. (2016). What English/Language Arts teacher candidates learn during coursework and practica: A study of three teacher education programs. *Journal of Teacher Education*.

Benitez, M., Jr. (2010). Resituating culture centers within a social justice framework: Is there room for examining Whiteness? In L. D. Patton (Ed.), *Culture centers in higher education: Perspectives on identity, theory, and practice* (pp. 119-134). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Berchini, C. (2014). Teachers constructing and being constructed by prevailing discourses and practices of whiteness in their curriculum, classroom, and school community: A critical inquiry of three first-year English teachers (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest, LLC. database. (UMI No. 3630576).

Berchini, C. (2016). Structuring contexts: Pathways toward un-obstructing race-consciousness. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 29*(8), 1030-1044.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.

Buchanan, J., Prescott, A., Schuck, S., Aubusson, P., & Burke, P. (2013). Teacher retention and attrition: Views of early career teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 38*(3), 110-129.

Burant, T. J., & Kirby, D. (2002). Beyond classroom-based early field experiences: Understanidng an 'educative practicum' in an urban school and community. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 18*, 561-575.

Carnevale, A. P., Strohl, J., & Melton, M. (2011). *What's it worth?: The economic value of college majors*. Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce. Access at https://georgetown.app.box.com/s/5s45uwkaf2epu9oz58qv

Chang, S., Anagnostopoulos, D., & Omae, H. (2011). The multidimensionality of multicultural service learning: The variable effects of social identity, context and pedagogy on pre-service teachers' learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(7), 1078-1089.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1995). *Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Clandinin, D. J., Huber, J., Huber, M., Murphy, M. S., Orr, A. M., Pearce, M., & Steeves, P. (2006). *Composing diverse identities: Narrative inquiries into the interwoven lives of children and teachers*. New York: Routledge.

Cooper, A., Beare, P., & Thorman, J. (1990). Preparing teachers for diversity: A comparison of student teaching experiences in Minnesota and South Texas. *Action in Teacher Education, XII*(3), 1-4.

Darling-Hammond, L., Berry, B., & Thoreson, A. (2001). Does teacher certification matter? Evaluating the evidence. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 23*(1), 57-77.

Donnell, K., & Harper, K. (2005). Inquiry in teacher education: Competing agendas. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 153-165.

Florio-Ruane, S. (2001). *Teacher education and the cultural imagination*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gee, J. G. (1992). Socio-cultural approaches to literacy (literacies). *Annual Review of Linguistics, 12*, pp. 31-48.

Gilpin, G. A. (2011). Reevaluating the effect of non-teaching wages in teacher attrition. *Economics of Education Review, 30*, 598-616.

Gomez, M.L. (1996) Prospective teachers' perspectives on teaching 'other people's children'. In K.M. Zeichner, S. Melnick and M.L. Gomez (Eds.) *Currents of reform in preservice teacher education* (pp. 109–132). New York: Teachers College Press.

González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (Eds.). 2005. *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Goodlad, J. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gruenewald, D. A. (2003). Foundations of place: A multidisciplinary framework for place-conscious education. *American Educational Research Journal, 40*(3), 619-654.

Haberman, M. (1991). Can cultural awareness be taught in teacher education programs? *Teaching Education, 4*(1), 25-32.

Haddix, M. (2008). Beyond sociolinguistics: Toward a critical approach to cultural and linguistic diversity in teacher education. *Language and Education, 22*(5), 254-270.

Haddix, M. (2015). Preparing community-engaged teachers. *Theory Into Practce, 54*(1), 63-70.

Hallman, H. L., & Burdick, M. N. (2011). Service learning and the preparation of English teacher. *English Education, 43*(4), 341- 368.

Haviland, V. S. (2008). "Things get glossed over": Rearticulating the silencing power of whiteness in education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 59*(1), 40-54.

Hogan, M. L. (2006). Making contact: Teaching, bodies, and the ethics of multiculturalism. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 28*, 355-366.

Imig, D. G. (2001). Preface. In J. B. Anderson, K. J. Swick, and J. Yff (Eds.), *Service-learning in teacher education: Enhancing the growth of new teachers, their students, and communities* (pp. vii-viii). New York: American Associations of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Josselson, R. (2011). Narrative research: Constructing, deconstructing, and reconstructing story. In F. J. Wertz, K. Charmaz, L. M. McMullen, R. Josselson, R. Anderson, & E. McSpadden (Eds.), *Five ways of doing qualitative analysis: Phenomenological psychology, grounded theory, discourse analysis, narrative research, and intuitive inquiry* (pp. 224-242). New York: The Guilford Press.

Jupp, J. C., Berry, T. R., & Lensmire, T. J. (2016). Second-wave white teacher identity studies: A review of white teacher identity literatures from 2004 through 2014. *Review of Educational Research, 86*(4), 1151-1191.

Kaufman, J. E. (2004). Language, inquiry, and the heart of learning: Reflections in an English methods course. *English Education, 36*(3), 174–191.

Kerby, A. P. (1991). *Narrative and the self*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Kinloch, V. (2009). Suspicious spatial distinctions: Literacy research with students across school and community contexts. *Written Communication, 26*(2), 154-182.

Kinloch, V., & Smagorinsky, P. (2014). *Service-learning in literacy education: Possibility for teaching and learning*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Larkin, J. M., & Sleeter, C. E. (Eds.). (1995). *Developing multicultural teacher education curricula*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lensmire, T., & Snaza, N. (2010). What teacher education can learn from blackface minstrelsy. *Educational Researcher, 39*(5), 413-422.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Luria, A. R. (1981). *Language and cognition*. J. V. Wertsch (Ed.). New York, NY: Wiley Intersciences.

Marx, S. (2003). Reflections on the state of critical White studies. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*, 3–5.

Moll, L. C., & González, N. (1994) Lessons from research with language-minority children. *Journal of Literacy Research, 26*(4), 439-456.

Moss, G. (2008). Diversity study circles in teacher education practice: An experiential learning project. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(1), 216-224.

Murrell, P., Jr. (1992, April). *Deconstructing informal knowledge of exemplary teaching in diverse urban communities: Apprenticing preservice teachers as case study researchers in cultural sites*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2009). *Percentage distribution of school teachers, by race/ethnicity, school type, and selected school characteristics: 2007-2008* (Data File).

Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2009/2009324/tables/sass0708_2009324_tl2n_02.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2013). *Number and percentage distribution of teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools* (Data File). Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d13/tables/dt13_209.10.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2014). *The condition of education: Racial/ethnic enrollment in public schools* (Data File). Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cge.asp

New, C. A. (1995). Oral histories: An interactive link in teaching Language Arts. In J. M. Larkin & C. E. Sleeter (Eds.), *Developing multicultural teacher education curricula* (pp. 105-114). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics & moral education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Reissman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Schaefer, L., Long, J. S., & Clandinin, J. (2012). Questioning the research on early career teacher attrition and retention. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 58*(1), 106-121.

Schuck, S. (2003). Getting help from the outside: Developing a support network for beginning teachers. *Journal of Educational Enquiry, 4*(1), 49-67.

Seale, C., & Silverman, D. (1997). Ensuring rigour in qualitative research. *European Journal of Public Health, 7*, 379-384.

Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*, 94–106.

Sleeter, C. E. (2008). Equity, democracy, and neoliberal assaults on teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*, 1947-1957.

Smagorinsky, P. (2013). The development of social and practical concepts in learning to teach: A synthesis and extension of Vygotsky's conception. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction, 2*, 238-248.

Smagorinsky, P., & Barnes, M. E. (2014). Revisiting and revising the apprenticeship of observation. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 41*(4), 29-52.

Tuckett, A. G. (2005). Applying thematic analysis theory to practice: A researcher's experience. *Contemporary Nurse, 19*(1-2), 75-87.

Van der Veer, R. (2007). *Lev Vygotsky*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1933/1935). 'Dinamika umstvennogo razvitiya shkol'nika v svyazi s obucheniem', in L. S. Vygotsky, *Umstvennoe razvitie detey v protsesse obucheniya*. Moscow-Leningrad: Uchpedgiz, pp. 35-52.

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

Wertsch, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2010). Theorizing identity: Beyond the 'us' and 'them' dichotomy. *Patterns of Prejudice, 44*(3), 261-280.

Zeichner, K. M. (2012). The turn once again toward practice-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 63*(5), 376-382.

Zeichner, K. M., Grant, C., Gay, G., Gillette, M., Valli, L., & Villegas, A. M. (1998). A research informed vision of good practice in multicultural teacher education: Design principles. *Theory Into Practice, 37*, 163–171.

CHAPTER 2

ENCOURAGING INTERACTION AND STRIVING FOR RECIPROCITY: THE CHALLENGES OF COMMUNITY-ENGAGED PROJECTS IN TEACHER EDUCATION[1]

[1] Barnes, M. E. To be submitted to *Teaching and Teacher Education*.

Abstract

Opportunities for community-engaged work in teacher education are increasingly important as the demographics of practicing and pre-service teachers (PSTs) and those of students entering U. S. PreK-12th grade each year continue to diverge. In this manuscript I draw on theories of place-conscious pedagogies, funds of knowledge, and teacher identity development to inquire into pre-service English Language Arts teachers' developing conceptions of community as they engaged in a Community Inquiry Project (CIP) meant to introduce them to the local communities as part of their teacher education coursework. Findings from this study suggest that PSTs' experiences with communities and schools growing up could limit their understanding of reciprocity between communities and schools as teachers, and their potential to take a funds of knowledge approach to teaching. The findings from this study could have implications for the ways that teacher educators incorporate opportunities for experiential learning via community-based projects into their programs. In particular, I argue for practices in teacher education in which teacher educators, PSTs, and community partners explicitly and regularly discuss, re-define, and challenge the concept of reciprocity in community-engaged projects.

Keywords: experiential education, teacher education, reciprocity, community-engagement

Introduction

Opportunities for experiential learning have been incorporated into teacher education programs with increasing frequency world-wide in recent years. In the U. S., experiential learning in teacher education has included formal student teaching, service-learning projects (e.g. Hallman & Burdick, 2001; Lake & Jones, 2008; Kinloch & Smagorinsky, 2014), community inquiry projects (e.g. Burant & Kirby, 2002), diversity study circles (Moss, 2008), and "cross-cultural immersion projects" (Sleeter, 2001, p. 97). Service-learning, when combined with narrative inquiry strategies, has been used in Canada, Kenya, and Turkey with pre-service teachers (PSTs) whose backgrounds differ from those of their students (Mitton-Kukner, Nelson, & Desrochers, 2010). Rather than directed solely at observation, the practicum placements preceding formal student teaching in Ireland have been structured so that PSTs may practice using specific pedagogical methods in actual classrooms (McCormack & O'Flaherty, 2010).

Experiential learning in teacher education programs can provide PSTs with opportunities to develop their multicultural awareness through interactions with diverse populations of students (Chang, Anagnostopoulos, & Omae, 2011; Hogan, 2006; Moss, 2008). Interactions with diverse student populations are particularly important in settings like the one featured in this study, where the demographics of the PST population do not mirror those of PreK-12th grade students. Most U. S. college students choosing to major in Education are monolingual middle-class White women (Carnevale, Strohl, & Melton, 2011; National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2013; Sleeter, 2008). However, the demographics of practicing and pre-service teachers do not mirror the increasing diversity of students entering U. S. PreK-12th grade each year (Banks, 2006; NCES, 2014). Further, the majority of teacher educators in U. S. schools of education are also White (United States Department of Education, 2016), contributing to the

incorporation of experiential learning opportunities that can provide opportunities for PSTs to learn from, about, and with local communities as they prepare to teach diverse populations of students (New, 1995; Sleeter, 2008).

Ideally, opportunities for experiential learning should occur over time and in multiple spaces (Richards, Moore, & Gipe, 1996; Sleeter, 2008), encourage PSTs to learn about teachers' various roles in schools and communities, and should encourage interactions among community members, teacher educators, and PSTs. Foundational to these interactions is reciprocity, "where all learn from and teach one another" (Mitchell, 2008). I draw from place-conscious pedagogies (Gruenewald, 2003) to extend the concept of reciprocity to include individuals' interactions with and in places. Reciprocal interactions and relationships, both with other individuals and with places, are based on connection rather than difference (Bickford & Reynolds, 2002; Mitchell, 2008) and challenge power hierarchies where the needs, interests, and knowledge of one group are positioned ahead of the other.

This study is set in a university-based school of education in the U. S. Southeast. The demographics of this English Education program and many of the surrounding secondary schools mirror the national demographic data of U. S. teachers and students. As a teacher educator in this program, I incorporated experiential learning into my teaching, through the use of a Community Inquiry Project (CIP) to better prepare PSTs to work with diverse groups of students. I approach this project and subsequent research from a conception of community that includes people, places, and tools—but also extends across time to include histories and imagined futures (Dewey, 1927; Greene, 1995). Further, I consider communities as continually constructed (and re-constructed) through social interactions (Wallerstein & Duran, 2008).

In this study, I inquire into the ways that PSTs' prior life experiences inform their understandings of the interaction between schools and communities as they complete the CIP during teacher education. This inquiry is guided by the following questions:

1. In what manner did PSTs draw on their own conceptions of and experiences with school and community while growing up as they inquired into the community surrounding the university and/or the community in which their student teaching school was situated?
2. In what ways did PSTs' own experiences with school while growing up influence the ways they went about learning about the particular students they were working with in their student teaching placement?

For the purpose of analysis, I differentiate between community and students in the presentation of research questions. I do not, however, understand students and communities to be separate and distinct entities. I elaborate on this relationship in the specific theoretical and conceptual frameworks presented next.

Theoretical and Conceptual Frameworks

I approach this study from the understanding that myriad factors, experiences, people, and places interact to inform PSTs' developing conceptions of teaching and schools (Barnes & Smagorinsky, 2016; Smagorinsky & Barnes, 2014). Specifically, I use a place-conscious pedagogical approach (Gruenewald, 2003) that recognizes individuals as actively constructing and manipulating spaces to frame my inquiry into the ways that PSTs learn about and make sense of the communities surrounding them. Both the teaching and research presented in this study developed out of a funds of knowledge approach to teaching that regards students as belonging to extensive social networks that offer a wealth of cultural resources (González, Moll,

& Amanti, 2005; Moll & González, 1994). PSTs' knowledge of communities and schools also contributed to their developing teacher identity (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995).

Place-Conscious Pedagogies

Places have multiple dimensions, with the perceptual, ideological, and sociological dimensions particularly salient here (Gruenewald, 2003). The perceptual dimension of place suggests that peoples' perceptions of places are relational—shaped by their interactions with other people and places. Individuals' experiences in schools can both support and hinder their ability to perceive places as relational (Abram, 1996).

The ideological dimension assumes places to express ideologies and relationships of power. In other words, spaces can facilitate and legitimize certain cultural reproductions of power based on the ways people interact with and attempt to control them (Foucault, 1997, 1980; Gruenewald, 2003; LeFebvre, 1974). Many social institutions, like schools, have traditionally been places where control has been used "to legitimize and reproduce the authority of those institutions" (Gruenewald, 2003, p. 629).

Finally, the sociological dimension of place recognizes places to be social constructions. People infuse places with meaning, and are also shaped by the places surrounding them. Disregarding place in education limits the opportunities for students to consider how culture, society, and politics interact in the process of place-making (Gruenewald, 2003).

Unfortunately, schools often disregard the perceptual, ideological, and sociological dimensions of place (Gruenewald, 2003). Alternatively, place-conscious pedagogies recognize places to be both constructed and pedagogical (Greene, Burke, & McKenna, 2016; Nespor, 1997), shaping and shaped by individuals who move through them (Gruenewald, 2003). Further, when educators extend pedagogy to include places, they may encourage students to critically

examine the interactions among multiple sociocultural contexts: cultural, historical, social, emotional, personal, and place-based, among others. Experiential learning may provide a means through which educators can connect schools and communities (Basso, 1996; Feld & Basso, 1996). In particular, opportunities for experiential learning during teacher education could help PSTs to extend their own multicultural awareness as they learn about, with, and from community places and people (Chang, Anagnostopoulos, & Omae, 2011; Larkin & Sleeter, 1995; New, 1995). However, short-term community-based experiential learning methods that lack opportunities for critical reflection are also criticized for privileging the needs of the university over those of the community (Bortolin, 2011), positioning university students as providing a service to the community (Flower, 2008; Hallman & Burdick, 2011), and potentially reinforcing deficit-oriented stereotypes of others (Mitchell, 2008). As I developed and incorporated the CIP into my teaching, I was aware of the common criticisms of community-engaged experiential learning opportunities and crafted the assignments and expectations of the project so as to avoid the above pitfalls.

Funds of Knowledge

As I determined the overarching purposes of the CIP, I drew on a funds of knowledge approach to teaching (González et al., 2005) that incorporates "those historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household or individual functioning and well-being" into pedagogical and curricular decisions (Moll & González, 1994, p. 443). The knowledge and skills that individuals possess are woven into extensive networks forming "an essential tool kit that households need to maintain (mediate) their well-being" (González et al., 2005, p. 19). The concept of funds of knowledge is also fluid, "its content and

meaning are negotiated through discussions among participants" (González et al., 2005, p. 19), which are also dependent on specific circumstances (Vélez-Ibáñez & Greenberg, 1992).

González et al. (2005) were specifically interested in the ways that a funds of knowledge approach to teaching could help teachers to understand the social lives of students and families. When teachers approach their teaching from an understanding that students' communities contain a wealth of knowledge, they can also recognize the classroom as a part of students' social network (Vélez-Ibáñez & Greenberg, 1992). Specifically, González et al. (2005) worked with practicing teachers to help them use the tools of ethnographic research to develop an inquiry stance toward the community—tools that could conceivably be transferred to other settings and situations. The purpose of the teachers' inquiries was to encourage teachers to see students' homes and communities as relevant to and "rich resources for teaching and learning" (González et al., 2005, p. 14). Like González et al. (2005), I designed the CIP to encourage PSTs to view the community surrounding the university from the standpoint of a learner, to document the various resources and practices of the community, and to consider the inclusion of community-knowledge in teaching to be an effective pedagogical method.

Teacher Identity Development

In this study, I am interested in the tension between PSTs' personal practical knowledge (their conceptions about teaching based on their own experiences in schools as studnets) and the professional knowledge landscape, made up of the political, social, and cultural forces at play in education, schools, and communities (Clandinin, Huber, Huber, Murphy, Orr, Pearce, & Steeves, 2006). The apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975), those experiences PSTs have as students in schools themselves, is particularly influential in the development of PSTs' personal practical knowledge. Clandinin et al. (2006) also recognized the teacher's personal practical

knowledge as nested within a dynamic professional knowledge landscape, which includes the "the relational, temporal, and shifting nature of school contexts" (p. 6). As teachers move across in- and out-of-school spaces, their personal practical knowledge comes into contact with the professional knowledge landscape.

Although PSTs may enter teacher education with expectations of what teaching and schools look like, that personal practical knowledge may not "fit" within the professional knowledge landscape they experience and learn about during teacher education (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995). In this study, I draw on place-based pedagogies, funds of knowledge, and teacher identity development as I inquire into the ways PSTs learned about and made sense of the role of communities in schools during teacher education.

Method

In this section, I review the context and participants involved in this study, the details of the Community Inquiry Project, as well as the data collection and analysis procedures.

Context and Participants

All data for this study were collected during the 2015-2016 academic year. At the time of data collection, all 10 participants were completing their final year in the undergraduate English Education program at a large state namesake university in the U. S. Southeast. Unlike Teaching English as a Second Language (TESOL), which prepares PSTs to teach English to non-native English speakers, the English Education program prepares PSTs to teach composition, language, and reading/literacy (grades 6-12). In the final year of the program, students moved as a cohort through a series of five university-based courses, including Lesson Planning and Assessment, Reading Methods, Writing Methods, Young Adult Literature, and a seminar meant to provide support for students as they completed their practicum. PSTs spent two days each week in their

practicum settings during the fall. I was the instructor for the Reading Methods course during the fall semester, and also served as a supervisor to four students as they completed their practicum work. During the spring semester, I supervised the same four student teachers as they completed their formal student teaching in secondary schools.

Demographic data for all 10 participants in this study can be found in Table 2. The participants selected their pseudonyms and also provided their own gender and racial/ethnic group identity classifications. The demographics of all 24 students enrolled in the program, as well as the 10 students who consented to participate in this study, are representative of the demographics of teachers in U. S. schools in that they were 80% white and 80% female.

Table 2. Participants.

Pseudonym	Race/Ethnicity	Gender
Arthur	White	Male
Maddie	African American	Female
Johnny	Puerto Rican	X[2]
Red	White	Female
Jana	White	Female
Jill	White	Female
Krista	White	Female
Dee	White	Female
Sandy	White	Female
Kasey	White	Female

The university is located in the town of Lindfield (a pseudonym). According to the U. S. Census Bureau (2015), at the time of this study, the estimated population of Lindfield was 122,604. Of this population, 62%[3] identified as White (compared with a U. S. national average of 72%), 27% identified as Black or African American (13% national average), 4% identified as Asian (5% national average), and 11% Hispanic or Latino (16% national average).

[2] Johnny 12 Guns chose "X" to represent a preference not to align with one gender.
[3] All percentages are approximations.

Approximately 14% of Lindfield residents spoke a language other than English at home. Although the U. S. Census Bureau reported a poverty rate in Lindfield approaching 40% of the population (as compared with a national average of 13.5%), when college students were not factored in, the poverty rate for Lindfield dropped to approximately 27%.

Lindfield was home to 21 public schools: 14 elementary schools (preK-5th grade), 4 middle schools (6th-8th grades), and 3 high schools (9th-12th grade). The school district enrolled approximately 13,700 students each year and had an average graduation rate of 80%. Alternativuely, the university enrolled over 36,000 undergraduate and graduate students annually, with 70.1% identifying as White, 9.5% Asian, 4.8% Hispanic, and 8.1% African American (all percentages of Asian, Hispanic, and African American students have increased over the past 10 years).

The Community Inquiry Project

In the fall of 2015, I taught the Reading Methods course. The course was designed to help students understand literacy, text, and pedagogy through the lens of the community. Specifically, students were encouraged to consider what literacy practices were common, necessary, and/or privileged in the community as they began developing lesson plans for potential future students.

Students worked in groups of 3-4 to explore the local community. Specifically, the CIP required groups to complete tasks including riding the city bus away from the university campus, conducting interviews with local community members, and identifying public resources (see Appendix A for the project description). Each group could determine the method by which they would complete tasks, with some groups choosing to divide up tasks among the various group members and other groups completing tasks collectively. PSTs also engaged in three small group

discussions, constructed a multimodal tour of Lindfield, and completed three written reflections on their experiences in the community during the semester.

To encourage PSTs to explicitly consider how community knowledge might inform their teaching and lesson planning, they completed a lesson plan reflection, modification, and rationale assignment. Each PST was instructed to annotate one lesson plan from the unit they taught that semester, noting assumptions they were making of students through various aspects of the lesson and revising the plans accordingly. Finally, students wrote papers explaining the ways that their community knowledge was informing their instructional and curricular choices and rationalizing the modifications made to the lesson plan. In addition to the tasks PSTs completed during the fall, 10 PSTs agreed to participate in one-on-one interviews with me the following spring.

Data Collection

Data collected for this study ~~i~~include the lesson plan analysis assignments, regular blog reflections, and one-on-one interview transcripts. The interviews followed a semi-structured protocol (Seidman, 2013) meant "to generate detailed accounts rather than brief answers or general statements" (Reissman, 2008, p. 23) and that allowed for flexibility within the interview process. These interviews were conducted at the location and time of the participants' choosing, following the semester in which I was their teacher, so as to encourage participants to speak openly about their experiences (Reissman, 2008). Participants also completed written reflections throughout their work in the CIP. Similar to the interview questions, the directions provided to students for these reflections were open-ended.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was both generative and recursive. Specifically, I followed a process of thematic coding (Braun & Clarke, 2006) to conduct my analysis. To familiarize myself with the data, I transcribed the interviews and then read all of the data for each participant. For instance, I began with Sandy—reading her interview transcript, three blog reflections, and lesson plan rationale paper. As I read the data, I made notes that were guided by my research questions.

After reading through all of the data and noting my initial impressions, I began generating, and subsequently modifying, codes (Tuckett, 2005). I then sorted the codes into broader categories (Braun & Clarke, 2006). After coding the data corpus, I reviewed the codes and categories—refining both to determine which codes did and did not "fit" within particular categories and to tabulate the relative frequencies with which the different codes were used. Finally, I searched for themes across the data and ultimately developed four overarching themes: *participants' perceptions of home community*, *participants' perceptions of the university and student teaching communities*, *parental involvement*, and *approaches to teaching*. The four themes, the categories within each theme, and the frequencies of both are presented in Table 3 and delineated below.

Table 3. Theme & category frequencies.

Theme/Category	Code Frequencies
Theme 1: Perceptions of Home Community	110
School type	61
School-home community relationship	7
Community Descriptors/Involvement	42
Theme 2: Perceptions of University and Student Teaching Communities	266
Membership in Community Surrounding the University	24
Method of learning about community surrounding university	65
Community perceptions	113
ST descriptors	64
Theme 3: Parental Involvement	63

Personal parental involvement growing up	43
Parental involvement in Community and/or Student Teaching (ST) School	20
Theme 4: Approach to Teaching	235
Method of learning about ST community and/or students	42
Relevance of community knowledge to teaching	48
Relevance of student knowledge to teaching	76
Planning instruction	69

Participants' perceptions of home community. The 10 participants in this study discussed their schools and communities growing up by sharing information about (a) the type(s) of school they went to, (b) the relationship between the school and the surrounding community, and (c) the local communities of which they were a part and the nature of their involvement. The specific categories and respective codes and relative code frequencies for this theme are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Perceptions of home community.

Category	Frequency
School Type	
Private	3
Public	7
Home-school	2
Hybrid/Other	4
Majority White	6
Majority Non-White	3
Strict	3
Sheltered	8
Academically rigorous	9
Involvement in Extra-curricular Activities	12
High Socioeconomic Status (SES)	4
Low SES	0
School-Home Community Relationship	
Race-SES Alignment	1
Race-SES Misalignment	6
Community Descriptors/Involvement	
"Close-Knit" Community	8
Live Near School Peers	0
Did not live near school peers	4

Knew each other outside of school	8
Membership in community-based organizations	6
Not involved in community surrounding school	3
Conservative	3
Liberal	1
High SES	1
Low SES	0
Diverse	7
Worked during school (had a job)	1

Participants' perceptions of the university and student teaching communities. Four categories of codes were used to develop the theme of participants' perceptions of the community surrounding the university as well as the community surrounding their student teaching-placement school, which I refer to as the "ST" school from hereon in. Participants' coded statements were categorized by membership in the community surrounding the university, the method by which they learned about the Lindfield community, their perceptions of Lindfield, and ST-community descriptors. The categories, codes, and relative code frequencies for this second theme are found in Table 5.

Table 5. Perceptions of university and student teaching communities.

Category	Frequency
Membership in Lindfield Community	
Self	3
UGA students	4
Non-UGA students	12
Not self	5
Method of Learning about Lindfield Community	
Physical contact	50
Online research	9
Email/phone calls	3
Personal knowledge	3
Community Perceptions	
Challenges	27
Positive attributes	23
Diverse	14
Surprising/Learned something new	49

Student Teaching (ST) School Descriptors	
Challenges	23
Positive attributes	25
Students and/or teachers live near one another	0
Students and/or teachers do not live near one another	3
Students and/or teachers know each other outside of school	2
Majority White	7
Majority Non-White	3
Conservative	1
Liberal	0

Parental involvement. The theme of parental involvement was divided into two categories: the involvement of the PSTs' own parents growing up and the parental involvement they were observing in the community and/or ST school. The specific codes that made up these two categories as well as the approximate frequencies with which the codes were applied to the data are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Parental involvement.

Category	Frequency
Personal Parental Involvement Growing Up	
Physical presence in school	6
Regular communication	2
High expectations	7
Parents not/minimally involved	9
Choice in schooling	17
Other parents were involved	2
Parental Involvement in Community and/or Student Teaching (ST) School	
Physical presence in school	2
Regular communication	3
High expectations	5
Parents not/minimally involved	9
Choice in schooling	0

Approach to teaching. The final theme was generated as a point of synthesis across the other three themes. Drawing from their knowledge of the local community, their own personal experiences in schools and communities growing up, and their observations and experiences at

their ST schools, the participants described their approaches to teaching. Participants discussed specific pedagogical practices as well as their general beliefs about teaching and lesson planning. This last theme was composed of four categories: method of learning about the ST community, relevance of community knowledge to teaching, relevance of student knowledge to teaching, and planning instruction. The categories, codes, and relative code frequencies are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Approach to teaching.

Category	Frequency
Method of learning about ST community and/or students	
Specific solicitation	6
Interactions with students	20
Physical contact with community and/or community members	8
Personal experiences	8
Relevance of Community Knowledge to Teaching	
Specific examples from own teaching	20
Specific examples from observing others	4
Belief Statements	24
Relevance of Student Knowledge to Teaching	
Specific examples from own teaching	37
Specific examples from observing others	7
Belief Statements	32
Planning Instruction	
Start from text and/or literary concept	12
Collaborate with other teachers/peers	6
Differentiate for student interests	17
Differentiate for student needs	30
Teach to the majority	4

Findings

PSTs' conceptions of schooling, teaching, and students are informed by the variety of life experiences they have preceding their entrance into schools as teachers (Lortie, 1975; Smagorinsky & Barnes, 2014). In this study I was interested in how those personal experiences that PSTs bring with them into teacher education influence the ways they learn about the

community and also how they approach teaching in light of their knowledge of the community. The findings from this study suggest that PSTs' personal experiences in schools growing up contributed to particular understandings of the ways that individuals interact with one another and with places—further contributing to limited understandings of the concept of reciprocity in teacher-student-community relationships. I present the findings of my research by analyzing the four overarching themes.

Participants' Perceptions of Home Community

Participants began teacher education with K-12th grade school- and community-based experiences that shaped their developing conceptions of teaching and the relationship between communities and schools. In this section I review the types of schools the participants attended as well as the nature of their involvement with various communities before beginning college.

School type. The 10 participants represent diverse experiences in schools. From kindergarten through 12th grade, Sandy and Dee attended private Christian schools, and Jana, Red, Maddie, and Johnny attended public schools. Krista moved from public school after 1st grade and attended private school from second through fourth grades, until finally deciding, along with her parents, to be homeschooled until high school graduation. Arthur was homeschooled until 8th grade, when a shift in the family's financial needs demanded that he move into a public high school. Both Kasey and Jill attended public schools until high school, when they applied for and were accepted into a public performing arts school and public-independent military school, respectively.

Six participants described their schools as predominately White, sheltered, academically rigorous, and offering a wealth of extra-curricular and athletic activities to students. Dee described her school experience as sheltered—her father was a teacher at the school, all of her

siblings attended the school, and she graduated with a class of 27 students (all of whom had been in school together since kindergarten). Jill also described her school experience as sheltered, and said that when people learn what town she's from, they comment that it's "so unsafe, there's all this gang activity and all of these drive-by shootings," descriptors of the community that Jill did not experience growing up.

Participants described their schools as academically rigorous—offering Honors and Advanced Placement classes, International Baccalaureate programming, and the opportunity to earn college credit in high school. Further, many of the clubs that participants discussed had grade-based membership requirements.

Other popular extra-curricular activities included membership in religious and/or service-based organizations and participation in band and athletics. Arthur described the Fellowship of Christian Athletes (FCA) as having a strong presence in his public school. Teachers from the school served as facilitators of the club and would sometimes tell students: "when you go home at night, don't do homework, just pray." Other students mentioned that community service was a requirement of all graduates from their high school.

School-community relationship. Most participants described the racial make-up and/or the socioeconomic status of students attending their schools as not representative of the demographics of people who actually lived in the communities that surrounded the schools. Sandy described her school as a "bubble" whose student population was not representative of the majority-Hispanic population that surrounded the school. Like many of her school peers, Sandy's parents chose for her to attend the private school that was physically distant from her home because she would have been a racial minority at the nearby public school.

Red and Arthur, however, were unique cases. Both Red and Arthur attended schools that were unlike the places they experienced outside school. Red's high school was located in a town made up of two specific socioeconomic classes—the wealthy families who had lived in the town for generations and the poorer families who were newer to the area. Although the high school was located in the wealthy side of town, its student population was both racially and economically diverse. Red noted that the racial divide within the school was quite obvious because those students enrolled in higher level courses were primarily White. Only Arthur said that his high school was representative of the diverse community within which he lived—busing students from across the county to attend the single high school.

Community involvement and descriptors. Participants said that their schools and communities growing up were "close-knit" and indicated that they knew and spent time with their school peers outside school, with 16 codes so attributed. The code of "close-knit," in particular, included instances where participants shared that people regularly interacted with one another in positive ways either within the community or in the school. Although at the time of her interview Dee described her "close-knit" school community in a positive light, by the end of high school she remembered feeling that the "tiny" school was "definitely something I wanted to get away from when I was ready." For Jill, the community of people she spent the majority of her time with revolved around the school. Jill said: "I went to school with virtually the same kids from 6th through 12th grade and so that's like a big sense of, um, like my community we all went to the same church, and we all went to school together." She also noted the homogeneity of students who primarily came from "middle class" households. Arthur discussed the shared communities of church and school and noted that many of the FCA members and teacher-facilitators attended church together.

Given the relative frequency with which the code of "close-knit" was applied to the data, it is not altogether surprising that the majority of participants also said that they knew and spent time with their classmates outside school. Simply knowing one another outside school, however, did not indicate physical proximity. More participants indicated that they lived physically distant from their school and school peers than those who reported that they lived near one another. For Sandy and Dee, who attended private schools, the physical distance was probably a result of choosing to attend schools outside their district.

A more limited number of participants considered themselves and their families to be removed from community involvement. Perhaps because his family moved a number of times, Johnny spent most of his social time with family. Similarly, Krista explicitly stated: "My family's never been very active in communities."

As demonstrated in the findings, most of the participants in this study (along with their parents) were able to control their interactions with other people and places prior to teacher education. Overwhelmingly, the participants shared stories of choices that were aimed at maintaining homogeneity across their home and school communities. Participants went to private schools with the same groups of students from PreK-12th grade, they interacted with their school peers in out-of-school spaces like churches, and they chose to attend schools that promoted shared value systems. Participants' interactions were thus limited to those with similar others.

In effect, most participants did not have to actively establish reciprocal relationships between themselves and the people and places with whom they interacted growing up because that reciprocity was established through the choices they were able to make. For instance, when Sandy (along with her parents) chose to attend a majority-White private school growing up, she

placed herself alongside similar others, where a race-based power hierarchy, in particular, was minimal.

The ability to control one's interactions through the use of choice was unquestioned for eight participants. PSTs often drew on their own experiences with schooling, parental involvement, and choice as they made sense of their experiences in the community during the CIP and their students during both practicum and student teaching. Because most of the participants did not recognize choice to be a privilege growing up, they were unable to recognize the ways that choice was not universally or equitably bestowed on all populations once they moved into teacher education.

Participants' Perceptions of the University and Student Teaching Communities

As the PSTs began their formal teacher education coursework and the CIP in particular, they began to notice differences between their own school- and community-based experiences and those they were observing in their ST schools and the town of Lindfield. Specifically, PSTs' perceptions of Lindfield were shaped by their understandings of community membership, their methods of learning about the community, and their perceptions of both Lindfield and their schools.

Membership in Lindfield community. Only Dee and Maddie specifically named themselves as members of the community surrounding the university. For Dee, her membership was based on the fact that she lived in the county, that physically "I'm there." Maddie's membership in the community was unique, however, as she grew up in the community surrounding the university, having attended elementary and middle school in Lindfield. Although Maddie moved to a different town before starting high school, she maintained a sense of

belonging to the community surrounding the university, one that was perhaps even bolstered by her move back to the community to attend college.

In their CIP reflections, participants specifically named non-university students as members of the community—with 12 codes so attributed across the data. With the exceptions of Dee and Arthur, all other participants named non-university students as community members. Most of the PSTs did not recognize themselves to be community members and, although they could easily list information they learned about students and the community, they did not interrogate the interactions between and among people and places. Their community memberships may have informed the ways the participants learned about the Lindfield community as part of the CIP.

Method of learning about the Lindfield community. Participants learned about the Lindfield community through physical contact, online research, email and/or phone calls, and their personal knowledge. Of the 66 codes in this category, 50 were attributed to instances where participants named physical contact as the method through which they learned about the community. Physical contact included participants' interactions with either the people or the places surrounding the university. Jill, Red, Johnny, and Krista named physical contact with the greatest frequency, specifically identifying interviews with local community members and riding the city bus.

Although many participants used online research to learn about Lindfield during the CIP, Dee was the only participant to name phone calls and emails as an inquiry method. Throughout her interviews, reflections, and rationale paper, Dee referred to herself as "shy" and "private." Dee also repeatedly described her school and childhood growing up as "sheltered." Dee's

personal attributes as well as her school experiences growing up could have contributed to her use of more indirect methods of learning about the community, as compared to her peers.

Finally, only one participant explicitly drew on her own personal knowledge of the community. Red specifically referenced her experiences working at the local country club and babysitting as informing her understanding of the community, particularly her perception of a divide between wealthy and poorer families.

Community perceptions. In describing their perceptions of the community surrounding the university, participants named both challenges and positive attributes. Additionally, participants described the community as diverse and named aspects of the community they found surprising or new while completing the CIP.

Participants named challenges (27 codes) and positive attributes (23 codes) of the community with similar frequency. Challenges the participants perceived to be facing the community included poverty, lack of safety, and a "bad" school system. For example, after reading a news story about a girl being chased through a local middle school by another student with scissors, Sandy concluded that the local middle school is "not as structured of a school as I'm used to." Kasey acknowledged that she didn't want to explore the community on her own as "there were some neighborhoods that we drove through where I think I would have felt a little edgy if I were by myself."

Participants also named positive attributes of the community. These statements were often also coded as surprising for participants. Contrary to many of the findings in the preceding paragraph, positive attributes of the community included feeling that it was safe, well-resourced, and had good schools. Jill's online research helped her to learn that one local school offered support programs to parents. Johnny noted the convenience of the local public library, as well as

the free resources offered to local community members. For Johnny, the centrality of the library contributed to his perception of the community as "close-knit." Jill also viewed the community as "close-knit" when she discussed her experiences while interviewing two women who worked at a local daycare. Even though the women Jill interviewed evinced some negative feelings about the local school district, she also noticed that they were "reticent to say anything derogatory."

Seven participants explicitly described the community as "diverse." Jana named diverse physical spaces, noting that the town included the urban downtown area, suburban neighborhoods, and even rural farmlands. Dee discussed the ways that she was learning about diverse perspectives held about the community, depending on the source of her information and the person with whom she was talking. Similarly, Jill acknowledged the diversity of perspectives and experiences of the community members when she expressed her fear of overgeneralizing the community and her concern with creating an accurate portrayal of the community in her final CIP project.

Finally, the majority of codes (49) in this category were attributed to that information participants found either surprising or new about the community. Surprises named by participants included the easy access to and regular use of technology within the public schools and the public library, the inconsistent and unreliable nature of public transportation, the divide between places frequented by local community members and university students, and the ease with which the participants felt they were learning about the community by spending time there.

ST school descriptors. During the fall semester participants completed practicum observations two days each week, before (ideally) beginning their student teaching in the same school in the spring. Participants were all placed in middle or high school classrooms for their practicum and student teaching. For some participants, the ST school was located in Lindfield;

however, most of the participants were placed in ST schools between 15 and 45 minutes away. In this section, I review participants' descriptors of their ST schools.

All participants in this study were placed in public ST schools. Five participants described their ST schools as having a majority-White student population, two described their schools as majority non-White, and three did not reference the racial make-up of their school when asked to describe the demographics. Three participants indicated that the students at their respective schools did not live physically near one another, and two said students at their schools knew one another outside the school context.

Participants referenced challenges (23 codes) and positive attributes (25 codes) of their ST schools with similar frequencies. Challenges named by the participants included behavior issues, high populations of students receiving free and reduced lunch, and lack of access to technology. Arthur described his ST school as "a hard place to work" primarily because of behavior issues, noting that "Kids tell you to go fuck yourself and they get in fights." Many of the participants were especially aware of the divisions within their schools in terms of race and socioeconomic status. For instance, Jana said that her ST school was made up of "basically very poor people and then like professors and people who work for the university, their kids. Those are usually the White kids." Across the interviews, participants noted that advanced courses were often populated by White students and on-level classes were more racially diverse.

Participants also noted a number of positive attributes of their ST schools. Red and Maddie considered their ST schools to be close-knit because many of the teachers had attended the school as students themselves. Dee noted the "constant communication between everybody in the school at all times" as contributing to a sense of community and congeniality at her ST school. The prevalence of non-academic, service-based organizations, and students' active

involvement in such organizations, was seen as a positive attribute of Jill's ST school. Finally, Kasey was proud of the wealth of resources available to teachers and students at her ST school.

Unlike their experiences in schools growing up—where most participants and their families were able to choose which schools to attend—PSTs were unable to choose the schools in which they would complete their practicum and student teaching. Consequently, the PSTs' abilities to maintain homogeneity across their own experiences growing up and the school within which they would work were limited. This fissure could potentially have influenced the methods they used to learn about the Lindfield community as well as their ST schools.

Parental Involvement

PSTs' own experiences with parental involvement growing up shaped their expectations for and perceptions of parental involvement in Lindfield. The ability to make educational choices was a significant characteristic of PSTs' parental involvement growing up, and one that differed greatly from their experiences in Lindfield.

Personal parental involvement. Participants' talk indicated that parental involvement could take a variety of forms, including their physical presence in the school, regular communication with the school, high expectations of their child's academic work, and choice in schooling. Six participants described their parents as being physically present at the school, with only one participant noting her parents' regular communication as a form of involvement. Jill, in particular, mentioned that her mother showed up to all of the military parades at the school. Arthur and Krista's parents were physically present because they were homeschooled. Similarly, Dee and Maddie had parents who worked in their schools, so their presence and involvement was unavoidable.

Choice in schooling, however, was the most frequently coded form of personal parental involvement, with 17 statements coded as such. Dee, Sandy, Jill, Kasey, Maddie, Arthur, and Krista discussed the reasons behind their parents' choices to educate them in particular ways: home-school for Arthur and Krista, private school for Dee and Sandy, application-based public schools for Jill and Kasey, and moving to a particular area of the district for Maddie. Although the participants discussed choice frequently throughout their interviews, no participant discussed the ways that choice was a privilege. This finding became even more salient as I moved into the second category in this theme.

Only three participants indicated that their parents were not involved in their education. Sandy specifically mentioned that her parents did not communicate with or attend school-related functions because they had busy jobs, but other parents were very active in her private school. Similarly, Kasey mentioned that her parents were always supportive of her, but ultimately expected her to take personal responsibility for her learning. With seven of the nine codes in this category attributed to her, Red was perhaps the greatest outlier, with parents who were critical of her focus on academics. Specifically, Red shared that in response to her enrollment in advanced courses, "my parents were kind of just like 'why are you doing that?'" Red was one of only two participants (Kasey being the other) to say that she had a job in high school. For Red, the job was necessary so that she could buy the supplies she needed for school and to participate in extracurricular activities.

Parental involvement in community and/or ST school. With the exception of the "other parents were involved" code, the same codes from the previous category were used to analyze the data for the category of parental involvement in the community and/or the ST school. This category had fewer codes (20 codes) than the previous category (43 codes), perhaps because

participants were only discussing their perceptions of the community and ST from a brief period of time. The codes for parental involvement in the community or ST school were proportional to those of the personal parental involvement. For instance, physical presence in school represented approximately 14% of the total codes for personal parental involvement and 10% of the total codes for parental involvement in the community and/or ST school.

Regular communication between schools and families was viewed as a positive quality and an indicator of good parenting. For instance, Dee applauded her student teaching placement school because the parents responded to her calls and emails and students made changes based on that communication. She also lauded her ST school for inviting parents into the school for conferences. Alternatively, Sandy and Arthur were frustrated by parents who did not return phone calls or show up to scheduled conferences.

Although choice in schooling represented approximately 40% of the codes for the personal parental involvement category, the same code was never applied for parental involvement in the community and/or ST school. Parental involvement represents another point of tension between the personal practical knowledge about teaching and education that PSTs brought with them into teacher education, and the professional knowledge landscape they were beginning to experience through their inquiries into both the Lindfield community during the CIP and their ST schools during practicum and student teaching (Clandinin, et al., 2006).

Approach to Teaching

The categories generated in this final theme indicate that the PSTs believed students' personal lives and interests should inform planning and instruction. However, the PSTs struggled to name specific ways that such information could be incorporated into teaching.

Method of learning about ST community. The participants engaged in four practices to learn about their ST schools and respective communities. The most frequently discussed methods of learning about the ST community were the interactions that participants had with students during school—with 20 of the 42 codes so attributed. With the exception of Jana's, all other participants' data were coded for "interactions with students" at least once across the various data sources. Participants' interactions with students were primarily geared toward building connections with them. For instance, Johnny mentioned that he often talked with students about their favorite music, went home and listened to the music himself, and then continued conversations with students regarding their musical tastes.

Participants also mentioned specifically soliciting information from students in school regarding their interests, access to technology, and/or community and school involvement and experiences via concept maps and student surveys. Time spent interacting with the community and/or community members was another method of learning about the ST community. For instance, Red knew two people who grew up in the community surrounding her ST school and asked them about the community and their experiences in school. The more common method of learning about the ST communities was by attending after-school athletic events.

Finally, the participants drew from their personal experiences in schools growing up to help them make sense of the ST community and students. To try and understand the level of her students' thinking about particular topics, Dee reflected on her own experiences in school. Dee said that,

> While I had a very abnormal high school experience, I would like to think that I had addressed or at least thought about these topics by the eleventh grade. As I wrote the questions, I took my own experience as a safe assumption for my students' experience.

However, Dee found that “it did not work quite as well as I would have liked.” Similarly, Arthur entered student teaching with his own ideas about what certain interactions meant, based on his experiences growing up. During his interview, Arthur described an instance where he had to tell a student “Look, I get when you say 'shut up bitch' that you're playing, but where I come from those are fighting words.” Both Dee and Arthur felt that what they were learning about students was superficial. Dee recognized that her fear around sharing too much about herself was perhaps limiting her students’ willingness to divulge information about themselves. Arthur felt that the school space limited his ability to learn about his students because assignments were not aimed at unearthing personal narratives and he did not have access to students’ home lives once they left school. The knowledge that the participants gained about the ST community, school, and students informed their talk in the next three categories.

Relevance of community knowledge to teaching. I understand communities and schools to be fluid, with the events, practices, people, and cultures of one space to be always informing those of other spaces. However, for the purposes of trying to make sense of the ways that my participants understood and managed the interaction that happen between schools and communities, I have divided the two spaces here.

Codes in this category address the interactions of people, events, practices, and places that extend beyond the classroom space. The category is divided into three codes: specific examples from the participant’s own teaching, specific examples from observing others, and belief statements. Participants referenced examples from their own teaching and general belief statements with the greatest frequency. For instance, Kasey drew from her knowledge of the ST community as predominantly White and economically privileged as she planned her unit on *To Kill a Mockingbird* (Lee, 1960). Rather than making her students feel attacked or guilty, Kasey

structured her unit to encourage students to talk openly about race, power, and privilege. During student teaching, Krista learned that very few community members had internet access at home, instead relying on the public library for WiFi access. Although the ST school provided laptops for all of the students, few students could actually access the internet on their computers once they went home. With this information in mind, Krista taught her students how to "look things up and then download them to their computer using the print screen" so that they could still complete research without internet access.

The participants also expressed more general beliefs about how community knowledge should inform teachers' planning and interactions with students. Jana believed that teachers should apply what they learn in the community to their classrooms, considering, for instance, how challenging it may be for students to secure school supplies and how students' cultural interests could be incorporated into the classroom.

Relevance of student knowledge to teaching. "Student knowledge" refers to participants' knowledge of individual students as it informed the specific happenings, tasks, and interactions that occurred within the classroom space. Notably, the *relevance of student knowledge* category received more codes (76 codes) than the *relevance of community knowledge* category (48 codes). The three codes in the *relevance of student knowledge* category include specific examples from the participants' own teaching, specific examples from observing others, and belief statements regarding the relevance of student knowledge to teaching. Similar to the previous category, codes for specific examples from participants' own teaching and belief statements were applied most frequently to the data.

Participants drew on their own teaching to demonstrate how student knowledge could be relevant to teaching. For instance, Red incorporated opportunities for student choice, specifically

in terms of how to read texts, in class. Maddie shared a method for building the morale of students. When she felt that a student needed encouragement during student teaching, Maddie was in the practice of leaving them handwritten notes that said, "I believe in you."

Participants also shared a number of belief statements regarding the relevance of student knowledge to teaching. Throughout his interview, Johnny articulated a belief that having high expectations for students and providing challenging assignments and texts for them were positive qualities in teaching. However, he was adamant that for such lofty goals to be attainable, teachers must first determine what students know and are able to do. The codes in both categories—*relevance of community knowledge* and *relevance of student knowledge*—inform the final category, which was concerned with the ways participants planned instruction.

Planning instruction. When asked how they went about planning instruction during student teaching, the participants' responses resulted in the following codes: *start from the text and/or a literary concept, collaborate with other teachers or peers, differentiate for student interests, differentiate for student needs, and teach to the majority*. Statements included in this final category were concerned with the more specific, local approaches to teaching that the participants undertook while student teaching. All 10 participants planned instruction by differentiating for student academic and social needs. This was also the most frequently applied code for this category. Participants reported starting from a text or literary concept and differentiating for student interests with similar frequency. Participants referenced collaborating with others with relatively less frequency—naming their cohort peers, mentor teachers, and online resources as the most helpful in planning instruction.

The fewest codes in this category were attributed to planning methods that explicitly taught to the majority. For example, Dee felt that the religious conservativism of her students

influenced how she taught—drawing from her own religious upbringing to help guide students through religious readings of texts. Dee did not acknowledge other readings of texts based on students who may not be religious. Jill, on the other hand, determined that the majority of the students in her class were experiencing an issue with bullying. For that reason, she chose to highlight characters' bullying behaviors when teaching *To Kill a Mockingbird* (Lee, 1960).

When considered in tandem with the earlier theme, *participants' perceptions of the university and student teaching communities*, findings regarding PSTs' *approaches to teaching* suggest that PSTs were frustrated that they were not learning as much as they wanted to about the community members (via the CIP) and the students with whom they were interacting (during practicum and student teaching). Many participants felt that there were barriers to learning about students on a deeper, more personal level potentially because both community members and ST students were selective about the information they shared with the PSTs. There are numerous possible reasons for this behavior—one of which may be linked to reciprocity and interaction. Although the PSTs did see value in learning about students and communities, they often struggled to attend to the interactions occurring among and between all of these places, and their own role in these spaces.

Although the PSTs expected community members to talk openly about their communities, they were not reciprocally offering information about themselves, or allowing or inviting others to interrogate them. The lack of reciprocity between the PSTs in this study and the communities into which they were inquiring potentially contributed to an us-versus-them mentality where interactions were limited and power hierarchies were reinforced (Flower, 2008; Hallman & Burdick, 2011).

The absence of reciprocity could be a symptom of the CIP design, (see chapter four for a more thorough critique). The project arguably valued breadth of knowledge about the community, over depth of knowledge about and experiences with individuals within the community. Further, the language of the project emphasized learning about and from community people and places, rather than learning with community members. The absence of reciprocity could also be due to the lack of models provided to PSTs preceding teacher education and/or during student teaching. Because so many of the PSTs in this study claimed to have limited interactions with community members growing up, they seemingly had few experiences to draw upon as they considered what a reciprocal relationship with community members could look like both in and out of the school space. Further, PSTs drew primarily from their own experiences teaching (both during practica and student teaching) to discuss the relevance of both community and student knowledge to teaching. Only 9% of the codes for these two categories were attributed to specific examples that PSTs observed in mentor teachers. These findings suggest that PSTs were not encouraged to analyze the ways their mentor teachers were regularly incorporating knowledge of communities or students into their teaching, further limiting PSTs' models of reciprocity in schools.

Discussion

In undertaking this study, my overarching concern was with the ways that PSTs' prior life experiences informed their understandings of the interaction between schools and communities. Because most of the PSTs in this study were able to make strategic choices growing up that allowed them to circumambulate people and places that were unlike them or unfamiliar, they often disregarded the interaction between themselves and the surrounding communities during their CIP work and student teaching. Thus, PSTs' experiences with people

and places preceding teacher education limited their ability to see places as relational and shaped by individuals (Abram, 1996; Gruenewald, 2003). The participants' past interactions with school revolved around control (being able to control where they went to school, with whom they attended school, etc.), potentially contributing to their conception of schools as places dominated by control. These PSTs, then, unwittingly perpetuated visions of schools as spaces that facilitate cultural reproductions of power (Gruenewald, 2003; LeFebvre, 1974) and did not recognize the cultivation of reciprocity across groups (students, teachers, and communities) to be valuable or necessary.

The findings of this study suggest that PSTs' experiences in schools growing up may contribute to their understanding of the relationship between individuals and places, particularly the ways individuals are able to manipulate places. Rather than viewing places as the products of ongoing construction and interaction, the PSTs in this study disregarded the role they played within places, and the role of interaction in place-building.

The findings from this study could have implications for the ways that teacher educators incorporate opportunities for experiential learning via community-based projects, practica, and student teaching into their programs. Teacher educators should incorporate activities, assignments, discussions, and opportunities for reflection that encourage PSTs to build synthesis across their various field-based experiences, thus building reciprocity among diverse experiences and settings. Further, rather than positioning the community and students as the mere objects of study, teacher educators could encourage PSTs to view themselves as involved in relationships with other people and places—relationships that require PSTs to understand and develop reciprocity. These reciprocal relationships could be established through teacher education projects aimed at partnership-building, rather than mere exploration. Finally, by taking a funds of

knowledge approach to teacher preparation, teacher educators could stress the transferability of the *tools* of inquiry, rather than the *findings* of inquiry (González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005). In so doing, teacher educators could challenge approaches to learning and place that position each as fixed, independent, and/or universal.

Opportunities for experiential education, like community-based projects, are growing in popularity in teacher education programs across the world (McCormack & O'Flaherty, 2010; Mitton-Kukner, Nelson, & Desrochers, 2010). As these programs evolve, it is paramount that teacher educators, PSTs, and community partners explicitly and regularly discuss, re-define, and challenge the concept of reciprocity. In particular, all stakeholders should regularly consider the ways their work is contributing to and/or taking away from the building of reciprocal relationships across diverse people and places.

References

Abram, D. (1996). *The spell of sensuous*. New York, NY: Vintage.

Banks, J. A. (2006). *Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum, and teaching* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson Education.

Barnes, M. E., & Smagorinsky, P. (2016). What English/Language Arts teacher candidates learn during coursework and practica: A study of three teacher education programs. *Journal of Teacher Education, 67*(4), 338-355.

Basso, K. (1996). *Wisdom sits in places: Landscape and language among the Western Apache*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.

Bickford, D. M., & Reynolds, N. (2002). Activism and service learning: Reframing volunteerism as acts of dissent. *Pedagogy: Critical approaches to teaching literature, language, composition, and culture, 2*, 229-252.

Bortolin, K. (2011). Serving ourselves: How the discourse on community engagement privileges the university over the community. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 49-58.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.

Burant, T. J., & Kirby, D. (2002). Beyond classroom-based early field experiences: Understanding an 'educative practicum' in an urban school and community. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 18*, 561-575.

Carnevale, A. P., Strohl, J., & Melton, M. (2011). *What's it worth?: The economic value of college majors*. Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce. Access at https://georgetown.app.box.com/s/5s45uwkaf2epu9oz58qv

Chang, S., Anagnostopoulos, D., & Omae, H. (2011). The multidimensionality of multicultural service learning: The variable effects of social identity, context and pedagogy on pre-service teachers' learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(7), 1078-1089.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1995). *Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Clandinin, D. J., Huber, J., Huber, M., Murphy, M. S., Orr, A. M., Pearce, M., & Steeves, P. (2006). *Composing diverse identities: Narrative inquiries into the interwoven lives of children and teachers*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Dewey, J. (1927). *The public and its problems: An essay in political inquiry*. New York, NY: Holt Publishers.

Feld, S., & Basso, K. (Eds.) (1996). *Sense of place*. Sante Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Flower, L. (2008). *Community literacy and the rhetoric of public engagement*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press.

Foucault, M. (1997). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings* (C. Gordon, Ed.). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (Eds.). 2005. *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts, and social change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Greene, S., Burke, K. J., & McKenna, M. K. (2016). Introduction: Literacies and the practice of democracy. In S. Greene, K. J. Burke, & M. K. McKenna (Eds.), *Youth voices, public spaces, and civic engagement* (pp. 1-21). New York, NY: Routledge.

Gruenewald, D. A. (2003). Foundations of place: A multidisciplinary framework for place-conscious education. *American Educational Research Journal, 40*(3), 619-654.

Hallman, H. L., & Burdick, M. N. (2011). Service learning and the preparation of English teacher. *English Education, 43*(4), 341- 368.

Hogan, M. L. (2006). Making contact: Teaching, bodies, and the ethics of multiculturalism. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 28*, 355-366.

Kinloch, V., & Smagorinsky, P. (2014). *Service-learning in literacy education: Possibilities for teaching and learning*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Lake, V. E., & Jones, I. (2008). Service-learning in early childhood teacher education: Using service to put meaning back into learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(8), 2146-2156.

Larkin, J. M., & Sleeter, C. E. (Eds.). (1995). *Developing multicultural teacher education curricula*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Lee, H. (1960). *To kill a mockingbird*. Philadelphia: Lippincott.

LeFebvre, H. (1974). *The production of space*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

McCormack, O., & O'Flaherty, J. (2010). An examination of pre-service teachers' attitudes towards the inclusion of development education into Irish Post-Primary schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(6), 1332-1339.

Mitton-Kukner, J., Nelson, C., & Desrochers, C. (2010). Narrative inquiry in service learning contexts: Possibilities for learning about diversity in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(5), 1162-1169.

Mitchell, T. (2008). Traditional vs. critical service-learning: Engaging the literature to differentiate two models. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 50-65.

Moll, L. C., & González, N. (1994) Lessons from research with language-minority children. *Journal of Literacy Research, 26*(4), 439-456.

Moss, G. (2008). Diversity study circles in teacher education practice: An experiential learning project. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(1), 216-224.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2013). *Number and percentage distribution of teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools* (Data File). Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d13/tables/dt13_209.10.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2014). *The condition of education: Racial/ethnic enrollment in public schools* (Data File). Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cge.asp

Nespor, J. (1997). *Tangled up in school: Politics, space, bodies, and signs in the educational process*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

New, C. A. (1995). Oral histories: An interactive link in teaching Language Arts. In J. M. Larkin & C. E. Sleeter (Eds.), *Developing multicultural teacher education curricula* (pp. 105-114). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Reissman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Richards, J. C., Moore, R. C., & Gipe, J. P. (1996). Preservice teachers in two different multicultural field programs: The complex influences of school context. *Research in the Schools, 3*(2), 23-34.

Seidman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*, 94–106.

Sleeter, C. E. (2008). Equity, democracy, and neoliberal assaults on teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*, 1947-1957.

Smagorinsky, P., & Barnes, M. E. (2014). Revisiting and revising the apprenticeship of observation. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 41*(4), 29-52.

Tuckett, A. G. (2005). Applying thematic analysis theory to practice: A researcher's experience. *Contemporary Nurse, 19*(1-2), 75-87.

United States Census Bureau. (2015). *QuickFacts: Athens-Clarke County (balance), Georgia* (data file). Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045215/1303440,00

United States Department of Education. (2016). *The state of racial diversity in the educator workforce* (Data file). Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/highered/racial-diversity/state-racial-diversity-workforce.pdf

Vélez-Ibáñez, C., & Greenberg, J. (1992). Formation and transformation of funds of knowledge. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 23*, 313-335.

Wallerstein, N., & Duran, B. (2008). The theoretical, historical, and practice roots of CBPR. In M. Minkler & N. Wallerstein (Eds.), *Community-based participatory research for health: From process to outcomes* (2nd ed.), (pp. 25-46). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Appendix A

Year Two Community Inquiry Project Overview

Through inquiry, immersion, analysis, and presentation, you will develop a more comprehensive view of the diverse stories students bring with them to the classroom and how these stories inform (and are informed by) their reading practices. This project is also intended to break down the barriers that may exist between the university and the surrounding town of Lindfield. Overall, through your work on the CIP, you will begin to identify methods that you can use to learn more about the diverse students who will populate your classrooms and to create culturally sustaining pedagogical practices and relationships.

Working in groups of 3-4, you will engage in various activities (from riding the city bus regularly to finding places where Lindfield youth hang out after school) to learn more about Lindfield, while also critically reflecting on your own understandings of community. Ultimately, you will take the class on a virtual tour of your area of Lindfield and consider the implications of your findings for teaching.

The overall components and due dates are as follows:

component	percentage
Concept Map (pre-project)	20%
3 Individual Reflections	20%
3 Group Discussions	20%
Lesson Plan Analysis	20%
Virtual Tour & Presentation	20%

What you're actually doing:
While you do the following activities, you should take 2 sets of notes. One set should be as objective as possible (descriptions, fact-based information) while the second set is more subjective (how do you feel, what are your opinions/thoughts about the experience). During the semester, your group will do each of the following:

- ride the city (NOT UGA) bus: notice who is there, who is not there, how do people interact with one another, how long are people on the bus, what is it like to navigate the city bus system, how long did you have to wait on the bus, etc.
- visit local businesses, housing neighborhoods, and public institutions
- conduct community interviews: ask people how long they have lived here, did they go to school here, what are their thoughts about the community, how often do they go to campus and for what purpose, what is the role of UGA in the community?, etc.
- attend school meetings (like PTO meetings) and/or public hearings
- identify available public resources (clubs/sports, playgrounds, libraries, etc.) and analyze their usage, safety, and upkeep
- identify interpersonal relationships (who do people spend time with, who cares for whom, who do people go to for help or advice)
- school observations: How many students ride the bus? How many students ride in the carpool? How do parents say goodbye?

- Follow local news (the online newspaper is free)
- Take photos (with permission if people are involved)

***Most importantly, be safe! Do not do any of the above work on your own – do this work with a partner or as an entire group. Also, be sure to contact the school in your neighborhood to get permission before attending their meetings.

Concept Map

You will complete a concept map (during class time) at the beginning of this project. In this map you will individually display (through words, pictures, or a combination of both) what you consider to be your community. Your maps will be shared with the class and revisited at the end of the project.

Individual Reflections

You will use your individual page on the class wiki to maintain a reflective blog throughout your work on the community inquiry project. The content of these reflections is generally up to you, however you should follow a "What?", "So What?", "Now What?" format (addressed in greater detail in the chart below). You should also try to take advantage of the online nature of your writing – including hyperlinks, pictures, and videos when necessary and/or applicable.

Topic	Possible questions to address…
What?	What happened? What topic is of interest today? What did you see in the community today? What happened in class that connected to the community? What are your beliefs about the community/future students? What do you anticipate about your future teaching/planning?
So What?	Why is this important/significant? What does it mean to you? What does it mean to others? Why did this stand out? How is this relevant to your coursework or other previous experiences?
Now What?	How will this experience inform future teaching? How has this changed your thought process? How will you act or speak differently in the future?

Multimodal Tour & Presentation

Ultimately, you will use all of this data to create a visual and multimodal community map of the neighborhood of Lindfield you were assigned. Your map should include a combination of words and images and should provide a more holistic and in-depth view of the diverse stories and experiences that make up your community. You will present your map to the rest of the class.

Each group member should have a clear and defined role in the presentation. Presentations should be no longer than 8-10 minutes and should be engaging, creative, and relevant.

Lesson Plan Analysis
For this assignment you may choose to either analyze a sample lesson plan (that I provide) or to use one of your own lesson plans from this year. There are two components of this assignment:

Component #1
Use the "review" function in Word to make notes throughout the LP on the following:
Assumptions about students (interests, abilities, resources)
Needs of students

Component #2
Alter the lesson plan to be less reliant on the assumptions about students
Re-write the lesson plan to reflect these changes

Component #3
Write a 700-800 word reflection outlining the changes you made to the lesson plan and thoroughly explaining how these changes better account for the needs and differences of your students. Your reflection should incorporate specific information you have learned about your students as well as incorporate references to the texts we have read so far in class this semester. Please use APA when organizing your paper and references.

CHAPTER 3

CONFLICTING CONCEPTIONS OF CARE AND TEACHING AND PRE-SERVICE TEACHER ATTRITION[4]

[4] Barnes, M. E. To be submitted to *Teaching Education*.

Abstract

Pre-service and novice teacher attrition has commonly been linked to a variety of individual (e.g., burnout, resilience, personal demographics) and contextual (e.g., student issues, poverty rates, salary, professional development, teacher education) factors. However, those teachers who were enrolled in a formal teacher education program with a required practicum component and who had supportive and empathic mentors during teacher education are far less likely to leave teaching, suggesting that teacher preparation does play a role in teacher retention. In this chapter I draw on theoretical approaches to teacher identity development and care in teaching as I inquire into the ways that one PST's personal experiences with and expectations for teaching bumped up against those of his Mentor Teacher during student teaching, potentially contributing to the PST's choice to leave teaching altogether. Findings from this study suggest that teacher educators should encourage PSTs to reflect on their expectations of the mentor relationship and to interrogate their own expectations of and definitions of care as they complete student teaching.

Keywords: teacher education, care, teacher attrition

Introduction

Pre-service teachers (PSTs) enter teacher education with expectations of their teacher education experience, as well as of their role as novice teachers. PSTs often draw on specific characteristics of teachers with whom they interacted in school as students as they construct an image of the ideal teacher and the teacher they hope to become (Cole & Knowles, 1993; Feiman-Nemser, 2001). Drawing merely from observations of teachers during the apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975), however, often contributes to overly simplistic expectations for teaching (Cole & Knowles, 1993; Feiman-Nemser, 2001). Thus, as they move into schools to teach, many PSTs struggle to negotiate their own developing teacher identities and expectations for teaching into school contexts, potentially contributing to their likelihood to leave teaching (Buchanan, Prescott, Schuck, Aubusson, & Burke, 2013; Schaefer, Long, & Clandinin, 2012).

Approximately 40-50% of U. S. teachers leave the profession within their first five years (Ingersoll, 2003; Ingersoll & Perda, 2010; Riggs, 2013). However, research indicates that teacher preparation may play a role in teacher retention (Buchanan et al., 2013; Darling-Hammond, Berry, & Thoreson, 2001; Gilpin, 2011; Skilbeck & Connell, 2004). Further, teachers who have supportive and empathic mentors during teacher education (Schuck, 2003) and in their first years of teaching (Johnson & Birkeland, 2003; McLoughan, 2004) are more likely to remain in the profession.

PSTs leave teaching in response to a number of individual and contextual factors (Schaefer et al., 2012). PSTs may struggle as they enter their field placements and realize that they have placed unrealistic expectations on themselves as novice teachers, they may be overwhelmed by the expectations placed on teachers in general, or they may feel unable to keep up with the pace and complexities of classroom life.

Some PSTs may realize that their personal temperament or work ethic prevents them from being able to teach in the way that they expected or would like to teach. The PSTs' struggle to develop a sense of self as a teacher could also contribute to their frustrations with or even choice to leave student teaching. For instance, PSTs may have personality traits that aren't conducive to classroom teaching or may experience tension between the teacher PSTs envision becoming and the teacher PSTs believe they will have to be. PSTs may also choose to leave teaching because they feel they lack the type of role model they desire in their Mentor Teacher (MT) (Bullough & Draper, 2004). To help PSTs navigate these tensions, many teacher education programs require tutoring experiences prior to a student's acceptance into teacher education and, once admitted, require PSTs to engage in field experiences beyond formal student teaching.

During student teaching, PSTs are both students and teachers and must navigate these dual roles while also developing relationships with an MT and K-12 students. Although Noddings (1984) differentiated between the roles of teachers and students in terms of care, PSTs' understandings of their role in the classroom may not be so clear—potentially contributing to knotty understandings of care. I draw on sociocultural approaches to teacher identity development (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Vygotsky, 1978) and literature on care in teaching (Noddings, 1984), to inquire into the ways that tension between one PST's developing conceptions of care and teaching and those of his MT potentially contributed to the PST's choice to leave teaching altogether. This study is guided by the following research questions:

1. What conceptions of care and teaching did one PST construct before and during teacher education coursework?
2. How did the PST respond when his conceptions of care and teaching conflicted with those of his MT?

Theoretical Framework

I draw on theories related to teacher identity development (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Owens & Ennis, 2005) and an ethic of care in teaching (Noddings, 1984) to inquire into the ways that one PST, Johnny, tried to negotiate his own expectations for teaching and his developing teacher identity into the context of his student teaching placement school.

Teacher Identity Development

I approach teacher identity development from a sociocultural theoretical stance that considers learning and development to be both ongoing and socially-mediated (Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1991). For Vygotsky, learning, whereby the learner appropriates new knowledge or skills differs from development, which occurs in the space between what the learner knows or is able to do on their own and what the learner can do with the support or guidance of a knowledgeable other (the zone of proximal development). Lave and Wenger (1991) extend Vygotsky's work to consider the experience of an apprenticeship in learning and development, whereby learning is "a process of becoming a member of a sustained community of practice" (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 65) and includes both developing an identity as a member of a community and becoming knowledgeably skillful. As the learner acquires the specific knowledge and skills associated with the apprenticeship, they develop an identity and a membership within the community and also begin to understand the ways that individual tasks and responsibilities fit within the larger scope of the profession. In teacher education, ideally, university-based coursework and field experiences work in tandem to prepare PSTs to become members of a "community of practice" of educators. As PSTs appropriate more of the skills needed to be a teacher, the could also work toward a greater degree of intersubjectivity, or a shared understanding of the practice of teaching (Smagorinsky, 2011).

The development of a concept of teaching and intersubjectivity, however, are a bit more complicated than alluded to above. As PSTs learn to teach, they navigate the sometimes antagonistic interactions of university and schools (Shulman, 2004) as well as their own expectations for and experiences in teacher education. Smagorinsky (2013) offers the practical concept to account for the development of a concept of teaching. Practical concepts, like the concept of teaching, are socially constructed over time and within contexts made up of diverse and often competing belief systems (Smagorinsky, 2013). Practical concepts, then, are inherently contradictory and amenable to change. As they develop concepts of teaching, PSTs' concepts are mediated by a number of theoretical, practical, cultural, emotional, and historical factors that contribute to diverse and changing conceptions of teaching.

Teacher Care Literature

Noddings' (1984, 1992, 2005a) ethic of care is relational and begins when the teacher, or the "one-caring," establishes care for the student, the "cared-for." The caring relationship is also reciprocal and is not complete until the student acknowledges and responds to the "one-caring" (Goldstein & Lake, 2000; White, 2003). For Noddings, the teacher is always the initiator of and model for care in the classroom (Tarlow, 1996).

Although Noddings argues that care is context-dependent, her conception of reciprocity assumes a shared understanding of care between teacher and student. High degrees of intersubjectivity, where teacher and student share a common understanding of the ways that, in this case, care is constructed and enacted in a setting, may not always be achieved in teacher-student relationships. For instance, one way that teachers may demonstrate care is by assessing student needs and then making pedagogical and curricular choices accordingly (Owens & Ennis, 2005). Although such effective teaching may be considered an expression of care by the teacher,

if the student does not interpret the behavior as care or feel cared-for in response, the caring relationship is incomplete (Noddings, 1984, 2005b).

Further, Noddings assumes that the way that the student acknowledges and responds to the teacher's care will be understood as such by the teacher. Noddings' description of the caring encounter does not adequately account for the cultural, social, historical, or other personal factors that inevitably contribute to diverse understandings or acts of care. This disconnect is particularly salient for the research I present here, where one PST's perception of care, specifically reciprocity in care, did not align with that of his MT—contributing to the PSTs' perception that the MT did not care for him or potentially for students, and thus a lack of intersubjectivity.

Many PSTs' perceptions of care are based on "limited experience and understanding of the realities of teaching" (Goldstein & Lake, 2000, p. 863), potentially contributing to idealistic goals in teaching. When teachers feel they aren't able to fully care for the needs of their students, they may become overwhelmed and eventually burn out of the profession (Owens & Ennis, 2005). In this study I aim to extend the literature on care in teaching, particularly the ways that PSTs' conceptions of teaching and experiences with students may be shaped by their perceptions of care preceding teacher education (Goldstein & Lake, 2000), potentially resulting in a lack of intersubjectivity between the PST and the MT.

Method

I present a case study (Stake, 1995, 2000) of one PST, Johnny, as he engaged in various education-based courses and service experiences over a two-year span. This case study approach allowed me to account for the contextual aspects of meaning-making and development (Flyvbjerg, 2001) and to reveal and redefine aspects of teacher development (Bloome & Bailey, 1992).

Participant

Johnny consented to participate in the two studies from which data for this article were collected and he also remained accessible throughout data analysis and writing, allowing me to conduct a form of ongoing member-checking. Johnny identified as Puerto Rican, and did not align himself[5] with either a masculine or feminine gender—instead selecting "X." Johnny's identities and experiences set him apart from the majority of pre-service and practicing teachers in the U. S., who are primarily White women (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2013, 2014).

Data Collection

Data collection took place over a two-year period to account for the sociocultural nature of learning and development (Vygtosky, 1987) and to contextualize Johnny's developing conception of teaching within his particular experiences over time. Data were collected at a large public university in the U. S. Southeast from two data collections in which Johnny was a participant: the *Service-Learning Course* and the *Community Inquiry Project*. The first data collection occurred during Johnny's sophomore year in college when he was enrolled in a service-learning elective course offered in the College of Education. The second occurred during Johnny's senior year when he was enrolled in the Reading Methods course, of which I was the instructor, and as he completed student teaching.

Service-Learning (SL) data collection. University students voluntarily enrolled in the service-learning course, where they tutored students at the local alternative high school for one hour and attended class on campus for approximately two hours each week. During tutoring, participants helped students to review for upcoming tests, prepare for and/or write a paper, or

[5] Johnny uses masculine pronouns to refer to himself and confirmed my use of masculine pronouns throughout this paper during a member-check.

analyze a text. In the on-campus class, students participated in stable-membership book clubs throughout the semester. Each book club was responsible for selecting three texts from a list of instructor-provided recommendations to read, discuss, and eventually teach to the rest of the class. The texts centered on the influence of topics such as race, class, language, gender, sexuality, and/or neurodiversity on schools and student learning.

Data. After gaining consent from all eight students enrolled in the course, I attended each university campus class meeting throughout the semester and maintained field notes. Each participant also completed pre- and post-study surveys that inquired into their beliefs about teaching, service-learning, and social justice. Finally, I conducted a one-hour semi-structured interview (Seidman, 2013) with each participant, including Johnny. During the interview I inquired into Johnny's experiences with school and volunteer work growing up, his interest in becoming a teacher, his reasons for taking the service-learning course, and his experiences in the service-learning course.

Community Inquiry Project (CIP) data collection. I incorporated the CIP into the Reading Methods course to introduce PSTs to the diverse communities surrounding the university and to encourage PSTs to think about the ways that community knowledge could inform their pedagogical choices, specifically in terms of reading instruction. Throughout the semester students reflected on their experiences in the community and considered how community-knowledge could inform their pedagogical and curricular choices.

Data. Data collected from the CIP include Johnny's reflections and assignments from the fall semester and the follow-up one-on-one interview conducted in the spring semester, at the mid-point of student teaching. The SL and CIP data collections comprise the data corpus for this study.

Data Analysis

I used thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) to consider Johnny's conceptions of care and teaching as he moved from the service-learning course in his sophomore year to his formal teacher education coursework in his senior year, as well as his perception of his MT's (whom I refer to by the pseudonym "Ms. Martin" from hereon) conception of teaching. I began data analysis by reading all of the data chronologically—starting with the SL survey data and finishing with Johnny's CIP interview transcript. As I read, I noted places where Johnny discussed his personal beliefs about and experiences with teaching and his experiences with Ms. Martin during student teaching.

After reading and annotating the data, I reviewed my highlighted notes and began to determine potential categories across the data. Using the research questions and theoretical frameworks to guide me, I developed three categories of codes to account for Johnny's conceptions about teaching preceding his student teaching, his experiences with teaching during student teaching, and then his perception of Ms. Martin's teaching. Each of the three categories, their component codes, examples from the data, and code frequencies are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Code key and frequencies.

Johnny's Conception of Teaching and Care Preceding Student Teaching – 60 codes total codes		
Code	Example from Data	Frequency
Concern for student experiences	From SL Observation Notes (Day 7): "he [Johnny] thinks analyzing literature can be hard and it becomes even harder when you feel that the literature/poetry is removed from your experiences" From SL Observation Notes (Day 9): "Johnny asks: 'what influence do you think a teacher incorporating pop culture has on students?'" From SL Interview: "I had Dr. XXXX for that class. And she, she was a lot better, she was uh she ran a tighter ship. And you know her lectures were um you know her lectures were always helpful" CIP Lesson Plan Analysis: "I would prefer to give students a moment of rest and freedom at the beginning of class. The freedom of choice in reading, especially, opens gateways to teachable moments because students, and even myself, could learn something unexpected from a	28

	new book” CIP Lesson Plan Analysis: “The group activity lacked writing, so students who learn by writing find their strength here, and to reiterate, students who learn better alone get to function in their preferred way here”	
Teacher-Student Relationship & Teacher’s Responsibility	From SL Pre-Study Survey: “I can serve an empathetic role, providing help from a perspective that's closer to students” From SL Interview: “[my responsibility is] teaching people that—teaching groups of students who ordinarily don’t get as much out of um the usual uh teaching in the community”	14
Use of literature to make sense of concepts	From SL Pre-Study Survey: “When we discuss the literature that's considered worthwhile or "classic," how authors from different perspectives perceive society, or even our very language and grammar, these are all gateways to social justice topics”	7
Societal factors influence individuals	From SL Observation Notes (Day 4): “Johnny points out the idea of ‘fault’– education relies on individual responsibility and doesn’t look at other factors (having enough counselors, funding for resources for teachers, mandatory testing influences what is taught). Johnny suggests that a lot of the problems being faced are systemic, not individual issues” From SL Observation Notes (Day 11): “problems are so widespread and influenced by so many different things that it’s hard to place blame on just one thing” From SL Interview: “in our, you know, in the U.S., you know race relations are, you know, a prevalent thing and they, they, they exist on all sorts of levels and they absolutely intersect very much, you know race relations with gender relations, with um, with gender and sexuality relations, with uh, with class relations, class conflict.”	11
Johnny’s Conception of Teaching and Care During Teacher Education – 35 total codes		
Code	Example	Frequency
Attending to student interests/lives	CIP Interview: “interacting with the students, it did make things good because... um.. it made recommending books to them easier because that was a big part of the class” CIP Interview: “I know in some ways it's fun for them to like tell me, to tell their teachers things that they know about that the teachers don't know about” CIP Interview: “I know it's fun for a kid when I'd talk to them about video games because I know it too. And when he uses his- his um, his jargon and I know what he's saying, that's interesting for him”	14
Attending to student academic needs	CIP Interview: “I think it can be hurtful if your expectations are out of reach, cause- and if you don't prepare them. Uh don't prepare them right ahead of time.” CIP Interview: “when I would sit down it would often be like ‘the essay's coming up, well we need some time to work on it but we also need some lessons to build those skills of writing the essay, so how to use quotes, how to transition between paragraphs, how to conclude or start, how to um how to decide on what pieces to use.’ So when it comes to lesson- came to lesson planning, especially since [pause] yes the	5

	lesson plans would often just be geared toward some kind of goal"	
Personal behaviors/experiences as a student affect teaching	CIP Interview: "that was a really hard thing to adapt to and it's something I'm still trying to figure out now. How to just get myself doing the things I have to do instead of putting them off for later so" CIP Interview: "timing is a big deal. And like I said it's something that I'm having trouble with. Like grading everything at once at the end of the night just because I didn't start on it earlier in the day, is a big problem" CIP Interview: "It's hard to make myself start doing things that I don't wanna do. But I really do need to learn that skill or learn some kind of strategy to get along with that because um... yeah putting things off is uh, is an issue"	8
Collaborating with others	CIP Blog Reflection: "co-teaching. It's hard to do when people are confused and it's just better when everyone has their cards out on the table." CIP Interview: "And you know I was expecting for, I was sort of just thinking that my mentor would ask me to do things or would invite me to do things, or to create a space to invite me to do things. Either ask me for, you know, what do you think is a good, what do you think is a good way to teach this lesson? Or do you have an idea for an organizer we can make? Or something like that. She didn't really do that" CIP Interview: "I would sit down expecting to walk through just ideas and thoughts but like my mentor was expecting me to have much more concrete ideas to match hers." CIP Interview: "I felt very constrained by my mentor, I didn't feel comfortable really deviating from what her expectations were"	8
Johnny's Perception of his MT's Conception of Teaching – 12 total codes		
Code	Example	Frequency
Attending to student interests/lives		0
Attending to student academic needs	CIP Interview: "I don't think that my mentor really- I don't think my mentor really prepared them for it. And, cause I mean she has high expectations. That's sort of like a character trait of her that she has high expectations for people all around"	4
Planning and instruction	CIP Interview: "I don't feel like my mentor was keen on slowing down or really changing her expectations or what she wanted them to do" CIP Interview: "I feel like there are times in the class where social justice issues sort of arose and I don't think they got explored by my mentor in the- in the fullest way" CIP Interview: "I understand how it can be, it can be uncomfortable and awkward to figure out how to incorporate that into a classroom. Um but like lately I really think that's something she should have thought about and maybe come back to."	8

Johnny's conceptions of teaching and care preceding student teaching. The first and second codes, *concern for student experiences* and *the teacher's responsibility in the student-teacher relationship*, accounted for Johnny's conception of care. The third code, *use of literature to make sense of concepts*, addressed Johnny's use of literature to mediate his developing conception of teaching. The role of social mediation was taken into account through the fourth code: *societal factors influence individuals*.

Johnny's conceptions of teaching and care during teacher education. I used four codes to analyze the CIP Blog Reflections, Lesson Plan Analysis assignment, and CIP one-on-one interview (all data collected during teacher education). The first and second codes, *attending to student interests and/or lives* and *attending to student academic needs*, addressed the role of care in Johnny's conception of teaching. The third code, the ways that *personal behaviors and experiences as a student affect teaching*, accounted for the role of interaction in development. Finally, the role of social mediation in learning and development was addressed in the fourth code, which attended to Johnny's experiences with and perceptions of *collaborating with others*.

Johnny's perception of Ms. Martin's conception of teaching. The first and second codes, *attending to student interests and/or lives* and *attending to student academic needs*, allowed me to inquire into Ms. Martin's conception of care in teaching. The third code, *planning and instruction*, provided insight into Ms. Martin's theoretical approach to understanding student learning and development.

Findings

Johnny was born in Puerto Rico, moving to the U. S. with his parents when he was only three. His parents spoke primarily Spanish at home and the family moved often, because Johnny's dad was in the military. Johnny spent most of his social time growing up with his

family and admitted to not knowing much about the local communities. When asked to describe the high school he attended for the longest span of time (approximately two years), Johnny talked about his high school experiences as if he hadn't been there. Rather than listing his involvement in the school, Johnny listed the names of clubs, sports, and classes offered at the school—information that could be easily found through a simple Google search. Overall, Johnny described his high school in the following way: "It seemed like a very interesting place where students had a lot of opportunities for different types of things." Thus, Johnny positioned himself as a bit of an outsider—he wasn't the student council president, athlete, or avid volunteer that so many PSTs were as high school students (Brookhart & Freeman, 1992; West & Brousseau, 1987).

Johnny described himself as a "lazy" student, not needing to put much effort in to perform well academically, and requiring coaxing from his mom to complete assignments. Even in some of his most challenging courses, however, Johnny didn't need to study and could typically complete large writing assignments in the day preceding the deadline. For the most part, Johnny was able to maintain this approach to school well into college. Johnny's diverse interests (which included alchemy, physics, and literature, among others) and admitted laziness as a student could help him to relate to a variety of students—particularly those who may feel unengaged with English Language Arts (ELA) specifically, or school in general.

In college, Johnny declared a double-major in English and English Education. Johnny took primarily English courses (e.g., composition, literature, etc.) until applying and being accepted into the English Education program in his senior year. In the three years preceding his English Education coursework, Johnny tutored primarily Latinx students through a local after-school agency and voluntarily enrolled in the service-learning class. Johnny also had a personal

love of literature and a knack for referencing literature to help him explain and understand pedagogical and educational issues. Together, Johnny's upbringing, diverse experiences in school, interest in and experience working with diverse populations of students, and love of literature made him appear to be an ideal PST.

For both his practicum and student teaching, Johnny worked with Ms. Martin, an experienced MT, at a "non-traditional" high school (per the district website). This school was designed to prepare students for careers and was guided by a nine-person board of directors that included two educators. Once enrolled, students chose a career pathway based on their career goals/interests and took courses accordingly. Teachers in all disciplines were expected to allow students to apply course content knowledge to their chosen career pathway and to prepare students for the common assessment associated with their pathway. Thus, in addition to the state-mandated discipline-specific assessments, students were also assessed on their career pathway knowledge.

Preceding and well into his English Education coursework, Johnny recognized the many and conflicting influential factors that shape what can and cannot happen in classrooms, whose voices are valued and heard, and whose voices are silenced. Johnny's goals for teaching included desires to frame ELA through a social justice approach to literature, to individualize instruction based on students' needs and interests, and to express care to students. This portrait of Johnny frames my inquiry into his experiences with and beliefs about teaching before and during student teaching as well as his perceptions of Ms. Martin's view of teaching.

Johnny's Conceptions of Teaching and Care Preceding Student Teaching

Only SL data were analyzed to account for Johnny's conceptions of teaching and care preceding teacher education. Specifically, Johnny's conception of teaching was shaped by his

concerns for student experiences, his concerns about the responsibilities of teachers, his use of literature to make sense of experiences, and his concerns regarding the societal factors that influence students and teaching. Each of these concerns also provide insight into Johnny's perception of care in teaching.

Concern for student experiences. Throughout his discussions during the service-learning class, his interview, and his responses to the pre- and post-study surveys, Johnny focused on the experiences of students in schools, with 28 codes so attributed. Notably, Johnny did not mention teachers at all in either the pre- or post-study surveys, and attributed his learning during tutoring to his interactions with students alone. Johnny was particularly concerned throughout the data with the diverse needs and interests of students and how students responded to particular pedagogical approaches. On Class #7 of the service-learning course, Johnny engaged in a discussion with another student, Caren, about a teacher she had in high school who used film to help students grasp challenging concepts. Johnny asked Caren if she found that approach to be helpful as a student. Similarly, during a group presentation about incorporating pop culture into teaching in Class #9, Johnny asked the class about their experiences as students themselves when pop culture was incorporated into the classroom.

Johnny also expressed his beliefs about the diverse needs and interests of students multiple times across the data. Specifically, Johnny discussed the need for teachers to teach texts and concepts that represent student experiences. He also asserted that teachers have misconceptions regarding student lack-of-engagement, believing that teachers place blame on students for apathetic attitudes, rather than on themselves and society. Johnny's concern with student experiences was highlighted by his repeated desire to develop greater empathy for students. Johnny mentioned in both his pre- and post-study surveys that he believed refreshing

his empathy for students was an important part of his growth as a teacher. Together, these findings help illustrate Johnny's perception of teachers as committed to developing greater empathy for diverse populations of students and aligning teaching with student interests and needs.

Teacher-student relationship and teachers' responsibility. Johnny drew on his experiences with teachers in school growing up as he discussed teacher-student relationships and the teacher's responsibility to students, with 14 codes so attributed. Johnny liked those teachers who showed that they cared for him as a person. He remembered one teacher whom he described as nice and cool and who wrote nice things on his papers and laughed at his jokes. He didn't discuss what or how she taught him, but he did remember liking both the teacher and the experience of being in her class. Johnny also spoke about favorable memories of a high school Statistics teacher who was "criminally laid back," but also went out of his way to make Statistics applicable to students' lives. Finally, Johnny remembered his high school Composition teacher. Although Johnny found her class to be challenging and the teacher to be "snarky," she "handed out the snark with care" and he continued to maintain contact with her following high school—whenever he felt "lost in the English major" and in need of guidance.

Johnny also drew on his experiences in college, including tutoring and coursework, to help him articulate teachers' responsibilities to students. Johnny remembered learning about the interests of a classmate and making reading recommendations to them accordingly. Based on this interaction, Johnny went on to say that as a teacher he would want to individualize instruction to students by recommending readings based on their interests. Through his service-learning tutoring, in particular, Johnny became increasingly concerned with supporting students who may be falling behind or are underserved in "traditional" school settings. Those teachers whom

Johnny remembered favorably in high school as well as his college experiences working with individual students, contributed to Johnny's conception of good teachers as those who recognize the variability in their students and make pedagogical choices to address diverse student needs and interests.

Use of literature to make sense of concepts. Johnny demonstrated a love for and knowledge of literature preceding student teaching through his regular use of diverse texts to make sense of new concepts and experiences, with 7 passages coded as such. Perhaps because he was an English major, Johnny referenced "classic" literature in his discussions. For instance, during a discussion about the ways that particular languages are privileged over others, Johnny drew on Shakespeare's writing as an example of the ways that language and perceptions of language are constructed over time.

Johnny also made references to young adult literature during class discussions. During a discussion about the ways individuals may behave in ways not stereotypically aligned with their race or ethnicity, Johnny drew a comparison to Sherman Alexie's (2007) *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian*, where the main character, a Native American boy, was called a "banana" because his peers perceived him to be acting White. Similarly, during a class discussion of Jonathan Kozol's (1991) *Amazing Grace*, Johnny drew comparisons between schools (as portrayed by Kozol) and societies in dystopian literature like *The Hunger Games* (Collins, 2008). Johnny's propensity to draw connections between different types of literature and between literature and society contributed to his conception of teachers as making academic content relative to student interests and experiences.

Societal factors influence individuals. Undoubtedly, the readings, discussions, and tutoring in the service-learning course contributed to Johnny's preoccupation with the many

societal factors influencing schools, students, and teachers. Of the 60 codes in this category, 11 were attributed to the ways that society influences individuals. Specifically, Johnny recognized schools to be implicated in societal inequities. Johnny was particularly drawn to Kozol's (1991) text and the ways that health concerns and inadequate healthcare may influence student attendance in school and family finances. Although earlier in the semester Johnny mentioned that teachers must see themselves as at least in part to blame for apathetic student behaviors, later in the semester Johnny's conception of teaching shifted as he found that placing blame could actually be a bit more complicated than he had initially thought. During his SL interview, Johnny said that there were a number of factors that influence and limit schools and teachers. He quite deftly acknowledged the role of intersectionality, recognizing that society, and thereby schools, are made up of intersections of "race relations with gender relations, with um, with gender and sexuality relations, with uh, with class relations, class conflict." Introducing students to the complexities and intersections of society and identity was an integral part of Johnny's conception of the ELA teachers' role.

Overall. For Johnny, teachers demonstrate care by attending to student needs and interests and subsequently using that information to guide instruction and course content (Owens & Ennis, 2005). In his one-on-one tutoring experiences, Johnny was able to express the type of individualized care that he believed to be important for teachers. Rather than facing a full classroom of students and developing lessons and units for those students, Johnny was responsible for supporting the academic and personal needs of only one student, over a relatively brief period of time. These individual interactions could have contributed to idealistic expectations for the ways that he would demonstrate and cultivate care for students in teaching.

Johnny's Conceptions of Teaching and Care During Teacher Education

As Johnny began formal teacher education, his conception of teaching expanded to include concerns regarding students' interests and lives, students' academic needs, the ways his own behaviors as a student could influence teaching, and how teachers collaborate with others. Johnny simultaneously struggled to maintain continuity across his initial ideas about teaching and his developing conception during teacher education. To account for the conceptions of teaching and care that Johnny developed during teacher education, I draw from the CIP data.

Attending to student interests and/or lives. Johnny's preoccupation with student experiences in schools during the service-learning course was mirrored in his discussions of teaching while completing his teacher education work, specifically during student teaching. Of the 35 codes in this category, 14 were attributed to Johnny's concerns for student interests and lives. For Johnny, some of the most rewarding experiences he had in student teaching were his individual interactions with students. Specifically, Johnny recalled making a book recommendation to a reluctant reader. After a week, the student had finished the book and returned to Johnny for another recommendation. Johnny spoke of the importance of getting to know students and building relationships with them to make individual reading recommendations, but also to inform curricular and pedagogical choices.

Johnny also wanted students to have more choice. During student teaching, students were completing a unit on argumentative writing. Ms. Martin chose the subject of "forgiveness" as the focus of the unit. However, Johnny believed the students lacked engagement with the overall unit because forgiveness was not a topic that was interesting or relevant to their lives. Instead, Johnny believed that a more engaging approach to teaching argument would be to allow students to choose their own topics. Similarly, Johnny remembered a class discussion where the students were drawing connections between forgiveness and police violence. In response to the students'

talk, Johnny's "mentor said like, you know, that we shouldn't let the actions of one member of a group dictate how we think about that whole group." Johnny felt that Ms. Martin's response shut down an opportunity to discuss social justice issues that were both interesting and relevant to the students and that her comment "didn't sit well with the students. They didn't buy that."

For Johnny, ELA teachers should attend to the individual interests of students and create classrooms where students may leave with ideas about "how to interact with texts in the real world" or questioning "what's your part in a community or what your responsibility is as a person in the world." Throughout his talk, Johnny aligned with students—their interests, engagement, and, their academic needs—rather than discussing the specific goals, experiences, policies, and/or standards that often shape what teachers can actually do in the classroom. Johnny's conception of teaching, then, was rooted in his care for the student experience.

Attending to student academic needs. Similar to his concern for incorporating student interests into teaching, although with less frequency (5 codes), Johnny believed that students' academic needs should guide teachers' pedagogical and curricular choices. Many of the belief statements that Johnny shared during his CIP interview were in opposition to what he saw in practice in Ms. Martin's classroom. Although Johnny admitted that Ms. Martin was concerned with improving students' reading levels and comprehension, he did not necessarily agree with her approach. Johnny gave an example where students did not perform well on a writing assignment and were given the option to revise and resubmit the assignment to improve their grades. Johnny, however, felt that students needed more guidance and practice to hone their skills, before completing the assignment for a second time.

Johnny felt that Ms. Martin held students to high expectations, but did not provide the appropriate scaffolding to help students reach those expectations. Overall, Johnny evinced a

belief that teachers must interact with individual students to determine their academic needs and develop appropriate curriculum. Such an approach to teaching may require teachers to put aside their instructional timeline, in order to meet the needs of students and scaffold them toward understanding. Here Johnny's conception of teaching was guided by attention to and care for students' needs, and did not attend to the social and political forces that shape teachers' work.

Personal behaviors and experiences as a student affect teaching. Johnny's personal behaviors as a student growing up informed his experience with teaching, with 8 codes attributed across the teacher education data. During his CIP interview, Johnny shared that "I haven't really been forced not to be lazy to succeed until quite recently, and it's been a shock." Looking back, Johnny believed that it would have been helpful if he had been challenged more in school growing up, rather than having to learn how to manage his time and various responsibilities during teacher education. In particular, Johnny mentioned that he struggled to make himself complete tasks that he didn't want to do (like planning and grading) and to stay ahead of Ms. Martin, who planned approximately two weeks prior to teaching. Johnny admitted that his own issues with time management contributed to his negative experience in student teaching and recognized that as a teacher "you can't put things off to the end and I did." Johnny's struggles with time management and with teacher-collaborations contributed to tension between Johnny's conception of teaching before student teaching and the one that was developing as he spent more time in schools.

Collaborating with others. When he entered student teaching, Johnny seemed to have a very particular understanding of the mentor-student teacher relationship. The code "collaborating with others" was applied 8 times across the data to account for Johnny's perception of the mentor-student teacher relationship. In his CIP interview, Johnny stated that he "didn't really

understand how to communicate with my mentor." He went on to say: "I was sort of just thinking that my mentor would ask me to do things or would invite me to do things, or to create a space to invite me to do things." Unfortunately, it wasn't until much later in the semester (too late in Johnny's opinion) that he realized that Ms. Martin was expecting him to be much more proactive in offering his own ideas for teaching and seeking out opportunities to teach. Although he didn't specifically clarify what "things" he was looking for, Johnny also mentioned that "she had the title of mentor. So I was expecting certain things."

The ways that planning and instruction factored into Johnny's conception of teaching conflicted with Ms. Martin's. Both Johnny's attention to individual student interests and needs and his personal work ethic also differed from Ms. Martin. Whereas Johnny viewed co-planning meetings as a time for brainstorming ideas, Ms. Martin viewed these meetings as a time to finalize the specific plans for upcoming lessons and units, making Johnny appear unprepared.

Overall. Johnny's conception of teachers positioned them as caring for individual students' interests and academic needs and making pedagogical and curricular choices accordingly. This conception of a teacher, particularly care in teaching, was also reflected in the expectations that Johnny had of Ms. Martin—that she would guide him through the process of learning to teach, communicate openly with him, and invite him into teaching scenarios. However, when Johnny entered student teaching, he didn't see Ms. Martin engaging in the types of individualized instruction and mentoring that he envisioned. This disconnect between Johnny's expectations and preconceived notions of Ms. Martin (both as a mentor and a teacher) and teaching and what he experienced in the school contributed to his commentary about needing to force himself to behave in certain ways.

Although Johnny enjoyed interacting with students, he disliked the time and effort involved in planning and grading outside school, tasks he did not specifically name as acts of care. One reason Johnny enjoyed tutoring so much could have been because he was able to work one-on-one with kids, but didn't have to do any work to prepare or follow-up. Thus, those parts of teaching that may be invisible during the apprenticeship of observation, tutoring, or service-related work, and even teacher education coursework were aspects of teaching that Johnny did not enjoy. As Johnny progressed through his senior year, he gained a better sense of the time and energy needed to prepare for and fulfill the responsibilities of teaching. Johnny's conception of teaching, thus, necessitated an expansion. However, as Johnny's conception of teaching expanded to include more responsibilities, he struggled to maintain his initial idea of teaching, in which he dedicated time to caring for individual students.

Johnny's Perception of Ms. Martin's Conception of Teaching

Before reviewing Ms. Martin's conception of teaching, it's important to point out that this is Johnny's perception—and not the conception of teaching that Ms. Martin shared herself. It is also important to note that one of the codes I initially anticipated using to analyze this category, *attending to student interests/lives*, was not used across any of the data. The absence of this code in the data could suggest that Johnny did not perceive Ms. Martin to care for her students, at least not in a way that Johnny recognized or valued.

Attending to student academic needs. Of the 12 codes in this category, 4 were attributed to Ms. Martin's attention to the academic needs of students. As mentioned previously, Johnny acknowledged that Ms. Martin was "very passionate about reading." Johnny, however, also felt that Ms. Martin was too rigid about her goals and timeline for teaching and did not flex her plans to accommodate changing student academic needs. Johnny perceived Ms. Martin's behaviors in

the classroom to be the result of her own choices. Although Johnny's assumption could be correct, there is a strong likelihood, given the context within which Ms. Martin was teaching, that her pedagogical and curricular choices were also the result of other pressures or influential groups (e.g., the board of directors, career assessments, etc.).

Planning and instruction. Johnny believed Ms. Martin to have very specific strategies for planning instruction, with 8 codes attributed to her planning across the data. Contributing to his perception of Ms. Martin as inflexible, Ms. Martin planned lessons and units approximately 2 weeks in advance and did not deviate from these plans. Further, Johnny felt that Ms. Martin planned units around ideas and texts that were personally interesting and relevant to her and strategically avoided certain subjects and discussions that were uncomfortable or awkward for her (specifically social justice topics). Johnny did not acknowledge that outside forces (e.g. curriculum, parents, teacher peers, administrators, policy makers) could have also shaped Ms. Martin's teaching and curriculum. Johnny's perception of Ms. Martin's planning and instruction as teacher-centered contributed to his personal disconnect from Ms. Martin and also a perceived disconnect between she and her students.

Overall. The conception of teaching that Johnny saw Ms. Martin articulate through her planning, instruction, and interactions with him during student teaching was markedly different from Johnny's conception of teaching before entering student teaching. Whereas Johnny viewed Ms. Martin as inflexible, teaching to the majority, and adopting a teacher-centric approach to teaching, he viewed himself as student-centered and interested in student needs. The differences that Johnny perceived to exist between his own conception of teaching and that of Ms. Martin presented a challenge to Johnny during student teaching that contributed to his eventual departure from student teaching and the teaching profession.

Discussion

Like many PSTs (Cole & Knowles, 1993; Lortie, 1975), Johnny entered student teaching with a particular view of the experience—both in terms of what it meant to be a teacher and what it meant to be a student teacher. Johnny's conception of teaching, particularly care in teaching, was shaped by his experiences preceding and during teacher education. Johnny, however, struggled to negotiate his ideas of teaching and care into the student teaching setting or to see Ms. Martin as the type of caring teacher he envisioned becoming. Further, Johnny did not consider that Ms. Martin's behaviors were shaped by various sociocultural factors. Johnny's inability to establish greater intersubjectivity with Ms. Martin in terms of both teaching and care contributed to his choice to leave student teaching and teaching altogether.

Perceptions of Teaching

Johnny's perception of care in the teacher-student and the mentor teacher-student teacher relationship, did not and, at times, could not manifest in the ways that he imagined, contributing to a lack of intersubjectivity between he and Ms. Martin. In addition to his own experiences as a student, Johnny's perception of care and of teaching and the setting of teaching, in particular, were informed by his experiences tutoring preceding teacher education.

Johnny's conception of care was relational and began with the teacher. However, Johnny did not see Ms. Martin model "one-caring" behaviors toward the students, at least not in ways that he recognized as care. Ms. Martin was also working under institutional pressures that required her to maintain a particular pace, to cover specific content, and to prepare students for standardized assessments. Perhaps it was not Johnny's lack of a model that contributed to his frustration and tension with teaching, but the societal forces that shape the behaviors of and possibilities for teachers.

Johnny valued one-on-one dialogues as a tool to help him learn about and build connections with students so that he could better teach them. From Johnny's perspective, however, Ms. Martin didn't dialogue with individual students or with Johnny to make pedagogical/mentoring decisions, potentially contributing to Johnny's perception of Ms. Martin as not caring. Johnny's expectation of a common understanding and expression of care was problematic and potentially limited opportunities for dialogue and interaction between Ms. Martin and students as well as Ms. Martin and Johnny.

Perceptions of Student Teaching

Johnny struggled to acquire the necessary knowledge and skills to develop a teacher identity and membership within the "community of practice" of teachers (Lave & Wenger, 1991). As Johnny transitioned from tutoring to student teaching, he struggled to negotiate his conception of care into the context of teaching. Unlike tutoring, student teaching taught Johnny that teachers are pushed and pulled in many directions, demanding them to be organized, to work efficiently, and to collaborate with others. Johnny maintained a student-identity (rather than adopting a teacher identity) that also shaped his view of and interactions with students. Johnny's student-behaviors were problematic as he entered student teaching, where time management, the ability to handle multiple responsibilities at once, and co-planning were necessary. The ways that Johnny viewed himself in relation to Ms. Martin could have contributed to his inability to master the more administrative aspects of teaching.

During student teaching Johnny was simultaneously a "cared-for" and a "one-caring," a dual-role that potentially contributed to tension between Johnny-as-student and Johnny-as-teacher. During one-on-one interactions with students, Johnny was able to assume the role of "one-caring." However, Johnny was unable to see himself as anything but a "cared-for" in his

interactions with Ms. Martin. When Johnny felt that Ms. Martin was not reciprocating her role as the "one-caring," perhaps because the ways that she expressed care did not align with his own expectations and needs as a "cared-for," he felt neglected. Alternatively, Ms. Martin may have seen the MT-student teacher relationship differently—not recognizing herself to be in the position of "one-caring" and Johnny to be the "cared-for" in all of their interactions.

Johnny struggled to recognize himself as both "cared-for" and "one-caring," reinforcing a unidirectional expression of care. Ultimately, Johnny's inability to see himself as possessing multiple, and even conflicting, identities—namely the identities of teacher and student—potentially contributed to his choice to leave teaching altogether.

Conclusion

Many PSTs enter teacher education having had limited practice working with whole classes of students. To challenge the idealistic views of care that may be generated through one-on-one interactions with students, teacher educators could require field-based experiences outside one-on-one tutoring preceding teacher education. Diverse field experiences could also help PSTs to garner a deeper understanding of the ways that institutions shape possibilities and impose limitations on schools and teachers.

To support PSTs and MTs as they work toward intersubjectivity, teacher educators could engage PSTs in ongoing discussions and reflections about their expectations for and experiences with an MT. PSTs should consider how their expectations of the MT could be improbable, the various responsibilities of the MT outside of the mentoring position, and that the needs of students must necessarily trump those of the PST. Similarly, teacher educators could encourage PSTs to interrogate their own expectations of and definitions of care and to continue to process

these understandings during student teaching. Discussions of care should include both the PSTs' expectations about expressing care to students and their expectations of their MT.

PSTs require support from teacher educators and MTs as they develop practical conceptions of teaching and of care and negotiate these developing conceptions into school contexts. As was the case for Johnny, unrealistic expectations of teaching may contribute to feelings of failure and bar PSTs from assuming teacher identities, eventually leading to the choice to leave teaching altogether.

References

Alexie, S. (2007). *The absolutely true diary of a part-time Indian*. New York, NY: Little, Brown Books for Young Readers.

Bloome, D., & Bailey, F. M. (1992). Studying language and literacy through events, particularity, and intertextuality. In R. Beach, J. L. Green, M. L. Kamil, & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Multidisciplinary perspectives on literacy research* (pp. 181-211). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.

Brookhart, S. M., & Freeman, D. J. (1992). Characteristics of entering teacher candidates. *Review of Educational Research, 62*(1), 37-60.

Buchanan, J., Prescott, A., Schuck, S., Aubusson, P., & Burke, P. (2013). Teacher retention and attrition: Views of early career teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 38*(3), 110-129.

Bullough, R. V., & Draper, R. J. (2004). Making sense of a failed triad: Mentors, university supervisors, and positioning theory. *Journal of Teacher Education, 55*(5), 407-420.

Cole, A. L., & Knowles, J. G. (1993). Shattered images: Understanding expectations and realities of field experiences. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 9*(5), 457-471.

Collins, S. (2008). *The hunger games*. New York, NY: Scholastic.

Darling-Hammond, L., Berry, B., & Thoreson, A. (2001). Does teacher certification matter? Evaluating the evidence. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 23*(1), 57-77.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record, 103*(6), 1013-1055.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2001). *Making social science matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again*. (S. Sampson, Trans.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Gilpin, G. A. (2011). Reevaluating the effect of non-teaching wages in teacher attrition. *Economics of Education Review, 30*, 598-616.

Goldstein, L. S., & Lake, V. E. (2000). "Love, love, and more love for children": Exploring preservice teachers' understandings of care. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16*, 861-872.

Ingersoll R. (2003). *Is there really a teacher shortage?* Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Ingersoll, R., & Perda, D. (2010). *How high is teacher turnover and is it a problem?* Philadelphia: Consortium for Policy Research in Education, University of Pennsylvania.

Johnson, S. M., & Birkeland, S. E. (2003). Pursuing a "sense of success": New teachers explain their career decisions. *American Educational Research Journal, 40*(3), 581-617. Retrieved from http://www.gse.harvard.edu/~ngt/Johnson-Birkeland_AERjournal_Fall03.pdf

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

McLoughan, C. (2004). Exploring the culture of mentoring in one NSW Primary School. Paper presented at the annual conference of Australian Association for Research in Education at Melbourne Nov 29 - Dec 2, 2004. Retrieved from www.aare.edu.au/04pap/mcc04909.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics. (2013). *Number and percentage distribution of teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools, by selected teacher characteristics: Selected year, 1987-88 through 2011-12* (Data File). Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=28

National Center for Education Statistics. (2014). *Bachelor's degrees conferred to females by postsecondary institutions, by race/ethnicity and field of study: 2012-2013 and 2013-2014* (Data File). Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/tables/dt15_322.50.asp

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics & moral education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Noddings, N. (2005a). What does it mean to educate the whole child? *Educational Leadership, 63*(1), 8-13.

Noddings, N. (2005b). Caring in education. *The Encyclopedia of Informal Education.* www.infed.org/biblio/noddings_caring_in_education.htm

Owens, L. M., & Ennis, C. D. (2005). The ethic of care in teaching: An overview of supportive literature. *Quest, 57*, 392-425.

Riggs, L. (Oct. 13, 2013). Why do teachers quit?: And why do they stay? *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from http://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2013/10/why-do-teachers-quit/280699/

Schaefer, L., Long, J. S., & Clandinin, J. (2012). Questioning the research on early career teacher attrition and retention. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 58*(1), 106-121.

Schuck, S. (2003). Getting help from the outside: Developing a support network for beginning teachers. *Journal of Educational Enquiry, 4*(1), 49-67.

Seidman, I. (2013). Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences (4th ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Shulman, L. S. (2004). The wisdom of practice: Managing complexity in medicine and teaching. In S. M.Wilson (Ed.), *The wisdom of practice: Essays on teaching, learning, and learning to teach* (pp. 251–271). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Skilbeck, M., & Connell, H. (2004). Teachers for the future: The changing nature of society and related issues for the teaching workforce. A report to the Teacher Quality and Educational Leadership Taskforce of MCEETYA. Retrieved from http://www.mceecdya.edu.au/verve/_resources/teachersforthefuture_file.pdf

Smagorisnky, P. (2011). *Vygtosky and literacy research: A methodological framework*. Boston, MA: Sense.

Smagorinsky, P. (2013). What does Vygotsky provide for the 21st-century Language Arts teacher? *Language Arts, 90*(3), 192-204.

Smagorinsky, P., Gibson, N., Moore, C., Bickmore, S., & Cook, L. S. (2004). Praxis shock: Making the transition from a student-centered university program to the corporate climate

of schools. *English Education, 36*, 214-245. Available at http://www.petersmagorinsky.net/About/PDF/EE/EE0363Praxis.pdf

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stake, R. E. (2000). Case studies. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 435-454). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Tarlow, B. (1996). Caring: A negotiated process that varies. In S. Gordon, P. Benner, & N. Noddings (Eds.), *Caregiving: Readings in knowledge, practice, ethics, and politics* (pp. 56-82). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

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

Wertsch, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

West, B., & Brousseau, B. (1987). *Research and evaluation in teacher education*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

White, B. (2003). Caring and the teaching of English. *Research in the Teaching of English, 37*(3), 295-328

CHAPTER 4

PRACTICING WHAT WE PREACH IN TEACHER EDUCATION: A CRITICAL WHITENESS STUDIES ANALYSIS OF EXPERIENTIAL EDUCATION[6]

[6] Barnes, M. E. To be submitted to *Studying Teacher Education*.

Abstract

In this manuscript, I reflect on and problematize the reasons for and methods through which I incorporated an opportunity for experiential learning, via a Community Inquiry Project (CIP), into my own teaching. I take the stance of a teacher-researcher to closely analyze the specific documents and tasks used to introduce pre-service teachers (PSTs) to the CIP. I draw on sociocultural approaches to teacher development and literature on experiential education in teacher education to provide a background for the CIP and respective study and offer critical whiteness studies as an appropriate lens through which to analyze the various elements of the CIP. Findings from this study suggest that the CIP limited PSTs' characterizations of community, understandings of sociocultural approaches to learning, relationships to the community, and perceptions of the role of community in teaching. I draw on these findings to suggest that teacher educators share their reflective practices with PSTs and regularly inquire into the diverse experiences of the PSTs themselves to better prepare PSTs to inquire into and draw on knowledge of communities as they work with diverse populations of students.

Keywords: teacher research, teacher education, reflection, experiential learning

Introduction

Opportunities for experiential learning in teacher education beyond the more formal practicum and student teaching have been offered as a method to prepare pre-service teachers (PSTs) to work with diverse populations of students and to develop their multicultural awareness (Chang, Anagnostopoulos, & Omae, 2011; Larkin & Sleeter, 1995). However, some experiences can actually be harmful and may cement stereotypical or narrow beliefs about others if not structured carefully and paired with critical reflection and self-inquiry (Burant & Kirby, 2002; Gomez, 1996; Haberman & Post, 1992). Although teacher educators may incorporate experiential learning opportunities into their teaching to explicitly encourage PSTs to develop practical concepts of teaching, many PSTs may view field-based experiences as providing them with tools that are only appropriate or helpful in one setting, rather than providing them with a set of universal and transferrable pedagogical skills (Haddix, 2015). As a teacher educator, I have experienced some of these challenges first-hand as I worked to incorporate an opportunity for experiential learning into the teacher education program within which I teach. In this article, I consider my own experiences as a teacher educator and teacher-researcher and consider how future community-based projects could be improved.

The PSTs enrolled in the two-semester English Education program where I teach reflect the demographics of U. S. teachers—they are predominately white, female, and come from middle class households (National Center for Educational Statistics [NCES], 2014). Many of my PSTs attended private or selective semi-public schools and admitted to having had limited interactions with diverse populations of others before entering college. Their perceptions of schools, students, and teachers are shaped by the cultural, historical, social, and political contexts they experienced preceding teacher education. Acknowledging the limited experiences of my

PSTs, I developed a Community Inquiry Project (CIP) and incorporated it into the one-semester course that I teach.

Through the CIP, I wanted to encourage PSTs to learn about the students, communities, and parents surrounding the university campus and their own student teaching placement schools, and to consider how that knowledge might shape their teaching. I also recognized that my limited time (one semester) was not adequate to thoroughly challenge the assumptions, experiences, and conceptions about schools, teaching, and students that PSTs had honed over at least 12 years in schools themselves. For this reason, I hoped the CIP would help PSTs to practice using various tools of inquiry, tools they could continue to refine as they moved into future teaching contexts, to help them learn about their students and communities.

The purpose of this article, however, is not to analyze PSTs' experiences with the CIP. Instead my purpose here is to reflect on and problematize the reasons for and methods through which I incorporated the CIP into my own teaching. I offer critical whiteness studies as an appropriate lens through which to analyze the various elements of the CIP. I also draw on sociocultural approaches to teacher development and literature on experiential learning in teacher education to provide a background for the CIP and respective study. After presenting my own purposes for and methods of teaching the CIP, I take a teacher-researcher stance to critically analyze the documents I used to introduce and guide students through the CIP, considering what belief systems and theoretical stances may have been communicated to students. My specific inquiry was guided by the following questions:

1. What perceptions of community did I perpetuate through the introductory and pedagogical documents associated with the CIP?

2. What assumptions of my PSTs did I perpetuate through the introductory and pedagogical documents associated with the CIP?
3. In what ways did the introduction and pedagogical documents of the CIP align, or not, with my goals for the project?

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

In this section, I review literature on the affordances and challenges of experiential learning, like the CIP, in teacher education. Next, I provide an overview of the evolution and major tenets of critical whiteness studies, as they provide a lens through which I will analyze the CIP. Finally, I draw on a sociocultural approach to concept development to consider how teacher educators consciously (and even unconsciously) shape novice teachers' conceptions of what it means to teach.

Experiential Learning in Teacher Education

As the divide between the demographics and experiences of teachers and K-12 students continues to grow (NCES, 2014), opportunities for experiential learning in teacher education courses have been increasingly viewed as an effective and even essential method for preparing teachers to work with diverse populations of students (Ball & Forzani, 2008; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Imig, 2001). Opportunities for experiential learning (e.g., service-learning, tutoring, cross-cultural immersion projects, etc.) may also prepare PSTs to recognize and flex to the shifting needs and demands of schools and students (Anderson, Swick, & Yff, 2001; Donnell & Harper, 2005; Imig, 2001; Kinloch & Smagorinsky, 2014; Sleeter, 2001, 2008).

To make sense of their practical experiences and to draw connections between the theoretical and practical aspects of their preparation, PSTs should also engage in reflection. Nurturing PSTs' reflective stance is particularly important in experiential learning, given some

of the critiques listed at the beginning of this article. Individual reflection on personal experience, however, may contribute to a view of the self as insular, untouched by social, historical, and/or cultural factors, and as self-sufficient (Brookfield, 1995; Fendler, 2003). To challenge potentially narcissistic view of the world and of teaching, field-based experiences should be structured so as to encourage PSTs to name and challenge assumptions of others and expectations of teaching (Hallman & Burdick, 2011; Kirkland, 2014) and should be paired with regular opportunities for both individual and collective reflection. To develop and implement the types of field-based experiences that may cultivate PSTs' inquiry-stance and simultaneously challenge preconceived ideas about others, teacher educators may also take an inquiry-stance toward their own teaching.

Critical Whiteness Studies

Critical whiteness studies inform my inquiry into and analysis of the CIP. Broadly, white teacher identity studies are concerned with the preparation of a majority-white pre-service teaching force to teach diverse students in public schools. An approach to teacher education that draws on white teacher identity studies, or what is more generally termed *critical whiteness studies*, is particularly important given the current landscape of U. S. schools wherein the demographics of PreK-12 students are increasingly diverse in terms of race, language, and socioeconomic status and the demographics of those who endeavor to teach them remain stagnant (primarily white, middle-class women) (NCES, 2013).

The first wave of critical whiteness studies developed in the late 1990s (Delgado & Stefancic, 1997; Fine, Weis, Powell, & Mun Wong, 1997; Kincheloe, Steinberg, Rodriguez, & Chennault, 1998) and was primarily concerned with the ways that teachers' whiteness and white privilege contributed to problems of whiteness and white privilege in institutions (Jupp &

Slattery, 2010). First wave researchers attended to the behaviors of individuals, rather than recognizing the ways that those behaviors were constructed within contexts (Berchini, 2014, 2016; Lensmire, 2010). In particular, the first wave of critical whiteness studies attended to race evasion techniques (Jupp, Berry, & Lensmire, 2016): the various ways individuals avoid discussing race. McIntyre (1997) wrote specifically of "White talk" that "serves to insulate White people from examining their/our individual and collective roles in the perpetuation of racism" (p. 45). Critics of this first wave of critical whiteness studies argue that it positioned teachers as stagnant and unable to contribute to or experience transformative change (Berchini, 2014; Laughter, 2011; Lensmire, 2010), that it did not consider the role of context in shaping racial identities (Berchini, 2016), and that it assumed a monolithic white experience (Lensmire & Snaza, 2010; Marx, 2003).

The second wave of critical whiteness studies instead recognizes the role of context in shaping white identities, as well as the ways that people perform and embody their whiteness and in turn permeate institutions with values associated with the white middle class (Haviland, 2008). Three characteristics of whiteness are foundational to understanding the second wave and differentiating it from the first: whiteness is powerful and also power-evasive, whiteness employs various techniques to maintain power, and whiteness is not monolithic (Haviland, 2008). Whiteness is a system of political, social, legal, and cultural advantage (Roediger, 2002) that is maintained by the conscious and sometimes unconscious denial of its existence (Banning, 1999; Fine, Weis, Powell, & Wong, 1997). The power of whiteness is maintained through various techniques, including a discourse of color-blindness (Frankenberg, 2001), evading critique (Gomez, Allen, & Clinton, 2004), and a lack of self-reflection and interrogation into the ways that one is implicated in the system of racial domination (Haviland, 2008). Finally, the

second wave of critical whiteness studies challenges essentialized understandings of white identity, and instead recognizes “identity as a complex and multidimensional social-historical construction that should not be reduced or essentialized to one of its characteristics or dimensions" (Jupp et al., 2016, p. 4).

Jupp et al. (2016) argue that when combined with increased reflexivity, nonessentialized approaches to white identity could allow researchers and teachers to consider the diverse experiences of white participants, and challenge approaches to understanding white identity that are demonizing. The second wave’s attendance to the role of context in identity development aligns well with sociocultural approaches to understanding how novice teachers develop a concept of teaching.

Sociocultural Teacher Learning

A sociocultural approach to teacher development recognizes that PSTs develop a concept for teaching by drawing on their own past experiences as students, their current work in schools (via practicum, student teaching, or some other form of field-based learning), their teacher education and content-based coursework, and the students and schools they anticipate working with as novice teachers, among other factors (Author & Colleague, 2016; Colleague & Author, 2014). The information presented in formal teacher education courses presents an opportunity to extend PSTs’ personal knowledge so they can see how their experiences fit within larger contexts. Similarly, PSTs’ personal experiences can help them to develop richer understandings of the formal knowledge presented to them in teacher education (Smagorinsky, forthcoming). PSTs, then, are developing a concept of teaching in the midst of numerous, competing meditational forces (Smagorinsky, 2013).

Further, teacher educators' conceptions of teaching and learning can influence PSTs' developing conceptions of teaching and the future teachers they will become (Britzman, 2003; Jones & Hughes, 2016; Zeichner, Grant, Gay, Gillette, Valli, & Villegas, 1998). For this reason, it is important to consider the role that teacher educators have in new teacher development. Just like PSTs, teacher educators enter their classrooms with preconceptions about their students and what they need in the classroom (Jones & Hughes, 2016). In this study, I inquire into the ways that my assumptions about my PSTs and implicit views of whiteness more broadly shaped the ways I incorporated experiential learning via the CIP into my teaching.

Development of the Community Inquiry Project

The English Education program within which I taught at the time of the study was a two-semester program occurring in the final year of undergraduate coursework. In the fall semester, students moved as a cohort through five required courses: Lesson Planning and Assessment, Adolescent Literature, Reading Methods, Writing Methods, and a seminar intended to support them through the teacher certification process. In addition to their coursework, students completed a school-based practicum where they spent two days actively observing at the school where they would also (ideally) student teach. In the spring semester, students continued to take the seminar course and also completed their student teaching. The CIP that I present here took place during the fall semester. Although the demographics of students enrolled in our program did shift from year to year, they remained reflective of the national demographics of pre-service and in-service teachers in U. S. public schools—approximately 76.3% female and 81.9% White (NCES, 2013).

Both the teaching and research associated with the CIP developed over a span of three years. In the fall of 2013, my first year as a PhD student and teaching assistant at a large public

university in the U. S. Southeast, I taught the Lesson Planning and Assessment course required of all undergraduate English Education majors. As I worked with students that fall, most of whom had lived in the town surrounding the university for at least the past three years, I learned that most of them knew very little about the town outside the university campus and downtown area. This town-gown divide (Blouin & Perry, 2009) contributed to the initial development and implementation of the CIP.

CIP Year One

In the fall of 2014, I again taught the Lesson Planning and Assessment course. After having lived in the community and teaching and supervising PSTs for a year, I decided to restructure my course so that the PSTs were learning how to plan for, lead, and assess instruction while they were simultaneously learning from and about the surrounding community. Through the CIP I wanted to provide a space for PSTs to learn about, from, and with the community members, potentially contributing to more complicated and nuanced understandings of the community that could inform future planning and teaching.

That fall, students worked in groups of 3-4 and spent time in the community surrounding the university. Some of the tasks students were expected to complete included riding the city bus outside the university campus, interviewing local community members, locating and learning about resources and infrastructure available to community members, following local news, and visiting spaces where youth spent time outside school. As the students completed the tasks, they also wrote individual reflections of their experiences and participated in small group discussions throughout the semester. Additionally, students created concept maps that visually illustrated their individual understandings of the term “community” at the beginning of the semester and

then worked collaboratively with their groups to create virtual multimodal tours of the community at the end of the semester.

Transition to Year Two

All of the tasks in the CIP were meant to allow PSTs to continue constructing their own conceptions of community as well as the relationships between schools and communities. By creating individual concept maps and writing individual reflections, the PSTs were encouraged to reflect on past experiences and to consider them in light of current ones. The individual reflections, small group discussions, and collaborative multimodal tours provided spaces for PSTs to reflect individually and collectively and to consider their experiences within various contexts over time in light of their current experiences in the community.

Students evinced complicated understandings of the community via their written reflections and small group discussions during this first iteration of the project. Rather than painting clear pictures of the community, the students often left their reflections and discussions with more questions than answers. These questions typically helped to guide students as they determined which tasks they wanted to complete next in the CIP. Although I was pleased to see my students learning more about the community and developing an inquiry stance toward it, I also recognized that students weren't engaging in discussions about how their knowledge of the community could or should inform their future teaching. This finding contributed to the modifications I made to the CIP in Year Two.

CIP Year Two

In the fall of 2015, I taught the Reading Methods course. As I designed the course, I decided to again focus on community. Specifically, I was concerned with helping students to understand literacy, text, and pedagogy through the lens of the community. I wanted students to

consider what literacy practices were common, necessary, and/or privileged in the community as they developed their lessons and selected texts for their own classrooms. This work needed to be preceded by inquiry into the spaces, experiences, and practices of the people populating the community. In this second iteration of the project, I began by having groups of students complete photovoice projects (Burke, Greene, & McKenna, 2014) where they used photographs to document texts in the community. Working in groups of 3-4 to complete the same tasks outlined previously, PSTs engaged in small group discussions and constructed virtual tours of the surrounding community. Individually, students also completed written reflections on their experiences.

To encourage students to explicitly consider how community knowledge might inform their teaching, they also completed a lesson plan reflection, modification, and rationale assignment. Each student was instructed to annotate one of their lesson plans, noting assumptions they were making of students through various aspects of the lesson—including assumptions about access to school supplies, transportation, knowledge of terminology, and parental relationships and supports, among others. After making these annotations, students rewrote the lesson, making modifications that would challenge their assumptions. Finally, students wrote papers explaining the ways that their community knowledge was informing their instructional and curricular choices and rationalizing the modifications made to the lesson plan.

Teacher Research as Method

To this point I have presented my reasons for incorporating and details of the CIP. Here, I shift to an analysis my own teaching of that project to consider if I actually designed and presented a project that aligned with my purposes. I consider my inquiry into my own teaching to

be a form of teacher research[7]. I draw primarily from the work of Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1993) among others (Ritchie, 2006; Rust, 2009) to understand teacher research as conducted by "insiders" in real classrooms who endeavor to find practical answers that can inform practice, to grow as reflective practitioners, and to learn more about the students and subjects they teach (Duffield & Townsend, 1999). Teacher research can also extend sociocultural approaches (Vygotsky, 1933/1935, 1978; Wertsch, 1991) to learning as it provides a space for researchers to work individually, inquiring into their own questions about teaching and education, but also to collaborate with others to make sense of and extend their research and understandings (Duffield & Townsend, 1999; Smagorinsky, 1995). I consider the systematic inquiry into the CIP that I engage in here to be a form of teacher research, as my goal in analyzing the CIP is to refine and improve my own teaching moving forward and to offer insight to other teacher educators interested in implementing community-based inquiry projects into their own teaching.

Data Collection and Analysis

To critically analyze and reflect on my teaching of the CIP, I conducted a document analysis (Bowen, 2009; Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Merriam, 1988) on the various materials I used to introduce and teach the project. I reviewed the content within the "words, images, plans, ideas, patterns" of the documents (Prior, 2008, p. 824) as well as the ways I used the documents in my teaching. This analysis allowed me to consider how my assumptions about PSTs and my beliefs about community influenced the places I chose to incorporate into my teaching, the ways that I introduced PSTs to these places, and the relationships I perceived to exist (or not) between my PSTs and the surrounding community.

---

[7] The definitions and goals of teacher research outlined here are those described in literature and might not necessarily reflect how teacher research is taken up in actual classrooms by actual teachers (either the purposes for embarking on teacher research or the methods of conducting research).

Specifically, I conducted a thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) on the documents used to introduce students to the overall course and the CIP during Year Two, including the course syllabus, daily lesson plans, CIP project overview, and powerpoint slides from each class session. I began analysis by reading through all of the data in the order that each datum was presented to students, beginning with the course syllabus. After reading through all of the data, I then returned to the first piece of datum and used my research questions to guide me through a second reading where I tagged statements to note my initial impressions (Miles & Huberman, 1994). In the third reading, I began to organize the tagged statements into codes, which generated four overarching themes: characterizations of community, sociocultural approaches to learning, relationship between PSTs and community, and the role of community in teaching.

Findings

Each of the four themes I review here is aimed at addressing the research questions guiding this study. Specifically, through the presented themes I consider (1) the perceptions of community (question one) and of my PSTs (question two) that I perpetuated through the various elements of the CIP. I also consider the ways that the various documents and assignments associated with the CIP either did or did not align with my stated goals for the project (question three).

Characterizations of Community

Although my intention in the project was to encourage PSTs to see communities and schools, and the community and the university, as mutually influencing one another, rather than as separate spaces, the CIP project overview, syllabus, and class powerpoints suggested otherwise. For instance, PSTs were required to inquire into the nature of community members' interactions on or with the university campus and what community members perceived the role

of the university to be in the town surrounding the school. At no point did the CIP project documents suggest that community members might be working in and for the university or that the community and the university may not be distinct spaces.

The word "race" was never used in any of the documents used to introduce or facilitate the CIP. The absence of race from these documents and even class discussions is especially glaring as the racial divide between my PSTs and the community members was not only obvious, but also a major impetus for the initial development of the project. By evading discussions of race, racism, and even white privilege, I was complicit with white educational discourse that reinforced the status quo even when the stated intention of my teaching was to challenge the status quo and expand students' perspectives (Haviland, 2008).

The CIP was also meant to encourage PSTs to see their students, families, and community members as a heterogeneous and diverse group of individuals. Although my directive via the CIP project overview that PSTs "provide a more holistic and in-depth view of the diverse stories and experiences that make up your community" suggested that the community was not a homogenous group, my use of the term "holistic" could have been problematic. By using "holistic" I intended to encourage PSTs to synthesize their community-based experiences into a comprehensive and focused final presentation; however, my language might have suggested that PSTs should seek out and present one unified vision of the community. Such an approach to understanding and portraying the community could contribute to PSTs' essentialized understandings of others, based on superficial experiences with and observations of the community members. Rather than challenging preconceived or oversimplified assumptions of others, the CIP could merely have served as a mirror, reflecting back PSTs' stereotypes of others

and further solidifying the divide between themselves and a chimerical monolithic "community" (Burant & Kirby, 2002; Gomez, 1996).

Sociocultural Approaches to Learning

I approach my teaching from a sociocultural perspective where learning and development are both individual and social processes that occur over time (Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1991). Individuals draw on their own cultural, historical, social, and emotional experiences as they make sense of new information and experiences, thus contributing to a view of learning as highly-contextualized and amenable to change (Cole, 1996; Vygotsky, 1978). As a teacher educator, I endeavor to structure and instruct my courses from a sociocultural understanding of learning and development, simultaneously modeling sociocultural teaching practices for PSTs.

Specifically, in the CIP I wanted to teach PSTs various methods of inquiry that they could take with them to other school settings—thus, emphasizing the contextualized nature of teaching and learning. Rather than the findings of the CIP, I wanted PSTs to view the methods they used to be adaptable to various settings. However, the Lesson Plan Analysis—both the directions and overall purpose of the assignment—suggested otherwise. In the assignment, I asked PSTs to use their knowledge of the community surrounding the university to make modifications to a lesson plan from their practicum school (a school that may or may not have been located in the town surrounding the university). In other words, PSTs took the knowledge they gained in one setting and applied that information to a completely different setting, thus generalizing their findings, rather than their methods. Instead, PSTs should have been tasked with identifying methods they could use to learn about the specific students with whom they were working.

I also wanted to begin the CIP by encouraging PSTs to reflect on their own identities and experiences in schools growing up. On the second day of class, for instance, PSTs participated in an activity that required them to consider the racial/ethnic groups of various people in their lives (Jiménez, 2014). This activity fed into small-group and whole-class discussions regarding the communities of people with whom PSTs surround themselves and how these personal communities may inform and shape their understandings of others, particularly in school contexts. I also wanted to recognize the individual and social aspects of learning and development by encouraging PSTs to engage in open-ended and ongoing reflective practices as they made sense of their experiences in teacher education and the community. Throughout the semester, PSTs regularly wrote individual reflections and engaged in small-group discussions to process their experiences. PSTs were encouraged to use these times of reflection to consider their own feelings as they spent time in the community and to draw connections among current and past experiences and to the experiences of other PSTs. Although opportunities for personal reflection were incorporated into the CIP, the initial development of the project was grounded in my own assumptions about PSTs. My assumptions about PSTs' experiences and beliefs stemmed from essentialized understandings of their whiteness (Jupp et al., 2016) and evaded the role of sociocultural contexts in shaping their identities (Berchini, 2016).

Relationship between PSTs and Community

Teacher educators, particularly those who view learning from a sociocultural perspective, commonly emphasize the importance of planning lessons and instruction that are rooted in the academic, social, and emotional needs and interests of students (Grossman, 1990; Zeichner, 1999. Encouraging PSTs to learn about students in order to teach them was an essential goal of the class and the CIP. However, it was not until I conducted interviews with PSTs following the

CIP semester that I took the time to learn about their diverse experiences. Thus, I drew from my own personal experiences (as a middle school teacher in a suburban setting and teacher educator), my reading, and my assumptions about PSTs to craft and introduce the various assignments of the CIP. This approach effectively disregarded the experiences of PSTs, positioned them as outsiders in terms of their relationship with the community, and reinforced a hierarchical relationship between my students and me.

In the syllabus for the course, I indicated that I wanted PSTs to "develop a more comprehensive view" of the community. The word "view" further positioned the PSTs as outside and divided from the experiences of community members and signified my assumption that my PSTs did not believe themselves to be members of the community or to have experience with or knowledge of the local community. As documented in another article from this same study (Author, in preparation), blanket assumptions about PSTs' lack of experience with the community were incorrect because one PST had attended both middle and high school in the local community and another PST had worked for several years in the community, garnering a knowledge of the town that far surpassed my own. Finally, I again emphasized the concept of "viewing" the community through the Year Two final project presentation, which was to provide a "virtual tour" of the community. The directions for the virtual tour reinforced the concept of viewing from an outside perspective as well as a physical and psychological divide between the PSTs (and university) and the local community. The positioning of PSTs as outsiders also reinforced an us-and-them binary, a central critique of first wave critical whiteness studies (Asher, 2007), potentially contributing to problematic perceptions of the role of community and teaching and learning how to teach.

The Role of Community in Teaching

One goal of the CIP was to break down in school/out of school binaries in terms of reading practices and personal experiences. In other words, I wanted to encourage PSTs to view those experiences and practices that are occurring at home and in communities as always present in and informing classroom interactions and behaviors (for the teacher and students, alike), and knowledge of the community to be a central part of teaching rather than an optional "add-on." However, rather than recognizing both schools and communities to be caught up in a skein that contributes to concept development and learning for PSTs, my syllabus and CIP introduction reinforced the in-school/out-of-school binary.

The syllabus was the first introduction that PSTs had to the overall purposes and scope of the course. Neither my word choice throughout the syllabus nor its overall organization suggested that community was the central component of the course or to teaching English Language Arts. In fact the word "community" did not appear in the syllabus until page four and was only used three times in the six-page document. Organizationally, the CIP and all related assignments were the last component of the syllabus, following the overall purposes of the course, course readings, and all other required tasks.

Only those books students were required to purchase were listed on the syllabus, leaving the various additional articles and chapters to be presented to students as they were assigned throughout the semester. Students may consider those texts they have to spend money on to be the most important core readings of a course. Neither of the assigned texts was explicitly or primarily concerned with communities, community-engaged reading practices, or sociocultural approaches to reading. Further, on the first day of class I explained to students that I wanted them to buy these particular books because I thought they would be helpful resources for them

post-graduation. Thus, I further solidified the idea that these textbooks (and their respective topics) would provide them with the most essential information in terms of (a) learning how to teach English and (b) being an effective practitioner.

Although the syllabus may have reinforced an in-school/out-of-school binary, various activities and assignments throughout the CIP challenged it. For instance, the photovoice assignment encouraged PSTs to draw connections between their perceptions of "text" and spaces outside of the classroom and even school building. PSTs also read excerpts from Freire's (1970) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* to consider the importance of reading the word and the world—further encouraging them to blur boundaries between in and out of school reading practices. The Reading Methods course was not taught in a vacuum, but was one of five courses required of the PSTs during their final year of coursework in the English Education program. As a whole, this program approached teacher education from a sociocultural perspective and aimed to develop socially just pedagogies. All five courses in the program were taught by doctoral students and a faculty member who met throughout the academic year to align the readings and assignments from each course with the overarching aims of the program. Thus, the Reading Methods course was not singularly responsible for developing PSTs' sociocultural awareness or conception of teaching.

My theoretical and research interests certainly shaped my curricular and instructional choices during the CIP. However, there are a number of instances where the language with which I introduced the project and taught my students and the specific tasks of the project did not align with or extend my theoretical stance and in fact contradicted the overarching goals of the project. By engaging in my own teacher-research and analyzing the documents used to both

introduce and teach the project, I am able to specifically name problematic elements so that I may make improvements to future iterations of the project.

Discussion

In this study, I analyzed the documents I used to plan and teach the CIP to consider how they may have shaped PSTs' developing conceptions of community, what assumptions I held about my PSTs, and to what degree the documents and the goals of the project aligned. Here, I discuss the above findings through the lens of critical whiteness studies to consider how future iterations of this work might better address the goals of the project and experiential learning opportunities in teacher education in general.

Providing an opportunity for PSTs to learn about the communities within which schools and students are embedded and the ways that communities inform and shape what happens in schools was a central goal of the CIP. Said differently, *context* was the central focus of the CIP. Although my intentions in developing the CIP as well as the various assignments and tasks throughout the project were to encourage PSTs to inquire into contexts, as the teacher educator I neglected to consider the context of my own students. Second wave critical whiteness studies suggests that when teacher education programs don't consider the broader sociocultural context (and the ways that context shapes PST identities) they fail to espouse "the mission of supporting teachers for socially transformative work" (Berchini, 2016, p. 1032) or model the types of sociocultural teaching practices so many of them tell PSTs they should be engaging in as teachers themselves. In short, as a teacher educator I didn't practice what I was preaching. Specifically, I did not consider my students' lives and backgrounds (their contexts) when developing the project and I did not engage in regular and critical reflection of my own practice.

I entered my second year as a teacher educator with a homogenous understanding of my PSTs, one rooted in my previous experiences as a teacher educator and also the demographics of my majority-white female cohort of students. I accepted and perpetuated a common narrative of pre-service and novice U. S. teachers as having a limited set of experiences with communities and populations who were unlike them (Sleeter, 2008). Through the CIP and my approach to teaching the Reading Methods course, I perpetuated the myth of the monolithic white experience and made pedagogical choices that were rooted in my assumptions about PSTs. As Berchini (2016) warns, "there is a profound, even debilitating disconnect between expecting teachers to conceptualize their own students as bringing resources to the classroom while framing the teachers themselves as bringing very few" (Berchini, 2016, p. 1032). Through critical reflection I have been able to identify such downfalls in my teaching so that I can make changes to future iterations of the project.

Considering context means more than simply knowing the demographic data of students and the local community. For teacher educators, context must extend to the individual stories and experiences that PSTs bring with them and continue to shape during teacher education. Second wave critical whiteness theorists suggest that the collection of PSTs' life histories could lead to more nuanced understandings of PSTs' experiences, questions, and ideas about society (Jupp & Slattery, 2010).

Future iterations of the CIP should be revised so that the project is framed around the understanding that PSTs, regardless of their race, are embedded within social, historical, and cultural contexts that have shaped and molded them into the people they are. Such an approach must begin with me engaging in some of the same tasks and inquiries that I will require of my students during the CIP. I also recognize that not all of my PSTs are white and that inquiring into

the experiences of minoritized populations in teacher education, especially when discussing concepts of privilege and race, is important.

The ways that PSTs engaged in reflection in the CIP perpetuated an us-and-them binary. To challenge such division, the project could be revised to focus on partnership-building rather than mere inquiry. Reflection in this type of project could be done individually, and also in tandem with a community-based partner. For instance, pairing PSTs with local high school students to engage in a shared inquiry into the community and to reflect on their individual and shared experiences, could challenge binaried approaches to understanding the community and others.

The incorporation of diverse and regular community-based experiences into teacher education programs has been increasingly popular over the past decade. However, as mentioned earlier in this article, teacher educators must be careful not to create community-based projects that reify deficit or stereotypical beliefs about others. For this reason, it is equally as important that teacher educators regularly inquire into the PSTs with whom they are working and the affordances and challenges of community-engaged projects in teacher education. Specifically, teacher educators must simultaneously and regularly reflect on their own biases, assumptions, and experiences (DeVault, 1995; Fonow & Cook, 1991; Hertz, 1997; McCorkel & Myers, 2003)—considering how their word choices, assignments, and readings may promote limited and potentially harmful perceptions of others, what community is, what the relationship is or should be between communities and schools, and the roles of PSTs within community spaces and classrooms. By sharing their reflective practices with PSTs and regularly inquiring into the diverse experiences of the PSTs themselves, teacher educators could better prepare PSTs to

inquire into and draw on knowledge of communities as they work with diverse populations of students.

References

Anderson, J. B., Swick, K. J., & Yff, J. (Eds.). (2001). *Service-learning in teacher education: Enhancing the growth of new teachers, their students, and communities*. New York, NY: American Associations of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Author. (in preparation).

Ball, D. L., & Cohen, D. K. (1999). Developing practice, developing practitioners: Toward a practice-based theory of professional education. In G. Sykes, & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice* (pp. 3-32). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ball, D. L., & Forzani, F. M. (2008). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(5), 497-511.

Banerjee, M., & Hausafus, C. O. (2007). Faculty use of service-learning: Perceptions, motivations, and impediments for the human sciences. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 14*, 32–45.

Banning, R. (1999). Race, class, gender, and classroom dis- course. In L. Parker, D. Deyhle, & S. Villenas (Eds.), *Race is . . . race isn't: Critical race theory and qualitative studies in education* (pp. 155-180). Boulder, CO: Westview.

Barnes, M. E., & Smagorinsky, P. (2016). What English/Language Arts teacher candidates learn during coursework and practica: A study of three teacher education programs. *Journal of Teacher Education, 67*(4), 338-355.

Berchini, C. (2014). Teachers constructing and being constructed by prevailing discourses and practices of whiteness in their curriculum, classroom, and school community: A critical

inquiry of three first-year English teachers (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest, LLC. database. (UMI No. 3630576).

Berchini, C. (2016). Structuring contexts: Pathways toward un-obstructing race-consciousness. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 29*(8), 1030-1044.

Blouin, D. D., & Perry, E. M. (2009). Whom does service-learning really serve? Community-based organizations' perspectives on service-learning. *Teaching Sociology, 37*, 120-135.

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal, 9*(2), 27-40.

Britzman, D. B. (2003). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.

Brookfield, S. D. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bullough, R., & Gitlin, A.D. (2001). *Becoming a student of teaching: Linking knowledge production and practice*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Burant, T. J., & Kirby, D. (2002). Beyond classroom-based early field experiences: Understanidng an 'educative practicum' in an urban school and community. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 18*, 561-575.

Burke, K. J., Greene, S., & McKenna, M. K. (2014). A critical geographic approach to youth civic engagement: Reframing educational opportunity zones and the use of public spaces. *Urban Education*, 1-27.

Clandinin, D. (1995). Still learning to teach. In T. Russell & F. Korthagen (Eds.), *Teachers who teach teachers* (pp. 25-31). London: Falmer Press.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cochran-Smith, M., Albert, L., Dimattia, P., Freedman, S., Jackson, R., Mooney, J., Neisler, O., Peck, A., & Zollers, N. (1999). Seeking social justice: A teacher education faculty's self-study. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 2*(3), 229-253.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, K. (2005). Researching teacher education in changing times. In M. Cochran-Smith and K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 69-109). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1993). *Inside/outside: Teacher research and knowledge*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1998). Teacher research: The question that persists. International Journal of Leadership in Education, 1(1), 19-36.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1999). The teacher research movement: A decade later. *Educational Researcher, 28*(7), 15-25.

Cole, M. (1996). *Cultural psychology: A once and future discipline*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Coulson, D., & Harvey, M. (2013). Scaffolding student reflection for experience-based learning: A framework. *Teaching in Higher Education, 18*(4), 401-413.

Dana, N. F., & Yendol-Silva, D. (2003). *The reflective educator's guide to classroom research: Learning to teach and teaching to learn through practitioner inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Dewey, J. (1904). On the relation of theory and practice. In J. Boydston (Ed.), *The middle-works of John Dewey, 1899-1924* (pp. 249-272). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

DeVault, M. L. (1995). Ethnicity and expertise: Racial-ethnic knowledge in sociological research. *Gender & Society, 9*, 612-631.

Dhingra, K. (2004). Students' perceptions of schools of education. In J. L. Kincheloe, A. Bursztyn, & S. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Teaching teachers: Building a quality school of urban education* (pp. 229-240). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Donnell, K., & Harper, K. (2005). Inquiry in teacher education: Competing agendas. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 153-165.

Duffield, J. A., & Townsend, S. S. (1999). Developing teacher inquiry in partner schools through preservice teacher research. *Action in Teacher Research, 21*(3), 13-20.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record, 103*(6), 1013-1055.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2012). *Teachers as learners*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Fendler, L. (2003). Teacher reflection in a hall of mirrors: Historical influences and political reverberations. *Educational Researcher, 32*(3), 16-25.

Fine, M., Weis, L., Powell, L. C., & Wong, L. M. (Eds.). (1997). *Off White: Readings on race, power, and society*. New York: Routledge.

Fonow, M. M., & Cook, J. A. (Eds.). (1991). *Beyond methodology: Feminist scholarship as lived research*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Forbes, B. A., Wasburn, M. A., Crispo, A. W., & Vandeveer, R. C. (2008). Teaching service-learning: What's in it for faculty at research universities. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 12*, 29–44.

Frankenberg, R. (2001). The mirage of an unmarked Whiteness. In B. Brander, E. Klinenberg, I. J. Nexica, & M. Wray (Eds.), *The making and unmaking of Whiteness* (pp. 72-96). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Gomez, M. L. (1996). Prospective teachers' perspectives on teaching 'other people's children'. In K. M. Zeichner, S. Melnick, and M. L. Gomez (Eds.), *Currents of reform in preservice teacher education* (pp. 109-132). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Gomez, M. L., Allen, A.-R., & Clinton, K. (2004). Cultural models of care in teaching: A case study of one pre- service secondary teacher. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 20*(5), 473-488.

Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts, and social change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Grossman, P. (1990). *The making of a teacher*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Haberman, M., & Post, L. (1992). Does direct experience change education students' perceptions of low-income minority children? *Midwestern Educational Researcher, 5*, 29-31.

Haddix, M. (2015). Preparing community-engaged teachers. *Theory into Practice, 54*, 63-70.

Hallman, H. L., & Burdick, M. N. (2011). Service learning and the preparation of English teacher. *English Education, 43*(4), 341- 368.

Hatton, N. & Smith, D. (1995). Reflection in teacher education: Towards definition and implementation. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 11*(1): 33-49.

Haviland, V. S. (2008). "Things get glossed over": Rearticulating the silencing power of whiteness in education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 59*(1), 40-54.

Hertz, R. (Ed.). (1997). *Reflexivity and voice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Honan, E. (2007). Teachers engaging in research as professional development. In T. Townsend & R. Bates (Eds.), *Handbook of teacher education: Globalization, standards and professionalism in times of change* (pp. 613-624). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Hume, A. (2009). Promoting higher levels of reflective writing in student journals. *Higher Education Research & Development, 28*(3), 247-260.

Imig, D. G. (2001). Preface. In J. B. Anderson, K. J. Swick, and J. Yff (Eds.), *Service-learning in teacher education: Enhancing the growth of new teachers, their students, and communities* (pp. vii-viii). New York: American Associations of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Jackson, P. (1968). *Life in classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Jiménez, L. M. (2014). “So, like, what now?”: Making identity visible for preservice teachers. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education, 10*(2), 69-86.

Jones, S., & Hughes, H. E. (2016). Changing the place of teacher education: Feminism, fear, and pedagogical paradoxes. *Harvard Educational Review, 86*(2), 161-182.

Jupp, J. C., Berry, T. R., & Lensmire, T. J. (2016). Second-wave white teacher identity studies: A review of white teacher identity literatures from 2004 through 2014. *Review of Educational Research, 86*(4), 1151-1191.

Jupp, J. C., & Slattery, G. P. (2010). Becoming teachers of inner-city students identification creativity and curriculum wisdom of committed white male teachers. *Urban Education, 47*, 280–311.

Kincheloe, J. (1991). *Teachers as researchers: Qualitative inquiry as a path to empowerment*. London: The Falmer Press.

Kinloch, V., & Smagorinsky, P. (2014). *Service-learning in literacy education: Possibilities for teaching and learning*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Kirkland, D. (2014). "They look scared": Moving from service learning to learning to serve in teacher education—A social justice perspective. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 47*(4), 580-603.

Labaree, D. F. (2004). *The trouble with ed schools*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Laughter, J. (2011). Rethinking assumptions of demographic privilege: Diversity among white preservice teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*, 43–50.

Lee, S., & Moon, S. (2013). Teacher reflection in literacy education. *International Journal of Higher Education, 2*(4), 157-164.

Lensmire, T. (2010). Ambivalent white racial identities: Fear and an elusive innocence. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 13*, 159–172.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *School teacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Loughran, J. (2002). Understanding self-study of teacher education practices. In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.) *Improving teacher education practices through self-study* (pp. 239-248). London, UK: Routledge-Falmer.

Marx, S. (2003a). Reflections on the state of critical White studies. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*, 3–5.

McCorkel, J. A., & Myers, K. (2003). What difference does difference make? Position and privilege in the field. Qualitative Sociology, 26(2), 199-231.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mitchell, T. D. 2008. "Traditional vs. Critical Service-Learning: Engaging the Literature to Differentiate Two Models." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 14 (2): 50-65.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2014). *The condition of education: Racial/ethnic enrollment in public schools* (Data File). Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cge.asp

Noel, J. (2011). Striving for authentic community engagement: A process model from urban teacher education. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 15*(1), 31-52.

Oner, D., & Adadan, E. (2011). Use of web-based portfolios as tools for reflection in preservice teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 62*(5), 477-492.

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2014). What are we seeking to sustain through culturally sustaining pedagogy? A loving critique forward. *Harvard Educational Review, 84*(1), 85-100.

Prior, L. (2008). Repositioning documents in social research. *Sociology, 42*(5), 821-836.

Ritchie, G. V. (2006). *Teacher research as a habit of mind*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA.

Roediger, D. (1999). *The wages of Whiteness: Race and the making of the American working class* (Revised ed.). London: Verso.

Rust, F. O. (2009). Teacher research and the problem of practice. *Teachers College Record, 111*(8), 1882-1893.

Ryan, M. (2013). The pedagogical balancing act: Teaching reflection in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education, 18*(2), 144-155.

Ryan, M., Carrington, S., Selva, G., & Healy, A. (2009). Taking a 'reality' check: Expanding pre-service teachers' views on pedagogy and diversity. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(2), 155-173.

Shulman, L. (2004). *Teaching as community property*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*, 94–106.

Sleeter, C. E. (2008). Equity, democracy, and neoliberal assaults on teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*, 1947-1957.

Smagorinsky, P. (1995). The social construction of data: Methodological problems of investigating learning in the zone of proximal development. *Review of Educational Research, 65*, 191-212. Available at http://www.petersmagorinsky.net/About/PDF/RER/RER1995.pdf

Smagorinsky, P. (2013). The development of social and practical concepts in learning to teach: A synthesis and extension of Vygotsky's conception. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction, 2*, 238-248.

Smagorinsky, P. (forthcoming). A developmental, social, cultural, and historical approach to literacy education.

Smagorinsky, P., & Barnes, M. E. (2014). Revisiting and revising the apprenticeship of observation. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 41*(4), 29-52.

Smagorinsky, P., Cook, L. S., & Johnson, T. S. (2003). The twisting path of concept development in learning to teach. *Teachers College Record, 105*, 1399-1436.

Stevenson, H. J., & Cain, K. J. (2013). Talking to paper doesn't work: Factors that facilitate preservice teacher reflection. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 40*(2), 78-88.

Thornton, M. B. (2014). An authentic, curriculum-based approach to service-learning. In V. Kinloch & P. Smagorinsky (Eds.), *Service-learning in literacy education: Possibilities for teaching and learning* (pp. 65-81). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1933/1935). 'Dinamika umstvennogo razvitiya shkol'nika v svyazi s obucheniem', in L. S. Vygotsky, *Umstvennoe razvitie detey v protsesse obucheniya*. Moscow-Leningrad: Uchpedgiz, pp. 35-52.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1934/1987). Thinking and speech. In R. Rieber & A. Carton (Eds.), *L. S. Vygotsky, Collected works, Vol. 1* (pp. 39-285). (N. Minick, Trans.). New York: Plenum.

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

Wertsch, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Zeichner, K. M. (1995). Reflections of a teacher educator working for social change. In T. Russell & F. Korthagen (Eds.), *Teachers who teach teachers* (pp. 11-24). London: Falmer Press.

Zeichner, K. M. (1999). The new scholarship in teacher education. *Educational Researcher, 28*(9), 4-15.

Zeichner, Z. M., Grant, C., Gay, G., Gillette, M., Valli, L., & Villegas, A. M. (1998). A research informed vision of good practice in multicultural teacher education: Design principles. *Theory into Practice, 37*, 163-171.

Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*(1), 23-48.

Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. (2014). *Reflective teaching: An introduction* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

In this dissertation I inquired into the development of pre-service teachers (PSTs) as they moved through the various courses and field-based experiences involved in formal, university-based English Language Arts (ELA) teacher education. I was particularly interested in the ways that teacher educators, mentor teachers, and community-based people and places potentially shape PSTs' developing conceptions of how communities can influence education. As I analyzed the data I found that PSTs' conceptions of teaching (i.e. their own expectations for teaching) were often in conflict with the professional knowledge landscape as constructed and presented by their teacher educators, Mentor Teachers (MTs), and/or community members. My inquiry into this tension allows me to consider potential implications for teacher education. Specifically, across the three chapters of this dissertation, I find that modeling, reflection, and inquiry are three tools teacher educators may use to help PSTs navigate tension during teacher education.

Modeling

In Chapter 2 I inquired into the ways that PSTs may draw from their own past school and life experiences as the model for the relationships that can and should exist between schools and communities. In this chapter, I found that relying on prior and personal school experiences as the sole frame of reference for understanding the relationships between schools and communities could lead to limited understandings of this relationship. Further, limited perceptions of schools and communities could contribute to deficit ideas about reciprocity, or the lack thereof, between schools and communities

I inquired into the relationship between Mentor Teachers (MTs) and PSTs in Chapter 3. In this chapter I argued that MTs might not always serve as models for the types of teachers that PSTs envision themselves becoming. This is an important concept to share with PSTs who may enter teacher education and student teaching, in particular, expecting to work with a MT who represents the type of teacher they will one day become. However, rather than rejecting an MT who does not serve as this model, PSTs should recognize the ways MTs may model other essential practices and skills needed to develop as a teacher.

Finally, in Chapter 4, I argued that teacher educators should model their own reflective and inquiry stances when preparing PSTs to teach—particularly when asking PSTs to be both reflective and inquiring practitioners. Through my own reflection on teaching, I found that teacher educators should be transparent with PSTs about the design of their courses, potential shortcomings, and the overall goals of teaching. In particular, teacher educators need to model the types of socially just pedagogies they purport to teach, including not making assumptions about or homogenizing PSTs based on demographic data alone.

Reflection

My findings from Chapter 2 suggest that PSTs should reflect on their own experiences with community members growing up. Such reflections might involve questioning the people and places PSTs engaged with (or not) growing up. PSTs should also critically analyze their own perceptions of the various communities to which they belong and spend time in—questioning their "place" in those communities and the ways that they make sense of what they experience and see in those communities. Finally, PSTs should use reflection as a tool of inquiry and growth. PSTs might consider which aspects of the community they are noticing and then critically analyze those reflections to consider what that information could mean for teaching and

schools. Ultimately, Chapter 2 suggests that PSTs should use reflection to consider how community-based experiences and interactions shape students' experiences in schools.

Reflection was a central aspect of Chapter 3, in which I inquired into the experiences of one PST as he worked with his MT during practicum and student teaching. Based on my analysis of the case, I argue that teacher education programs should incorporate opportunities for PSTs to explore their own expectations of the MT-PST relationship prior to and regularly throughout both practicum and student teaching. For instance, PSTs might reflect on how the MT-PST relationship should or could evolve over time. PSTs should also reflect explicitly on care. Such reflections might include inquiries into the behaviors of those teachers they considered to be "caring" as students themselves. PSTs might also reflect on the ways that they express care to others and recognize care when it's extended to them. Finally, PSTs should reflect on the awkward experience of being simultaneously a teacher and a student during student teaching; oftentimes closer in age to the students whom they are teaching than the MT with whom they are working.

In Chapter 4, I reflected on my own teaching of the Community Inquiry Project to consider the ways that my assumptions about my students as well as my own particular beliefs about communities and schools could potentially shape PSTs' developing conceptions of teaching. I drew from my own reflective practice to argue that teacher educators should engage in regular and critical reflections of their own teaching. Further, teacher educators should model their own reflective practices and modes for PSTs.

Inquiry

In Chapter 2 I argue that teacher education should be a place of inquiry. Specifically, teacher educators should encourage PSTs to learn various tools of inquiry and to see these tools

as potentially transferrable to different spaces and people. Further, by incorporating diverse inquiry- and field-based experiences in teacher education, beyond the more formal practicum and student teaching experiences, teacher education programs could help PSTs' to develop an inquiry stance toward teaching.

In Chapter 3 I argue that teacher educators should encourage PSTs to inquire into their own work habits, expectations of teaching, and goals for the profession as they move through teacher education. PSTs should be encouraged to participate in diverse inquiry- and field-based learning regularly before and during teacher education. These early field-experiences can include one-on-one tutoring and mentoring, but should also include opportunities for PSTs to work with small groups of students and even to actively observe in classrooms. In terms of care, PSTs should inquire into the ways that both they and their MT express and recognize care in the classroom. Specifically, PSTs should inquire into the nested contexts of teaching—questioning the ways that social, political, cultural, and historical forces are shaping and oftentimes constricting what teachers can and cannot do in classrooms, including the ways that they are able to express care.

Finally, findings from Chapter 4 extend research on teacher research (Cochran-Smith, Albert, Dimattia, Freedman, Jackson, Mooney, Neisler, Peck, & Zollers, 1999; Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005) to suggest that teacher educators should inquire into both their own class-based teaching and the overall structure and mission of the teacher education programs within which they are working. Such reflection could help teacher educators to create programs of teacher education that (a) are more responsive to the needs of PSTs and communities and (b) move toward better theoretical and practical alignment.

Conclusion

Overall, the PSTs in this study constructed conceptions of themselves as teachers as well as conceptions of teaching writ large to help them make sense of their experiences in teacher education and in the CIP. Many of the PSTs in this study experienced tension as they navigated the relationship between their own conceptions of teaching and the realities of teaching they were exposed to and learned more about during teacher education. This research could have implications for the ways teachers are prepared to enter and remain in schools unlike the ones they experienced as students themselves. When navigating places of tension becomes a regular part of teacher education, PSTs could feel more inclined to engage with unfamiliar people and places and/or polemical topics and texts as they move into teaching. These findings are particularly salient for PSTs entering increasingly diverse U. S. public schools as novice teachers, and potentially for increasing teacher retention.

References

Cochran-Smith, M., Albert, L., Dimattia, P., Freedman, S., Jackson, R., Mooney, J., Neisler, O., Peck, A., & Zollers, N. (1999). Seeking social justice: A teacher education faculty's self-study. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 2*(3), 229-253.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, K. (2005). Researching teacher education in changing times. In M. Cochran-Smith and K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 69-109). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.