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Abstract

This study was conducted with three participants, who were undergraduate students in a teacher training program in a western university, as they transitioned from university coursework to their student teaching internships over a five month period. Their internships were held in public elementary schools within the same or neighboring states in general and special education in grades 1-9.

This study used narrative inquiry in which the participants constructed their lived experiences through monthly interviews, response journals, pen and paper illustrations, and existing curricular and instructional artifacts. Thematic coding and Harré and van Langenhove's (1999) six modes of positioning theory were used to analyze the data to consider how participants were positioned and position themselves within their situated contexts and in relation to other people, organizations, and entities.

The findings of this study included a recognition that student teachers are positioned as learners, which gives them a degree of failure resistance (Dweck & Molden, 2005). However, it also puts them in a subversive position where they are susceptible to socialization processes resulting from high stakes accountability, prescriptive curriculum, and overreliance on mentor teachers, who may or may not be exemplary models. Transference of social justice and critical pedagogy university learning was not always possible because of the student teachers' positioning as "guests" within their internship classrooms and pressures, both real and perceived, to conform to micro, meso, and macro structures. A
recommendation is for teacher education programs to engage preservice teachers in *iterant positioning* so they are better able to internalize socially just pedagogy and are more enabled to utilize it in their own classrooms.
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Preface

In this dissertation, I have chosen to include personal narratives to introduce each chapter. I made this decision because through the course of my doctorate program and the execution of this study, I realized, just like my participants, I am situated within my own context that can be reawakened and transformed as I interact with them and their stories. In narrative inquiry, I, as the researcher, am not a static, objective individual. Instead, as Clandinin and Connelly (2000) state, "As inquirers, we meet ourselves in the past, the present, and the future... As narrative inquirers, we work within a space not only with our participants, but also with ourselves. Working in this space means that we become visible with our own lived and told stories" (pp. 61-62).

In beginning each chapter with a situated story from my own past, I attempt to make public "the secret stories" that have inspired and steered me toward my current choices in research and education. I answer the questions: why social justice?; why narrative?; why teaching?; why transition? We become what we have lived. Who I am as a teacher, researcher, and person is influenced by the people I have encountered and the experiences I have navigated in my lifetime. My choices are a result of the consequences I have lived. I attempt to demonstrate this through a gradual “backtracking” of my own educational narrative -- from veteran teacher to student teacher to student -- to show how the decisions I make now, the way I interact with these current participants, the way I conduct this study, and the way I analyze, interpret, and portray data are all subject to my positioning, my life, and the
experiences that have brought me to this place, this mentality, and this belief system. My situatedness is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3’s "Researcher Stance" section.
Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

My Ongoing Narrative: Why Race, Culture, and Power?

Invariably in a teaching career, you encounter defining moments, those times when realization strikes without warning, that smacks hard reality between your eyes and you are never able to perceive of children, teaching, and learning in the same way again. It is a moment of eye-opening, mind-altering clarity that profoundly changes everything you thought you knew, but then realize you didn’t. For me, it came in my third year of teaching when I sought to share my passion for Shakespeare’s work with my eighth grade students. I taught in an urban, east coast district immediately outside the Washington, D.C. border with students of whom 90% were African American, and my colleagues had deemed as "at-risk." No one believed they could learn the Shakespeare play, A Midsummer Night’s Dream, I had chosen for them to explore as part of a unit centered on influences on individuals. But they did. They read lines passionately; they argued textual meaning; they drew parallels to other texts and the outside world. They were fully engaged in the process of reading and living this play. Then, in my attempt to incorporate multiple modalities and engage "a transformational effort in the re-representation" (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009, p. 180) of the play’s meaning, I chose to show them one scene enacted on video. I enthusiastically pressed "play" on the VCR, but instead of the smiles I expected to see, I saw angry eyes piercing, boring holes into the TV screen. Tension grew thicker every second and filled every atom in the room. I shut off the VCR and asked the students what was happening.
'Where are the brothers?' one young man responded. I didn't understand and asked him to clarify. 'Where are the brothers? Why are there no black people doing Shakespeare?' The realization hit me squarely. I scanned the room and realized that my class, heavily represented by African Americans, was suddenly feeling alienated from Shakespeare not because of his play, but because of the film I thought they would be so excited to see. (Morrison, 2002, p. 48)

As I reflected on this disastrous result, I realized what Fordham and Ogbu (1986) meant when they discussed the problematic nature of African American students' achievement in school being seen as "acting White" (p. 176). The image on the screen of an all-White cast reinforced to the students Shakespeare was meant for White people; they, as a marginalized group, were not meant to access such texts. This event temporarily damaged the positive learning community we had created and taught me I needed to make better choices for curriculum content; that children of color had to have representation within classroom texts, and that I needed to strive to walk in my non-mainstream students' shoes.

**Purpose of This Study**

This one experience has significantly impacted my philosophies and choices for personal growth. Since becoming aware of my "White privilege" (MacIntosh, 1989) and shifting my paradigmatic understanding of dominant and marginalized culture, my focus in education has been to achieve social justice and equity for students. We as a society have long strides to make in this area. Teachers, as is so
often the case, are seen as the solution, the "front line" (Day, Fernandez, Hauge & Moller, 2000, p. 1), interacting with students in an attempt to reach social justice goals. Professional development and university training in anti-deficit thinking, cultural competence, critical pedagogy, and social justice are seen as plausible solutions for achievement gaps (see e.g., Ford & Grantham, 2003; Jones & Enriquez, 2009; Miller, 2010; Ukpokodu, 2004). Yet teachers cannot be considered in isolation. They operate in an ever increasingly complex system of social, political, and economic agendas, many of which can be in conflict with one another or with the overarching goal of democratic education itself. The ability to achieve equitable education is deeply affected by teachers' ability to navigate the "policy cascade" (Papola, 2012). When they are unable to do so, they may relinquish their agency or leave the profession altogether.

This study examined how preservice teachers, who have received critical, social justice training their coursework, transitioned into the complex, multileveled environment of public school teaching. In this dissertation, I begin in Chapter 1 by establishing the study's rationale and research question. In Chapter 2, I review research literature related to the globalization of education and its impact on teacher agency and teacher preparation. I also provide an overview of this study's conceptual lens - positioning theory. In Chapter 3, I situate this study's methodology - narrative inquiry - within the fields of qualitative and narrative research, and explain the choices I made based on the research. I also address my researcher stance, the participants, data collection and sources, and data analysis
procedures. In Chapters 4 and 5, I present the data from this study’s three participants, Bryan, Adele, and Maxwell. Their individual narratives are presented in Chapter 4, and the cross-analysis of their narratives is presented in Chapter 5. Finally, Chapter 6 summarizes the findings of this study and articulates pedagogical, theoretical, and methodological implications, study limitations, and suggestions for future research, including the extension of this study.

**Purpose of This Chapter**

In this chapter, I present an overview of research on the academic achievement gap in order to provide a rationale for my study. I then address key issues with teacher training and turn-over to show problems which arise when teachers are considered in isolation from their contextualized environments and how this is related to the academic achievement gap. Lastly, I explain how my study can help to provide answers to the problems and issues I have identified. I end with my research question.

**Persistent Achievement Gaps that Continue Reproduction of Inequity**

One of the most persistent issues currently plaguing public education is the enduring racial and socio-economic achievement gaps. According to the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), this gap has been documented since the inception of the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) in 1969, often referred to as the Nation’s Report Card (www.nces.ed.gov). Given radical social changes due to desegregation, increased access to health programs for mothers in poverty - such as Women, Infants, and Children (WIC); increased interventions for
children in poverty - such as Head Start; and, more recently, increased accountability for schools based on disaggregated population subgroups, one would expect the achievement gaps to have substantially closed over the past four decades (www.rethinkingschools.org). However, this is not the case. In fact, the achievement gaps have remained obstinately stagnant on a national level (www.nces.ed.gov). These achievement gaps are pervasive and intractable despite No Child Left Behind’s (NCLB) and Race to the Top’s (RTTT) intentional focus on traditionally underserved subgroups and the efforts of district, state, and federal policy to eliminate significant differences in performance (No Child Left Behind, 2001; Race to the Top, 2009). But the racial gap persists despite increasing socio-economic status of African American students, who often perform lower than poor White students (www.nces.ed.gov).

In 2001, Congress reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), often referred to as No Child Left Behind (NCLB), in order to call attention to traditionally marginalized populations of students. In the past, schools could "hide behind their averages" by reporting out school-wide means that did not reflect the enormous discrepancy between White students’ and students’ of color levels of performance. The federal legislation's intent was to begin closing these achievement gaps (No Child Left Behind, 2001). However, intentions have not aligned with reality. Many times, the children who are categorized into one targeted subgroup such as poverty (as measured by federal meal eligibility), also fall into other traditionally marginalized categories such as Latino/Hispanic, African-
American, special education, and English as a Second Language. They are "triple or quadruple bell-ringer" children who fall into multiple categories. Often poverty and minority racial status are strongly correlated (e.g., Hughes, Stenhjem & Newkirk, 2007; O’Connor & Fernandez, 2006; Russell, 1994; Skiba, Poloni-Staudinger & Simmons, 2005; Szymanski, 1983; Szymanski & Goertzel, 1979), so these children have a greater chance of being "left behind."

While there has been some movement to lessen the variance in intellectual performance over the past few years, the gap continues to be significant (www.edtrust.org, 2011). In the case of 17-year olds, the gap between White students and Latino and African-American students has actually increased in the past ten years (see Figures 5 & 6). Gaps in 4th grade math have seen the most improvement in the past three decades, with Latino students gaining more ground than African-Americans. What is significant about these data is White students are also seeing a rise in performance, indicating their scores are not being suppressed to demonstrate a false sense of eliminating achievement gaps (see Figures 1 & 2).

However, the accomplishments achieved in younger grades dwindle as students move through public institutions. By the time students reach 8th grade, the gap has widened. In 2008, the gap between White students and both Latino and African-American students was greater than it had been in 1988 before NCLB was established (see Figures 3 & 4). The same is true for high school seniors where tremendous gains made in the 1980s, again predating NCLB accountability

---

1 The figures are listed out of order in the text because I wanted the data in the appendix to appear in chronological order by age. However, I chose to address 17-year olds first within the text.
requirements, have leveled out and maintained two decades of significant achievement gaps based on race (see Figures 5 & 6). However, the true urgency of these statistics is not realized until the gap is explained in terms of impact on students, their skill attainment, and access to future professions. When 17-year old African American and Latino children have the same level of achievement as 13-year old White children (see Figures 7 & 8), they are leaving school less prepared with fewer marketable skills and greater chance to be in low-wage, limited-advancement jobs. This perpetuates the cycles of poverty and lower standards of living for people of color.

While it is true more White children in terms of sheer numbers live in poverty, percentage-wise, children of color are still more likely to live in poverty and have less access to social institutions such as quality education, health care, and housing (McDermott, Raley, & Seyer-Ochi, 2009; Wright, 2011). This translates into less access to higher education and the completion of degrees that provide a gateway to many professions. Bourdieu (2007) defines such assets as "cultural capital" - attributes and items "convertible into economic capital and may be institutionalized" (p. 84) because of their social value. Individuals and classes with power create social, political, and legal "rules" and reify their power through institutionalized means that maintain social inequities (see e.g., Apple, 2006a; Bourdieu, 2007). What is considered "valuable" is ephemeral and based on the criteria and needs of the upper echelons of social hierarchy (Bourdieu & Passerson,
This means children from marginalized populations continue to be marginalized because of social and political constructs that reproduce inequities.

It is important to recognize the achievement gap, while often presented as a Black-White dichotomy, actually encompasses a multitude of traditionally marginalized peoples including Native Americans and multiracial individuals as well as Asian American and Pacific Islander students, who are often stereotyped as "the model minority." Subsequently, the oppression and disadvantage for "the model minority" are masked by perceived achievement (Pang, Han & Pang, 2011). The achievement gap exists due to "disparities in academic performance between mainstream and marginalized populations" (Pang et al., 2011) and is not limited to only some marginalized groups.

If federal legislation and national standards have not been effective means for eliminating the achievement gaps, what is? Why does this gap continue? Where do these issues come from and how can they be addressed? If legislation, policy-making, and legal action (i.e., Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 1954) have not been able to budge the intransigent achievement gap, we must examine other root causes. It is possible the gaps could be attributed to inequities and assumed entitlements within society based on the historical legitimizing of racism by defining "inferior or superior races" (see e.g., Szymanski, 1983; Wilson, 1996). The historical roots that have embedded classist and racist ideologies into mainstream populations are deep and pervasive and have impacted the psychology of individuals in all levels of society. Racism continues to be "part of the institutional
reality of American society" and difficult to counter-act because institutionalized racism and classism "function systematically to disadvantage racialized groups and to advantage the racializers" (Lustig, 2004, p. 51). The remnants of these roots are apparent in the achievement gaps experienced by students of traditionally marginalized populations, who continue to be provided with less from the educational system than their more dominantly-cultured peers (Kozol, 1992, 2006; www.edtrust.org, 2011). Theories such as stereotype threat (Steele, 1997), attribution theory (Weiner, 2008), theories of intelligence (Dweck, 2007, Dweck & Molden, 2005), self-fulfilling prophecies (Jussim & Harber, 2005), and theories of deficit thinking (Ford & Grantham, 2003; Valencia, 1997, 2010) attempt to offer social-psychological explanations for this persistence. Others focus on socio-cultural roots that examine the interrelationships of power, positioning, and identity such as Kretovics's (1985) ideas of critical literacy, Bourdieu's (2007) concepts of social and cultural capital, and Harré and van Langenhove's (1999) positioning theory. The commonality between all these theories is the criticalness of how the teacher enacts, consciously or unconsciously, belief systems, values, and attitudes toward particular students based on socialized conditions and how s/he has internalized racist and classist legacies. The teacher, through curricular and instructional choices, pedagogical philosophies, and interactions with students, becomes the linchpin of social justice transformation.
University Training and Professional Development as Solution?

A common recommendation within educational reform scholarship is to train teachers or for universities to provide coursework in whatever issue is of concern to the researcher (see e.g., Ford & Grantham, 2003; Garcia & Guerra, 2004; Miller, 2010). Frequently in research findings, the responsibility for addressing the pervasive achievement gaps in the form of school reform, social justice, democratic education, multicultural education, and student achievement falls squarely on the shoulders of teachers and school personnel (e.g., Garcia & Guerra, 2004; Gardiner, Canfield-Davis & Anders, 2009; Jones & Enriquez, 2009). For example, Garcia and Guerra (2004) claim school reform efforts to close achievement gaps "often fail because of educators’ unwillingness to examine the root causes of underachievement and of failure among students from low-income and racially or ethnically diverse backgrounds" (p. 15). On-going professional development that encourages educators to experience cognitive dissonance (Garcia & Guerra, 2004), practice critical reflexivity and movement away from deficit thinking (e.g., Dray & Wisneski, 2011; Ford & Grantham, 2003; Jones & Enriquez, 2009; Miller, 2010), learn more about students’ culture and lives (e.g., Ukpokodu, 2004; Walker, 2011), and retrain attribution of student behaviors (e.g., Georgiou, Christou, Stavrinides & Panaoura, 2002; Reyna, 2000; Stewart, Latu, Kawakami, & Myers, 2010) is highly recommended in much of the research literature on improving schools and student achievement.
While all these recommendations certainly carry merit and preservice teacher training is a significant component to achieving equity for students, what happens when this training "bumps" against "out-of-classroom structures" (Clandinin, Murphy, Huber & Orr, 2010, p. 82) that dictate standardized achievement plotlines? What happens when high-stakes survival is in conflict with the enactment of social justice, multicultural, or anti-deficit training? What is the result of "collisions [that] occur between empowered preservice educators attempting to live plotlines of incremental change and seemingly unresponsive and hostile organizations bogged down by social change and by state and national policies" (Craig, 2010b, p. 133)? The teacher as an individual or even as a representative of the educational system cannot be considered in a vacuum exclusive of broader context. Instead, we must consider the impact of a changing world on the individual teacher's daily work and how these changes may conflict with the implementation of democratic and equitable philosophies. We also must consider how preservice and novice teachers are being prepared for these globalized contexts. Are university preparation programs and school district partnerships adapting to meet the changing teacher role? How do preservice teachers, who often have grown up in a world of high stakes accountability, view these shifts? What happens to their university training and theoretical knowledge base as they transition through the internship to their first years of teaching?
New Teacher Turn-Over -- Loss of Potential, Loss of Future

This era of unprecedented demands on teachers to be accountable for student performance can be disheartening, frustrating, and disillusioning for established and novice teachers alike. Perceived lack of influence over policy, accountability and assessment demands, bureaucratic impediments, and perceived inability to implement ideas such as equity and social justice into their classrooms causes 20% of all new teachers to leave the profession within their first three years, and half to leave by year five (Center for Teacher Quality in California, 2007; Carroll & Foster, 2010; Center for Education Statistics, 2005; Futernick, 2007). Much of the research on deficit thinking and its related theories such as critical race theory rely on training preservice teachers at the university level in critical pedagogy (see e.g., Dray & Wisnewski, 2011; Georgiou et al., 2002; Graham, 1988, Reyna, 2000), yet little consideration is given to the pragmatic barriers and constraints preservice teachers face within contextualized systems to develop agency. Because of requirements such as high accountability testing and federal mandates for proficiency levels, teachers are often faced with substantial pressures to stick to prescriptive curricula and test preparation programs rather than take risks to implement critical pedagogy training many receive in preservice coursework (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005). This is especially true for preservice and new teachers who worry about receiving positive evaluations, impressing potential employers, keeping their jobs, and maintaining working relationships with their colleagues (Margolis, 2006; Papola, 2012).
Change is difficult, and traditional lenses for viewing educational pedagogy, instruction, and curriculum can be hard to readjust. Without understanding the barriers teachers face to implement anti-deficit policies, critical pedagogy, and critical multiculturalism within their classrooms and without providing guidance, training, and support to navigate existing systems, established social hierarchies are left to prevail. New teachers become disenfranchised; students with less remain students with less; and achievement gaps continue to remain as static and wide as they have for the past forty years.

It is not sufficient to just look at novice teachers as separate, isolated entities. Instead, considering the experiences of preservice teachers transitioning from the university may not only provide a window into what school districts can do at the micro-level in preparing teachers, but also help us to look at the structures themselves (school districts and universities) in which the teachers operate at a macro level. By examining the interconnectivity of both, we may begin to identify how changes can be made at the micro, meso, and macro levels to provide teacher training that better matches the changing demands and needs of society and better serves traditionally marginalized students.

**Research Question**

This proposed study will explore the following research question:

- *How do preservice teachers experience transition from university student to student teacher?*
Chapter 2: Literature Review: Empirical Studies and Conceptual Lens

Introduction: Why Teacher Contexts?

In 1991, in an east coast urban district, I began my first year of teaching in an isolated, external temporary classroom with an eight-page language arts curriculum guide instructing me to teach my seventh graders dictionary skills, obscure diacritical marks like umlauts, grammar rules on constructing adverbial phrases, and poetry from dilapidated, outdated anthologies. While district leaders suggested we integrate language arts, as a new teacher, I had little experience in how to do such a thing, what goals I should set for students, and for what expectations in future grades I should be preparing them. When I asked for help from colleagues within my school, I was handed the *Warriner's English Grammar and Composition* (1982) textbook and told to work my way through it. In my frustration, I began to make up my own curriculum centered on literature themes (i.e., enduring conflict and tolerance based on *Anne Frank*), authentic experience (we designed and sewed memorial panels for the AIDS Quilt), and rigorous writing models (thesis arguments). Discrepancies between student learning in my class and in other language arts classrooms became readily apparent; students' learning experiences varied vastly depending upon their instructor, and there was no consistency in what they learned across a grade level. Each of us taught what we felt was important with few guidelines or standards to achieve. One was considered a "good teacher" as long as few discipline referrals were made to the main office. What students
actually learned was haphazard, dependent upon "luck of the schedule," and poorly documented.

Within my first year, the state and district where I taught became engulfed in "the standards movement," and the eight-page curriculum was soon replaced with a much more comprehensive document and end-of-course, high stakes assessments which linked student learning with teacher performance. In professional development sessions, curriculum specialists showed me how to read scope and sequence guides and how to write questions aligned with state performance-based assessments. My initial response to the overwhelming number of documents - content-based standards, pacing guides, curriculum guides, benchmark testing - was disappointment and trepidation. If I was required to closely follow these documents, how would I be able to incorporate such concepts as social justice, tolerance, and self-identity, which were imperative learning for my urban and diverse student population, into my instruction? How could I have students experience the AIDS Quilt or visit the Holocaust Museum if I had to busily pound metaphors and main ideas into them to meet assessment goals? My first views of standards documents and assessments encompassed resentment and frustration, until a colleague helped me to realize these concepts, skills, and knowledge were not to be taught in isolation, but through the vehicles (literature and other content) I had been using all along. A visit the Holocaust Museum was not supplementary; it was a powerful way to teach standards which addressed rhetoric, analysis of language, persuasive writing, and narrative. It was the first time I began to realize
the power of using standards and guiding assessments to enrich and elevate classroom instruction. I also began to realize the changing position of teachers with classroom constructs. The days of isolationism and unmonitored, self-directed instruction were over; the days of closer scrutiny and greater social accountability were ahead.

**Purpose of This Chapter**

My experience was certainly not an isolated or unique one as the standards movement took hold of education in the late 1980’s and early 1990’s, and widespread change continues to be commonplace in our increasingly technological, global, and capitalistic world (see e.g., Craig, 2010b; Elmore, 2011; Spring 2009). Teachers, therefore, are situated within increasingly complex, multilayered contexts (see Figure 9). This chapter examines recent changes in teachers’ work as well as some of the factors contributing to these changes, including the *No Child Left Behind* Act and the erosion of teacher agency through the policy cascade. Additionally, I present research on how teacher agency can be maintained despite conflicts with neoliberal or neoconservative policies and the degree to which veteran or preservice/novice teachers are able or willing to assert their agency within such constructs. Next, I discuss deficit thinking, how it relates to critical pedagogy, critical race theory, and social justice as well as how entire education systems can be predicated on deficit thinking. I also provide an overview of preservice training and teacher education program components. Finally, I provide an overview of positioning theory and how it helped elucidate teachers’ situatedness within current
constructs. Since my study focused on preservice teachers’ transition from university coursework to the K-12 classroom, this research provides a contextual background of teaching in American public schools, the environment into which participants entered and attempted to navigate. It is important to contextualize the work because teachers do not operate in a vacuum (Elmore, 2011; Spring, 2006), and the pressures, expectations, and ideologies under which they work must be taken into account since they impact teachers’ lived experiences, decision-making, and daily work.

Changes in Teachers’ Work

Research on teacher development, identity, and agency overwhelmingly identifies new positioning, expectations, and tensions in teachers’ work not only within the United States (Apple, 1988; Craig, 2010b; Crowley & Apple, 2009; Elmore, 2011; Spring 2009), but across the world in England (Hall, 2004; Helsby, 2000; Labaree, 2000; Schweisfurth, 2006), Ireland (Sugrue, 2006), Canada (Clandinin & Connelly, 1998; Clandinin et al., 2010; Liggett, 2011; Poole, 2008), Australia (Smyth, Dow, Hattam, Reid & Shacklock, 2000; Vongalis-Macrow, 2007), Norway (Karseth & Sivesind, 2010), Finland (Hökkä, Eteläpelto & Rasku-Puttonen, 2012), China (Tsui & Ng, 2010; Wong, 2006), Iraq (Vongalis-Macrow, 2006), and Latvia (Silova, Moyer, Webster & McAllister, 2010). Smyth et al., (2000) claim these new positions, expectations, and tensions are the result not only of accelerated changes regarding the purpose of school but also the direction and substance of these changes within a global economy. Commitment to school reform, while a wide-spread mantra, varies
extensively as educational problems and solutions are defined in disparate ways (Raphael, Au & Goldman, 2009) and involve broader contexts than simply the teacher within the classroom (e.g., Apple, 1993, 2006a, 2006b; Berliner, 2005, 2009; Darling-Hammond, 1993). These broader contexts involve multiple layers of participants, policy, and external influences that seek to make education the platform for agendas such as reducing global poverty and inequality for "sustained economic growth" (World Bank, 2007, as cited in Spring, 2009, p. 30), construction of a "self-gratifying but ultimately perpetually dissatisfied and superficial consumerist subjectivity" (Kenway & Bullen, 2008, p. 30), social justice and democratic education (Ford & Grantham, 2003; Gutmann, 1987; Hyslop-Margison & Sears, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Marshall & Gerstl-Pepin, 2005; Parker, 1996, 2001), human capital development (Spring, 2009), technological development (Apple & Jungck, 1990), and global competition (Sinagatullin, 2006; Spring, 2006). Teachers are at the heart of these competing agendas in essentially the same hierarchical position as the past; "they were and still are the front-line workers charged with implementing policies created from above" (Day, Fernandez, Hauge & Møller, 2000, p. 1). This means as countries attempt to reconcile schools' purposes and identities as well as educational landscapes, teachers "struggle to manage the challenges of the 'new work order' of conflicting expectations, curriculum reform, and restructuring which result in 'contested realities' of the meaning of professionalism confronting them in their daily work" (Day et al., 2000, p. 1).
In the United States, attempts to reform schools have been highly politicized, focused on global competition with countries out-performing the U.S. on international benchmarks, like the Organisation for Economic and Co-operative Development (OECD) sponsored Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) and Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) tests, and centered on forcing local school districts to improve instruction through standards and high-stakes assessments (Spring, 2002, 2006). Policy makers seek "a single, simple, universal solution" wrapped in a "single mandated measure...that yields a single number and allows you to be compared with every other individual, school, jurisdiction, or nation on this planet" (Elmore, 2011, p. 45-46). According to Spring (2002), the underlying message of the educational standards movement is "local school districts and teachers are not working hard enough to increase student achievement. The whip of high state achievement standards, it is assumed, will drive school districts and teachers to reform instruction" (p. 4). Fear of repercussions have led to reliance on prescriptive curriculum and pre-packaged instructional programs often positioning teachers as technicians and managers of an ideology searching for idyllic solutions rather than critical designers within diverse and multifaceted constructs (Apple, 2000).

Research surrounding teachers' new positioning reflects their complex situatedness with conflicting expectations and extensive internal and external pressure to conform to particular standards of "quality" (e.g., Apple, 2006a, 2006b; Berliner, 2005) "Within the dramatically changed circumstances of globalization,
schools are being required to act as if they were private businesses, driven by the quest for efficiency and operating in a supposed atmosphere of marketization and competition with each other for resources, students, reputation, and public support for their continued support" (Smyth et al., 2000, p. i). Global, federal, and state policies overwhelm the educational sector with attempts to "fix" schools and are often responses to political and economic agendas, privileging of particular knowledge, and perpetuation of hegemonic practices (Apple, 1993, 2006a; Craig, 2010a; Elmore, 2011; Spring, 2009). Goodson (2000) sees this pattern as part of a "global attack on the median level" or public institutions (p. 13) whereby existing power hierarchies are maintained through the reproduction of inequities and dwindling respect for educational workplace knowledge. Prescriptive curriculum, public pedagogy, and disenfranchisement of teacher expertise have moved teachers' roles from the professional to the technician, from the empowered to the automatic (Elmore, 2011; Goodson, 2000, Helsby, 2000). Clandinin et al., (2010) more gently refer to these tensions as "the bumping places" of individuals' lived experiences where "in-classroom places" and "out-of-classroom places" - school environments, policy demands - cause dilemmas and conflicting plotlines. As teachers attempt to "live out narratively coherent stories of who they each are as good teachers" (p. 87), they encounter tensions such as being an attentive teacher who supports and helps students versus being an objective test giver who is unable to assist during assessment timeframes (Clandinin et al., 2010).
Factors Contributing to Changes in Teachers’ Work

School Improvement: No Child Left Behind

One of the key reasons for No Child Left Behind’s (NCLB) creation was to ensure all public school students would “have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education” by “closing the achievement gap between high- and low-performing children, especially the achievement gaps between minority and non-minority students, and between disadvantaged children and their more advantaged peers” (NCLB, 2001, section 1001). This has led to a system of subgroups or “cells” whereby data are disaggregated by racial, socio-economic, language, and disability categories in both reading and math (NCLB, 2001). Benchmark scores were established in 2002, and, in order for schools to be on track to meet the 2014 universal proficiency requirement, they must meet adequate yearly progress (AYP) in order to be considered meeting success (NCLB, 2001).

NCLB has warranted significant debate since its inception, with theorists and practitioners alike levying arguments regarding its conflict with other successful reforms (e.g., Darling-Hammond, 2006), its effectiveness in addressing previously unseen subgroups of students (see Smyth & McInerney, 2007; Hardman & Dawson, 2008), its heavy bias for "scientific," quantitative measures of success (see Barone, 2007; Bracey, 2009), its failure to use a growth model of measurement (see Gifted Child Today, 2008; Ho, 2008), and its creation of an assessment-driven, "soulless" school system (see Ravitch, 2009). Some education literature argues on the one
hand that NCLB has failed because its flawed design has yielded a robotic culture of “teaching to the test” (Guilfoyle, 2006), a “skewed” curriculum, discouraged teachers, and a haphazard accountability system (see e.g., Cawelti, 2006). Yet on the other hand, individuals hail NCLB’s success, citing evidence the legislation has provided educators with tools to identify and support previously “invisible” poor and minority students (Haycock, 2006), improve curriculum alignment, and collect and use data (Zavadsky, 2006).

The NCLB legislation (2001) details a number of interventions schools and districts can use in order to raise student achievement, with a major focus on Reading First initiatives. Schools and districts are expected to integrate “scientifically-based reading research” (sec. 1221, b, 2) into existing curricular programs. This has led to an explosion of programmed learning as publishers and software developers work to provide distressed schools and districts the “silver bullet” that will raise test scores, fend off negative consequences, and improve student achievement (Guilfoyle, 2006). While some programs, such as READ 180 or Wilson Reading, have proven to be effective with some students (U.S. Dept. of Education Institute of Education Sciences 2009, 2010), not every intervention works with every child every time (Buffum, Mattos, & Weber, 2010). Such legislation has also repositioned teachers in new ways - their work, work environments, and agency have changed.
Erosion of Teacher Agency

Granger (2008) claims the "perverse spectacle of fear" (p. 206) surrounding school reform has discouraged the individual teacher "from realizing an attainable better self. She is being asked to settle for something less than she could be as a teacher and, moreover, as a human being" (p. 211). Agency, according to MacIntyre Latta and Kim (2010), is central to being fully human because it fulfills a sense of belonging and innate need to make contributions to communities and societies. However, the research contextualizes and frames this agency in different ways. Hökkä, Eteläpelto, and Rasku-Puttonen (2012) use Vygotsky's concepts of cultural tools and social context to frame agency, claiming, "Individual actions are thus always afforded and constrained by social context, and influenced by mediational phenomena, including language" (p. 85). For them, agency is socially distributed and shared because it takes into account an individual's ability to impact his/her situated context through "resources that are culturally, socially, and historically developed" (p. 85). Agency often includes the obligatory actions and authorities that accompany a role and the subsequent interactions within a specific field, thereby emphasizing its social and political contextualization (Liggett, 2011; Vongalis-Macrow, 2007).

McCarthy, Sullivan, and Wright (2006) focus on agency as personal. They state while cultural views of agency are appropriate and useful, agency is more about "how people negotiate personal change through their everyday dialogues with others" (p. 437). Its focus is on the individual's navigation of interpersonal
positioning, not the positioning itself. This places teachers in a more active role within their institutional structures since they are empowered to develop and define their own agency rather than being subjugated by static identity conceptions others may have for them.

**Conflict and Tensions for Teacher Agency within Current Educational Contexts**

In the literature, there are several "camps" regarding the degree to which teacher agency is possible and existent within the constraints of neoliberal (commitment to market economies and commoditization) and neoconservative (control over curriculum and values and rigorous accountability rooted in assessment) policies (Apple, 2011). Hartley (2000) and Poole (2008), like Vongalis-Macrow (2007), provide vehement arguments against consumerist and standardization of curriculum, repeatedly describing reforms, assessments, and "economic rationalism" as "heavy-handed" (Hartley, 2000, p. 114; Poole, 2008, p. 24). They claim the issue of pre-occupation with standardization and business models impose organizational identities on schools and teachers providing "depersonalized and dehumanized environments for many teachers" (Poole, 2008, p.30), harkening to comparisons with Marx's conceptions of increased worker alienation in capitalist societies (Schweitzer, 1993). Hartley (2000) also claims that in a "diversified and polymorphic world" (p. 128), certainty of performance, of systemic success, of modernity is "a rather difficult matter to nail down these days" (p. 128). However, these authors also portray teachers as passive agents who are subject to the indiscriminate policies and decisions of macro entities such as federal
legislation. While teachers’ agency may in fact be hindered by neoliberal and neoconservative demands, other literature demonstrates teachers may not be as inert as indicated.

One of the key conflicts emerging from the research is, like Margolis (2006) stated, the degree to which teachers and preservice teachers are willing or able to balance social justice and critical pedagogy with neoliberal factors. While Margolis (2006) focused on preservice teachers' desire to incorporate social justice pedagogy into their mentors' classrooms and often encountered resistance due to curricular, assessment, and accountability demands, Liggett's (2011) research demonstrates the opposite phenomenon. While the teacher candidates in her study were trained and encouraged to incorporate aspects of critical pedagogy into their practicum experiences, they tended to view neoliberalism as "an abstract force that seemingly can't be disrupted; it is 'normal and natural' (Foucault, 1972), a perceived unstoppable momentum that works against the implementation of critical multicultural education" (p. 190). Because of this view, they were fearful of losing their jobs or becoming alienated by their peers if they dared to deviate from the standard curriculum in order to incorporate elements of equity and justice not addressed in documentation and testing.

There is also concern if teachers are treated as commodities and bureaucratic agents by macro institutions and public beliefs, it is likely they will pass this treatment onto students rather than focusing on social justice pedagogy (Hartley, 2000). It is ironic that institutions recommend teachers be sensitive to
equity and justice issues in the classroom when teachers are not afforded the same
treatment (Hartley, 2000).

**Policy Cascade**

Even when teachers are able and willing to implement curricular and
instructional policy, they may be subject to a "policy cascade," which occurs when
"teachers, after receiving information from other groups and individuals above
them in the hierarchical structure of a schooling system, have their own
professional knowledge base and beliefs eroded, and instead adopt the actions and
ideology demonstrated by other groups and individuals" (Papola, 2012, p. 153).

Papola (2012) uses this metaphor to show how teachers experiencing roll-out of the
Common Core State Standards (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010) begin to
rely on information and belief systems passed down from national, state, school, and
building officials rather than their own professional knowledge and expertise.

It is not always the policy itself that is the issue, but the construction,
reconstruction, and interpretation which is passed through each power level of the
cascade. Ideas which did not exist within the original document or policy can
become part of the rhetoric given to teachers from hierarchical supervisors and,
because it may conflict with teachers' professional knowledge, may steer teachers
away from autonomy and toward learned dependency in an attempt to meet the
pressures and demands of the policy cascade (Papola, 2012). Over time, they
willingly, if unwittingly, yield their professional agency and voice (e.g., Day, 2000;
Poole, 2008; Roberts & Graham, 2008). Preservice and new teachers are
particularly susceptible to the policy cascade because they fear losing their jobs, being isolated or even shunned by colleagues, or unable to gain social and cultural capital (Liggett, 2011; Margolis, 2006; Papola, 2012). Their sense of agency is influenced by their positionality among peers, university personnel (since they still operate in both spaces), and educational communities (Liggett, 2011). Additionally, because of their recent entrance into the field, most do not have an established sense of agency or enough practical experience to "envision how to pursue change within the context of teaching" in a neoliberal school environment (Liggett, 2011, p. 192).

**Actions to Take**

A number of the research articles discussed ways to alleviate and even utilize the perceived boundaries on teachers' agency and autonomy. Roberts and Graham (2008) examined how preservice teachers saw themselves as influencing their own development within their institutional environments. They identified three proactive strategies that could be used in order for teacher candidates to build their own agency and efficacy: tactical compliance, personalizing advice, and seeking out opportunities to exercise control. Teacher candidates were able to earn autonomy by agreeing to a degree of compliance within mutually-recognized boundaries. This meant teacher candidates were able to balance requirements of the environment (their mentor teacher's accountability, pressures to conform) with self-maintenance needs and self-directed development opportunities. They also "took advice and
strategies belonging to experienced others as the raw materials for experimentation" (p. 1409), not as inflexible demands.

Another technique used to promote teacher agency is professional learning communities, which take the form of "networks of like-minded teachers" (Schweisfurth, 2006); school-based, interdisciplinary teams (Wood, 2007); and professional development opportunities involving narrative inquiry interchange (MacIntyre Latta & Kim, 2010). Overall, there is a trend in professional development to move toward supportive teacher teams where experience and expertise can be shared and a more community sense of agency is developed (e.g., DuFour, 2007; MacIntyre Latta & Kim, 2010; Vernon-Dotson, 2008; Waldron & McLeskey, 2010; Wood, 2007). Hökkä, Eteläpelto, and Rasku-Puttonen (2012) point out a focus on one’s own teaching mission as a result of individualistic agency prevents the interdisciplinary discourse that enhances community learning and organizational development. In contrast to Poole's (2008) solution of reinstituting isolation by having "teachers to simply close the door of the classroom and continue teaching in a manner that matches their constructed identities as teachers" (p. 29), Wood (2007) examines the role of teacher learning communities to provide effective professional development opportunities, empower teachers, and improve student achievement. The purpose of these groups was to "mobilize practitioner expertise and build collective responsibility" (p. 701). While the results of her study were mixed - there were aspects of the structures that worked well and others that were counter-productive - overall the idea held promise not only for substantial
change but for greater teacher autonomy. Schweisfurth (2006) found teacher learning communities served as a means to move beyond teacher isolationism, a contributing factor to low teacher morale and reduced teaching effectiveness. Being a part of such a network allowed teachers to stay connected (building social capital) and share ideas. It was seen as "a powerful force" providing "encouragement and inspiration in what might otherwise be a rather isolating environment" (p. 48).

Schweisfurth (2006) examined how Canadian teachers perceived their roles as the implementers of a national global citizenship curriculum. Rather than feel confined, oppressed, and passive about their roles, the teachers in her study indicated their clear priority for helping students develop as global citizens assisted them in finding or creating space to incorporate social justice, critical pedagogy, and global citizenship education. They felt empowered by determining how and where within the established curriculum they could make changes and take liberties without subverting the curriculum. None of the teacher participants "felt that it stretched their imaginations to interpret the curricular expectations" (p. 47) by relating the official curriculum with their driving global citizenship education agenda because they could "cover the essentials, but let go of some of the dreary content so [they could] talk about things like the media and democracy" (p. 47). Rather than lose their jobs, as was feared by teacher candidates in the Liggett (2011) study, these teachers found "Big Brother hasn't materialized" (p. 49). However, since these teachers were veterans, they may not experience the same degree of vulnerability as preservice teachers.
Operating in a Deficit Thinking Model

While the desire to improve and reform education is notable, it is often rooted in deficit thinking and focus on "fixing" what is "wrong" (e.g., Apple, 2006b; Nichols & Berliner, 2008). However, "what's wrong" is highly subjective and contains cultural bias and privileging of particular knowledge, people, or thinking paradigms (e.g., Apple, 2006a; Berliner, 2009; Nichols & Berliner, 2008; Sleeter, 2001). Popkewitz (2000) claims reform is often packaged as a "salvation narrative" (p. 167) to present a particular constructed image of "citizen" and "nation." However, what is inscribed as a "universalistic narrative" is not truly global, but "particular patterns of ordering and selecting that produce new forms of exclusion" related to poverty, race, and gender (p. 163). Spring (2009) furthers this idea by claiming, "Globalization of education is part of an effort to impose particular economic and political agendas that benefit wealthy and rich nations at the expense of the world's poor" (p. 13), and cites the World Bank's pedagogical foci - such as emphasis on individual autonomy - as examples of privileging particular epistemologies.

Traditional Defining of Deficit Thinking Theory - Relation to Race, Culture, and Social Justice

Deficit thinking theory is often associated with critical race theory, critical pedagogy, and social justice theory (e.g., Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Ford & Grantham, 2003; Mosley, 2010). It has its roots in colonialism and the conquest of the Americas and Africa by European nations (Menchaca, 1997; Russell, 1994;
Wilson, 1996). In the United States, hegemonic beliefs and desire for economic profit fueled justification of generational slavery and super-exploitation of people of color. Subsequent racialized legislation and practices, such as Jim Crow laws, poll taxes, immigration restrictions, and institutionalized segregation, limited racial minorities’ access to quality health and educational services and denied them social and political rights afforded Whites (Menchaca, 1997). According to deficit thinking models, the legacy of these social injustices lies within our current institutions, particularly schools, where poor or minority students are seen as unsuccessful because of internal "deficits" or "deficiencies" such as lower intelligence, limited language skills, lack of motivation, unacceptable behavior, or lessened morality (Valencia, 1997; Valencia & Black, 2002; Walker, 2011). Deficit thinking occurs "when educators hold negative, stereotypic and counterproductive views about culturally diverse students and lower their expectations of these students accordingly" (Ford & Grantham, 2003, p. 217). According to such arguments, educators and policy makers construct assumptions of students based on racial and socio-economic factors and adopt a "blame the victim" mentality (Miller, 2010; Valencia & Black, 2002) because they do not see themselves or the system of which they are a member as part of the problem nor do they "assume responsibility for students' low achievement and failure" (Garcia & Guerra, 2004, p. 150). The onus is on students and their families to alter background factors such as culture, values, and family structure or face limited opportunities to meet with success in school
(Walker, 2011; Weiner, 2006). They must adapt to existing institutional structures or risk failure (McKenzie & Scheurich, 2004).

Miller (2010) describes her deficit perspective as the "'If Only' mentality" where she lamented her students' parents' perceived lack of involvement because she "assumed that the parents of students [she] taught lacked knowledge of ways to support their children's growing literacies" (p. 243), did not value education, or did not care enough to make an effort. The result, in her mind, was their children's lack of academic success. Through critical self-reflection, she realized how her ignorance of other cultures (and her own positioning in the dominant culture) compelled her to hold deficit beliefs about her students and their parents based on her "white, middle class norms" (p. 246) and to perpetuate the common cycle of dominance and failure, oppression and devaluation. Engaging in deficit thinking means she "took their points of view away from them by not carving a space in [her] curriculum for their existence" (pp. 247-248) and demonstrated her doubt in student and parent abilities.

Some researchers claim deficit thinking is an outcome resulting from a lifetime of unquestioned socialization into dominant cultural beliefs and values (Jones & Enriquez, 2009; Miller, 2010). Individuals and entities are products of their habitus, defined as the "embodiment of past experiences marked by present speech, actions, tastes, and dispositions that can presumably predict some future performance" (Jones & Enriquez, 2009, p. 146). They position themselves and are positioned by others based on their interactions, both past and present, and by
assumptions or interpretations made based on perceived characteristics (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999; Jones & Enriquez, 2009). Therefore, the recognition of one's class, racial, gender, and power position in society becomes a journey based on reflexivity and reflective practice.

Jones and Enriquez (2009) chronicle the journeys of two teachers as they, impelled by a masters class, develop critical literacy skills - learning to read "the world and the word" (Freire & Macedo, 1987, p. 29) - and begin to incorporate these reflective practices into their classrooms. The researchers assert by engaging in social justice training, teachers can change their habitus, become "attuned to social and political positionings of students by one another, themselves, and the literacy curriculum," and become "generative rather than simply reproductive" (p. 162). Recognizing, identifying, and embracing their own lived experiences help educators begin to overcome deficit thinking.

Two Prongs to Overcoming Deficit Thinking and Social Inequity

Critical race and critical pedagogy researchers use such examples to advocate for implementing preservice and inservice programs that raise teachers' awareness and understanding of such deficit thinking (e.g., Ford & Grantham, 2003; Jones & Enriquez, 2009). While critical race theory addresses many of the same concerns of deficit thinking – hegemony, institutionalized prejudice, intentional and unintentional reproduction of societal inequities – a significantly different component is its call to action. The theory consists of two prongs: exposure of racism in education and enactment of solutions to resist continued marginalization.
Exposure of racism is often accomplished through vocalization of story, providing the individual an opportunity to share “counterstories” that challenge dominant society (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Parker & Lynn, 2002; Solorzano & Yosso, 2002). It becomes necessary to “name one’s own reality” (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995) because much of reality is socially constructed; stories provide members of marginalized groups a vehicle for psychic self-preservation; and the exchange of stories can help overcome ethnocentrism and dysconscious monolithic world views.

However, it is not enough to merely discuss racism or provide individual lived experiences. The second prong of critical race theory is action, which according to Hess (2008), becomes the key to civic equity because “being informed but not doing anything with that knowledge creates a culture of bystanders” (p. 374).

When dealing with racism, (or classism, or sexism), being a bystander or "just teaching" uncritically without awareness of social power dynamics is the same as perpetuating institutionalized inequities. Tatum (2003) uses the following metaphor to demonstrate how passivity and non-action contribute to these institutionalized inequities.

I sometimes visualize the ongoing cycle of racism as a moving walkway at the airport...Passive racist behavior is equivalent to standing still on the walkway. No overt effort is being made, but the conveyor belt moves bystanders along to the same destination as those who are actively walking
[active racist behavior]. Some of the bystanders may feel the motion of the conveyor belt, see the active racists ahead of them, and choose to turn around, unwilling to go to the same destination...But unless they are walking actively in the opposite direction at a speed faster than the conveyor belt -- unless they are actively antiracist -- they will find themselves carried along with the others (p. 11-12).

Lack of action equates to apathy and passive contribution to the way individuals in society are positioned – essentially serving as Tatum's (2003) "moving sidewalk." It is the people who hold power -- those who the current society favors and who unconsciously move along that sidewalk -- who must "fight hard to make sure that all students...are not shut out of democratic education" (Hess, 2008, p.375). Critical race theory claims it is in those inevitable confrontations where individuals must justify their actions and persuade others to turn and walk with them, where they must decide the conflicts are worth the attainment of democratic ideals, where they resolve the issues that keep the sidewalk moving, that they begin to gain civic understanding and social justice.

**Broadening Deficit Thinking Conceptions to Macro and Meso Levels**

What needs to be considered, however, is the fact that deficit thinking is not limited to individuals operating on the micro level of classrooms and interpersonal relationships. Nor is it limited to cultural understanding. Teachers do not operate in a vacuum; their contexts are riddled with political, social, economic, and fiscal agendas that influence the degree to which they are able to implement anti-deficit
thinking strategies and paradigms (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005; Spring 2009). Politicians, community leaders, business corporations, and other socio-political groups also engage in deficit thinking regarding educators and educational structures. Deficit thinking is seen on this macro scale with state and federal legislation that enforces particular neoliberal or neoconservative agendas (Spring, 2009), as well as on a meso level where school and district administrators in attempting to implement such policy, erode teacher agency. On the micro level, traditionally-marginalized students are seen as "deficit" because they appear to lack skills and knowledge privileged by mainstream American society. The teachers who teach them are also seen as "deficit" because they lack the cultural competence, concern, self-knowledge, or skills to instruct children different from themselves (e.g., Ford & Grantham, 2003; Settlage, 2011). On the meso and macro level, schools are seen as "deficit" because they cannot overcome the social and economic disenfranchisement and inequities institutionalized into American social systems. Countries are seen as "deficit" because they do not score comparably on international tests of functional or mathematical literacy or because their culture regards the community as more important than the individual (Spring, 2009). The "blame the victim," "if only" mentality begins at the top of the policy cascade and ends with the students and teacher in a single classroom.

Deficit thinking permeates the entire educational organizational structure as it exists in its current incarnation. Federal policymakers see the U.S.'s rankings on the TIMMS and PISA international tests and believe schools are failing rather than
consider if what these tests measure - functional literacy (Spring, 2009) - reflects Americans' strengths of innovation, design, and divergent thought (Pink, 2006) or reflects what we want students to know, understand, and be able to do. Other international measures do not receive the political and media attention these tests do. For example, the Global Entrepreneurship and Development Index (GEDI) provides a "detailed look into the entrepreneurial character of nations" and considers "characteristics of productivity-enhancing entrepreneurship," which include innovation, market expansion, growth orientation, and having an international outlook (Acs & Szerb, 2012, p. 2). According to this index, which measures divergent thought and innovation, the United States is ranked first in the world. Countries that focus on efficiency score much lower (Acs & Szerb, 2012). The question then becomes, why are we as a nation focusing on one set of measures and ignoring another? Why is functional, convergent, content-based learning privileged in our society over critical thought, design-learning, and collaboration and skill-based curricula? Because policymakers choose to focus on the former, they engage in deficit thinking rather than putting energies and resources into our strengths. This is not to say policies, standards, and accountability are negative components of education. They provide guidance and a degree of consistency in what students learn within a school, district, state, or the nation. It does mean, however, we as a country need to make sure we know what outcomes we want our students to achieve and how the skills we equip them with will help them function in a global, highly technical world.
Teacher Preparation

The research on teacher preparation overwhelming argues the criticalness to establishing and implementing high quality programs (see Boyd, Grossman, Lankford, Loeb & Wyckoff, 2009; Cornu & Ewing, 2007; Crosswell & Beutel, 2012) because teacher quality is one of the most consequential variables to impact students' learning (see Callahan, Griffo & Pearson, 2007; Rivkin, Hanushek & Kain, 2005). Much of the research on teacher preparation focuses on the "inputs" of the programs, such as the curriculum, ideology, or methods of training, and less on the "outcomes" that result from preservice teacher training (Boyd et al., 2009).

However, these "inputs" are vast and, at times, contradictory. There are arguments for teacher preparation to focus on race, diversity, and social justice (Cochran-Smith, 2004a; Cochran-Smith, 2004b; Cochran-Smith, Shakman, Jong, Terrell, Barnatt & McQuillan, 2009; Darling-Hammond, French & Garcia-Lopez, 2002), encourage recruitment of people of color (Irizarry, 2007), generate better student performance (NCLB, 2001), address school reform and educational globalization (Darling-Hammond, 2010), be technologically rich (Chesley & Jordan, 2012), address specific content, pedagogy, and instruction (Chesley & Jordan, 2012; Ingersoll, Merrill & May, 2012; Tigchelaar & Korthagen, 2004), teach behavior management (Chesley & Jordan, 2012; Crosswell & Beutel, 2012), incorporate skills which work within and against neoliberal agendas (Bloomfield, 2009), and develop professional learning communities (Cornu & Ewing, 2008). Therefore, preservice teachers enter the field with skills, strategies, theories, and conceptions that range
widely and are dependent upon the educational programs which they have attended (Boyd, et al., 2009).

One of the key elements that emerges from the research literature is the need for quality transition practices that provide multiple field experiences, strong mentor support, and theory and practice bridging. Wandry, Webb, Williams, Bassett, Asselin, and Hutchinson (2008) claim, "Failure to provide a comprehensive approach to transition-focused educational practice can only produce a sense of indignation on the part of novice educators - that they have not been adequately prepared for the realities of school-based practice" (p. 24). Gore and Thomas (2006) assert transition experiences impact preservice teachers' effectiveness, job satisfaction, and intention to remain in the field.

**Varied Field Experience**

Often teacher candidates experience a single field placement with one mentor teacher (see Jones, 2012). This does not allow them to observe a range of grades, teacher styles, or techniques, and it can increase the degree and intensity of "transition shock" (Corcoran, 1981) they experience moving between teacher education and professional teaching (Grudnoff, 2011). Development as a teacher requires time, practice, and experience (see Callanhan et al., 2007) which are components often found in preparatory programs of fields such as seminary or medicine (Grossman, Compton, Igra, Ronfeldt, Shahan, & Williamson, 2009). However, Grossman et al. (2009) found "prospective teachers have fewer opportunities to engage in approximations that focus on contingent, interactive
practice than do novices in the other two professions we studied" (p. 2055). This means new teachers are often held to the same standard as veteran teachers, expected to perform at high levels with less time in the field, fewer authentic experiences, and less instruction in constructing, deconstructing, and reconstructing educational aspects.

**Quality Mentor Teachers**

Lack of mentor teacher support was found to be a main factor as to why individuals withdraw from teacher preparation programs (Hobson, Giannakaki & Chambers, 2009). Grossman and Davis (2012) argue that mentors not only need to be high quality but also receive training, ongoing support, and be well-matched to the novice teacher to whom they are assigned. This is significant because there exists an inherent power imbalance between the mentor teacher and the student teacher. Mentor teachers are empowered to evaluate their student interns and determine their ability to gain formal licensure. According to Brown (2009), this power imbalance could make student teachers susceptible to pressures to model, often unquestioningly, their mentor teacher's practices. Loughran, Brown, and Doecke (2010) assert the imbalance can also make it difficult for student teachers to implement innovative and creative teaching practices developed during preservice coursework - to teach "against the grain" (Cochran-Smith, 1991).

Mentor teachers need to be aware of how preservice teachers position themselves within the transition storyline and be able to work with what they bring into internships (Pinnegar, Mangelson, Reed & Groves, 2010). Preservice teachers
do not enter their internships ignorantly or without awareness of how teaching works. According to Tomlinson (1999), they have spent years implicitly learning about how to teach through their personal classroom experiences and "tacitly 'know what to do' in the classroom" (p. 534). However, the interns may not be aware of teachers' "private intentions or personal reflections of classroom events" (Borg, 2004, p. 274) they witness positioned as a student. Additionally, the mentor teacher usually has established the culture of the classroom in which the preservice teacher is learning to teach. This means the mentor teacher serves as a powerful model for preservice teachers, not only because of the evaluative power they wield but also because of the expert role they play. Their ability to help preservice teachers deconstruct their rationale for instructional and pedagogical decisions is critical for growth.

Theory to Practice Bridge

The theory to practice gap is one of the largest difficulties with transition preservice teachers cite (see Grudnoff, 2011; Wandry et al., 2008) and it has been an enduring challenge (Allen, 2009). Grudnoff (2011) found that while the practicum experience has been identified as a key to bridging this gap, it "did not adequately prepare them for the complexities and demands of full-time teaching" (p. 232). However, Loughran, Brown, and Doecke (2001) claim such preparation is "inevitably inadequate" because no preservice program can "fully create or sustain an environment that genuinely equates with the reality of full-time teaching" (p. 7). They take this idea further by stating teaching about learning should not attempt to
equate with full-time teaching unless its purpose is to repress critical evaluation and "merely socialize beginning teachers into the profession" (p. 7). This is problematic because preservice teachers often privilege technical, pragmatic elements of teaching over conceptual or philosophical ones (Allen, 2009; Crosswell & Beutel, 2012).

What knowledge and skills student teachers gained prior to entering their internships was found to be a catalyst for their learning within classrooms (Brown, 2009; Callahan et al., 2007). Those who acquire strong content and pedagogical knowledge feel more prepared and confident as they embark on the transition (Brown, 2009; Gold, 1996). They are subsequently more likely to spend quality time with their mentor focused on instruction rather than emotional support (Grossman & Davis, 2012). Allen (2009) also found they are less likely to abandon their pedagogical training or "succumb to traditional socialization processes" if their existing knowledge base and ability to provide "change agency" (p. 653) is supported within their school environments. It is not about "'getting by' to 'get in' to the profession" (Bloomfield, 2010, p. 233); it is about developing teachers who can apply theoretical knowledge in a pragmatic way. It is about developing in preservice teachers "a capacity to critically analyze and, at times, resist the insistent agendas" of political forces that can have socializing effects on the districts, schools, and mentor teachers interns work with in their field experiences, and it is about finding "spaces to interrogate the versions presented as to what counts as a 'good' teacher and leader" (Bloomfield, 2009, pp. 42-43).
Knowledge and Disposition Transference

According to research on knowledge and disposition transference, preservice teachers retain and implement varied levels of university learning within their classrooms (e.g., Alderman & Beyeler, 2008; Alger, 2009; de Jong, Cullity, Sharp, Spiers & Wren, 2010; Fitzgerald, Mitchem, Hollingsead, Miller, Koury & Tsai, 2011; Gainsburg, 2012). The connections (or disconnections) between university learning and professional practice have been attributed to limitations of teacher knowledge; teacher beliefs; observation of traditional teaching methods that may cause teachers to resist reform ideas; and "school, district, and broader educational cultures for suppressing pedagogical innovation" (Gainsburg, 2012, p. 2). Many studies point to the need for teacher education programs to not only introduce pedagogical and instructional learning practices to preservice teachers (Alderman & Beyeler, 2008; de Jong et al., 2010), but to find ways to scaffold authentic learning situations (Fitzgerald et al., 2011) and provide opportunities to rehearse these practices (Gainsburg, 2012) in order for novice teachers to internalize both concepts and tools, increasing their efficacy to engage in knowledge transference. The programs also needed to account for teaching contexts in which preservice teachers would operate during student teaching and professional experiences (Alger, 2009).

Alger (2009) considered the degree to which four secondary content preservice teachers were able to effectively transfer literacy learning strategies within their respective classrooms. She found that while the ability to use strategies transferred, as evidenced by their use in lesson plans and instruction, they did not
necessarily grasp an understanding of why they needed to teach reading as it pertained to their discipline. The reading strategies were used infrequently because teachers assigned very little textbook reading, and often employed "workarounds" (p. 67) or ways students could avoid textbook reading. She attributed part of this result to the disconnect between how teachers use textbooks (as reference tools) and how districts expect them to be used (as content pacing guides). While some transference occurred, the strategies were not necessarily appropriate for teaching contexts or did not account for preservice teachers' needs to embed these strategies in multimodal or multiple text sets.

Gainsburg (2012) explored the conception of transference with new math teachers and found they valued the practical tools - some of which were merely demonstrated by their instructors and not overtly taught - as well as the conceptual learning they gained in their university courses. However, these tools did not necessarily translate into effective use within the classroom because the new teachers often did not have enough experience with them to internalize the associated concepts in a transformational way. If used, the activities were often replicated as presented rather than adapted to meet teaching contexts. Gainsburg (2012) attributed this to considering teacher development as a "a set of jumps in expertise" (p. 17) where "new teachers need to have rehearsed a method almost to the point of habit before they will use it in their classrooms" (p. 19).

In their work on preservice teachers' transference of cooperative grouping paradigms and practices, de Jong et al. (2010) identified four fundamental principles
contributing to the degree to which knowledge and skills carried from university to classroom settings

- Since transference is critical to enacting good practice, it should be explicitly taught to preservice teachers. They need to know the challenges they may face in making the transition.
- Transference is a "recursive, dynamic and interdependent process" (p. 51) that occurs between and among people, systems, and contexts.
- Transference is constructed and therefore influenced by learners' prior knowledge and epistemology.
- Transference occurs differently depending upon the degree of comfort and confidence to which new teachers have been able to accommodate learning within their existing schema.

They argue that understanding the nature of transference will help teacher educators and education programs provide preservice teachers with more powerful opportunities to implement their university learning in their classrooms.

**Needs Within the Literature**

There is little research on how preservice teachers experience the transition from university preparation coursework, which tends to eschew high accountability assessment training and focuses on social justice and democratic education ideals (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005), to K-12 teaching contexts where they may encounter tensions with neoliberal and neoconservative constructs within the policy cascade as they attempt to implement their training. While they may demonstrate a
conceptual understanding of critical pedagogy and anti-deficit thinking within their university courses, very little is known about how much preservice teachers are able or willing to transfer this learning as they move through practicum and student teaching experiences into their own classrooms. This study will contribute to the literature by examining how three different preservice teachers navigate three different public school contexts. These contexts will likely vary in the degree to which administrators and staff members comply with federal, state, and local policies regarding the implementation of curriculum and instruction, and therefore impact the experience each preservice teacher constructs within his/her situation. To what degree do neoliberal and neoconservative constructs impact their agency to implement equitable, social justice-based instruction? Do they become socialized by the policy cascade? To what degree do deficit thinking (within educational constructs, toward them from colleagues, from them toward students) impact the transitional experience? How much are the participants able or willing to transfer their university learning to their internship experiences? This study’s focus is to examine the preservice teacher not as an unattached, decontextualized entity, but as a single individual operating within a large, multi-layered, complex system over a four-year period of time, though this dissertation addresses only a portion of this timeframe.

Clift and Brady (2005) assert the literature in preservice teacher research is overreliant on short-term case studies using lasting for one semester. They propose more longitudinal studies that examine "how beliefs are shaped and reshaped by
practice" over time are needed in the field. It is my hope this study may help to fill this gap in the literature.

**Conceptual Framework: Positioning Theory**

The dynamic interplay of individuals and the language they use in order to place themselves or others in positions of power (or subordinance) are basic concepts of positioning theory as delineated by Harré and van Langenhove (1999), Harré and Moghaddam (2003), and Moghaddam, Harré, and Lee (2010).

"Positioning theory" is rooted in social constructivism, which stresses social phenomenon and identity development are a result of interactions with other individuals and within social groups (Piaget, 1952; Vygotsky, 1978). It provides a socio-cultural framework to understand how the personal self is manifested in social discourse, and, according to Harré and van Langenhove (1999),

Its starting point is the idea that the constant flow of everyday life in which we all take part is fragmented through discourse into distinct episodes that constitute the basic elements of both our biographies and of the social world. The skills that people have to talk are not only based on capacities to produce words and sentences but equally on capacities to follow rules that shape the episodes of social life. Not only what we do but also what we can do is restricted by the rights, duties, and obligations we acquire, assume, or which are imposed upon us in the concrete social contexts of everyday life (p. 4).

Essentially, positioning is "a metaphor to grasp how persons are 'located' within conversations as observably and subjectively coherent participants in jointly
produced story-lines" (van Langenhove & Harré, 1995, p. 362). Through the positioning theory framework, we are better able to recognize and analyze the discourse-rooted dynamic interactions that occur in our daily lives and the influence of these "small scale interactions" (Moghaddam, Harré, & Lee, 2010, p. 9) on our self and public personas. This is an important conceptual lens to consider how preservice teachers view their transition from university coursework to their professional career because it provides a framework recognizing how individuals are positioned in relation to other individuals and within broader structural contexts.

Positioning theory also relates to the duties and obligations associated with positions. Positioning acts are episodic, "labile, contestable, and ephemeral" (Moghaddam, Harré, & Lee, 2010, p. 9) because they refrain from viewing individuals in static roles (such as doctor-patient, teacher-student). Instead, they recognize positions people take up within a conversation or repeated interactions may change from word to word, and power shifts can occur with each gesture and utterance. Positioning is integrally related to language and discourse, and it is highly contextual. As Gee (2002) states, "To understand the meaning of any piece of language, written or oral, then we must grasp the situated world-building, who, and what meanings language communicates" (p. 202).

McVee, Hopkins, and Bailey (2011) summarize different types of positioning that can occur within each encounter. The primary type is self-other, which involves
how a person positions him/herself in relation to others. This can be broken down into multiple categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-AS-other</th>
<th>Participant takes the position of another person (the proverbially stepping into another’s shoes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-IN-other</td>
<td>Participant takes a position of likeness or similarity with another person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-OPPOSED-to-other</td>
<td>Participant takes a position opposed to another person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-ALIGNED-with-other</td>
<td>Participant takes a position aligning with another person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most positioning is "tacit," where people position themselves and others unconsciously and without intent. However, when people engage in reflexive positioning, they intentionally position themselves to guide the way in which they act upon and consider the roles and obligations within a context (Yoon, 2008). This becomes important because it is those who master discourse, who are able to effectively use rhetoric and mediate positioning, whose voices are heard (McVee et al., 2011). When power structures are used to continuously reinforce particular roles, such as sexist or racist stereotypes, "static positioning" occurs. In this case, articulated beliefs "serve to reify a particular position" over time (McVee et al., 2011, p. 113).

Harré and van Langenhove (1999) identify six modes of positioning that I used to frame Chapter 5’s cross-analysis of this dissertation. These are:

- **first order positioning** - ways that people position themselves in their ongoing storyline
- **second order positioning** - ways the ongoing storyline can be explicitly challenged
Positioning theory emerged in order to provide a framework to explain the "complex cluster of generic personal attributes, structured in various ways, which impinges on the possibilities of interpersonal, intergroup, and even intrapersonal action through the assignment of such rights, duties, and obligations to an individual as are sustained by the cluster" (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999, p. 1). According to Harré and van Langenhove (1999), positioning is focused on the interlocutors within particular conversations where both first order positioning - the way individuals locate themselves and others within a storyline - and second order positioning - when another individual questions the first order positioning - occur. However, the rights for self-positioning and other-positioning are not equal and depend upon the moral duties or properties that are locally or momentarily identified with a specific position. The degree to which people engage in deliberate positioning depends upon 1) differing capacities to position themselves and others; 2) differing willingness to position and be positioned; and 3) differing levels of power to enforce positioning acts. This is important when considering the interaction between any groups where power differentials exist such as teachers –
students, teachers – administrators, or educator – state/federal mandates because the subordinated individuals can be limited by their role; they may be less capable developmentally, less willing because of authority repercussions, and hold less power to position themselves and the individual/ institution with authority. This can significantly affect trust, confidence, efficacy, and agency. While application of positioning theory to education is relatively new, two primary areas emerge from the literature - use of positioning to explain teacher and student identity and positioning to examine conflict within academic settings. Both of these areas are significantly related to student achievement because self actualization cannot occur when safety, social, and esteem needs go unmet (Maslow, 1948).

Teacher and Student Identity

It is important to consider both teacher and student identity in relation to positioning because "once having taken up a particular position as one's own, a person inevitably sees the world from the vantage point of that position and in terms of particular images, metaphors, storylines and concepts which are made relevant within the particular discursive practice in which they are positioned" (Davies & Harré, 1990, p. 46). Identity positions teacher take up for themselves and assign to others open (or close) student access to different identities. The teacher, as the dominant authority within the classroom, may take up his/her own identity position, and because identity is relational, unintentionally impact others’ identities (Reeves, 2009). Bucholtz and Hall (2005) refer to this as "indexical inversions," an association "imposed from the top by cultural authorities" (p. 596), from the most
powerful (teacher) to the least powerful (student). Both Yoon (2008) and Reeves (2009) address the impact of how teachers position themselves with regard to ELL students.

In Yoon’s (2008) study, a qualitative examination of six English Language Learner (ELL) students across three teachers’ classrooms, she found the teacher who positioned herself as "a teacher of all children, invited the ELLs’ active participation by assuming full responsibility for their learning" (p. 516). This means she saw herself as supporting student learning, regardless of who the child was, through multiple ways. She saw the English as a Second Language (ESL) teacher as a bridge between the ELLs’ families and herself, but she took a proactive role in meeting her students' social, emotional, academic, and cultural needs in her classroom. Subsequently, the ELL children in her class experienced a sense of belonging and participated more. Additionally, the non-ELL students interacted with the ELLs and considered them an integral part of the class composition.

This contrasts sharply with the two teachers who positioned themselves as general educators and established a dichotomy between themselves and the ESL teacher. They "appeared to lack cultural inclusivity in their approach" (p. 516), considered the ELL students to be the domain of the ESL teacher, and often blamed the students or ESL teacher for lack of academic progress. The ELLs "felt like uninvited guests and withdrew in the regular classrooms where teachers...focused only on subject matter or American monoculturalism and did not show interest in the students" (p. 517). The teachers who did not position themselves as teachers of
all children marginalized the ELLs in their classroom and positioned them as "inferior," leaving them isolated and powerless, even within student-centered classrooms.

Reeves's (2009) study also demonstrates how a teacher’s positioning can impact the identity of students. In her case study, a teacher positioned himself as a naturally competent teacher who executes a stern, tough love approach. He also positioned himself in opposition to other teachers within his school (second-order positioning) who were "more maternal" and who saw ELL students as needing special care. Subsequently, he positioned the ELL children in his class as "just like any [other] kid" (p. 38), denying linguistic and cultural differences and refusing to make instructional accommodations. This assimilationist approach constrained how ELLs were able to position themselves within the classroom as "capable, legitimate learners" (p. 40). The identity in which he positioned himself significantly impacted the identity his students were able to take up for themselves.

Classroom interactions examined through the conceptual lens of positioning theory have been shown to be complex and multidimensional. Not only do we see the impact of teachers' limiting the positions available to students (Davies & Hunt, 1994; Reeves, 2009; Yoon, 2008), but Ritchie and Rigano (2001) and Ritchie (2002) demonstrate positioning that occurs in a classroom is not a matter of dichotomies and dualities (powerful/ powerless). Instead it is a tool to help illuminate how positioning practices are experienced differently by individuals within the same
social field. This reinforces the idea that positions and storylines unfold concurrently with presumptions that may limit possible future actions.

It is not just how a teacher structures a classroom or the degree of cultural competence a teacher adopts that affects student positioning; the language s/he uses is paramount to how students internalize their identities as members or non-members in a discourse community. Martin-Beltán (2010) shows how "students enact their attributed proficiencies and how they replicate practices of exclusion and accommodation that they themselves had experienced" (p. 273). She claims perceptions of proficiency are not static, but fluid and constructed through interactions with others. Her concern, like Anderson (2009), is with the long-term effects of consistent positioning on perceptions and student identity and the impact of teachers' "public declarations or naming of learners' proficiencies" (p. 273) on students' self-identities. Collins (2011) extends this concept to student behavior in the classroom in her analysis of a child who is identified and excluded from the discourse circle for his inadvertent positioning in opposition to the teacher by rejecting her construction of him as a "problem." Through this action, he is subsequently positioned by his peers as a "bad, bad boy" (p. 783), a label he may then identify with and live up to. It is important to remember "teachers are in a position to strategically empower learners by publicly declaring and reifying their proficiency and to remind learners of what they can do to participate in the classroom discourse communities" (Martin-Beltán, 2010, p. 273-274).
Anderson (2009) argues to expand the conception of positioning to include analysis of micro (local, face-to-face), meso (institutional, school), and macro (structural, societal) factors because "structural processes are implicated by what are perceived as followable norms due to their recurrence and authorization of practice" (p. 292). In other words, large scale practices are fluid and influenced by what happens at the immediate level. While not deterministic or static, students’ positioning acts in a classroom contribute to the broader significance of determining what "kind" (p. 293) of person a student is recognized as and which discursive characterizations come to be associated with that child's identity. Teachers are positioned by policies, laws, and other constructs, but they also position themselves in relation to those constructs as commensurate, in conflict, or submissive. A new teacher’s interactions within the school or field will reflect how they position themselves and identify with these policies and constructs as well.

**Positioning and Conflict**

One of the areas positioning theory research is just starting to develop is considering how the theory may be used to understand how conflict occurs and perhaps seek ways to rectify it. Moghaddam and Harré (2010) indicate, "Positioning conflicts can occur whenever the rights and duties claimed by members of the subordinate institutions come into conflict with the management ideas and ambitions of the subordinate institution. Since their interests are different, conflict is inevitable" (p. 7). Students may demonstrate this through acting out behaviors or passive aggression in situations where they feel marginalized and unable to achieve
a positive identity within a classroom. Teachers may demonstrate such conflicts through learned helplessness by resigning their professional knowledge in favor of conforming to top-down mandates (Papola, 2012). Moghaddam et. al. (2010) suggest there are three sources of damaging misunderstandings that, through applying positioning theory, could be remedied and resolved: 1) different meanings given to the same action by people involved in the episode; 2) discordant story-lines; and 3) the need to create or magnify conflict. The hope is that in utilizing positioning theory, beliefs that trigger such conflict may be brought to the forefront.

Often with conflict, an "us vs. them" mentality is constructed based on oversimplifications where one group is positioned as "good guys" and the other as "bad guys" (Christie, 2008). This good guy-bad guy dichotomy can also be applied to politicians, policy makers, and educational marketers who may portray themselves as the "good guys" demanding higher standards for teacher and student performance and providing quality education for all students, with teachers and administrators positioned as self-serving "bad guys" perpetuating inequitable systems and inviting "the 'soft bigotry' of low expectations" (Granger, 2008, p. 212). In other views, hard-working, conscientious educators are depicted as the "good guys" where their agency and voice are suppressed through the deskilling process of top-down policy (Apple, 1988). Neither depiction is fully representative of the educational contexts in which the United States public schools now operate.

Educators often do not realize their own positioning within the mainstream culture and how their subsequent "attitudes, assumptions, mechanisms, rules, and
regulations” (Gay, 2000, p.26) impede their teaching of students whose cultures position them differently from, sometimes in opposition to, the mainstream culture. When they are unconscious to inherent biases (as part of their habitus), educators can fall into deficit belief systems for differently-cultured students. School failure on the part of traditionally marginalized students becomes attributed to a host of “lack ofs,” and immense energy is wasted in trying to fix perceived “failures” instead of building strengths, successes, and subsequently, student self-efficacy. Success begets success, and by building self-efficacy in students of color, they are better positioned to achieve at higher levels because they have gained more social and cultural capital in their field.

**Teacher Positioning Within Larger Constructs**

While much of the research addresses positioning of the student and teacher, these same concepts can be applied to the positioning of an individual teacher with peers, supervisors, and within educational domains. Grenfell and James (1998) suggest teacher training and professional development - i.e., "educational phenomena" (p. 167) - can be considered fields within fields and the outcome of training programs or teaching sessions are, like all fields, dependent upon what knowledge, beliefs, and dispositions (their habitus) participants, instructors, administrators, and other educational personnel bring with them. If we consider "educational phenomena" as multiple interrelated fields, we begin to see "a complex picture of multitudinal layering and interconnecting links" (p. 168) that offer insight
into person-to-person contact on both micro and macro levels. Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) suggest ways to analyze field in three levels:

1. analyze the position of the field in relation to the field of power
2. determine the structure between participants' positions within the field
3. analyze the participants' habitus developed from their internalization of social and economic conditions.

Each of these levels can be applied at varying degrees of locality to build consciousness and appreciation of multiple forms of capital that may exist among the field's participants. A teacher may apply these levels within his/her classroom to determine the positioning of him/herself and students to inform pedagogical, curricular, and instructional decisions. An administrator may apply these levels within an individual school with teachers and other classified or certificated personnel; a superintendent may apply them at a district level to consider not only the interactions of principals but also to examine how educational fields interact with political, business, or economic fields. We can even consider the macro positioning of education as an entire field within a complex social structure that, in fact, impacts the daily life of every single person within it.

While positioning theory began as a way to metaphorically understand how individuals situate themselves within a single discourse, these ideas can be used to examine larger domains moving from the individual conversation to intergroup dynamics to even international relations. By "linking macro-level problems with
micro-level analyses," such as broad issues of racism and classism to single
discourse analysis, "transdisciplinary analysis can deepen our understanding of
macro-level threats to human security while informing actions that are needed to
address some of the most urgent and profound issues that bear on human well
being and survival in the 21st century" (Christie, 2008, p. viii). By considering
positioning within a conversation, an individual teacher can insightfully reflect on
how his/her cultural capital positions students differently within his/her classroom
and make adjustments to the power hierarchies that may have bubbled in
unconscious levels previously. A principal can better resolve conflicts among
students - either individuals or groups - by examining how each side tries to
position themselves and others to gain or yield power. Districts can question
conceptions of "system justification theory" whereby individuals in subverted
positions, such as teachers or groups traditionally marginalized, inadvertently
"adopt or act on worldviews that reflect the interests of dominant groups rather
than themselves" (Moghaddam et al., 2010, p. 6), and begin forging ways to provide
more equitable educational experiences for everyone. "Ignorance of people
different from ourselves often breeds negative attitudes, anxiety, fears, and the
seductive temptation to turn others into images of ourselves" (Gay, 2000, p. 23).
Positioning theory's emphasis on narratives encourages greater visibility of
unconscious habitus, greater acceptance of other's differed cultural capital, and
"opens up another dimension for the idea of negotiating issues, such as real or
imagined grievances" (Moghaddam et al., 2010, p. 4).
My Study

I used positioning theory as the key lens to examine my data because it allowed me to consider not only my participants’ constructed experiences of transitioning from university coursework to classroom instruction, but also how that constructed story was influenced by and situated within larger social, political, and economic constructs. It is a framework that takes into account a critical lens that questions the why, how, where, and what of mainstream, dominant language, literacy, and culture. It also allowed me to consider how issues of power (preservice teacher as lower hierarchy; teacher as implementer of prescribed curriculum) impacted the learning experiences, socialization, and tensions of three preservice teachers.
Chapter 3: Methodology

My Ongoing Narrative: Why Narrative?

For my student teaching, I was assigned to four X- and Y-level, 9th grade classes. X and Y denoted they were at the very bottom of the academic hierarchy, and my cooperating teacher was only too happy for me to relieve her of their obligation. In my struggles to teach these inner-city students about Shakespeare, Frost, Hughes, and Dickinson (i.e., the established curriculum), one little voice provided me with direction I have tried to maintain ever since. In the middle of a poem, one of my students raised her hand and asked me, "Why do we read all this?" referring to the literature anthology (consisting of mostly narrative structured stories) strewn across her desk. I didn’t know how to answer her at that moment; I’d never really thought about it.

After a day or two, I returned to the student with a long-puzzled-out answer: "We read 'all this' in order to understand how other people feel and think and relate to others. We read literature to get a glimpse of what life looks and feels like from someone else's point of view. It helps us to gain understanding of perspectives we may not have experienced, and it helps us to be more tolerant of differences we may not initially comprehend. 'All this' lets us examine the threads that bind us together in humanity."

Literature, and narrative in particular, has continued to shape my life and the ways I am able to construct my personal experiences. For me, the ability to create and relate story is powerful and operates on a primal human level; we begin very
early in life to tell and hear stories. It is how we relate to one another and ourselves; it defines our past, present, and future. Our lives are lived in narrative, but that narrative is highly impacted by the context in which it occurs and the perceptions with which both the narrator and listener enter the exchange. Narrative explores and represents the complexity of lived experiences, allowing the many layers and roles of the narrator - as story teller, character, and actor - to emerge (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2011). Because of its close nature with lived experience, its consideration of contextualization, as well as my own personal affinity, I chose to use narrative inquiry methodology for this dissertation to examine how preservice teachers transition from their university experiences to their student teaching internship.

**Purpose of This Chapter**

In this chapter, I will provide an overview of narrative research -- its purpose, its goals, and its situatedness in the larger methodological landscape. This is in order to set the context for narrative inquiry as a qualitative method. I explain how I chose to follow Clandinin and Connelly's (2000), Connelly and Clandinin's (2006), and Clandinin and Rosiek's (2007) conceptions of narrative because they focus on considering individuals as whole people situated within larger constructs and contexts. In fact, Connelly and Clandinin's conception of narrative as "less a method and more about a way of thinking about the curriculum field" (Craig, 2011, p. 20), creates a broad-stroked approach to utilizing and constructing teacher narrative that sincerely appealed to me. Next, I discuss how narrative has been used
in educational research with some emphasis on the evolving role of "small stories" (Bamberg, 2006) in research circles. I chose to include this research because it argues individual’s accumulated daily personal stories are what define social and cultural contexts. By examining the "small stories" of individual preservice teachers rather than seeking generalized grand narratives, I am able to provide a richer, more intimate picture of how these participants make transitions within their environments affected by the specific attitudes, beliefs, knowledge, and dispositions they bring with them. Finally, I explain my researcher stance and provide a detailed explanation of the methodology, methods, participants, site, data sources, and data analysis procedures I employed to conduct this dissertation’s study.

**Narrative Inquiry as Methodology**

In this section, I situate narrative inquiry within qualitative research, addressing its purpose and multiple perspectives for implementation and utilization. I begin with an overview of narrative as constructed experience and key research in the field, particularly with defining how the researcher and participants are situated within narrative spheres. While some narrative research focuses on the collection of stories from participants, literature in the field problematizes the researchers’ role claiming they are part of the construction process, memories, and experiences which echo or resonate (Conle, 1996) and cannot be ignored. In fact, the researcher’s role can lend depth and complexity to the process (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Connelly & Clandinin, 2006; Craig, 2011; Riessman, 2008). I then explain how narrative inquiry has been used in educational research, with
particular focus on "small stories" that account for social and cultural contexts and inform and affect narratives. This is important because in this dissertation, rather than attempt to construct holistic narratives that address and generalize entire groups of people's experiences, I chose to focus on my participants' individual lived stories - how they daily navigate interactions and circumstances in their transitions from being positioned as university students to being positioned with increasing responsibility and independence as student teachers.

**Situating Narrative in Qualitative Research**

Narrative is fundamental historically, culturally, and socially, existing in our daily lives from the records of Rome to the folklore of Native Americans to the television sit-com my son is watching to the text message my daughter just received. It is how people commonly shape and construct their experience. As a result, narrative inquiry has permeated the domain of more than one single field including law, psychology, history, education, and anthropology (e.g., Amsterdam & Bruner, 2000; Bruner, 1986; Carr, 1986; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Holstein & Gubrium, 2000).

Literature, and narrative in particular, is not the end in and of itself; it is merely the vehicle - the insightfully and artistically crafted vehicle - through which we ask and answer questions of humanity. These "stories" we read and the ones students write are seen as expressions of the self, of a way to examine the self in different positions, of wondering what the writers were saying about being human. Narrative is about "how people imagine themselves and one another...how we
imagine our world" (Gourevitch, 1998, p. 4). Clandinin and Connelly (2000) claim narrative involves the “reconstruction of a person’s experience in relationship to the other and to a social milieu” (p. 39). It is about living "in the midst" (p. 63) of lives in motion with a "nested set of stories" (p. 63) of individuals, classrooms, schools, communities, and landscapes that began before the researcher and participant entered into the study and will continue after they depart.

Chase (2011) builds on Clandinin and Connelly's ideas by stating narrative is not just about the reconstruction of experience, but about making meaning through the “shaping and ordering of experience” (p. 421) to understand other people’s actions, decisions, or construction of events as well as our own and to see the interconnectivity of history, lived experiences, consequences of action, and narrated lives. The concept that individuals engage in construction and meaning making causes narrative methodology to be viewed suspiciously by formalistic viewpoints because stories cannot represent "truth" (Bruner, 1986; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Josselson, 2006; Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2011; Polkinghorne, 2007). However, as Josselson (2006) points out, the fallacy in this thinking is that narratives should not be considered as research reported "facts" but as situated interpretations to gain contextual knowledge. Narrative considers how individuals are situated within larger contexts and constructs, and how those contexts and constructs incidentally shape individuals’ identities and perceptions. It considers how change is both a catalyst and result of life experiences and provides a temporal, circumstantial, and contextual quality to research (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). These are all
conceptions of narrative that helped me to shape my understanding of this methodology and determine my choices within this dissertation.

**Narrative Borderlands, Paradigmatic Shifts, and Turns**

Pinnegar and Daynes (2007) claim narrative inquiry differs from more quantitative forms of research because “both the stories and the humans are continuously visible in the study” (p. 7). This is in contrast to traditional positivist and post-positivist approaches, which seek verifiable descriptions and stable consensus of reality (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007). Clandinin and Rosiek (2007) use the metaphor of “borderlands” to illustrate the boundaries researchers with positivist and post-positivist philosophies must eventually cross when engaging in narrative inquiry methodologies.

In order to cross these “borderlands,” researchers who engage in narrative inquiry must experience shifts from a positivist approach to thinking to an often less comfortable and more nebulous one. Bruner (1986) sees this as moving from the paradigmatic to the narrative – from “actual” knowing to “possible” knowing. Pinnegar and Daynes (2007) characterize these shifts in thinking as four “turns” that create an environment where narrative inquiry can flourish. In the first turn, the relationship between researcher and the researched becomes a partnership where research comes from the “vulnerable observer” (Behar, 1996) or even a co-constructor (Frank, 2009; Riessman, 2008). Second, words become the dominant means of research as researchers seek the how and why behind "sterile" numbers. Third, in relinquishing a desire for predictability and control, which is the driving
force behind positivist views and grand narratives, researchers move from the general and universal to the local and specific. The individual, personal story becomes the power behind understanding experiences. Fourth, by recognizing alternate epistemologies, researchers can accept contributions from a wider group of people who are not considered bound, static, atemporal, or decontextualized (Dewey, 1976, as cited in Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Pinnegar & Daynes, 2007). The researcher may encounter these turns in any order and to varying intensity. Narrative inquiry involves broader conceptions of knowing, understanding of power dynamics, and concern with human interaction, thereby moving away from traditional assumptions for scientific reliability, objectivity, generalizability, and validity. Narrative inquiry redefines ways of knowing from “truth,” empirical proof, and the subsequent “heartlessness to logic” toward verisimilitude, “lifelikeness,” and human intention (Bruner, 1986, p. 11, 13; Polkinghorne, 2007).

In this dissertation, I considered these borderlands and narrative turns because there were places where I often felt muddled or uncertain about my processes or conceptions. The borderlands conception was particularly helpful as it kept me focused on my participants’ narratives and prevented me from crossing into areas where I was tempted to impose my ideas, background, or thinking on the data. The narrative turns also shaped my ability to accept the participants’ stories for what they were and not for what I perhaps wanted them to be.
Narrative as Empowering Storied Text

Narrative inquiry is "a radical challenge to silencing [as] not only about having a say, but about talking back in the strongest sense -- saying the very things that those in power resist hearing" (DeVault & Ingraham, 1999, as cited in Chase, 2005, p. 669). It is a dichotomous process involving both the story teller and the listener. Narrative has the power of taking a hostile audience and, through the power of story, bringing people to a place of understanding. Singleton and Linton (2006) assert a person's story is a person's story, and one cannot deny, refute, or dismiss that individual's lived experience. This is the power of narrative in eliciting social change. It begins with a paradigm shift, with a personalization of an individual - marginalized or not - and an understanding of that person's humanity. "Taking the other's perspective is a necessary step in constructive social change" (Frank, 2000, in Chase, 2005, p. 668). Narrative has therefore been instrumental historically in empowering the disempowered, including the excluded, giving people control over their own representation, and facilitating social justice changes (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007; Noddings, 2007; Pinnegar & Daynes, 2007).

Hymes (1996) points out linguistic analysis foundations have merit in determining the role of narrative within society, but he takes a profoundly critical stance using anthropology as his lens. According to his train of thought, “cultural stereotypes predispose us to dichotomize forms and functions of language use” (p. 113); therefore our habitus (Bourdieu, 2007) impacts how we construct story, relate it to others, and interpret what we hear. Narrative, interpreted as a mode of
thought, serves as a social marker to the distribution of power, rights, and privilege within society. While narrative use of language is universal, “the right to think and express thought in narrative comes to be taken as a privilege, as a resource that is restricted, as a scarce good so that the right to unite position and personal experience in public is a badge of status and rank” (p. 119). In other words, while narrative voice can belong to everyone, everyone is not heard and valued to the same degree. This was an important conception for my study because I considered how the participants were positioned within their storylines as they transitioned and how they chose to narrate based on that positioning. As student teachers, they were often relegated to a subverted positioning, which meant their "narrative voice" was not always heard within their school contexts.

I also considered the degree to which toxic public and social narratives may have affected the participants' experiences. Fischman (2001) asserts teachers are in a "schizophrenic" position where they are subjected to harsh social criticism and at the same time expected to be the source of social hope. They balance precariously "between achieving society's dreams or failing to uphold those aspirations" (p. 413). Educational dilemmas are complex, and simplistic narratives of contamination ("let's blame the teachers") or narratives of redemption ("defeat the enemy and emerge with the perfect teacher and model student learning in harmony") do not take this complexity into account (Fischman, 2001; Maruna & Ramsden, 2004; McAdams, Reynolds, Lewis, Patten, and Bowman, 2001). Instead, the focus needs to be on the individual experience because it offers the opportunity narrative has
always provided - to give voice to the voiceless, presence to the invisible, and power to the disempowered. It goes beyond the oversimplified archetypes and instead presents dynamic, multifaceted people operating within a larger sphere. The goal of narrative is to take a past action or event, focus it in the present "telling moment," and consider its "forward orientation" anticipating audience response, which is important because "the worst that can happen to a narrative is that it remains 'responseless'" (Bamberg, 2006).

**Grand Narratives vs. Small Stories**

During the women's and civil rights movements, personal stories made it possible for everyday people living their everyday lives to contribute intellectually to the movement, providing powerful, authentic, at times gut-wrenching evidence for the need for social and political change (Pinnegar & Daynes, 2007). The movement away from privileging "grand narratives" and "big stories" is considered by some researchers (Bamberg, 2006; Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007; Georgakopoulou, 2007) to be the next "narrative turn". Instead, these researchers see a shift toward "small stories" within social and cultural contexts with a focus on the natural features of everyday life and immediately recent events focused on the "reflexive interplay between narrative environments and narrative practices" (Chase, 2011, p. 425). Narratives become much more than the generated stories; they become texts considered, produced, and received with attention to purpose, consequence, audience, response, and circumstances.
In the current environment dominated by "neos" (liberals and conservatives), teachers' voices have diminished as they have become deskilled (Apple, 1988, 2006). It is in these "small stories," the recounting of their daily interactions, reflections, and, in some cases, the omission of what is told, that preservice and novice teachers' situated experiences can be seen and may serve as microcosms of identities and societies "coming into being" (Bamberg & Georgakopoulou, 2008). Because narrative research tends to "eschew the objectification of the people" studied (Josselson, 2006, p. 3) and recognizes the constructedness of knowledge, it was an appropriate means through which to examine preservice teachers as they transition from the university to their student teaching internships. Teachers' identity construction is impacted by their environments and the narratives to which they are exposed within their environments particularly early in their careers, subsequently impacting the narratives they tell (Gore & Thomas, 2006). Changing public and cultural narratives that support teacher agency, professionalism, and social justice pedagogy requires understanding and valuing the individual narratives and "small stories" of beginning educators as they transition from the university world to the public school world.

**Narrative as Inquiry**

In research, "narrative" takes on multiple interpretations. Chase (2005) shows how narrative has been interpreted in psychological, sociological, anthropological, and auto-ethnographical ways to address issues of identity construction, organizational contexts, long-term involvement with communities,
and self-reflection. Kramp (2004) states narrative inquiry is both a process (a means for data gathering) and a product (a means for communicating data). Clandinin (2007) says narrative inquiry can include “telling” stories – past events being told or interpreted – or “living” stories – unfurling reflections of participants’ ongoing lives. These views focus on analyzing stories holistically to seek common themes, plotlines, or other patterns and presenting the findings as a narrative explanation. Emphasis is on understanding “the place of the individual biography within a wider historical story” (Elbaz-Luwisch, 2007, p. 356).

In narrative inquiry, as presented by both Chase (2005) and Lichtman (2011), the focus is on the interviewee as narrator, as storyteller, who is able to relate personal stories of what it means to exist within a certain context or to undergo particular events, offering a glimpse into the uniqueness of each individual's lived experience. Lichtman (2011) opens her chapter stating, "People use stories to make sense of their lives and the human experience. Narrative research...makes use of the study and analysis of such stories as the central vehicle for conveying information learned from and about others" (p. 179). It is a vehicle through which researchers come to understand another’s perspective in a highly personalized way and then share these "storied texts" (Barone, 2007) with other audiences for academic, political, or social purposes. Narrative "is significant because it embodies - and gives us insight into - what is possible and intelligible within a specific social context" (Chase, 2005).
Pinnegar and Hamilton (2011) define narrative inquiry as a specific subcategory where "a story of narrative research exists in tension" and it "more fully utilizes story in every aspect of the research process" (pp. 53-54). They use a representative narrative fragment involving The Wizard of Oz to show how narrative inquiry embraces not only the research puzzle and the lives of participants, but also researcher's lived experience and "bumps" as the story unfolds. Narrative inquiry for them addresses not only the phenomena being studied but also gives voice to the researcher, whose "secret stories" (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) can become public because of narrative resonance with participants’ stories (Conle, 1996).

**Narrative Inquiry in This Study**

I used narrative inquiry for this study because it considers how individuals are situated within larger contexts and constructs and how those contexts and constructs shape individual identities and perceptions. This is important since I wanted to consider how preservice teachers transition from one context - university coursework - to another context - professional school environments. Each environment contributed differently to shaping and ordering the participants’ experiences and the meanings they made from these experiences. Because this dissertation envelops only a portion of a four-year, longitudinal study, the participants are only beginning to shape and construct their transitional experiences and will continue to do so over the next three years. I will continue the study as these participants transition to early career teachers.
Because of my desire to consider contextualization of the preservice teachers' transitional experience, I used Clandinin and Connelly's (2000) interpretation of narrative as a holistic reflection of a contextualized and dynamic individual situated within the midst of larger cultural, social, and institutional narratives. Conceptions of narrative construction that consider the whole person, taking into account “ontology of experience” (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007, p. 39) as this experience unfolds through time in relation to a dynamic social, personal, and material environment were effective for encapsulating and elucidating teachers’ lived experiences.

This dissertation adds to the current literature on how preservice teachers’ use of narrative to construct "small stories" in education illustrates and defines transitional experiences.

**Methodology of This Study**

In this section, I begin by explaining my researcher stance regarding my positioning with the participants, who are my former students, and the writing of this dissertation, which includes autobiographical vignettes to begin each chapter. I then provide a detailed account of the participants and sites involved in the study. Next, I explain and justify the data sources I used, including Skyped video interviews, participants’ journals and reflections, existing data from university classes and student teaching, researcher notes, and visual methodology (see Prosser, 2007, 2011; Clark-Ibañez, 2004) in the form of mind/concept maps in order to gather the participants’ ongoing constructed narrative of their transitions.
Visual methodology was used to provide a tangible means for participants to express their situatedness in their transition, narrate their experiences and, in some cases, document their transition in a spatial/pictorial way. Finally, I explain the procedures I used to catalog and thematically analyze the data gathered.

**Researcher Stance**

**Positioning with Participants**

As a graduate teaching assistant at a western university, I was assigned to teach two different courses and two different practicums over a two-year period. This allowed me to interact with undergraduate and graduate students in multiple ways, and in some cases, multiple times. However, the predominance of my teaching experience is in middle and high schools where I taught English because of a love of literature and narrative. My career began in urban settings where I experienced cognitive and social dissonance in my interaction with students of different races, ethnicities, cultures, and socio-economic levels than I had lived. These interactions instituted in me a critical stance and desire to seek social justice concerns in my teaching.

This critical stance is discussed by Clandinin and Rosiek (2007) in their framing of narrative inquiry boundaries. They warn while narrative inquiry and critical theory seem to be highly commensurate, there are concerns the narrative researcher must account for. They claim the most significant tension is between listening to the person's narrative with an open ear and risking the dismissal of portions of his or her lived experience as deficient in order to substantiate claims of
injustice. "A person's experience must be listened to on its own terms first without
the presumption of deficit or flaw, and critique needs to be motivated by the
problematic elements within the experience." Otherwise, if we "treat experience-
based narratives as mere ideological artifacts, we reinforce the disempowerment of
people who have been excluded from official knowledge production" because
essentially we hijack their personal representation (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007, pp.
50-51). This meant I needed to pay attention to my participants' stories,
maintaining openness to what themes, ideas, conceptions, and identities emerged
instead of initiating a tight critical lens which presumes deficit or flaw in the
participants or the context within which they are operating. I needed to balance an
understanding that each individual is on one hand shaped by their environment and
macrosociety, but on the other hand, his or her experience is unique and "more than
the living out of a socially determined script" (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007, p. 62). I
needed to avoid providing leading questions, remaining open and pliable to
whatever direction or turn the participants' experiences and stories took,
attempting to follow rather than lead. Otherwise, I would have risked imposing my
expectations or a grand narrative onto the participants' experiences and "small
stories."

An issue I faced in this study was to determine what role and position I
should take with the participants. I spent six years as a staff developer and coach
where I received extensive training in the eight roles of a staff developer (Killion &
Harrison, 1997). As a teacher, coach, and catalyst for change, my inclinations are to
help students and teachers in their daily challenges. Because I had been the participants' teacher and mentor, they occasionally looked to me for assistance, particularly at the beginning of the study, as we engaged in conversations about their transition from the university to student teaching internships. I had to consider such questions as: To what degree do I become a "vulnerable observer," crossing traditionally established lines of empathy between researcher and participant (Behar, 1996)? What is the impact on the study, their understandings, and my understanding based on the position I take? What is the role of power differentials in this process? I determined ahead of time to remain in the role of sympathetic researcher, leading a listening ear, providing reassurance, and demonstrating empathy as needed. At times, it became difficult for me to refrain from offering suggestions, providing resources, or guiding thinking. However, sometimes just allowing the participants to talk through a situation, with perhaps my asking some clarifying questions, was enough for them to process, rethink, and reconsider their situations or issues. It was necessary for me to maintain a level of concern and empathy in order to ensure I had rapport with the participants, but I also needed to remain the researcher and not coach. While traditional post-positivist ideologies emphasize objectivity, qualitative research, particularly narrative and ethnography, requires a high degree of trust and subjectivity within the researcher/participant relationship (see Behar, 1996; Bruner, 1986; Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Florio-Ruane, 2001; Pinnegar & Daynes, 2007; Riessman, 2008).
To be an effective narrative researcher means to engage in empathetic listening, which requires "the willingness to put the other's story at the center of one's attention, to resist defensive reactions, to acknowledge the limits of one's ability to put oneself in another's shoes" (Chase, 2011, p. 428), and to refrain from telling the speaker what to do or solve the speaker's issues (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009; Kise, 2006). Instead, the researcher asks questions that allow the speaker to consider the issue in a new way and find their own answers. A general mantra in coaching is the respondent has the answer inside of them; the coach's job is to help them identify it (Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2009; Kise, 2006). This position recognizes the difference in power that exists in teacher-student, coach-teacher, experience-inexperienced, older-younger relationships, which was the case in this study. In situations where the participants encountered tensions and confusions, I was able to provide them empathetic listening while letting them work through their concerns with very little commentary or feedback from me. I provided them with narrative space and my presence; listening was often enough for them to work through the situation themselves. Through the use of empathetic listening and questioning, I was able to build trust and provide support without being too directed in my approach. I realize my role as their former teacher and mentor as well as someone nationally recognized as an exemplary teacher put me in a power position where it would be easy for me to overly direct them in one way of thinking or another, but this is something I consciously refrained from. I often deflected the problem solving back to them through questioning practices that help them see
options within themselves. The one exception to this was when Maxwell described to me a case of suspected child abuse. I felt I had to provide directives to ensure this situation was reported and properly handled not only for the child's safety but also for Maxwell's legal responsibility (interview, December 11, 2012).

Inclusion of Researcher Stories in Dissertation

In this dissertation, I have chosen to include personal narratives to introduce each chapter although this is not an autoethnographical study. I made this decision because I began my doctorate studies mistakenly believing researchers conducted and wrote about "big" and “important” issues distant from themselves. I doubted if I would ever know how to write about something “big” and “important” or if I would even know it had arrived in my presence. Gradually, I learned there are no "big" and "important" things that arrive on your doorstep; instead, I realized researchers wonder. Their research and writing grows from the people, tensions, conflicts, or experiences they encounter in their own lives and subsequently wonder about. They, too, are situated within a context. I recognized my wondering was also fodder for research, and this wondering was the compilation of my own experiences and tensions. Narrative in particular operates in a “three-dimensional space” where inquirers “meet themselves in the past, present, and the future” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 60). According to Clandinin and Connelly (2000), narrative inquirers are not merely objective recorders of story, but instead are part of the world in which they interact. As narrative researchers interact with and listen to participants, they can experience “a cascade of ghostly memories of people and
happenings flooding into [their] consciousness” (p. 66) due to the necessary intimacy that arises when trust and rapport are established. Because narrative is personal, interactional, and transactional, reaching across autobiographically boundaries is inevitable. The researcher cannot simply “turn off” his/her memories and emotional responses to the participants’ stories. As participants tell their stories, these stories may resonate with the researcher, affecting their interaction, interpretation, and perception of the experience (Conle, 1996). One story leads to another; one event brings forth the "ghostly" figures of memory aroused from metaphoric connectivity and narrative resonance that can directly influence educational and research choices (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Conle, 1996). Even, the language chosen to portray individuals is affected by the researcher’s own situatedness, biases, and interpretations. Working within a three-dimensional narrative space means

we as researchers become visible with our own lived and told stories. Sometimes, this means that our own unnamed, perhaps secret, stories come to light as much as do those of our participants. This confronting of ourselves in our narrative past makes us vulnerable as inquirers because it makes secret stories public. In narrative inquiry, it is impossible (or if not impossible, then deliberately self-deceptive) as researcher to stay silent or to present a kind of perfect, idealized, inquiring, moralizing self (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, pp. 61-62).
In beginning each chapter with a situated story from my own past, I attempt to make public the secret stories that have inspired and steered me toward my current choices in research and education. We become what we have lived. Who I am as a teacher, researcher, and person is influenced by the people I have encountered and the experiences I have navigated in my lifetime. My choices are a result of the consequences I have lived. I attempt to demonstrate this through a gradual “backtracking” of my own educational narrative to show how the decisions I make now, the way I interact with these participants, the way I conduct this study, and the way I analyze, interpret, and portray data are all subject to my positioning, my life, and the experiences that have brought me to this place, this mentality, this belief system, this wondering.

**Participants**

The participants for this study were three students from a western university enrolled in the College of Education teacher training program. They were in two different classes I taught as part of the program: Introduction to Inclusive Classrooms in the spring semester of 2011 and Literacy in Grades 4-8 in the spring semester of 2012, both of which are methodology courses required within the university’s educational licensure program. Through my classes, I provided training and experience with teaching in equitable, critical, anti-deficit thinking ways. The participants also underwent one practicum experience with me where they wrote and delivered literacy lesson plans, and I was able to provide feedback and coaching on the implementation of critical theory concepts we discussed in
class. All the participants are seeking dual certification in elementary education, K-6, and special education, K-12.

These students entered their student teaching internships at various points in their teacher training career and, in some cases, differently from when they expected.

- Maxwell\(^2\) began his general education internship with fifth graders in fall, 2012, and his special education internship in December, 2012. While his internship was meant to extend through February, 2013, he was recruited and hired for a special education position within a district middle school. He is completing his special education student teaching concurrently with beginning his career.

- Bryan and Adele began their general education student teaching in first grade classrooms in January, 2013, and will continue with their special education internship in secondary schools through June, 2013. Both will graduate in May, 2013, and are considering applying to Teach for America to begin their careers next fall.

For the four-year, longitudinal study, three additional participants, Anne, Rose, and Danielle, have been recruited. However, since they were not transitioning to student teaching until fall, 2013, I chose not to include them for the purpose of this dissertation. This information is summarized in Figure 10.

\(^2\) All names in this document, even in quotations, are pseudonyms chosen by the participants.
Sites

The participants' student teaching was conducted in different locations because the participants chose to complete internships in places based on who they chose or were placed with as mentor teachers. Maxwell, Adele, and Bryan student taught in the district where the university they attended resides.

While I considered having participants videotape their classrooms and surroundings, this became an issue with IRB because of the possibility of children being taped without proper permissions. However, one of the IRB representatives pointed out because the study is about the participants' construction of their experiences, it was not necessary for me to be at the sites or to have them videotape their schools. The participants were responsible for their narratives. They were able to provide any pertinent physical descriptions necessary to develop the narrative contexts. The participants provided me with artifacts, drawings, and journal entries that helped to contextualize their narratives more. I was better equipped to ask questions whereby participants grappled with their and their sites' situatedness, and I could better "interpret puzzling aspects of interviews" and "demonstrate the reflexive interplay between [the] narrative environment and students' narrative practices" (Chase, 2011, pp. 425-426).

Data Sources and Data Gathering Procedures

Data sources for this investigation included traditional and new technology methods to accommodate participants' different storytelling methods and address distances between the researcher and participants. Additionally, the sources made
use of materials participants generated in order to meet university course requirements. These data sources included videotaped interviews conducted via Skype; participant reflections through typed or handwritten journals; participant drawings; field notes; reflective memos; and existing data from student university classwork, my instructional lesson plans, and instructor notes (see Figure 11).

**Interview Sessions**

Beginning in November, 2012, I conducted a series of monthly videotaped oral interviews with participants using Skype. Also, I applied for and received IRB modifications for additional preservice interviews at the participants' requests. Skype technology was used for several reasons. First, because the participants student taught in different schools, and the schools changed for each internship, Skype allowed me to have contact with them regardless of their varied and changing locations. Second, the technology encouraged a "distancing" and "equating" experience for the participants because I, as their former teacher, was not in the same space with them. They were able to find a comfortable, private place (often home) whereby they could engage in a casual conversation of their experiences rather than feeling the need to be professional which may have occurred if the interviews were conducted in a university office or school setting. This allowed them to be more open and thorough in their responses. Because I was not in their presence and there as a physical distancing in place, it made it harder for me to step into the a coaching role. I was better able to maintain my position as researcher.
Each interview averaged sixty minutes, though oftentimes, the interviews ran longer. Specific interview data are provided in Figure 12. Given the nature of narrative inquiry, these times varied depending upon the participant, the participant's frame of mind at the time of the interview, the time of day the interview took place, the interview content, or changes and events that had occurred since our last contact.

In narrative inquiry, as presented by both Chase (2005) and Lichtman (2011), the focus is on the interviewee as narrator, as storyteller, who is able to relate personal stories of what it means to exist within a certain context or to undergo particular events, offering a glimpse into the uniqueness of each individual's lived experience. Narrative research is the vehicle through which researchers come to understand another's perspective in a highly personalized way and then share these “storied texts” (Barone, 2007) with other audiences for academic, political, or social purposes. By framing questions to invite narrative discourse, I encouraged participants to share their different experiences through stories, providing their unique perspectives on the transition experience. This was done in several ways. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) suggest using journal writing, autobiographical writing, letters, photographs, mementos, and other objects that can trigger memories. In my participants’ cases, they were encouraged to bring artifacts to the interviews, such as lesson plans, photographs, writings they completed in one of my classes, an assignment for a different class, a research article, journal reflections, pictures they took of their students, and videos they
recorded as stimuli to begin narrating their plotlines as they experienced their transitions. Additionally, because life experiences can be important in understanding an individual’s culture, identity, and subsequent response to actions (Tierny & Dilley, 2002), I also encouraged participants to share stories from their background they believe shaped their current perspectives, beliefs, and decisions. At times, I asked questions to encourage them to make links and explain current actions through reflection on past life events.

Because my goal was to solicit narrative responses, I considered the interview sessions as parts of a broader question about the evolving story of participants’ transition (Chase, 2005). However, it has taken some time for participants to recognize my goal for specific experiences rather than generalized ideas. I attempted to find a balance between open-ended, unstructured questions that allow participants to navigate their own experiences with more structured extending and clarifying questions to help the story teller delve deeper into the narration (Chase, 2005). Using their journal reflections and drawings was particularly helpful in encouraging them to develop their narratives.

Since I already knew the participants, it was not as necessary for me to spend time initially building trust and rapport; this was done through the classroom and practicum interactions. I encouraged a continuing sense of comfort by providing supporting statements, asking extending questions, and reassuring the participants it was their experiences I sought – there were no “right” or “wrong” answers. On the occasion when a participant appeared to be answering questions or providing
stories they thought I wanted to hear, I gently redirected them and reminded them the purpose of the study was about their transition, not about any expectation I might possibly have. The duration, thoroughness, and intimacy of their narratives let me know if they felt comfortable with me in one-on-one dialogues. This did not appear to be an issue since the participants openly shared confidential opinions and stories with me.

The first interview session established participants’ back stories, perceptions of such topics as: education in general, educational policy, instruction and pedagogy of students, and their perceived strengths or challenges as a preservice teacher entering the student teaching experience. Subsequent sessions built on the initial narrative, allowing participants to share their ongoing experiences as they moved from their position as university student to student/preservice teacher. I will continue to provide open-ended prompts that encouraged participants to tell their stories in a specific, personal manner. I was not able to have a "concluding" interview with any of the participants because only Maxwell completed his internship prior to the completion of this dissertation, but because he was hired and completed his special education placement concurrently with his beginning a new job, his endings and beginnings overlapped. I have, instead, asked Maxwell, Bryan, and Adele to reflect carefully on their progression as they transitioned.

Reflective Journal

In order to assist the participants in remembering experiences they want to share or key ideas of their narrative, I encouraged them to keep a reflective journal.
I highly suggested the participants use some form of journal to record their experiences and thoughts throughout the study, though the form and method was of their choosing. As part of their grade, the participants were required to submit two reflections per week during their internship semester, but these reflections were not obliged to be longer than 300 words and, according to the participants, were often underdeveloped because of time constraints. While all the participants completed this minimal requirement, Bryan chose to keep an ongoing journal where he jotted down notes, ideas, thoughts, and events as they occurred. This was as much an organizing tool for him to keep his priorities and responsibilities straight as it was a means through which he could narrate his experiences. All the participants shared these reflections with me.

**Visual Methodology**

Prosser (2011) explains visual methodology allows for layered representations, simultaneously presenting feelings, ideas, perceptions, and/or information "without the material being forced into an order or hierarchy" (p. 490) and instead developing conceptions of interrelatedness rather than linearness. It also allows participants to use creative and metaphoric means to express complex thoughts that may be difficult to articulate linguistically. Participant-created illustrations or photographs elicit the respondents', not the researcher's, agenda, empowering the interviewee and often providing unexpected directions in the research (Clark-Ibáñez, 2004; Prosser, 2007, 2011). To apply this literature, during the first interview session with each participant, I asked them to illustrate how they
perceived their positioning within educational contexts such as their university, school, and district; pressures they felt; or how they straddled both academic and professional worlds. They completed these illustrations using paper and pen/pencil to visually depict how they view their situatedness. These illustrations were reminiscent of mind maps and concepts maps I required in the EDUC 211 class the participants took with me, so they had experience with designing such artifacts.

These illustrations proved to be powerful sources for the participants to generate their narrations because they were able to articulate how they viewed the transitional periods in which they were involved. Each participant’s illustration was very different, but each addressed the issue clearly. Adele found this method to be more applicable to her than journal-keeping. She changed her illustration as she spoke with me about its contents, and then proceeded to transfer the picture to a large, butcher paper poster where she continuously altered her perceptions as time progressed. She added new pressures, tensions, or victories, and crossed out obsolete items to document her shifting emotions, beliefs, and situatedness. Her illustration became, in many ways, the source for her to visualize how she constructed and reconstructed her transitional experience.

I asked Bryan, Adele, and Maxwell to illustrate their positioning with paper and pen/pencil a second time after they had been student teaching (Maxwell at week 7 of his special education internship; Bryan and Adele at week 7 of their general education internship). They were given the opportunity to either revise the first drawing or to create a new illustration to depict their current situatedness.
These, however, were not completed within the timeframe for the dissertation and are not included as data points here, although they will be considered in the longitudinal study. Also, as part of the longitudinal study, I will ask them to repeat this process again at the end of their student teaching internships or, for Maxwell, the end of the teaching year to provide further comparative data.

**Researcher Reflective Memos**

In addition to the participant videotapes and transcripts, I created field notes and reflective, analytic memos like the ones described by Goldstein (1998) after each interview or other interaction with data in order to capture my observations, experiences, feelings, and thoughts in close time proximity to the interaction with participants. This allowed me to reflect on the interactions, data, and patterns that emerged as the interviews unfolded, and to consider each session from both an analytic and reflective perspective. It also helped me to "look inward" and check my biases and researcher stance to ensure I was remaining true to my participants' narratives (Florio-Ruane, 1999) rather than seeking to find a particular outcome within those narratives (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007). I was able to consider problematized areas such as how to handle three of the six recruited participants' decisions to student teach in later semesters, their desire to conduct monthly interviews even during their university semesters before entering their internships, or two of my participants' dating each other and student teaching in collegial classrooms. I reflected upon the results I was getting from participants - lots of talking, little talking, vague responses, rich narratives - and considered how my
interviewing techniques, questions, and posturing may have impacted this interaction. Additionally, I created memos detailing the "how-to" issues of technology and interviewing to examine problems that arose, such as a camera failing or Skype freezing, and figuring out ways to solve them. These memos reflected information I wish I had known going into the experience of being a first time researcher.

**Existing Data**

We also had the myriad of instructional materials I used in both classes and the practicum with the participants available for use. These resources included PowerPoints, textbooks, assigned articles, activities, lecture notes, letters to practicum teachers, email discourse, classroom activities, and homework assignments. The participants had their returned assignments with my feedback including lesson plans, lesson reflections, papers, cumulative projects, quizzes, classwork, and Reader-Writer notebooks. Additionally, they had their classroom notes, reading notes and outlines, and other support materials they may have gathered or created on their own. I had electronic copies of some of the participants’ resources since I saved lesson plans they designed for practicum with my feedback and comments.

While neither the participants nor I pulled the resources out very often to actually look at or use, we both referenced the assignments, readings, and activities regularly. One example is when Maxwell cited how he had used a classroom community building activity from one of my classes when he was first hired mid-
year in order to provide some routine and structure with students who had experienced a great deal of upheaval as multiple teachers and substitutes rotated through their classroom. These materials provided all of us with evidence of the curriculum, instruction, and pedagogy in which preservice teachers at this university had engaged and, at times, provided rationale for participants’ classroom choices as student teachers.

**Data Analysis Procedures**

As I collected data, I catalogued all data sources and then transcribed all interviews, visual methodologies, and interactions with participants. Additionally, I reviewed field notes and analytic memos, sometimes further developing and building upon the memos to construct my understanding of the events occurring. I also rewatched the interview sessions, following along on printed transcriptions in preparation for the next session or to see where narratives crossed and merged.

Riessman (2008) identifies four foundational ways of analyzing narrative inquiry: 1) thematic analysis; 2) structural analysis; 3) dialogic/performance analysis; and 4) visual analysis. In considering these modes of analysis, thematic analysis appealed to me because stories are compared for similar thematic conceptions that rise to the surface and "transcend the subjective and particular" (Frank, 1995, as cited in Riessman, 2008). McAdams (2012) compared thematic analysis with Strauss and Corbin’s (1990) grounded theory methodology because integrated themes are "discovered" through patterns and repetitions within the various narratives. However, Riessman (2008) disputes this comparison citing a
number of differences, the most important being grounded theory's objective to inductively generate stable conceptions to be used generalizably across cases. Narrative analysis, on the other hand, is committed to case centeredness. It was this sense of case-centeredness I wanted to remain true to.

This clarifying of narrative's role reinforced for me the desire to use thematic analysis for this study. While it was my goal to provide a multivocal story (Frank, 2009), I did not seek to generalize my participants' stories beyond their own experience. However, I do believe the thematic analysis is limiting in that it often fails to consider the context in which the story is occurring; Riessman (2008) describes it as a story "dropped from the sky" (p. 62). This is in contrast with my attempt to consider contextualization of participants' construction of experiences. This led me to consider dialogic and performance analysis instead. In dialogic and performance analysis, "stories don't fall from the sky" (p. 105) because they are conceived in situated contexts. The investigator becomes more active in co-constructing the story and recognizes the narrator is not necessarily the "final authority" of the discourse (p. 107). The researcher takes a more critical stance of narrator positioning, language, and narrative choices instead of taking them at "face value" (p. 137). I chose to incorporate some of this analysis form because I wanted the stories contextualized, and I wanted participants to closely consider some of the more complex and dynamic issues and tensions they encountered such as standardized testing, differentiation, and special education advocacy.
This does not mean I was defensive or aggressive in my interactions with participants. However, it did mean I was not always a passive listener within our interview sessions but often provided questions to challenge the participants' thinking, such as how they were able to reconcile seemingly opposing ideologies, and I subsequently served as a co-constructor of the stories. The questions I chose to ask and the points I asked for elaboration on logically affected the narrative the participants told. My mere presence was enough to change the narrative they chose to tell, and any gestures, expressions, or verbal affirmations, questions, or statements I made also impacted the outcome, therefore I served to co-construct the narratives simply by being interactive with the participants (Riessman, 2008).

However, in order to ensure I had written individual narratives that resonated, I engaged in member-checking by sending each of the three dissertation participants the final draft of his/her own narrative (Maxwell, 2005). All the participants approved of their respective narratives without issue and were excited to provide an analogy or metaphor to summarize their experiences to that point. I did not send them the cross-analysis to member check because I was concerned with confidentiality issues. Two of the participants were dating and would easily be able to identify each other within the cross-analysis despite the use of pseudonyms and non-identifying data. I therefore chose to only member-check the individual narratives.

In the analysis, I considered ways participants positioned themselves within their narratives. This approach to identity "as a performative struggle over the
meanings of experience opens up analytic possibilities that are missed with static conceptions of identity and by essentializing theories that assume the unity of an inner self" (Riessman, 2002, p. 701). I used concepts of positioning theory as delineated by Harré and van Langenhove (1999), Moghaddam and Harré (2010), and Moghaddam, Harré, and Lee (2010) to examine the shifting roles and positions participants took in relation to their story, their environment, themselves, and me. This brought forth some understandings of the group dynamics, culture, and climate of the experience of transitioning from roles of subordination to roles of varying power levels. The individual narratives are presented in Chapter 4, and the cross-analysis narrative is provided in Chapter 5. The thematic cross-analysis is summarized in Figure 13.
Chapter 4: Data Analysis - Beginning the Stories of Transition

My Ongoing Narrative: Why Teaching?

My dad wanted me to be an engineer, or an architect, or an accountant -- anything that involved math and made a significant amount of money. Teaching, especially teaching high school English, did not carry enough status or, perhaps, bragging rights to meet his deemed level of occupational worthiness. Yet, from the time I was a senior in high school, I was compelled to teach; it was the only thing I could see myself doing. Every time I stepped in front of a classroom, I felt the same level of focused confidence I did as an actress on stage. "This is something I can do; this is something I can do with excellence," I thought feeling like, for once, there was something at which I was more than "just good enough." Nothing deterred me from this path either. Not the sixteen-year old diagnosed sociopath who urinated in my student teaching classroom; not the cooperating teacher who chastised my methods as "too loose" and straying from "traditional" and "respected" (read: "old") forms of teaching (read: worksheets and textbooks); not the district that furloughed me for ten days on a first-year teacher's salary; not one of my student's being killed by a gang of other students; not even the eighth grader who went after one of my colleagues with a sawed-off shotgun. Teaching is what I always, always wanted to do, and even when it was tough; even when I had to call my mother to tell her I was okay because I knew she’d watch the news and worry about me; even when I was so dejected, exhausted, and frustrated, I never considered leaving children, and later, leaving teachers.
Purpose of This Chapter

In this chapter, I present three narratives of preservice teachers in transition: Bryan, Adele, and Maxwell. Each of these participants was a student in two university classes I instructed—one on inclusive classrooms and one on middle-grade literacy—during their enrollment in their teacher preparation program. Each of their narratives includes a synthesis of monthly interviews, written reflections, participant-generated illustrations, and other artifacts, such as lesson plans or articles, each individual chose to provide as a means to tell his or her story. I begin with Bryan's story, move to Adele's, and then end with Maxwell's. They are presented in this order because each subsequent participant's story grows more complex and difficult due to different forces. Bryan's transition has been the most straightforward and uncomplicated, though it is not without tensions and doubts. Adele's transition has been bumpier and less satisfying to her. She has experienced more internal and external conflict in her attempts to be an excellent teacher intern. While Maxwell's transition has been very positive, because of unforeseen and fortuitous circumstances, he has experienced multiple transitions in the six months since his internship journey began.

Brock, Nikoli, and Wallace (2011) state, “All of our interpretations of others are filtered through veils of our own lived experiences” (p. 144). In this chapter, I attempt to represent the participants’ “lived experiences” in order to consider how these experiences impact how the participants construct storylines of their transition from university student to student teacher and how the individuals
subsequently choose to position themselves within their organizational contexts. This, of course, is taking into account I am also interpreting their storylines based on my lived experiences and lenses.

Throughout the individual narratives, each participant responds to particular interactions with individuals and institutions based on the plotlines they have lived and the experiences, philosophies, and beliefs they bring with them into these new transitional spaces.

**Bryan’s Story**

Bryan is a twenty-three year old student at a western university. He is currently enrolled in the university’s dual certification program that will allow him to earn licensure in both elementary education (K-6) and special education (K-12). This program requires two internships of ten weeks each. In the fall, 2012, semester, Bryan completed his required coursework. He began his general education internship in first grade at a district elementary school in January, 2013, and began his special education internship at a district middle school in March, 2013.

I interviewed Bryan four times for this narrative - twice before student teaching and twice after he began his general education internship. Each interview took approximately 50 minutes (see Figure 12). He also provided weekly reflections, drawings, and journal entries to demonstrate his thinking as he initiated his transition into a general education internship. The following narrative tells how Bryan came to the education field from high school. It also focuses on how
philosophies of caring and fun have impacted his transition from university student to student teacher.

**Finding Education**

Bryan began his story by telling me he comes from a family that values education; both of his parents and his sister hold masters degrees, so it was expected for him to attend some sort of post-graduate schooling when he left high school. However, he lacked direction, and, because of his avoidance in facing these indecisions, "put everything off to the last minute," not even applying to a university. In an effort to help him find a potential direction, his parents took him to a community college where he saw signs advertising fire fighting training. "I didn't want to sit at a desk job all day, so I chose that," he said. He enrolled in the fire fighting academy, attended evening classes, and enjoyed aspects of his training. "I'd go on ride-alongs. The first time I saw a dead body, that blew my mind. Just learning all kinds of anatomy and physiology; that was awesome!" (November 7, 2012).

However, he was dissatisfied with this life choice as well. "I just remember going to parties and talking to kids, and they were like, 'Oh, what's your major? What are you doing?' And I just felt like I'd hung around the same group of people that I went to high school with even though I moved to City A from City B. I did the part time fire academy, which was just on weekends, and I was 18. Everyone in the program were all in their thirties, and they were coming back to school, and I just, I felt out of place. Even though I still wanted to join, I just felt out of place because I
was young, and you know, I just felt out of place basically. I just did not feel like I had this college experience - the college experience that I felt was portrayed in the media like what you see in movies like *Animal House* or on TV with big frat parties."

He decided to speak to a university advisor, who suggested he consider high school teaching since he didn't want "to sit at a desk" and "didn't really care too much about money" (November 7, 2012).

One of his first classes required him to tutor at a district high school through the AVID (Advancement via Individual Determination) program, but he was frustrated with the students' disinterest and lack of motivation in the elective course. Concurrently, he was assisting at a homeless shelter with younger children. "We'd come in, and it was like homework club. We'd come in and bring them out, and they were so happy, you know, like they're so happy to be here. But you look outside, and it's tent city. But they're enthusiastic. I'd compare that with my tutoring at the high school" (November 7, 2012). The younger children's enthusiasm for learning was the impetus for him to switch to a dual major of elementary and special education. From that point, he genuinely enjoyed his interactions with students and felt like "everything mattered."

Besides being a meaningful occupation, Bryan felt taking education classes at the university helped him in many ways. "I was taking classes here, and I just felt in place like I was enjoying what I was doing. My social life improved; everything was getting better. I started with the [education] program, and when I got in, I really enjoyed it. I like how pretty much all of the kids I got into [the program] with I've
taken classes with. I like having that sense of camaraderie. It's like a big family. Even now, probably eighty percent of the kids in all my classes are the same group" (November 7, 2012). It is apparent having the same cohort of students to move through the rigorous educational licensure program has been an important support for Bryan and helped him not only succeed in his pursuit of a teaching degree but also enjoy the process.

**Happy and Humble to Excited and Anxious - Situated in Transition**

Being a student teacher means occupying multiple spaces and positions at the same time. In December, as Bryan was finishing his university coursework, meeting his lead teachers for internship, and preparing to begin student teaching, he illustrated how he felt he was situated within these spaces. His conceptualization included three different drawings (Figures 13, 14 & 15). His first illustration is set in fall, 2012, at the end of the semester. "This is me, in the corner, happy and humble. Then over here, A+, and then the College of Education Building. To be honest, it was probably the easiest semester to this point. Part of the reason is I'm looking beyond school so stuff that felt hard is not hard anymore. I'm looking on to student teaching, so that's why I drew this. I'm kind of cool-headed and in control" (December 18, 2012). After six years in higher education, Bryan felt he knew well how to be a student, and his ability to look into the next phase of his life gave him confidence.

---

In order to preserve confidentiality, participants' drawings and resources, as they appear in the appendix, have been adjusted in cases where identifying information was included.
In his second illustration, Bryan depicts his feelings about moving into the internship and student teaching, the next phase of his transition. "I don't know if you can see it. I'm kind of nervous and anxious. In the bubble, I have a few things - 1st grade, thumbs up, and UNS. I also have the school I'll be working at over here (points to upper right corner). And then down here, I have excitement and anxious. All these represent something. Even though he [the drawing] looks really scared, I'm just more anxious; anxious over new things. I'm big on routines, so when I have to adjust to a new school, a new class, even a new practicum, it takes me a little while for me to feel in control" (December 18, 2012). He further explains he included "UNS" (another state university) because in a conversation with one of his contacts, he learned the last semester of classes includes a practicum with a teacher that becomes the internship lead teacher to maintain continuity. "How cool!" he expresses. "I feel like the transition from being a college student to a student teacher is a lot easier than what I'm feeling. I think that would be a better model for me. Granted, I do see the pros and cons. If you're with a bad teacher, you're stuck with her for a whole year pretty much. But I feel for the most part, you're given a good teacher you can just model off of, and for me, that would work better" (December 18, 2012).

In his third illustration, Bryan decided to represent the challenges and tensions he perceives as he transitions. He indicated "theory vs. practice" at the top because a key component to his transition is "taking everything I've learned from [my university], learned out of the textbook, and applying that to every day...
Everything I've learned at [the university], I've been able to apply some of it in practicums I've had, but how that translates when I take control and have to manage thirty-four kids” (December 18, 2012). He also indicated other situations that would require him to balance responsibilities including: his time investment in the internship while working to pay tuition bills; first grade students in his general education internship with seventh graders in his special education internship; and the high expectations others have for him as well as those for himself. He also indicated his need for knowing routines; it's the unknown, the not-knowing, that causes his anxiety about transitioning. "Like I said, adjustment for me is kind of a big thing so once I get used to, 'Okay, this is what I’m doing Monday through Friday, and this is how I’m going to manage my time,' it will be fine. But, until then, I’m a little anxious about it” (December 18, 2012).

**A Philosophy of Caring**

As a developing teacher, Bryan identifies with a philosophy of caring and associates good teaching with feelings of belonging. He cites his third grade teacher as an example. While he does not remember any specific events, he does "associate her with feelings of caring and belonging. This is so different from my fifth grade teacher. He made us write essays for punishment. I even had to stay behind at recess and to write the essays. I hated writing for a long time because of it. I saw too many times where kids were punished or reprimanded for 'not getting it,' even though they were trying" (November 7, 2012). This sense of caring also made an impact on him during the 9-11 attacks on the World Trade Centers. "I was in
seventh grade and I had - I remember this. I was in my first class of the day - PE - and [my teacher] didn't make us change out. We all went to the library and just kind of had a debriefing. It was interesting as far as gender goes because he was one of the first male teachers I had, and he was big and gruff like you think of a football player. Then to actually hear him get choked up and debrief was, like, it's okay to be masculine, but also sensitive and caring. I just remember that" (December 18, 2012).

He also responded from a position of caring when discussing the Sandy Hook Elementary School shooting that occurred just before we spoke in December. "I've thought about it, if like that happened in my class, I think I would definitely...I don't know how the school was set up, but one of the reports I read was the teachers put all the kids in the closet or the bathroom, and I think I probably would've done the same. Just lock them in there, and then try to barricade the door, and then take the gunman out myself. Keep them safe. So, I definitely would; I would be a bullet-stopper for kids, for sure" (December 18, 2012). But such incidents have not hampered his desire teach. "I've definitely thought about it. If anything, it's sort of fueled my passion because when it happened - what a coward, you know, elementary kids. They're innocent...Why would you - why would you do that?" (December 18, 2012).

This philosophy of caring became an important component in his selection of lead teachers for his general and special education internships. While it was important for him to be with "a really good teacher," it was also important to him
that the teachers be a good fit. When he observed his lead general education
teacher's first grade class, he observed, "She was just really supportive, and I got a
good vibe from her. I'm big on vibes, so I got a good vibe" (November 7, 2012). His
response to the lead special education teacher was similar; "[The principal] got me
her name and email. I talked to her, and it was the same thing. Very enthusiastic;
'We'd love to have you.' I didn't observe her, but I went in and talked with her. She
said, 'This is what we have going on, and this is what you would be doing,' and again,
just big on the vibe. She was like, 'Oh, we'd love to have you. I think you'd like it'"
(November 7, 2012).

His belief in his choice for a lead teacher was reinforced as he began
observing her and slowly took control of the classroom. "I really, really like my lead
teacher in the sense of her and I are very similar as I would like to consider myself a
laid back person who doesn't get stressed out. Like Mondays, they're kind of crazy,
and there's all this testing going on. She doesn't get upset" (January 21, 2013). The
teacher demonstrated concern for her thirty-two students, implementing
personalized, differentiated strategies to meet their learning needs, but she also
took the time to ensure Bryan was also learning, which was very important and
impressive to him. "She's always asking me, 'Am I doing enough to help you out?'
Each day, she makes time to debrief, even if that means she has to be there longer.
She's very good about it. Even in the middle of a lesson, she'll literally stop and tell
me a side note like, 'See how I'm doing this?'" (January 21, 2013).
This ability to demonstrate caring became one of Bryan’s barometers for his own reflective practice as a novice teacher. He felt he improved because "I’m more comfortable with the class. I can let down my guard and let my quirkier side come out" (February 24, 2013). "By relaxing, I started joking with the students and my real personality came out. Students loved this and the lesson was a combination of laughs and learning. I am excited to try showing my lighter, more enjoyable side while teaching" (Week 6 reflection). Better student rapport and more relaxed interactions within the classroom are his indicators of improvement.

During this transition, Bryan vacillated between teaching philosophies, sometimes believing content knowledge is the most important factor to effective teaching. However, one particular instance has solidified his belief that caring and rapport are the most important components of a successful classroom. "This [Figure 16] was given to me by the Dean of Students at my school. He copied this from a book. It’s broken up into three sections on one page - high influences, medium influences, and low influences. It’s from some study that was done. Under the high influences, there were six things listed. The number one is ‘high expectations,’ and the number 12 - they weren’t in order - but number 12, [next on the list] was ‘rapport with students.’ When I read that, it changed my mind in the sense that you can be a mediocre teacher, but if you can make a connection, a personal connection with a student, you can be 'better than better.' If you have a good rapport with students, and you’re only a mediocre teacher, you can be better than a teacher who is outstanding. So when I read that, to me, it changed my mind."
I’m not saying, 'Don’t try to improve’ or 'Don’t try to get better,' but, to me, the skill set I have **can** be good enough if I keep working on my relationship with my students and building that good, positive role model” (February 24, 2013). He reiterated he is not striving to be a mediocre teacher, but instead felt more accepting of his novice status; even inexperienced, if he cares and builds rapport, he can be a great teacher while learning the art and science of the teaching profession.

One of the conflicts facing Bryan regarding his caring and rapport philosophy was an unexpected shift in his special education lead teacher assignment, which took place in mid-March. While he believed in December his placements were set, and he would be able to work with a middle school special education teacher with whom he "felt a vibe," circumstances changed in January. "My lead teacher from middle school called me, and she told me she had another intern. She thought the other intern was dual, so the other intern would do her ten weeks, and then I would come in. But, it turns out the other intern is only SPED, so she's doing fourteen weeks. So she [the teacher] called me, and was like, 'Hey, it's not going to work, but there’s another lady in my department - a really good teacher - who would love to have an intern.' I said, 'Okay, that sounds good.' I just met her last week, and, um, yeah, first impressions are kind of -- interesting.

"When I first met my first lead teacher from the middle school, she was all excited. This lady was more business. She was like, 'I’m tough, and here’s what I teach, and here's what I want you to teach,' and I couldn't make that right-off-the-bat personal connection. Everything seemed kind of cut and dry and just business-
like. The other lady and my first grade teacher were more personable. They asked me questions about school and life. It wasn’t just about my internship and this little timeframe that I’m in right now. She made a few comments like, 'Just be prepared to set the tone. Middle schoolers try to get away with a lot of stuff.' Maybe it was good for me to hear...but, I think the big thing for me is my comfort zone. In first grade, I finally feel really comfortable. I enjoy going in every day. I’m excited about it. I feel like I’m where I need to be at this moment so I can drop my guard and not have a million things running through my head. It shows my teaching more; I can joke. Now I have to learn how to do that in a different setting to a different age level, so it’s not going to be the same...[The second lead teacher] said, 'We work from bell to bell. There's not instruction time wasted.' I thought, 'Okay. That’s a good philosophy, I guess.' She seemed kind of strict” (February 24, 2013). Working with a teacher who does not necessarily value rapport and caring to the degree he does will be a challenge he faces as he enters his second internship placement.

**Little Breathing Room for Fun**

One of the emerging tensions Bryan is experiencing is the demands to meet assessment requirements and getting a class of thirty-two, widely-ranged first graders to all meet standard using creative and "fun" instruction. He attempts to make new material for students "seem manageable and not daunting by making the lesson interactive and 'gamey'" (Week 6 Reflection). One of the restraints he has found is the programmed curricula the school uses, like Lead 21 and Everyday Math, are often restrictive and limited in their scope. This has been problematic for Bryan
since he believes "it is my job as a teacher to present the content and lesson in a fun way that keeps [the students] engaged so they can learn" (Week 7 Reflection).

When he began teaching literacy to first graders, he "went right off the Lead 21 curriculum they use so I just had the three small groups rotate through and just pretty standard stuff. Book walk, questions during the reading, and then debriefing afterwards, so I didn't really have a chance to...I just went off their curriculum" (January 21, 2013). He became frustrated with the sterility and simplicity of the leveled readers because they did not allow him to engage his young readers in higher level thinking skills or more interesting interactions. "It's hard because it's first grade so it's pretty standard. There's not much to it. It's pretty much point and read, point to the text. You can't get much from the book because it's so low; even the highest group. The books are maybe 150 words, so there's only so much you can talk about. Even when its strategies have been text to self, text to world connections. There's only so much you can compare. I think it would be different if you were with an older grade where you could really get into the meat of the book and discuss. Even like when we read Across Five Aprils, there was a lot you can talk about and throw in an opinion, but they're first grade so they're still learning how to have an opinion. But the books themselves just don't have that much...not a whole lot to a basic reader... [they use] lower books, not much, not much to talk about" (January 21, 2013).

After a little more experience in the internship, Bryan was still struggling with reconciling the leveled readers and higher order thinking processes. "I think I
had too low of expectations of my students. For instance, we had PLC [professional learning community] meeting about the 'close read' strategy; we really dissect and read a short paragraph, and you don't frontload a whole lot. You choose a text that's at grade level or above, and you go through and reread. Everything is text-dependent questions. The big thing, the epiphany I got from that is the students can’t read the text, but you can read the text to them, and you can still take part in higher level thinking discussion. Yeah, the leveled readers are pretty -- low -- so there's not a whole lot of meat to pull from. I'd like to take back that statement; you definitely can do higher level stuff and books that are at a high level reading. Like I said, you can read it to them, and they can still take part in the discussion" (February 24, 2013).

Bryan also began to recognize the limitations young, beginning readers have with text interaction, realizing his initial evaluations did not account for children’s developmental levels. "I kind of agree with myself to a point. There's only so much you can do when you're at that level. I think I said that without realizing if they're still learning sight words and they're still learning how to sound out words, you can't provide a novel. I noticed the entire time I've been there, my lead teacher's been doing the DRA [directed reading assessment], and some of the lower books will be three words a page. It will consistently say, 'Said Jake,' 'Said Jake,' and sometimes they won't even make a connection on page two" (February 24, 2013).

Another limitation to the "fun" Bryan seeks to have within the classroom is the amount of time available to teach particular concepts and lessons, particularly
when the time must be shared with assessment requirements. "It doesn't seem like there's much time to do a whole lot of other [activities]. I've only seen one read aloud. We're going to do another one on Monday or Tuesday because it's Martin Luther King Day, but it feels so cramped for time, like every minute. My lead teacher's trying to get through thirty-two DRAs, so she's pulling kids throughout the day, and then we've got a unit assessment coming up. You know how it is. So it just feels like there's not a whole lot of breathing room to say, 'Hey, let's mix it up!' I would like to maybe try something different, but that's what the kids scored low on, and that's what the data is showing; they need work with phonics; they need to work with breaking up words and putting them together" (January 21, 2013).

Because he must ensure students are successful in areas assessment data indicate are problematic, Bryan and his lead teacher are compelled to focus on phonics taught through the prescribed curriculum rather than “mixing it up” in more engaging ways.

This time crunch also frustrates him with math because Everyday Math uses a "recursive looping" (February 24, 2013) curriculum structure where students are often simply introduced to ideas without having to attain mastery of them. "It still kind of puzzles me - why would you teach something if you aren't going to test it? Why waste time? I know you should think outside the box and not just teach to the test, but looking at the 'make 10' strategies, for instance. I was like, 'Whoa, this is complicated.' Not necessarily complicated for me, but for a six-year old, and from my experience in trying to teach it in the other practicum [from fall, 2012], this isn't
worth it. It seems to me these curriculum were developed for a large amount of
time, and maybe it's just my particular classroom, but it seemed like there's so little
extra time that they are set on a tight schedule. A lot of these things - there's not
room to do extra stuff" (January 21, 2013).

While this lack of fun has not dampened his desire to teach, it has made
Bryan wonder about the environment in which he is interning and how it is affecting
instructional, curricular, and pedagogical decisions, which are often in conflict with
his university training. "I mean, teaching's still fun, but going back to what we
learned in the university, for instance, like your [Jennifer's] class doing Book Club or
Readers' Theater. All that seemed like creative, fun ways to teach literacy. Maybe
it's just the grade level. Maybe it's the just the school, but part of that fun is being
taken away, I think, when you're so focused on passing the test. My lead [teacher]
said in her previous school, she had a lot more leeway, and she said part of the
reason is because [this school] didn't make AYP last year. To keep this grant - it's a
SIG [school improvement] grant - they have to maintain growth. So there's more
testing going on because they have to show growth, and all the kids get free and
reduced lunch so there's snacks coming in. Just the whole dynamics of the school,
she said, are different than her other school... [The university] didn't prepare me for
a structured, rigid curriculum. However, I do think maybe later on in my career, or
even my first job, I'll have more leeway to do some of the things I learned - creative
ways to show [learning]" (January 21, 2013).
Bryan's Transition Journey

As Bryan has moved from university student to student teacher, he has relied on a philosophy of caring and a desire to provide engaging, "fun" learning as guidance in his decisions. These philosophies have been the sources of tension within his transition as he has encountered situations that have forced him to reconsider or redirect his position. However, he recognizes doing an impressive job student teaching could mean the difference between a full-time contracted position teaching or having to substitute and make ends meet. He compared the transition to being "a red-shirted freshman entering a collegiate sports team. I have learned a great deal from my time in varsity sports in high school, but the reality of college sports is at a whole new level. I have a partial scholarship, but I can't play the first year because of stipulations being a 'red shirted' freshman. If I don't prove myself this year, my scholarship will not be renewed, and I have no shot at actually playing on the team. If I make a good impression, I will secure the trust of my coaches and teammates and have a shot at being part of the team, not a 'red shirted' freshman. Nothing is guaranteed, but there's a good chance, this year will make or break my college dreams.

"Similar to a 'red shirted' freshman, student teaching is a lot different and more challenging than college classes. I know my best shot at getting a job teaching is making a good impression at the schools I student teach at during my internship. I could just squeeze by, but then I highly doubt I’d get hired. I am trying my best to
earn a spot on a teaching team somewhere, and in my mind, hard work will earn me that proverbial spot on the team” (personal email, March 6, 2013).

**Adele’s Story**

Adele is a twenty-three year old student at a western university. She is also currently enrolled in the university’s dual certification program that will allow her to earn licensure in both elementary education (K-6) and special education (K-12). In the fall, 2012, semester, Adele completed her required coursework. In January, 2013, she began her general education internship at the same district elementary school as Bryan teaching with the other first grade teacher; therefore they are on the same grade-level team and sometimes share cross-team experiences. She began her special education internship at a district high school teaching language arts and study skills in March, 2013.

I interviewed Adele four times for this narrative - twice before student teaching and twice after she began her general education internship. Each interview took approximately 80 minutes (see Figure 12), where she often worked through issues by "thinking aloud." She also provided weekly reflections, drawings, and lesson plans to demonstrate her thinking as she transitioned into a general education internship. The following narrative gives some background on how Adele came to pursue teaching as her occupation. It also focuses on how philosophies of proactivity and management and her existing social and cultural capital have impacted her transition from university student to student teacher.
Finding the Obvious Path

Adele comes from a family of educators - her father is a retired principal and her mother is a special education teacher - and grew up deeply involved with school and school work. "I remember when I was young, my brother and I would play - well, he was forced to play - school where I would make him sit, and he would write his name. I would yell at him if he tried to walk away from me. I wanted to play 'school,' and we did. My mom joked that's why he could write his name so early because I forced [him], hand over hand" (November 11, 2012).

Despite having such strong affinity for teaching at an early age, Adele initially rejected following the path that seemed so clearly laid before her. "I didn't want to do what everyone else was doing, or what they said. So, I tried to go into nursing, and I didn't like it at all. When [professors] told me I was going to have to retake the class after I got a 'C' in anatomy, I thought, 'No way. I'm not retaking this class.' I think at the same time, I was taking an introductory education course to see what else I might like. I fell in love with the class and everything we had to do. It was obvious. I shouldn't have wasted that year. So, it was...it was always kind of obvious that I wanted to [teach]. I always really liked it and always liked school...It's just obvious that's what I should do" (November 11, 2012).

Refining the Path to Follow - Impact of Practicum

The next challenge was to determine what grade levels and content areas she wanted to pursue. Again, her family and practicum experiences played an instrumental part in her decisions. "I remember middle school, and I didn't like it
that much. I don’t know why not high school. I think at the time - it was probably because I was twenty and those kids are eighteen - that was kind of too close in age. I always thought 'younger,' I think, because I have younger cousins. I saw all the young kids and how they reacted to my dad at his school. Then my mom pushed for [special education certification] because, 'You'll always have a job,' she said" (November 11, 2012). After observing her mother’s classroom, Adele decided, "I actually do like the high school level as well. I would much prefer high school special ed than elementary, just in my few experiences through the practicums. And the little guys - the young, young - I'm not so sure about any more after this recent practicum of crazy first graders. I'm refining, getting smaller and smaller in the ages that I like" (November 11, 2012).

Adele has continued to explore different age groups through her university experiences to better determine her future direction. Through a science practicum, she learned she likes upper elementary students because "the kids were really excited to see us and funny. They'd want those hugs, and they'd want to see what you brought for the day; they were really interested" (November 11, 2012).

Two difficult practicums have also helped Adele determine she does not want to teach elementary special education. "I haven't really loved the special ed elementary level experiences of my practica, and I will openly say they were - they were crazy. The behavior - I got called the 'F' word and saw a child throw his shoes, and then scale up a filing cabinet and sit on the top throwing his shoes two different times. Oh yeah, and it was the first day I was there. [The teacher] told me these
things rarely happen, but be prepared just in case, and then it did happen. It didn't scare me off from education. Then I did the autism class. A kid tried to bite me, and one kid just slept. The other didn't talk. One was hard of hearing and would screech. That was [the teacher's] day, every day. No, no, no, thank you" (December 20, 2012). She did include that while the autism practicum was intense, the class itself helped her to "recognize what some children live with" (November 7, 2012) and reinforced her desire to work with special education students, just at an older age.

An ineffective and inconsistent math practicum affected her enthusiasm to teach math at any level. "[The lessons] weren't fun to plan because we didn't know how to plan them such that we would get a decent score or decent feedback because it was never consistent. [The children] were sometimes excited to see we brought dominoes. But then, they're not paying attention; they're tapping the dominoes. All my dominoes look disgusting now; I don't know what they did to them. They just weren't respectful, so I don't think I really feel more confident in teaching math. I think I'll do okay following the Everyday Math curriculum in my first grade student teaching room, but I don't feel I got it from practicum" (December 20, 2012).

Actually, student teaching in a first grade classroom reaffirmed her desire to work with older students, and she is eager to begin her special education internship at a district high school. "I'm anxious to move on and excited to see how I do with older grades" (February 27, 2013).
In December, as Adele was finishing her university coursework, meeting her lead teachers for internship, and preparing to begin student teaching, she illustrated how she felt she was situated within multiple spaces. Her conceptualization began as a single-page mind map, which she amended as she was talking through it in the December 20, 2012 interview. Based on our conversation, Adele then chose to put her single page on a large sheet of butcher paper and used markers to continue adding to the map throughout her first two months of student teaching (see Figures 17 & 18). She saw herself split between being a student at her university and being an intern beginning to emerge as a professional teacher. Situated as a student, she identified economic and academic elements that were impacting her. Economically, she still must pay for school while having limited time or desire to have a non-education related job. "We're still a part of the university online and paying for tuition. I added [to the mind map] paying for tuition for sixteen credits was over $4000. We were shocked. I have some scholarships to offset that, but it was still more than we've paid in a while, so that was kind of a big thing" (December 20, 2012). This was particularly stressful since Adele both quit her on-campus job and moved to an off-campus apartment in an attempt to position herself more as a teacher and less as a student. To offset her "panic when I see my savings go lower and lower" (December 20, 2012), Adele began tutoring a first grade student and later added a second one.
Academically, Adele had a harder time delineating the lines between being a student and being an intern, however, as she talked during her interviews, she began to categorize her roles more distinctly, thinking and changing her mind map as she progressed. "As a student, we have to do assignments and be observed. We still have to do that as an intern, so I still consider that on the student side, still student-esque to be given an assignment list and be observed doing lessons. I just equated it more with being a student. You're being evaluated as an intern though you're a student at the same time. So, it's weird; so much of it overlaps. But graduation is something you do as a student. There's a note to myself - I need to order my cap and gown...We went and took all the pictures. Those were more student-y things" (December 20, 2012). "Talking it through made me see that actually a lot of the student stuff could almost be laid over the intern stuff. If I had transparencies, they would sit together in a picture" (December 20, 2012).

She also began to see her student role as meeting the "less real" expectations of professors that may or may not pertain to her role as a growing and learning educator. "I don't want to spend all this time doing their - not busy work - but doing their assignments when I want to be teaching. I want to know what it is like to be a teacher every day, not a practicum student a few hours a week...Some of the little assignments are actually getting me more excited because we have to write a letter home to parents. Well, that's easy... In fifteen minutes, I had a letter and people are actually going to read this. This is real. Real parents are going to read it...[The internship] just seems more real...And I guess it'll be the most real on August 28th
when it's me standing in there alone, and [the students] come in staring at me. That's when it'll be really real" (December 20, 2012).

**A Philosophy of Preparation, Proactivity, and Management**

On the intern side of her illustration, Adele listed several items relating to organization and preparedness: "I have begun to organize my folder to keep my forms/plans etc. in;" "want to read some books over break to be prepared;" "clothes out and lunch made;" "already passed Praxis II (less stress)" (illustration, February 27, 2013). Such comments indicate Adele's preference for organization and working ahead, which she has repeatedly done including completing her education program portfolio well ahead of the deadline, developing a filing system for her internship in November ("It's one of those black boxes where you can put hanging file folders"), and spending her winter break reading books such as *Teach Like a Champion* (Lemov, 2010) and *The First Days of School* (Wong & Wong, 2005) to feel prepared when she entered her internship in January.

Her interviews consistently reflected this need for organizing and feeling prepared, and she self-identifies these traits as strengths to carry into the classroom. "[My strengths] are planning and organizing. Reading groups, math groups, intervention groups. I'm good at setting those kinds of things up" (November 11, 2012). She relies on establishing systems to allay nervousness or anxiety about her transitional state. "I made some of my own folders up - in progress and completed assignments - because I don't want to just be throwing papers around. As I finish an assignment, it either goes in a folder or in the
completed file so I have it. Pre-organizing is what's going to help" (December 20, 2012). She takes pride, even defensively, in her systems. "So, as much as it drives me nuts that some people don't do things this way, I'm just proud of myself for doing things this way because it helps a lot. People joke, and I sometimes get irritated when they say, 'You're so organized,' and they make it almost sound like a bad thing. They don't - it's not a bad thing. I'm sorry that you're doing college in a different way than I am. I came straight from high school. I didn't take a break. I don't have children yet, and you know, now I don't have a job either...I'm glad that I can spend the time doing this" (December 20, 2012). Her "pre-organizing" often means practicing skills before she actually implements them in the classroom. After reading *The Daily Five*, Adele decided to try out her newly attained knowledge on her younger cousins. "[My aunt] is always telling them to read, so I can say, 'Hey, you two, get a book! Let's read, and I'll brush up!'" (December 20, 2012).

As a developing teacher, Adele's tendencies toward organization mean she identifies with a philosophy of effectively managing students. She associates good teaching with a well managed classroom where students readily demonstrate learning and progress, usually in a measurable way. "I think you should be able to look in a classroom and know there's learning. I can see it. I can tell that the teacher's teaching, and these students are getting it. They are putting it on paper, and you can show me" (November 11, 2012). One classroom in which she was a practicum student reinforced to her the correlation between good behavior management and student learning. "[The teacher] sits for a few minutes, and the
kids are not really there. They’re all over. Then she gets up and walks away and leaves some of the kids sitting there. She goes to her desk; she’s not even getting kids. I’m thinking, ’Okay, do you want them to sit down? But you’re not doing what you want them to do. You’re not modeling for them how you want them to be sitting here.’ Then she told us that she thought the last practicum students brought her a little behind in her math curriculum. There’s no way those [university] students in six lessons brought her that far behind. If she would require [the children] to sit at their desks, there’s no way the kids could have fallen that far behind...

“The way [the teacher] teaches; she teaches where kids are up and down, and she’s talking over the students. They’re used to that. They’re not used to my partner and me coming in and saying, ’You don’t talk while I’m talking. If you have a question, you raise your hand. We don’t want you to tattle to us.’ It’s a struggle... [My partner] and I have the hardest time managing. We’re worried about teaching and being observed because we know [the teacher’s] classroom management is a problem when we say, ’1,2,3, all eyes on me,’ and only half of them say, ’1,2, eyes on you.’... I don’t think that’s how it should be. I don’t think it needs to be a military classroom where they stand, sit, stand, and don’t talk...I don’t feel that there’s a lot of learning going on, and I wonder what the principal says when he walks in. Does he see learning? I don’t know. It’s not how I would run a class” (November 11, 2012). It was frustrating for her as a preservice teacher with limited classroom time to correct behaviors and retrain students. However, for Adele, student learning cannot happen if the teacher is spending significant amounts of time attempting to control
behavior problems. "[The children] need to know how to work in groups. I don't know if that teacher had taken the time to teach them those things, if she just laid out their expectations" (November 11, 2012). For Adele, behavioral expectations need to be articulated, taught, and enforced. Learning cannot occur in chaos.

Her proactivity and organization also drive Adele to a "get stuff done" mode for herself - "I want it done; I don't want to have to be rushing" (January 21, 2013) - as well as for others. In her first grade PLC meetings, Adele is often frustrated when other team members are not prepared for the meetings. "They say, 'We're going to discuss data,' and we bring all our stuff from the Lead 21 test we gave, ready to discuss. The other teacher hasn't even graded hers yet, but we've given ample notice we're going to do this. Then [the meeting] turns into - not gossip hour - but I could be doing other things. I just need to start bringing grading to do because they get off topic, and they start talking about things I really don't understand or don't need to understand...I'm still stuck on the fact that we were supposed to discuss data, and we're not...We're just sitting there" (January 21, 2013).

In her internship, Adele was able to observe and use a variety of effective classroom management techniques that appealed to her philosophy of organization and good management. "Ms. Smith holds high expectations for her first graders. She often tells them to 'do your job,' and students know what that job is. I like the way she speaks to her students because she doesn't baby them, although they are young. When it is time for them to move from the carpet to their desks, she tells them what their job is, and they usually get straight to work. When students have
been told their job and reminded a time or two, but still are not working, Ms. Smith has them 'move a rocket.' The students all start on green each day and can go up twice or down twice. Green is ready to learn...I used this specific behavior and reinforcement method as a way to show students that I too am one of their teachers now, and I deserve their respect...Another facet of behavior and reinforcement are the quiet signals Ms. Smith uses, and that I am learning. The students are very receptive to the quiet signals and are beginning to adhere to them when I use them" (Week 2 Reflection). Having behavior management strategies to implement helped Adele as she transitioned to full control of her internship classroom.

Interestingly, while Adele prefers organized, well-managed, structured classroom processes and procedures, she does not favor the programmed curricula Everyday Math or Lead 21 used in her internship school. In fact, she finds these to be quite restrictive and not particularly innovative. "I've never seen so much repetitive asking of the theme question and the unit question. How can we use and protect earth’s treasures? What are earth’s treasures? What can we do to care for earth? It's all the same. I wondered the other day if they're beating a dead horse now" (January 21, 2013). Part of this tension comes from her desire to try new ideas but also feeling compelled to follow her lead teacher, who is often reliant on the programmed curriculum. At one point in her internship, Adele became very excited because the lead teacher considered developing a social studies/reading unit based on the Titanic. "We were walking around the teacher book room and [my lead teacher] said, 'Oh, kids always like to hear about Titanic.' I said, 'I love it!' I
watched that movie far more than I want to admit. It just blows my mind - this boat and iceberg! I could care less about the love story part, but the boat part! She talked about maybe during the flex week we could pick a longer book - it was one of those leveled books, maybe six chapters with big pictures. Every student would have it, but we would read it to them and talk about the history part. I got so excited. Then, she said we could just go back to this other book she brought out, and I was like, 'Oh' (shrugs and drops shoulders)” (February 27, 2013). She was disappointed not only because the class would not be learning about a topic which she personally found interesting, but also because of the lack of variety, control, and autonomy she felt having to follow the programmed curriculum. "There’s not much choice. Lead 21 does not leave you much room to add or pick and choose unless you are really, really exact on your time. There just aren’t many choices. Here’s your stuff; here’s your curriculum guide; go teach...I’m thinking at the high school level it will be a little different in that respect because you can pick. If I want to teach a mini-lesson on something, there’s way more room for that” (February 27, 2013). Greater curricular and instructional autonomy is why Adele is eager to begin her special education internship at a district high school.

It's Not My Place

Because her parents are educators, Adele has accumulated significant social and cultural capital (people and knowledge) that have helped her through her transitional experiences. Her father in particular continuously provided a collegial relationship with her, affording her tangible resources, like a large box of National
Geographic magazines, but more importantly, an opportunity to talk out issues and gain salient advice. His advice spanned from where to live - "My dad thinks it’s cold here" (December 20, 2012) - to teaching student behaviors - "My dad and I talked about that. It’s something you have to teach, how to work in partners and how to work together" (November 11, 2012) - to helping her gain balance. While Adele wanted her lead teacher to spend extensive time with her every day after school planning, her father was able to help her to understand that teaching could easily become all-encompassing and that she needed to strive to have more than just teaching in her life. "One day the first week [of internship], my lead teacher just left. She said, 'I am meeting someone for coffee. I've got to go,' and just left. I was sitting there, bug-eyed I'm sure, like but, but, but what do I do? It was the first week. I still had questions, and she just left. I was kind of upset. My dad said, 'You have to understand that she could stay there until six or seven, but she has a life and she needs to, and you need to, too. Teaching will take over.' He said, 'Ask your mom. She knows what I was like.'" (January 21, 2013). Adele benefitted from having a father who had lived the consuming life of an educator and could pass on his experience, including his mistakes, to her.

Her mother has also given strong support, encouraging Adele to travel, providing networking connections across the country with family members who are educators, and recommending she pursue special education certification to better ensure future employability. She has also provided an effective model by which Adele could later evaluate other teachers and classroom environments. "I like the
co-teaching model of my mom in a classroom with a general ed teacher, teaching all the students. She has her [students] in there that she will say, 'Oh yeah, here's your notes page to take notes on,' or whatever they need” (November 11, 2012). "I know how my mom teaches in her classroom; it's not as structured" (February 27, 2013). These experiences also have helped her decide on her teaching preferences. "I would rather teach a small class of middle school special ed math, or however they do it now, but the pull out, I don't like. I just don't. I'm more used to my mom co-teaching with a general ed teacher as a special ed teacher, but she does the teaching when it's all history. The other teacher pulls the kids aside if they need help or something. But she's in the room and has a class of however many high school kids are in a class nowadays. I like that setup better. I think I'd get bored sitting in a room having one kid come to me every forty-five minutes. I'd fall asleep" (December 20, 2012).

As a result of Adele's exposure to a variety of professional teaching situations beyond her university training, she has a more refined understanding of what she deems to be "good teaching" and appropriate pedagogical, curricular, and instructional choices. This has given her a more critical eye in her internship experience, allowing her to recognize her lead teacher's subtle classroom actions. "When's she's teaching, she says, 'Oh, Miss Wynn and I have been working on this.' Whether I know what she's talking about or not, she brings us both into it to encourage that two-teacher structure, and I like it" (January 21, 2013). However, this more critical eye has also led to frustration with her lead teacher at times. "My
first week was their first week back, and I wrote that on my chart because it was rough. [The students] weren't ready to learn. [The teacher] hadn't obviously prepared as much as maybe she should have, so I had almost a little bitter taste about it. I wasn't agreeing with everything she was doing" (January 21, 2013).

She has been challenged most with reconciling her opinions in her team PLC meetings because the team members "don't get along, that first grade team sometimes. You can feel it...I stick more to what my lead teacher says, but I'll admit, she's got attitude. She won't back down when she wants something her way. [Bryan] just goes with the flow, but his lead teacher will put up a fight against my lead teacher when they disagree. It's more of a good conversation happening, but sometimes I just sit and think, 'Ooooh, here we go." (February 27, 2013). Sometimes she sides in opposition with her lead teacher. "You don't have to always follow the book exactly, so I agree with the other teachers in that way" (January 21, 2013).

While she sometimes expresses her opposition privately with her lead teacher - "I'll tell her what I think afterwards, but just to her because I do not try to create conflict" - her response in group settings is often silence: "It's not my place to butt into those things" (January 21, 2013).

**Adele's Transitional Journey**

As Adele has moved from university student to student teacher, she has relied on her organizational skills, proactive stance, and desire for autonomy as guidance in her decisions. They have also been the source of tensions within her transition as she has encountered situations that have forced her to reconsider or
redirect her position. She considers student teaching to be "another step forward. There was the transition from middle school to high school; high school to college, and now college to the real world - each transition becoming more difficult. It could be like steps or hiking; more difficult as you go up, but with each, there is greater reward" (personal email, March 9, 2013). For Adele, transitioning has been a bumpy trail where she has learned as much about what she does not want to emulate as a teacher as she has about who and what she wants to be. The social and cultural capital she brought with her into her student teaching experience made her a critical observer with clear ideas of what does and does not constitute teaching excellence.

**Maxwell’s Story**

Maxwell is a twenty-four year old student who graduated in May, 2012, from a western university’s dual certification program, where he completed licensure requirements in both elementary education (K-6) and special education (K-12). He conducted both his internships as a post-graduate. In August, 2012, Maxwell began his ten-week general education internship in fifth grade at a district elementary school, and in November, 2012, began his special education internship at the same school. While scheduled to complete his special education internship at the end of January, 2013, Maxwell applied and was hired for a special education position at a district middle school, taking over mid-year for a teacher who left due to a "melt down." He, therefore, spent the final three weeks of his internship teaching full time with his own classes, students, and caseloads. Originally hired as a long-term sub,
his passing the Praxis and completing the district hiring process have allowed him to be transferred to professional contract status. He has therefore undergone two key transitions - from university student to student teacher and from student teacher to professional teacher - within six months.

I interviewed Maxwell four times for this narrative - once during his general education internship, once during his initial special education placement, once while he straddled both his special education internship and new full time position, and once as a completely professional teacher. Each interview took approximately 70 minutes (see Figure 12). He also provided drawings, reflections, and journal entries to demonstrate his thinking as he initiated his transition into a general education internship. The following narrative tells how Maxwell came to the education field from high school. It also focuses on how philosophies of "Line Six" and personal accountability have impacted both his transitions. Because his transitions have been in quick succession, there are points where he has blended them together. I have chosen to follow his lead and not attempt to create discrete categorizations of each transition.

Sports, Sports, Sports and Muddled in Mud

Maxwell grew up in southern California and was "always just sports, sports, sports, sports, sports" (November 27, 2012). He didn't have any trouble with school until seventh grade. "That's when my dad got remarried. It was junior high, and a new school, and I think there were a lot of distractions and problems outside of school that made me struggle" (November 27, 2012). He had a reputable 3.0
average, but he was not necessarily a motivated student. He admits literacy was not in the forefront of his priorities; "I don’t think I ever wasn’t a reader, but I just doubted myself. I was reflecting, 'Did I do reading? Did I read at all?’ Sports, sports, sports - that was my summers, weekends, and everything in high school...Can you imagine if I tried, or if I had read and applied myself?” (November 27, 2012). In high school, he applied for and was accepted at Florida State University, where he had wanted to go "for my whole life.” Unfortunately, he was unable to go. "I applied there, and they cut my program. I was accepted, and they cut my program. So, I went to junior college, and then I was muddled in mud. I was just like, 'What do I do’?...I went to three years of junior college, in and out of classes. You know, W's, withdrawals. I just felt stuck in junior college. I wondered, 'Where can I go? Just what do I do?'” (November 27, 2012).

In an attempt to find his future, he enrolled in the western university because "I was tired of California, just the same thing.” He also found a reason to begin excelling in school. "Like I said, it was just sports, sports, sports, and I didn’t really, honestly ever get motivated for school until I came to the university...My dad was like, 'If you don’t pass the classes, you’re going to come back.’ I decided I wasn’t coming back, so that was my motivation. That was when I really accepted responsibility [for my own learning]. I didn’t pay attention to my [high school] teachers or junior college professors up until then. Then I realized what makes a good teacher - being flexible, having rapport with the students. I never really paid attention to how the teachers taught until I came to the university and decided 'I
need to pass the class” (November 27, 2012). Paying attention to how his professors were helping him to pass classes and gain both motivation and confidence inspired him to enter the teaching field. He credits his motivation, his effort, caring professors, and being "just lucky" as "what led me here today" (November 27, 2012).

**Motivated 2 Teach - Situated in Transition**

In December, as Maxwell was moving from his general education to his special education internship, he illustrated how he felt he was situated within multiple spaces (Figure 19). He began with his key concept – “motivated 2 teach” - because he was excited to be in his teaching internship and looking forward to the day when he could be in his own classroom. He also color-coded each component with purple and green reflecting motivators and red and blue reflecting stressors. He began by pointing out the UNK (his university) box. "I put UNK and this stuff right here are my first experiences with good teaching, applying myself, and just finally having success. Like working for success and being rewarded by the grades I got. [It was] where I really was like, 'Wow, I want to differentiate. I want do all this. I actually want to teach.' I just found it. That was one of my motivations to teach, and I color-coded it" (December 11, 2012). He continued to explain his motivators related to UNK including "being flexible," "learning to apply myself," and "making a difference" (illustration, December 11, 2012). He pointed out several professors who inspired and motivated him because they demonstrated care and concern for his academic progress. "I just got lucky with some professors that cared, emailed,
responded" (November 27, 2012). "I was communicating with my teachers a lot. They were like, 'If you're not in class, you need to email me. It is not okay to just not show up.' So [they were] making a difference" (December 11, 2012). He appreciated their high expectations of him, and he learned to rise to meet them.

The other side of Maxwell’s web indicated the stressors or "what kind of scares me to teaching" (December 11, 2012). One of his primary stressors was planning because of the time required and the necessity of understanding standards. He explained some of his attempts to conceptualize standards. "We would send you [Jennifer] the rough draft [of our literacy lesson plans] on Monday night, and we were teaching Friday. There were a couple times you would say, 'Well, are you sure you're really teaching the standard there?' I had to ask myself, 'Do I really understand this standard? Am I teaching it how? What's the best way to teach it? How can I reteach it if I need to?"" (December 11, 2012).

Planning also included the paperwork involved with special education caseloads - "Miss a step; legal actions. Kind of worries me a bit" - and teaching to the standardized tests. "I feel like we do that a lot. We always mention the CRTs, the CRTs, the CRTs [criterion reference tests]...Are you going to be able to ace it? I'm wondering because I'm going to be a sub for the stretch run for the CRTs at this school. I'm interested to see what it looks like; what the feeling is with the teachers. Are they worried about their jobs? I feel like high stakes testing is crazy...After my general education ten weeks, I wondered, 'What would these students score if I had them all year?' Because I really want feedback...I don't know if they'd pass the CRTs,
so that's a big thing for me" (December 11, 2012). Testing and the desire for feedback led to Maxwell's next set of bubbles. "I also put 'stressed.' Teaching to the test goes with stressed. Then it goes from 'stressed' to 'Am I good enough?' I have all this education. Can I apply it with students? With different students?" (December 11, 2012).

Perhaps the biggest stressor Maxwell has experienced is dealing with parents and administration. "I put them as a main thing - parents and administrators - right there, and then I branched it out to 'first impressions with the principals.' They come in your class for the first time. What's it look like? What are they thinking? Then the parents also. Sometimes, I might stutter, or I just spit everything out, just all over the place. I wonder, 'Are they going to judge me? What are they thinking? So parents and administration are huge for me because we do a lot with parents, and the administrators are our bosses really. They even have bosses that tell them to enforce stuff. That's why I said, 'high expectations.' I think it's good, but [administrators] just need to be clear across everybody" (December 11, 2012).

Parents continued to be a source of stress for Maxwell as he has transitioned into a permanent teaching position. While he has not completed his second illustration of how his situatedness has changed, he talked with me a little bit about it. "Getting more experience with parents was another stressor...I just don't know what to expect out of them. Yesterday, we had an IEP, and the parent was crying in the IEP because she thinks it's bad that the student was involved [in the special education program]" (January 23, 2013). However, as he gains experience working
and communicating with parents, his stress and nerves are subsiding. One particular experience helped to build his efficacy and even enthusiasm for the next encounter. "I was extremely nervous going into the meeting because of special circumstances that happened before the student’s IEP. Previously, there were incidents and even physical altercations between this student and another at school. The parents had been in contact with the principal and general education teacher recently. All this ‘stuff’ had been happening, and I am only a student intern; needless to say I was nervous. I had many questions that wouldn’t be answered until the IEP meeting when I met his parents face to face. Would they be mad at the school staff? Would they treat me with disrespect? Did they even think I would know what I was talking about?"

“Before I knew it, it was time for the IEP meeting after school, and I immediately introduced myself to the mom, and she seemed nice. I ran through the special education rights, and she was already familiar with them, so that was a plus. I kept the meeting professional (a must) and as the meeting progressed, I felt more and more comfortable because the mom and I were agreeing on many things about the student. Did I mention that the assistant principal was there, who had never seen me teach before, let alone communicate with parents? Well, the IEP meeting was a success, and I felt that it was a great success because I knew the student and had support from my lead teacher if I needed it (luckily, I didn’t). I am excited for my next IEP meeting this Thursday because I want to experience the same success and gain even more experience with parents"

(Family Outreach Reflection, December, 2012).
**Line Six: No Student is By Themselves - Ever**

The last component Maxwell included in his illustration was a highly motivating philosophy he refers to as "Line Six." "That came from the high school days with my old high school coach...He was a big motivator - big, big motivator for me. It was lifelong and building character. Coaching and doing the right thing, even if it's not the popular thing. I feel like I learned a lot of life lessons throughout my whole life to apply it. Line Six was very motivating to me. Line six means a team and a family. It was just a huge motivation - teaching me the right thing to do, character, being accountable for your actions. I feel like I really benefitted from it, and I try to have that kind of accountability with my students" (December 11, 2012). He operates from a core belief that "no student is by themselves ever...My high school coach's philosophy was team and family. That's what our football team was. I want my students to feel like that because I felt like I was never on my own, and that was the best feeling in the world. We talk as teachers about having a safe environment where every student can say how they feel any time...I just want my students to feel like they are safe in my classroom, and that we are in this together, and they're not by themselves. 'You're not alone.' I hope they never feel that way" (November 27, 2012).

This philosophy is extremely powerful to Maxwell, as evidenced in almost every aspect of his educational experience including interactions with students, parents, colleagues, and even testing. He demonstrates and enacts this philosophy by little things, such as referring to his students with challenging behaviors in highly positive terms. "I was observed today, and I had three students. One of them has ADHD, and he was everywhere. It was just as hard as controlling 28 or 25 students, just those three. But it
was fun. They're characters...Yeah, they're unique" (November 27, 2012). He said this completely genuinely without sarcasm or frustration. When he accepted his junior high position, people told him negative things about junior high children and questioned his decision - "Oh my gosh, you want to deal with that?" His response after two weeks was, "They're just the coolest people in the world" (January 23, 2013). Maxwell accepts all children for who they are and recognizes their importance to "the team."

He also enacts this philosophy as he interacts daily with students. Over several interviews, Maxwell described a student he tutored in an after school program who was causing him some difficulty. It would have been easy to write the student off as "troublesome" because he had a history of altercations with teachers, however Maxwell chose another way to work with the student. "Today, he was in the after school program, 3:30-4:30, and he's just rolling on the ground. I'm just like, 'Why?' His shoe was off, and I was like, 'If you cannot act like a fifth grader, you'll just sit at your desk.' What do I do? Why is he giving me this problem? I want him to like me, but I understand if he doesn't like me, he doesn't like me. Too bad...He calls me 'Willy Wonka.'...But, I'm like, 'Why is this problem behavior occurring? Am I reinforcing it somehow? So, today, I gave him five minutes to sit at his desk. Then I asked, 'Are you ready? Are you ready to act appropriately? He actually chose a partner that was near me...I gave him a thank you note. 'Thank you for making good decisions'" (November 27, 2012). It was important for Maxwell to assure the student he was valued and needed.

Maxwell also spoke with the fifth grader. "'It's an after school program. It's supposed to be more lackadaisical, but you know, we're still here. I'm the teacher; this is my role. You're the student; you have to respect me.' Then I told him what I wanted to
see out of him - just relax. 'I'm not going to be disrespectful to you, so it's a two-way street'...He was like, 'Okay,' and then the rest of the forty-five minutes to an hour, he was quiet" (December 11, 2012). Rather than leave the situation at simply gaining compliance from the student, Maxwell continued to reflect on root causes for the boy's behavior and how to overcome them. "He was bullied last year by one of our bigger students because he's a physically tiny student...He doesn't really trust; he doesn't let down his guard. I don't know how to get that guard down...He needs to be on my team...'I want you on my side because that will just make the day.' He could be my student next year if I get a job there teaching sixth grade" (December 11, 2012). They have since been able to continue tutoring without incident. He clearly sent the message – you are not alone; we’re in this together – and the boy responded positively. Because he chose to “get the boy in his team” rather than be authoritarian, condescending, or confrontational, he was able to help him “let down his guard” and act with less fear and more trust.

In January when Maxwell accepted the middle school position, he entered into a very difficult situation. "These kids have had so much inconsistency - a teacher who, I guess, would yell at them, was physical with a student, and was having behavior problems. It just wasn't a good situation. Then they had a sub. Then they had a different sub while [the administration] was trying to hire me" (January 23, 2013). In a sea of chaos, Maxwell looked to create an environment of trust and mutual respect. He immediately informed the students they would begin with a "clean slate" and indicated they would never be alone in his classroom. "Don't hold anything against me. I don't hold anything against you. We don't know each other. It's not going to happen over the
first couple of days, but we'll get to know each other.' Also, I told them shoulder buddies are big, so if I ever ask a question, they need to talk to their shoulder buddy because once they do, I can call on anybody, as long as they have talked to their shoulder buddies" (January 23, 2012). For Maxwell, there is nothing that cannot be accomplished when one is with a team. This team/family concept helps him to promote a safe, trusting, positive environment where students feel they can take risks and "let their guard down," even when they have previously experienced bullying, turmoil, and failure. His desire for them to succeed and his support for them encourages his students to feel safe and begin to take academic risks.

Maxwell also demonstrated this desire to create a team in a difficult IEP meeting with a parent. When the parent became defensive of the teachers' attempts to explain her son's reading learning disability, he was able to step in and help ameliorate the situation. "All of a sudden, she touches her son. She's like, 'I want you to listen to me. I think you're so awesome.'...We weren't saying anything that he wasn't awesome. We were just telling [her] where he was. She [kept asking], "How soon can he get out of special ed? What do we have to do?" I responded, 'We think he's awesome too. If he's not showing growth, he needs [the special education services]. It's like driving, but with glasses. We're just helping him drive''' (January 23, 2013). The next day, the mother called Maxwell to ask if her son could be moved from home economics to a Read 180 class so he could improve his reading fluency, a suggestion Maxwell had made in the previous day's meeting. Because he allied himself with the parent on the same team to benefit her child, he demonstrated caring and concern, and eventually convinced her of action steps they could take for him to improve.
Teachers have provided for Maxwell positive examples of being a team and family. Even though he completed his special education internship in his own classroom, he did not feel like he missed out on having a lead teacher or model. He was given a mentor immediately by the principal, and he also clicked with two other teachers. "I feel that I have two lead teachers. I have my eighth grade language arts/English teacher, who is special ed. I go to her. I also have the department head, who's super knowledgeable about what she wants out of me. So, it's like I have two lead teachers, just not officially or technically. It's a lot of support. I have a lot of back support to make me successful with feedback" (January 23, 2013). His department chair understood that in order to get him as a new teacher "on the team," she needed to go at his pace and provide small bites for him to digest. "She would give me little increments. 'Okay, here's this; do this. Okay, once you're done with this, now we're going to go here.' She wasn't trying to overload me. We have a lot to do, and I understand that. She wasn't trying to overstress me and overdo me. She said, 'Any time I'm giving you too much, you just say, "Hey, stop"'" (January 23, 2012). Maxwell appreciated feeling like he had "back support" from individuals who valued him. While he is now operating without a cooperating teacher in his classroom, he is "not alone - ever," experiencing the same feeling he strives so hard for his students to have.

There has been one exception to this team/family experience, which has caused Maxwell some conflict and tension. A third year teacher, rather than attempting to help Maxwell to transition into his teaching, attempted to exert power and authority over him, an action he attributes to her "having a chip on her shoulder" and "wanting to be heard" by her peers. "One time, I was substitute teaching for my lead teacher, and [the third year
teacher] came in the classroom when we were doing word sorts. She jumped in and started teaching some of my kids. I was just like, That's cool, but would you do that if Ms. Franklin was here? Is that appropriate?...She knew I was subbing, and she wanted my students to know she had something over me, I felt like” (December 11, 2012).

Rather than become confrontational, Maxwell chose to deflect her attempts to seize power and chalked it up to an experience he now had in his repertoire. "She's definitely different. But I know there's going to be more teachers like her. Some people are the way they are, and I accept that. I'm mostly passive, but I'm not going to let the little stuff bug me because I'll just wind up being someone like her" (December 11, 2012). While he describes himself as "passive," it is apparent this is not the case. Because he tends toward a team-oriented philosophy, he is conciliatory and attempts to negotiate ways to help individuals - students, colleagues, parents - be on the same side. This is not passivity but sophisticated understanding of others and an ability to be persuasive without being aggressive or authoritarian.

**You've Got to Believe in What You're Teaching - It's Not Always Going to Be the 1990s**

The other component to the Line Six philosophy Maxwell shared is accountability for one's actions. His belief that he is responsible for his students' learning plays out in a number of ways. Throughout the four interviews, Maxwell constantly asked questions of himself in a reflective manner, attempting to find ways to be excellent. For example, in November he wondered, "How do I know where the students are at? Like just informally?" In December, "Do I really understand this standard? Am I teaching it how? What's the best way to teach it? How can I reteach it if I have to?" In his new teaching
role, he was "intrigued" by student behavior root causes - "What's going on? Am I causing this behavior?" (January 23, 2013) - and what to do about them - "How much do I step in? What do I do? How much of this is me? How much of this is the age? How much of this is God-knows-what else I don't even have control over?" (February 23, 2013). He engages in this reflective stance because he believes he is the primary person accountable for his students' learning and wants to do everything in his power to ensure no one is left behind.

Because of this sense of responsibility, Maxwell prioritizes quality educational experiences for his students. This also means he sees standardized tests as merely an extension of his job. While it would seem his embracing of testing accountability would be in conflict with his philosophy of no student ever being alone, he sees quality instruction as involving teaming that prepares students to be able to perform on individual tests. Considering his students are some of the lowest performing in the school, many of whom will receive an attendance diploma from high school, one would expect him to be nervous or anxious about the benchmark exams and how he is judged by them. This, however, is not the case. "I feel that the test should reflect what they've already learned, what they know. It's an accumulation. This is what we've been working for...You talk about CRTs [with the students] and ask 'What's your score?' We discuss, 'Why do we do guided reading groups? Oh, to be better readers,' and they understand. That's how we get our CRTs up. I would hope I give that message, that what we're working for is the future. Yes, at the end of the year, we would hopefully do well on the CRTs because we have been working together the whole school year" (November 27, 2012).
He continued to explore this idea of prioritizing good teaching for the students' well being and allowing high stakes testing to take its course. "The CRTs make teachers accountable for what they're doing in the classroom. If there's a bad teacher, I think the CRTs will show it. I would hope they would show it...I think that if you teach the Common Core Standards, that the scores, the state testing should take care of itself. I feel like small groups, engaging your students - you're doing all the things a good teacher should do - your scores will take care of themselves" (December 11, 2012). He cites one teacher at a guided reading training he attended who was unable to articulate her processes and was resistant to the ideas being presented. His lead teacher showed him that this teacher's CRT scores were low, and he attributed it to her unwillingness to change. "[She] wasn't necessarily flexible. She was like, 'Well, I'm new to word sorts.' It was like she was trying, but she didn't believe in it. You just got to believe in what you're teaching. If you don't believe it, how are you going to teach it? I think your students will understand if you don't buy into it" (December 11, 2012).

Maxwell has no difficulties reconciling quality instructional practices, the Common Core Standards, and high stakes testing. To him, they make sense. Teachers, in his eyes, are the most responsible people for their students' learning. The standards provide structure for the instruction; the testing holds teachers accountable for conducting quality instruction, and accountability is part of the job of teaching. For him, it is a natural progression. "[A math teacher in the school] thinks the standards are just so hard. I'm like, 'They're just standards.' It's just the new revamping of education. We're moving forward in this period of time. It's not always going to be the 1990s, or 2010s and '13s. We're going on. It's not going to be the same as the '30s or '40s. It has to go on because
it has to improve" (February 23, 2013). He is actually befuddled and even amused by some of his colleagues' fears about the Common Core Standards and CRTs. "[The teachers] are blaming the Common Core for dropping scores. This is all I've known. I was taught in school and university Common Core - how to read them, how to write, how to do everything with the Common Core. It's weird because at my internship school, they were about Common Core. It was normal. Then I came here, and it's all of a sudden, 'Common Core's coming! I can't believe the test results!' I guess the state of education is the district superintendent. He said our scores were going to drop fifteen to twenty points or percent because of the testing. I think if he says that, the teachers really believe it. You know, he just reiterated what they were thinking, and it was weird. I think [the students] could do just fine. If we're teaching, and we're doing standards - Common Core Standards - why shouldn't the students improve on CRTs or MAP tests? [Teachers] are weirded out about it. It's like this big thing to them, like this big, dark cloud, and it's...I'm not laughing, but they just make it a really big deal. I think if they just taught and did, you know, our jobs, it'll take care of itself. If it doesn't, you know what you have got to do differently. Common Core is all I've known. It's not really a big deal to me. I never saw the state standards - only Common Core" (February 23, 2013). Considering Maxwell was in middle school at the advent of the No Child Left Behind legislation in 2001, he has grown up with teacher accountability, high stakes testing, and school reform. They are simply a part of the teaching profession he accepts, and Common Core is merely the next step in the ongoing continuum. To Maxwell, quality teaching includes taking responsibility for student learning and being held accountable for delivering quality instruction in a meaningful, engaging way.
Maxwell's Transitional Journey

As Maxwell has moved from university student to student teacher and from student teacher to professional, he has relied on philosophies of teaming and accountability as guidance in his decisions. These positions have helped him to overcome most tensions or conflicts he has encountered. For him, entering the unknown world of teaching is "like when I take a test. Going toward the test, I'm like, 'Hmm, I wonder what's going to be on it. Am I ready?' You can be like, 'I've already studied. I've gone to class. I read the book. I've done all this. I feel prepared. Am I prepared?' You just try to prepare yourself as much as possible. Then when you get to it, you're like, 'Okay, it wasn't that bad,' or 'Wow, maybe I should have studied more.' I feel like that's what the whole teaching thing is like; like going toward a test" (December 11, 2012). For Maxwell, transitioning is a learning process that requires preparation ahead of time, including studying with colleagues. Performing poorly does not equate to failure; it simply means you need to study more, make adjustments, and try again.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I analyzed the individual themes that emerged from "within" each participant’s constructed narrative. I then narrated each participant’s individual experience of the transition between university student and student teacher. I focused on addressing how their past experiences impact their present and future decisions as they interact with individuals and institutional constructs within their specific contexts. This was to establish for the reader an understanding
of each participant as an individual and what factors and forces were specifically motivating or hindering for them within their own storylines. By providing these individual frameworks, it is my intention to better understand why the participants construct their narratives in the ways they do and how these constructions encourage them to take up particular positions as they engage in their transitioning experiences. Each participant’s constructed storyline helped him or her take up particular positions based on the traits, beliefs, philosophies, and experiences they brought with them into their transition as interns and novice teachers. These storylines impact how they position themselves in relation to the individuals - professors, teachers, students, parents, and supervisors - and institutions - curricula, testing, standards, and school environments - they encountered as they progressed through their university and student teaching experiences. Their points of tension were most often the result of being positioned in ways that were in conflict with how they had positioned themselves and the storylines they were choosing to live. This point will be discussed further in Chapter 5’s cross-analysis of the three participants’ narratives.
Chapter 5 - Cross-Narrative Analysis

My Ongoing Narrative: Why Teacher Preparation?

As educators, we all have moments in our careers we are not particularly proud of, and I am no different. I always had a good sense of what I should teach, how I should teach it, and why I should teach it that way. My struggles were with behaviors, particularly incessant student talking, and since I had no training in classroom management, the tools in my toolbox were limited to those I experienced as a student in school or observed as an intern watching others. I am embarrassed to say my first attempt at quieting a class early in my student teaching resulted in the entire group copying a page from a dictionary because it was the technique that had been done to me (aside from being paddled as a second grader for telling the boy behind me to do his own work). Needless to say, I lost a great deal of credibility and trust with my students as a consequence of that ugly misstep.

While I never repeated that particular mistake, I did succumb to the technique I saw many teachers in my inner city school use - raising my voice and slamming books on the floor. Again, I had few alternatives in my toolbox to employ. One day, after raising my voice to a very boisterous class, I stepped back in frustration, humiliation, exhaustion, and disgust and thought about what type of teacher I was becoming - one who blamed students for not listening; one who saw silence and compliance as authority; one who did not model behaviors I wanted my students to enact. That is not how I entered the teaching field; it is not how I envisioned myself as a teacher; it was not the storyline I wanted to be living. I
feared being the teacher students went home and complained to their parents about or still hated twenty years later. I had to take up a new position in relation to my students and construct a new storyline; one that still required respect, but one where I modeled that respect and used humane, thoughtful, and caring ways to amend less than ideal situations. I had to do things differently than I had witnessed or been socialized into. I never raised my voice in anger or used books as a silencing device after that. I learned to stop talking and start listening. I learned to ask students what they needed to be successful, and I was surprised by how much they could teach me. Teaching, particularly in the beginning as one moves from a sheltered university world to the complex and often isolated classroom world, is a bumpy, windy, uncertain road with many obstacles and hurdles. There were unexpected curves I didn't see coming, and potholes from which I thought I would never be able to emerge. But, somewhere along the way, the road smoothed out; the signs are clearer; I can see long distances; and I can navigate those obstacles with barely turning the steering wheel. It started with determining how I wanted to position myself as a teacher and then continuously repositioning myself in relation to individuals and institutions to persist in living up to those expectations.

**Purpose of this Chapter**

This chapter builds on the within-analysis conducted in Chapter 4. In Chapter 4, I constructed common themes, philosophies, and beliefs which shaped individual participants and helped them determine how to position themselves and make decisions within their unique transitional experiences. In this chapter, I
present a cross-analysis of the three participants’ narratives, including common themes that unify the experiences as well as indicating nuances and differences in how the themes played out for each participant as a result of context, plotlines, identity, and interactions.

In her work, Rice (2011) argues it is not enough to discern how teacher candidates came to the profession because this tends to focus on a "narrow canon of acceptable plotlines for coming to teach" (p. 146). Instead, she claims researchers should ask how they came to be teachers - how they learned the necessary skills and knowledge to become teachers and how their personal narratives subsequently position them. In this chapter, I attempt to move beyond simply presenting the “narrow canon” of how participants came to education, and instead delve into how they are learning and developing as teachers based on their positioning in the school contexts as they engage in this transitional experience.

Harré and Van Langenhove (1999) identify six modes of positioning that I considered as I engaged in the cross-analysis component of this dissertation. They are as follows:

- **first order positioning** - ways that people position themselves in their ongoing storyline
- **second order positioning** - ways the ongoing storyline can be explicitly challenged
- **moral positioning** - the characteristic roles that people assume within storylines based on accepted duties and actions associated with the roles
- **personal positioning** - when characteristic roles are not adhered to in interactions
- **tacit positioning** - unconscious and unintentional positioning
- **intentional positioning** - intentionally striving to position oneself or others

According to Evans (2011), positioning always includes moral and personal positioning, however the more that an individual’s actions cannot be determined or understood based on a role, the more emphasis is placed on personal positioning.

In this chapter, I discuss two common storylines with multiple branches that emerged as the participants, Bryan, Adele, and Maxwell, experienced their transitions into student teaching. I use the modes of positioning to examine how they position themselves and are positioned by individuals and institutions. This takes into account how they have been positioned by their past, developing particular traits, dispositions, and philosophies through experiences and encounters, that impact how they position themselves in the midst of a major life transition. This model also allows me to consider issues of power (Glazier, 2011) the participants encountered and the ways they empowered themselves, surrendered power, or attempted to negotiate and “survive” power structures within their storylines and contexts. This information is summarized in Figure 20 and is based on similar organizational structures in Slocum-Bradley (2010) and Rothbart and Bartlett (2010).
Storyline #1 - Stops and Starts: The Positives of Participants’ Positioning

Hitting Walls and Bouncing Back

Assignments, Grades, and Jobs

In this section, the participants tend to engage in second order positioning as they attempt to negotiate their simultaneous roles as both university students and interns. They often challenge the position of a typical college student, though they tend to do this in a subverted way, rather than “acting out” and risking angering those with the power to “harm” them, such as professors, with poor performance evaluations or grades. While outwardly and publically compliant, they privately challenge the relevancy of assignments and take on additional duties or hardships to separate themselves from the student role they are attempting to transition from.

The emerging story of Bryan’s, Adele’s, and Maxwell’s transitions begins with their positioning as university students, with the responsibilities and duties assigned to that role, laid alongside their positioning as preservice teachers. This included completing assignments for grades and jumping through professors’ proverbial hoops, which the participants sometimes found frustrating and pointless at this juncture of their journey. As Bryan stated, "One lesson I was graded harshly on my formatting of the lesson plan, and my response was, 'Is this relevant to my teaching? Let me know on the content and the strategies I'm using versus, okay, you don't like how my lesson plan is formatted? I don't find that useful. Point out hey, maybe I should be inquiring more instead of telling the kids. Let them infer; infer and ask questions versus direct instruction. That is useful to me, not 'indent here'"
Feedback regarding the formatting of lesson plans was not helpful or relevant to the interns; they wanted information regarding the content, construction, and execution of their instructional choices, which had much greater meaning to them as they entered into student teaching.

Adele also commented on how she viewed the required college assignments. "I don't want to spend all this time doing their - not busy work - but doing their assignments when I want to be teaching" (December 20, 2012). "At the college level, I was worried, 'Am I doing this right? I've got to make sure I'm doing it right; it's for a grade.' Now, the worst that happens is [my lead teacher] may say, 'Yeah, sure, do that,' knowing it's a terrible idea, but I need to learn it's an awful idea. She'll let me do it. Or she'll say, 'That's a really bad way to do it,' or 'Great idea, go for it.' I feel like I have less to lose now than winging it on a big project at the college level" (January 21, 2013). Adele felt the pressure of performing for grades and the need for perfectionism in what she submitted in class because her grade was depending on it, even if she perceived it was not relevant to her current "real" learning.

Being a university student also meant finding the money to pay for tuition, room, and board but struggling to find time to work because days were spent interning at schools, often until five, six, or seven o'clock at night. All three participants held part-time jobs, often working in excess of twenty hours a week while interning. Time management and attempting to get everything done, including working, was a big issue as each attempted to negotiate their different plotlines. Bryan worked extended hours on weekends. "I'm still getting used to
how I should manage my time...I left too much to do over the weekend, and then with work, I didn't have enough time [to plan]. Luckily, that Sunday, I got off early, and I got home and lesson planned. I need to spend more time at school" (January 21, 2013). Maxwell continued to work at a local restaurant - "I'm waiting tables on the weekends" (November 27, 2012) - not only through his two internships, but also once he became a full-time teacher. "I took twenty-one units in the fall of last year; twenty-one units in the spring. I've been so busy; I was like, 'Let's just keep it rolling with this job opportunity.' It's like I've known nothing else but to be busy, so I mean, just why not?" (January 23, 2013). The busy-ness, however, took its toll in February. "I'm actually having a sub on Monday. I've been working at the restaurant twenty hours a week, plus the forty [for regular teaching]. It's been kind of crazy" (Maxwell, February 23, 2013).

Adele took a different path in an attempt to reposition herself as a student teacher rather than a university student. She quit her on-campus job and physically moved off-campus. "I'm trying to pull out of the university mindset in more ways than classes. I'm quitting my campus job because I have to move on to student teaching. The other job - they know I'm leaving too. So, it's closing up the university stuff and trying to get into these two classrooms I'm student teaching in" (November 11, 2012). In an attempt to continue making money in a means related to her chosen occupation, she began tutoring two girls. While she had been "saving with the knowledge that I most likely would not be able to keep both jobs," this change was not without financial stress. "I'll be okay, but I do start to panic when I see my
savings going lower and lower, and I know even though [my parents] are helping me, they only give me this much” (December 20, 2012).

**Eager to Teach – Contradictory Positions**

In this section, the participants tended to engage in *first order positioning*. In the on-going transition-to-teaching storyline, they were all excited to be moving from the “theoretical” context of the university to the “real” world of teaching. However, they were also nervous and fearful because they were entering a storyline they did not know. It had already been occurring, and they may or may not have been prepared for the challenges that awaited them. It was the moment when “the rubber met the road,” and they had to demonstrate their competence as future teachers, even though they were still morally positioned as learners.

While stressful, all three participants were eager to move from what they viewed as the university’s theoretical world into the classroom’s real world because they wanted the opportunity to apply their learning, though they also recognized the limitations of their "borrowing" a classroom for internship. Bryan expressed this by saying, "I’m ready to be done with the classes now. I know there will be work to go with [the internship], but I’m looking forward to the hands-on...I’m really looking forward to being able to call a class mine, even though it's not mine" (November 7, 2012). Maxwell noted the dichotomous position of wanting to be a teacher, but also recognizing the need to still learn. "I want to do this, and it's just exciting. I want to be a teacher, so I want to make it. That’s important to me...but I’m still a student" (November 27, 2012). Moving into student teaching also meant
being able to finally see what they might be capable of. As Maxwell stated, "I'm either ready to teach, or I'm not. Just throw me in the pit and see how I do" (January 23, 2013).

This eagerness to rush forward into student teaching was also tempered with concerns and a desire for feedback. Maxwell said, "I'm still being observed as part of the internship by my supervisor...I just want to know that I'm doing everything right" (January 23, 2013). Feedback was particularly important to Adele, who became ambivalent when she felt her practicum teacher was not fulfilling her duty to provide guidance. "She doesn't help us in that manner. If we had gotten her feedback, then we would have [followed it]. She kind of peeks in during the lessons, with the students, but doesn't necessarily stop. I feel like she can see us struggling, but doesn't do anything, which maybe she isn't supposed to do I guess. It's a practicum" (November 11, 2012). On the one hand, Adele was frustrated she did not get effective feedback prior to conducting a lesson, and felt she had to take up a defensive position because she was subsequently left to struggle through the process on her own. But she also deflected her own criticism by providing an "out" for the teacher - perhaps the teacher was supposed to let her struggle. Adele's language indicates her shifting positions between being a student and being a teacher. She was frustrated with not receiving help, but she also recognizes the teacher's position in letting her learn on her own. She was conflicted as to her role and her teacher's; the vacillating language and contradictions with herself show this tension. Since this is a new transition for the participants, they did not have a strong
basis for comparison to determine if their experience was "normal" or "right." Adele positioned herself as a learner, expecting feedback and assistance from the teacher, however when the teacher did not take up the instructor role Adele was expecting her to, Adele floundered and was uncertain how to view her performance or her position.

The participants’ most prominent source of fear was in long term planning because of its broad, far-reaching scope and newness in the participants’ experiences. "It’s the fogginess that scares me" (Maxwell, January 23, 2013). Bryan expressed this fear in a series of questions: "I haven’t had a chance to teach a whole day. How do you chain those together to a full week, then a full month, and then, a whole year? How do you fit everything together? It's like we've got a lot of loose pieces that are essential, but we haven't had the whole. That’s what I hope to get out of student teaching - really learn how to gel everything together" (November 7, 2012). However, even as they progressed through student teaching, the participants found long-term planning to still be problematic. Maxwell explained the dilemma this way, "Because this is new, you're only able to look this far in front of you, as opposed to seeing the big picture, and that's kind of frustrating" (January 23, 2013). Because they are positioned as novice teachers and do not have experience teaching for an extended period of time, they cannot see the entire road. Most of the time, particularly at the beginning, they can only see the things immediately in front of them - planning only days in advance and unable to develop contingency plans - because they do not yet have the long-range vision to see where
they are going. They haven’t been down the road and have to take each turn as it comes instead of anticipating what may be around the next bend. This is frustrating to the participants because they believe they are responsible for student learning – taking up the moral position of teacher – but they are limited by their inexperience and unable to fulfill the expectations they believe are placed on them by others in the educational field.

**Starts and Stops and Starts Again - Positioning as both Teacher and Learner**

In this section, the participants largely engage in *tacit, first order positioning*. They are student teachers, and their professors’, administrators’, supervisors’, and lead teachers’ expectation is that they *learn* how to be a teacher through the internship process. However, there were times when they had to engage in *intentional positioning* when students took up *second order positions* to challenge their role as "teacher." The stops and starts the participants experienced were often the result of dichotomous positions and expectations associated with each position and were sometimes contradictory. As teachers, they are supposed to have answers; as students they are still learning skills and gaining experience. While this dichotomy causes frustration at times, because they accept their positioning as learners, they develop “failure resistance” and continue to take risks, learn from their mistakes and grow as future teachers.

Because Bryan, Adele, and Maxwell are student or novice teachers, they have conscious incompetence (Howell, 1982); they are often aware of what they don’t know (though there are time they don’t know what they don’t know), but are not
entirely sure how to learn it. New drivers must be acutely aware of not only the route they have chosen to take, but also must consciously analyze how to coordinate the clutch and gearshift; how to steer; how to look between the speedometer, rearview mirror, side mirror, short, medium, and long distance views; determine what the weather is doing and which switches to engage as a result; where the road is going; and what signs say all simultaneously while making split-second decisions. This is until they gain unconscious competence (Howell, 1982) and subsequently some automaticity to these actions. New teachers are the same way. They must be able to negotiate classroom behavior, individual student needs, instructional planning, content, resources, physical space, and a multitude of other stimuli at the same time, making adjustments and decisions at a moment’s notice. They do not have the experience or "with-it-ness" yet to be able to prioritize some of these stimuli while moving others to the background and making adjustments to this arrangement as necessary. As a result, they engage in a series of stops and starts, jerking forward and backward and forward again, and at times, completely stalling out only to have to restart the engine.

Bryan experienced a series of stops and starts related to his students’ behavior and his actions as a teacher. In his second week of student teaching, he was trying to instruct a math lesson, but the first graders "were just not listening. I was having a tough time managing the class," (January 21, 2013). "The students were being obnoxious and not participating. I had to take two minutes off their recess for misbehavior. After the lesson, I debriefed with my lead and told her I felt
like the kids were testing me, and this was a power struggle. My lead [teacher] gave me an idea, and the following day, I met the class at music and walked them back to the classroom room to start the two minutes lost of recess from the previous math lesson. While students 'did their time,' we talked about my expectations of them during my time teaching and the appropriate behavior they needed to show. We also discussed the reasons why they lost recess and how they should act. We went over quiet signals my lead teacher uses that I also would be using. I felt I needed to end the power struggle and let students know that even though I am a new teacher to them, the same good behavior they show to my lead teacher, is the same behavior I expect. The following day during math, I had no behavior issues and the whole class was respectful and participating. I felt like I gained their respect and, even though I don't like taking away recess, it was necessary to end the power struggle. The rest of the week went well, and after that small incident, there was noticeably better participation and no management issues” (Week 2 Reflection). In this situation, Bryan had accepted his moral positioning as the teacher with the power and control of the classroom, however because his students did not initially view him as "teacher," they rejected this positioning and challenged his authority by acting out. They claimed power over the classroom routine. Bryan then had to engage in intentional positioning by withholding recess time and reminding the students of his expectations in order to reestablish his position as teacher.

However, the process of learning how to manage student behaviors is an ongoing one. Even though Bryan had some success in the above incident, he was
challenged again a week later with another math lesson that began well, but then met with some difficulty. "The lesson had some good points, but also there were times where managing student behavior took away from learning of the content. To start the lesson, I used pictures of hamburgers and an alligator to hook students. This worked well, and I built the anticipation by having two student volunteers come up to the front to hold the mysterious pictures (hamburgers). All of the students were engaged and wanted to know what the pictures were of. I used this excitement to teach the concept of greater than and less than. I anticipated that because the lesson was at the end of the day, students would be loud and excited. This was an understatement. It turned out that the opening portion of the lesson worked well but after the hook, I spent time redirecting misbehavior and gaining student attention. I tried switching gears and using the active board to get some student interaction. This worked briefly, and students seemed to focus when they knew they might get the opportunity to come up to the board and answer a question. From this point, the lesson kind of headed south. I did not get a chance to have a nice closure and review main points from the lesson.

"On the bright side, I gave my assessment and only a few students did not answer all questions correctly. This made me feel good because although behavior was a problem, learning still took place. In retrospect, I was proud of myself for staying calm and using many management techniques to control behavior. There were things I could have done better, such as explicit directions before handing out a worksheet. However, as a whole I felt like the lesson was a good first observation,
and I know with more experience I will improve" (Week 4 Reflection). Again, Bryan's students challenged his moral positioning as teacher, and he had to intentionally reposition himself as the authority figure in the classroom by making adjustments to the lesson as it evolved. He also positioned himself as a learner - "there are things I could have done better" - and recognized growth is part of the process. Because of this, he was able to identify what he did well - "staying calm and using many management techniques" - and build on those successes instead of wallowing in his mistakes. Bryan has taken up a dual position of being both a teacher and a learner. He recognizes student teaching is a learning process where mistakes will occur, and because of this, he has developed what Dweck and Molden (2005) refer to as "failure resilience" because he adopts an incremental belief attributing his mistakes to a learning process, not a reflection of his talent, ability, or character. Even though he has encountered stops, he continues to reflect, make repairs, and find a way to get back on the road again.

However, just as he was starting to build momentum and "see a growth in myself; getting comfortable in the situation," he came to another roadblock. "There's a few girls in whole group discussions - some of the responses I get from two or three of them - I can't see the misconception...I'm trying to make an attempt to really understand. Part of it - no excuses - but they receive enrichment; they're Tier 3. They're not special ed yet, so in that sense, I do feel a little helpless because I don't even know where to start with those three because it's a culmination of things. Behavior. I'm sort of clueless to what's going on in their minds. I mean, not to
sound rude, but they’ll be sitting there watching me. I’ll ask a question, and kids will be responding; we’ll be writing stuff on the board. I can tell they’re engaged, and I’ll ask one a similar question, and I will get an answer completely -- The last time I was being observed, the response I got from one of these students, I didn’t even know what to say. I couldn’t clarify her answer. I just kind of froze for a second, and I was like, ‘Can you explain a little more?’ Then she was trying to explain, and she’s also an EL so her accent is kind of hard to understand when she talks...But, I couldn’t understand the thinking. I’m trying to see where she’s coming from. So, that’s one thing I’m still trying to figure out” (February 24, 2013). In this circumstance, Bryan feels powerless. Positioned as a teacher, he is responsible for student learning and expected to know what to do, but as a student teacher, he has not gained the skill set and experience to address the situation yet.

Adele takes up similar conflicted positions. As a teacher, she expects and is expected to be able to convey the learning necessary to students, however as a student teacher, she does not yet have the skills and competence to be able to do so, and this dichotomy is reflected in her own stop and start experiences. "Writing traits can be difficult to explain to a high school student, and as I was attempting to explain Word Choice and Voice in a way that seven and eight-year-olds will understand, I could feel myself becoming flustered. At the time I knew something was not clicking with the students, and I was struggling to find the right words. Of course, if I am struggling to even understand myself, there is no way that the students are getting what these two writing traits are all about."
"So while I was struggling and becoming flustered, there were two students peeling their nametags off their desks and wrinkling them and re-sticking them and just plain not listening. Not only were they not listening, though, I became further distracted by the fact that they were not listening to me. Reflecting on what I should have done now, the best thing to do would have been stop, take a breath, and call on my lead teacher to help me. Instead, I proceeded to walk (in a stomping manner) to the two students’ desks and with force take their nametags off their desks. I immediately felt bad and was then even a little embarrassed because my lead teacher took over shortly after that. We discussed the writing portion of the lesson, and she said that she just knows after many years of teaching how to teach students these writing traits. But in a way, I was more concerned with how I reacted to my stress.

"At lunch, I taped the nametags back on the desks and told the two boys I put them back, and they were not to touch them (please). My lead teacher simply said the fact that I felt badly about my reaction was enough, and we moved on to how we can teach the writing traits so that students will be successful. Having had this experience early on in internship helped me realize when I am becoming flustered and at a point where the instruction is no longer productive. It is okay to call for help when needed, and even when I am in full control, if there is something that I am not quite sure how to teach, my lead teacher will still be able to help me. Although embarrassed about my actions, I can now assure that I keep myself in check while teaching" (Week 5 Reflection). In this situation, Adele was trying to conform to her
moral position of teacher, but when she was ineffective in her instruction, her students began to act up, challenging her role as the class authority. In her frustration with herself at not being able to fulfill the position of teacher because of ineffective instruction, she attempted to regain her authoritative positioning through stomping to the students and forcefully removing their name tags. However, she realized at that moment and afterward these were ineffective actions to intentionally reposition herself as the head of the classroom. Her lead teacher stepped in and, by taking the class back over, repositioned Adele as a learner. When Adele reflected back on the situation, she was able to identify her errors and determine what she would do differently to construct a different storyline the next time such a situation occurred.

Another example of Adele’s stops and starts occurred when she gave a math assessment that students did not do well on. She had to reflect on her own performance and make a decision based on that reflection. "I did a math activity that just bombed, and I showed [my lead teacher] the papers, and I said, 'These are awful. They didn't learn anything, and I didn't teach it right. Can I throw these away?' And she said, 'Yeah, sometimes things don't work, and you know what? Just let it go. They're going to get more practice with it in the final lesson and it carries over into the next unit" (January 21, 2013). Because Adele took up a position as learner, she was able to realize her execution of the lesson was flawed, and as a result, her students did not learn the concept. Rather than blame students, she took
responsibility, and, with the help of her lead teacher, redesigned and retaught the lesson so students could better understand it.

By taking up a first order position of being a learner, the participants were able to reflect, persevere, and, at times, have very positive experiences that encouraged them to continue to take risks, make mistakes, and learn. One example of this success was Maxwell's "sludge flea" lesson, which he adapted for his fifth graders from a lesson he experienced in his university science methods course. "When it was time to teach the lesson, I was nervous. I had my girlfriend drop off the overnight package, which of course had hazardous labels on it (this makes the students believe it’s dangerous; it’s not). I told the students how excited and lucky I was to have my Grandpa send me this new source of energy, Sludge Fleas. While I had the students take notes on Sludge Fleas, they could see them in the jar moving up and down because the jar was out and visible (close to me, not them). The highlight of the lesson came when I told students the best thing about Sludge Fleas is that they are a great source of protein. I then ate two Sludge Fleas, and the students flipped out. 'Mr. Shaw!!' 'Eww!' 'You’re gross!' 'I can never look at you the same!' You name it, and the students said it. I then followed this with a couple of coughs and explained that the exoskeleton of Sludge Fleas can get caught in my teeth. I then drank ‘pond water,’ and the students lost it.

I loved doing this lesson because students are so funny and their faces are the best. Did my teacher really just eat Sludge Fleas? Is this real? What the heck? I explained to students the next day that I didn’t eat Sludge Fleas, and the reason the
raisins were able to move up and down is because of buoyancy. When the raisins are in the soda, carbon dioxide molecules attach themselves to the raisin; this makes the raisin less dense. The raisin eventually becomes buoyant and floats to the surface. Once it reaches the surface, carbon dioxide bubbles pop and the raisin sinks to the bottom" (Sludge Fleas Lesson Reflection). Sludge fleas gave Maxwell an opportunity to succeed at enacting the type of engaging teacher he strives to be. Positioned as a learner, he experienced and internalized this lesson; then positioned as a teacher, he was able to execute it himself. This success helped him build efficacy and encouraged him to step more into his teacher positioning and less into his student positioning.

Another outcome of the participants' taking up first order positions as learners is that it allowed their lead teachers and supervisors to take up positions as coaches to assist them in their transitions. If they had taken up positions equating themselves with teachers with the core knowledge and experience of veteran teachers, their supervisors may not have been as accepting or willing to assist them. However, because Bryan, Adele, and Maxwell were willing to accept their moral positioning as student teachers with a great deal to learn, they were able to ask for, receive, and effectively use support and guidance from the people overseeing them. For example, Maxwell explained, "My lead teacher was always there for support, which was nice because if I had a question I could go to her. For instance, if we were running behind in reading that afternoon, what should we do? I would ask her because I know that she wants to be at guided reading and STEM questions by 2PM
every day. Should we continue reading with the students, or should we stop where we are and break out into small guided reading groups? One of the most important things that I learned from my lead teacher during my internship in 5th grade was that teachers are not perfect, and we do make mistakes. Before my internship I had this idea of what a real teacher was like; now I know that real teachers make mistakes. Teachers are human and can forget to do certain things every once in a while. I learned that if we come across mistakes that the best thing to do is to own up to it" (Week 10 Reflection).

Bryan echoed how much he appreciated even small bits of guidance from his lead teacher to help him get past a series of stops and put him back into gear again. "Math is at the end of the day, so it’s a constant struggle with not having a good lesson. Then slowly, it started to click. I was doing calendar in the morning, and I took some helpful hints my lead teacher gave me. She's like, 'They can't sit there for too long, so get them up and moving.' I think it was two or three weeks ago, I did that. I started doing Simon Says in between as my transition and they just love it. So now my lead teacher is like, 'Okay, you can make that a little educational.' It takes no more than a minute, and it's like a brain break...This has helped me get better at reading their body language and know they need a break" (February 24, 2013). Allowing themselves to learn opened the participants to absorb teacher knowledge (Shulman, 1987) their lead teachers had gained through their own experiences.
Making Adjustments

In this section, the participants tend to use first order positioning as reflective teachers who evaluate themselves in relation to their and their students’ performance. They see themselves as responsible for student learning, not outside forces or even the students themselves. This means they rely on reflection and reflexivity in their instructional and pedagogical decisions and adjustments, asking what they need to do to ensure each lesson is better.

One of the skills teachers develop as they gain experience and unconscious competence is an ability to make classroom adjustments in the moment. This has been a source of stress for the participants because, as student teachers, they are uncertain of how to "read" a class and do not have enough options readily available in their toolbox to readjust as needed. They experienced stops and starts as they tried to determine when to push through a lesson, when and how to make minor adjustments, and when to completely abandon a lesson and change directions. Adele pointed out, "While teaching, I generally follow the skeleton of the lesson, but when students are obviously confused, I cannot go on and just hope that they catch up. I have noticed that during math, a lot of times students need more examples...Making instructional decisions immediately while teaching can be productive but could also end in set-backs; by making a decision on the spot, the teacher is helping the students be successful immediately. The problem with that becomes could there have been an even better solution? Are more steps being taken on the spot than would be necessary if the teacher simply stopped what
he/she was doing and came back to it after reflecting at the end of the lesson? It is a hard decision to make because in the “right now” of the lesson, we want students to understand the material and be successful, but we must always think what is the best solution, and that may not come to us right away while we are juggling the many pieces of a lesson” (Week 7 Reflection).

Bryan also believed "sticking out" a lesson and reflecting later was a better route to take. "Adjustments constantly need to be made while teaching. I have found that even if a lesson is going well or went well, something can be done to improve the overall effectiveness of a lesson. I have found that adjusting in the middle of a lesson is not always the best idea but is sometimes necessary. During one math lesson, the majority of the class understood frames and arrows, while a small group of students did not seem to have a clue how to solve the problem. My lead suggested she pull them and work in a small group while I continue with the rest of the class and move on to the rest of the lesson. This was a decision made on the “fly” and worked well in this case. However, being in a class by yourself does not warrant enough manpower to shift students to small group when remediation is necessary. I also prefer to stick to my lesson plan and not change in the middle of a lesson unless the adjustments are minor. My personal preference is to reflect on the effectiveness of a lesson and consider adjustments to improve instruction for the next lesson. I also think that making instructional changes while teaching, wastes instructional time. This is especially true if students have to be moved such as regrouping or different supplies have to be gathered. For these reasons, I have
found that time is better spent sticking to a plan, reflecting on the lesson, and then making adjustments for future lessons" (Week 7 Reflection).

Maxwell saw making adjustments as part of his responsibility to ensuring quality student learning. He related them to making mistakes and needing to correct them. In one interview he said, "The test was passed out and [my lead teacher and I] were looking it over and realized that one of the questions didn’t have the correct answer listed (multiple choice). What did we do? We told the students they needed to redirect their attention to us and switch two numbers so that the correct answer was now available for them to choose from. Mistake was fixed just like that, and it didn’t have to be difficult.

Now what happens if the students do not notice a mistake that I made? Is it okay to just continue with them under this misconception? No way; it’s not okay to continue teaching students just because no one has called out a mistake or asked, 'Mr. Shaw, are you sure?" (Mistakes - They Happen Reflection). Because Maxwell, Bryan, and Adele take up positions as individuals who own the responsibility for their students' learning, they attempt to make the best decisions in an instant that they can. At this point, that means Bryan and Adele are less likely to change directions in the middle of a lesson, but will reflect deeply after the lesson and take steps to anticipate and ameliorate the issues for next time. Maxwell, because he takes up the position of responsibility of getting everyone on his team, is more likely to switch gears in mid-lesson to make sure everyone is in the car and driving in the right direction. He is also further along the transition continuum than Bryan and
Adele, having gained more experience and autonomy as a teacher and positioned less as a student (He has graduated; he was finishing his second internship as the other two were entering their first). This may account for his greater efficacy in making on-the-spot adjustments to lessons.

**Working with Parents**

In their interactions with parents, the participants tended to take up *first order positions* as allies, though stops and starts also occurred in their interactions. This was partly because parents were an unknown factor in their transition. While they had experiences in their university coursework to address curriculum, standards, testing, planning, and working with both students and teachers, they had very little if any experience with parents from which to pull. This meant they did not know what positions to take up with parents because they did not know how parents as a whole would position them. Maxwell expressed this confusion, "I'm just nervous around parents. I haven't dealt with them a lot...What are their expectations of the teacher? What do they want me to do?" (December 11, 2012).

However, the participants also learned quickly to position themselves as allies with parents with whom they worked in order to foster better learning situations for students. "I realized the parents know their student or their child. I mean, you say, 'Their behavior is this,' or 'They're going too fast, they just need to slow down.' [Parents] are like 'Yeah, I see this at home. I tell him all the time, or I tell her all the time.' That was kind of nice to relate. When I was running the meeting, I kind of related to the parent a lot" (Maxwell, December 11, 2012).
Maxwell positioned himself as an ally during an IEP meeting he had with a parent who was upset her child was enrolled in the special education program when he explained to her, "[Special education services] are like driving, but with glasses. You know, we're just helping him drive" (January 23, 2013). He also suggested the boy take Read 180 instead of home economics in order to improve his reading fluency. He intentionally positioned himself as caring and concerned for her son and on an even level with her rather than take a more dominant and superior position. Maxwell's offering the parent a new way to consider how the special education services could help her child, as opposed to the negative storyline from which she was operating, allowed her to accept the circumstances and instead find solutions that would benefit her son. She felt personally positioned by the stigma of having her son in special education, however Maxwell’s intentional positioning as a caring ally allowed her to accept the school’s help and "get on the team" with the teachers. The parent called the next day and agreed with Maxwell’s suggestions, despite her earlier apprehension. This gave him some confidence; "I feel that I'm getting better with parents" (January 23, 2013).

Adele also experienced the importance of taking up a position allied with parents when she had an impromptu conference with the mother of a child who had just enrolled in the school. "On Thursday morning, I was walking speedily back to our classroom, and there was our newest student's mom sitting in one of our chairs. She had a brace on her leg, and it took me a minute to take in why she was there; to
talk to us about her son, Jack’s, progress and difficulties. He actually attended our school for kindergarten, and the family moved back recently for reasons we found out while talking to Jack’s mom. At first, my lead teacher wasn’t in the room because she stopped to ask another teacher a question. Of course, I had the students start working so I could speak with Jack’s mom. She told me that Jack hated coming to school, and it was a constant fight each morning to get him out the door. Mom said that Jack would hide so they couldn’t find him, and then they had to force a jacket on him in order to get him to school. She seemed concerned mainly about his reading, which is below grade level right now. Jack’s mom said that he screamed and cried at night because he wasn’t able to read the fluency pieces we sent home for the week.

"I told Jack’s mom that we love having him in our class, and he is a really hard worker. When my lead teacher came into the classroom, I gave her a quick synopsis of what we had been talking about, and she helped find the right words. She also gave Jack some books that day to take home and keep there that were at his appropriate level so that he would not be frustrated at home. The real reason this parent conference was such a big deal - not just a conversation about a student’s progress - was because Jack’s mom told us something very personal about his past. I walked away to redirect the students, but my lead teacher caught me up at our lunch, and I was just about sick to my stomach when she told me what had happened to him. I don’t want to divulge too much about a student’s personal life, but it really helped me figure out how to teach him. He needs a lot of patience and

---

4 All names have been changed.
support right now as what happened to him is pretty recent. It is interesting to me that such a short conversation with a parent can teach you so much about a student" (Week 7 Reflection). Because the parent saw teachers as a means to help her child, positioning herself as an ally who was reliant on teacher partnerships, Adele was able to take up a position of assistance. Additionally, she was able to intentionally position herself as a teacher who better knew how to meet this child's needs. Adele realized that knowing about the boy's background allowed her to empathize with him, better understand what was driving his behaviors, and subsequently better adjust her instructional and curricular choices to meet his needs. She was no longer looking through her own filtered lens, but was now able to consider what the boy's lens might be instead. It also made her aware of how important communication with parents could be in helping her serve students well.

However, the participants also learned that while most of the time taking up a position aligned with parents is a positive experience, there are times this must be weighed with a student's well-being. One of Maxwell's fifth-grade parents came into the school for a conference, and there was concern. "[The mother] is not very nice to [the student], and I think there might be some physical abuse going on there. During the parent conference, we [the teachers] sugar-coated a lot because we didn't want him to get physically abused at home. We didn't say, 'Oh, his attitude's horrible. He's not motivated as much as he should be, has trouble working.'...My special education lead teacher was [concerned] because the mom kept on referring to 'slap, slap, slap' a little bit too much. I've never done anything with CPS [Child
Protective Services], so I don’t know when you would call“ (December 11, 2012). In this case, Maxwell and the students’ other teachers had to decide to take up a position that was protective of the student even though it was an uncomfortable and even disconcerting situation which positioned them potentially in opposition with the parent. They are positioned by legal policy, required to report any suspected abuse to CPS, regardless of what personal positioning they may want to take. It was not enough to simply "sugar-coat" the issues the boy was having at school; by law, the teachers are not only expected to but compelled to make a report to protect the child regardless of how they may want to position themselves with the parents. The teachers must provide power for the student in a situation where he cannot speak up or out against his parents’ actions.

**Summary Analysis of Storyline #1**

As the participants first engaged in their student teaching internships, they often engaged in *first order positioning* as learners attempting to understand how to apply the theoretical knowledge and skills they had gained through university courses and practicums. They accepted their *moral positioning* as learners within their internships relying on feedback from supervisors or lead teachers, and responding to mistakes or difficulties by reflecting on the circumstances, determining ways to improve, and resolving to change the storyline for next time. They attributed mistakes to being part of the learning process, and did not consider these "stops" to be a reflection on their character, ability, or potential. At no point did they identify themselves as "failures," "bad teachers," or "unable to do this;" they
acknowledged mistakes as mistakes and used them as growth opportunities. According to Dweck and Molden (2005), there exist two primary views of intelligence that “attribute” success or failure to a stable or unstable, uncontrollable or controllable feature. In the “entity” view of intelligence (stable, uncontrollable), individuals believe they are born with certain immutable degrees of ability uninfluenced by environmental factors. In the “incremental” view (unstable, controllable), individuals believe a person's intelligence is malleable; they get smarter by taking on challenges, and making progressive steps toward goals. This position makes them more resilient to failure, able to “bounce back” and learn from mistakes. Because Bryan, Adele, and Maxwell predominantly engaged in first order positioning as learners through their transitional experiences, they did not blame themselves, refuse to take risks, or give up. They persevered, always starting again and adding each new piece of learning to their acquired teacher knowledge base (Shulman, 1987).

**Storyline #2 - Tensions and Conflicts: The Negative Side of Participants’ Positioning**

**Dealing with Other Drivers and Rules of the Road**

The greatest tensions the participants faced in their transitions were at points where the positions they took up as a result of their past experiences, philosophies, and training were in conflict with the positions of individuals - professors, teachers, students, and supervisors - and institutions - curriculum, pedagogy, testing, standards, and school environment - they encountered. Often,
these individuals and institutions had storylines askew to the participants, and because of the participants’ *moral position* hierarchically as students or preservice teachers, they were often forced to reposition themselves or risk consequences, perceived or real, for not doing so. Because of their training in social justice, equity, differentiation, and critical thinking, they were often in a dilemma as to whether to accept the moral position as student teachers or to take up a *second order position* and challenge their assumed subjugation.

**University Influences and Models - Shifting Positions**

In this section, participants initially took up *first order positions* as students learning from their teachers or professors, and those positions were usually *personal* because the participants modeled themselves after the individuals who demonstrated the traits and characteristics they wanted to emulate. However, when they were faced with faculty members who they did not believe modeled effective instructional practices or pedagogy, they engaged in *second order positioning*, rejecting the models and sometimes even the content from these courses.

Lortie (1975) has proposed that teachers gain implicit and tacit knowledge of teaching by apprenticing through observation from the time they first enter school. While in most cases they are not "privy to the teacher's private intentions and personal reflections on classroom events" (Borg, 2004, p. 274), they are able to "recall specific and vivid instances, both positive and negative, from their own educations, and reflect on them in productive ways" (Mewborn & Tyminski, 2006, p.
In this way, they may recreate positive practices they learned while deliberately and intentionally countering negative conditions that were detrimental or missing from their own experience (Mewborn & Tyminkski, 2006; Tomlinson, 1999; Zeichner & Gore, 1990).

All three participants discussed ways their philosophies and teaching practices were shaped by their university training. They particularly cited classes that were fun, engaging, challenging, and flexible as making an impact on the type of teachers they wanted to become. As Maxwell stated, “I never really paid attention to how the teachers taught until I came to the university. Then I took responsibility for my own learning...I’m glad I finally did find the motivation. You [Jennifer] were very flexible as a teacher. You’re always so nice. It was like going to your class was one of the better classes of my whole entire week because it was like, I knew it was going to be fun and engaging. It was three hours, yes, but it was just like, bam, over” (November 27, 2012). In subsequent interviews, Maxwell frequently cited flexibility and engagement as critical aspects of being a good teacher.

A key component was that participants learned as much from what they observed teachers and professors do as from the content taught. “We don’t have rows of students any more. Table groups, obviously engaging the students. I learned that through you [Jennifer] and another professor. You were just really big on making sure the students were comfortable. Icebreakers were huge, you know. Like those little things that take five, ten minutes. Not a lot of other teachers might have done it or thought to do it. You know the content, but do you know how to
engage students, and make everyone feel like they actually have a say in the class? So, that was huge” (Maxwell, November 27, 2012). Interestingly, when Maxwell began his teaching job mid-year, one of the first things he did was to conduct some ice breakers and use the “My Job, Your Job, Our Job” lesson plan for establishing classroom expectations that I had used to begin both classes he had with me (Morrison, lesson plans, Spring 2010). He took up a first order position, like with the sludge fleas lesson plan, intentionally modeling himself after teachers whose classes he had positively experienced and whose techniques he wanted to emulate.

For Maxwell, the university education program was a transformative experience. “I learned that literacy is everything. The more I realized how important it was... I became more self-conscious of myself as a reader... It made me more conscious as a reader – my own interests – and that when I go as a teacher, I have to have magazines, biographies, comics. You know, all sorts of books because I realize as a reader, I like sports books” (November 27, 2012).

The self-realization Maxwell gained from his literacy classes carried into his understanding of what students need and want as readers, and it also helped him develop ways to become a better literacy teacher. “I think going into student teaching, one of the murky areas – not like a weakness – was the reading comprehension, helping students understand the text they’re reading at their ability level, whatever level it is. But when I did student teach, it was like reading the book in [our literacy] class. You have stopping points. You help the students to understand. You ask them a question, like maybe inference. ‘I wonder how he’s
feeling.’ So reading comprehension was maybe a weakness, but I realized you can really delve deep into those texts. The students that can’t read it, you just – no one knows you’re helping them out because you’re helping everyone really understand the text. So you just question them. ‘And, oh really?’ They say something. ‘Oh, why? Oh, why? And why? What do you think happens next? Make predictions.’ You know I just realized that reading books can be fun, and getting those strategies – ‘What do you think is going to happen next? We’ll come back to that. What do you think he really means when he says this?’ Just helping the students understand inference. That was one of my weaknesses, and I think now might be my strength because I know how to discuss it and help students understand what I want them to understand, and that they bring a different point of view to the story” (November 27, 2012). In this example, Maxwell is shifting his position from that of a student learning the skills modeled within his university classrooms to that of a teacher actually engaging in the strategies and witnessing their effect for himself. He carries the positive feelings and learning he experienced into his teaching to replicate for his own students.

*Enacting Differentiation*

It was also apparent the participants had internalized conceptions of meeting students’ individual needs through differentiation. For example, one of the points when Adele became frustrated was when the two first grade teachers were insisting their teaching needed to be the same even though leading and lagging data said the students were performing differently. Her response of “Different students would
need different supports, so why, why should it be the same?” (January 21, 2013) indicates she understands the necessity to provide individualized and appropriate instruction for students. In this case, Adele took a second order position, challenging the notion that learning in both classrooms should be identical regardless of student needs. She followed through with meeting these needs when she created a supportive resource for her special education students. “My idea was to create a resource for students to either keep at their desk to pull out when needed or to keep them in a neutral place where students could access them as needed. The resource I made is like a folder; a large piece of construction paper folded in half with basic information on the four sides. I had them laminated as well so they can withstand little first grade hands. We are using a new phonics guide for decoding words, and that is included on the resource for students to reference” (Week 4 Reflection).

Bryan also demonstrated an understanding of differentiation and attempted to use it in several ways within his student teaching experience. “My lead teacher believes in teaching to the highest student and scaffolding for all the other levels. This is a real challenge, and I find myself constantly thinking of ways to challenge the high students in my class while not making lessons too hard that lower students become frustrated. One way I try and keep lessons challenging is by providing auditory, visual, and kinesthetic information. This meets the needs of certain learners while also challenging students who are not as comfortable with a certain learning style” (Week 6 Reflection).
When Maxwell took over mid-year as a full-time special education teacher, he explained how he handled a student who had been extremely disruptive with the prior teacher. “He’s emotionally disturbed so he doesn’t know how to have relationships with the teachers or peers, and I really feel that the other teacher didn’t understand that – understand his disability. It’s not like he’s trying to do it; it’s proven his behavior affects his academics. So I let him sit in the back, the last row, and if he wants to get up, he doesn’t disturb the whole class, I’m trying to increase his time in his seat...’Fair’ to every student means it’s not the same. ‘Fair’ changes for every student” (January 23, 2013). By defining “fair” in individual terms based on each child’s circumstances and contexts, Maxwell demonstrated he not only understood but could implement conceptions of differentiation.

The participants position themselves as advocates for different styles of learning, flexible to assist all students. This positioning choice, according to the participants, is a direct result of their experiencing flexible, engaging, and differentiated classrooms, as well as classes that did not demonstrate these qualities, in their own school careers, particularly in university and practicum classrooms.

**To Emulate or Not To Emulate**

In this section, participants tended to engage in second order positioning, challenging the conceptions of "teacher" and "student" with which they were presented in their own storylines. When they encountered teachers who were frustrating, technology-phobic, inconsistent, or just countered their beliefs, the
participants were faced with conflicts as to how to respond and the degree to which they chose to take action.

It was not always the positive examples that influenced the participants. As Bryan stated, “There are many aspects that have influenced my philosophy of teaching. Number one is probably my parents and my upbringing...Also, good and bad teachers. I consider the teachers in the classes I despised, and how they, even up until college, and even now there are a few classes that I just do not look forward to for various reasons. I don't necessarily want to teach how I was taught, particularly in some classes” (November 7, 2012). In reference to his math practicum, he added, “That class was a good example of what not to do basically” (December 18, 2012). He even stated the ineffectiveness of this class hindered his desire and confidence to teach math in his internship. Maxwell also indicated he learned from the bad examples as much as from the good ones. “Engaging the students, questioning each student, building rapport – it seems like you [Jennifer] have really good rapport. It was never bad to come to class in your class. I had a behavior class for special ed just last spring, and it was just like we had two hours and forty-five minutes of PowerPoint. It was just unbelievable – not engaging at all. So, I just learned engaging students, moving. Do not just sit there. Be lively. Don't be boring. No one wants to be the boring teacher” (November 27, 2012). While neither Bryan nor Maxwell broke from their moral positions as students, they did observe, learn, reflect, absorb, and when given the opportunity to enact their
teaching philosophies, intentionally positioned themselves in opposition to the negative storylines they had experienced.

There were times, when participants saw something in a classroom that countered what they were taught at the university, and they had to reconcile this information. One example is when Bryan met with his lead teacher for the first time and she explained to him how she grouped students. “She has thirty-four kids in there so she has six groups, and they’re all grouped by ability. She said, ‘You know, people talk about grouping students by ability or tracking them. If they’re a low group, they’re always going to be low.’ But she was like, ‘This is the way I differentiate. I group them by ability.’ She’s like, ‘By no means am I saying I want them to stay low, but they’re getting the support they need because I know where they’re at and then when we work in small groups, I can work with five at the same time’” (December 18, 2012). Bryan was conflicted about this because his university training had explicitly taught him grouping by ability could be harmful to students and flexible grouping by modality, interest, and readiness levels was a better practice (Morrison lesson plans, EDUC 211, Spring 2010). In this situation, Bryan believed in implementing flexible grouping practices, however because he was positioned subversively as a student teacher working within the confines of the lead teacher’s beliefs and routines, he faced tensions between what he wanted to do and what he was able to do. He wanted to take up a position as teacher with differentiated grouping practices but was not empowered by his role and circumstances to do so and subsequently yielded to the teacher’s milieu.
While overall they were happy with their university training and felt it had sufficiently prepared them for their transition into student teaching, there were areas they felt needed improvement or had been completely omitted. Bryan felt he had not been trained enough in how to address the strict structures and pressures resulting from federal and local policy; “It [the university program] didn’t prepare me for a structured, rigid curriculum” (January 21, 2013). After a negative math practicum experience, Adele commented, “Grading procedures were not consistent from week to week or from person to person. The classroom I was in was awful. I think they [the university officials] need to screen the teachers before they place us because the teacher I had had no classroom management. Were they trying to torture us, because the lack of classroom management didn’t make it a learning experience? I don’t feel that I really learned how to teach math because of it” (December 20, 2012). The participants were not usually empowered as students to challenge their learning circumstances; they would risk their grades if they did. However, once they began to gain more power in their transition, they reflected on what they disliked and attempted to enact their roles as teachers differently, though this was not always possible within the confines of the student teaching experience.

**Making an Impression – Held to the Same Standard**

Positioned as student teachers, Bryan, Adele, and Maxwell wanted and needed to make a good impression on others and meet their expectations. They wanted to be viewed as valuable, contributing members of teams, effective teachers who demonstrated quality instruction, individuals who cared about their students,
and potential employees worthy of being recommended and hired for jobs. Because
they were seeking good recommendations and observations from their lead
teachers and good grades from their professors, the interns often took positions of
acquiescence so they would not be seen as troublesome or causing conflict. “I’ve set
the bar for myself high, which was my plan. I knew that...I’m not trying to fool
[supervisors] into thinking I’m good. I want them to be impressed that, ‘Oh, she’s
growing. Oh, she wants to improve in these areas.’ That’s what I was thinking I
wanted – to impress them so that I do get good feedback” (Adele, December 20,
2012). “I want to finish strong because I definitely want a job here” (Maxwell,
December 11, 2012).

This positioning was particularly stressful because even though the
participants were learning and gaining experience, they were expected to still
deliver quality instruction at the level of veteran teachers. Allen (2009) points out
that new teachers are expected to perform their roles of teaching “to a professional
standard” as soon as they enter classrooms. “Lack of experience is no longer a
useful alibi for new graduates who flounder in the classroom” (p. 651). Maxwell
recognized he was positioned in this way when he stated, “Right now, I’m only a
student intern, but I’m trying to be as professional as I can be. So like, what do they
expect out of me? If they ask me a question, am I going to know it? If I don’t know it,
what’ll I do? Help, you know, because on my first day, my first year teaching, I’m
going to be held to the same standards as a fifteen year teacher on her first day or
his first day” (November 27, 2012).
In the Midst

In this section, the participants tended to relegate themselves to *first order moral positions* as student teachers within their teaching contexts because they lacked the experience, organizational history, and background knowledge necessary to institute change, and they were professionally respectful of the decisions which predated their arrival within their respective contexts, recognizing they did not have all the information nor all the answers.

Clandinin and Connelly (2000) discuss how narrative researchers are always "in the midst - located somewhere along the dimensions of time, place, the personal, and the social" (p. 63). We drop into a story already in progress, with participants living their lives before we ever enter the inquiry field. Additionally, participants’ institutions and communities - their narrative landscapes - are also in the midst of stories (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). The stories are ongoing; the plotlines extending to the past and future, and we enter the narrative without necessarily knowing events that have occurred or context for particular circumstances.

The same was true for Bryan, Adele, and Maxwell as they transitioned into their student teaching internships. While all three conducted observations and met with their lead teachers before they began their general education internships, they were still positioned as newcomers, dropped into the classroom, school, and district plotlines which had been occurring since the beginning of the semester, the beginning of the year, or even over several years. This caused confusion for the interns, who often did not follow conversations or reasoning for existing decisions.
For example, Adele faced confusion when counselors or other support people would come into PLC meetings to "talk to the teachers. I'm looking and trying to listen, but I'm like, 'What are you talking about?' Or they're talking about a meeting they had with the principal or something that happened before we were there, something [a teaching strategy] they were trying. So, I'm kind of lost" (January 21, 2013).

Being "in the midst" of existing plotlines also put the interns into a position of having to simply accept the way things had been established. Maxwell discussed how he wanted to teach standards well and be sure he was reading them correctly, but he was unable to give his input as to how "correctly" was defined or how he envisioned them being taught. "I didn't plan with the fifth grade team back in June, so I don't know how they exactly said, 'We're going to hit this standard with this book.' I don't know how they did that. I wasn't necessarily involved in that planning. The standards were already lined up to the books, and what we had already been teaching, so that was kind of nice. But I know that I don't see everything the same as you, and you don't see the same as me" (December 11, 2012). Because he had not had a voice in how the standards should or could be taught and what curricular vehicles to use, he was bound to teach them in the way they had been established by another group of people. While this made it easier for him to execute the lessons, they may or may not have been designed and planned in line with his philosophies or ideas. However, Maxwell was also respectful that these decisions were made by professional educators with standards and student learning
in mind and was more willing to simply accept the existing circumstances as a result.

**Socialization - I Do What My Lead Teacher Does**

In this section, the participants were often conflicted with their positioning they wanted to take, often shifting from *first order moral positions* as student teachers with little perceived power to *second order positioning*, challenging the status quo and attempting to fight socialization processes. Sometimes these shifts happened within the same discursive interchanges as the participants grappled with how they fit within complex contexts and what type of storyline they wanted to write for themselves while still maintaining good relationships with their supervisors and lead teachers.

As a result of their being newcomers in the midst attempting to learn and survive within new contexts, Bryan, Adele, and Maxwell became susceptible to socialization processes (Loughran, Brown & Doecke, 2001). These processes make it difficult at times for student interns and novice teachers to “teach against the grain” (Cochran-Smith, 1991) because they are generally trying to cope with the pressures associated with being a full-time teacher. The expectation of the participants, their supervisors, and their lead teachers was for them to learn and absorb how to be teachers, but this disregarded what the interns knew and brought with them into their student teaching contexts (Tomlinson, 1999). Allen (2009) states processes of workplace socialization can begin to appear from participants’ first entry into their school environments, usually revealed through changes in their
“social selves” and how they “come to attach meanings to aspects of classroom life through interpersonal exchanges” within the classroom setting (p. 651). Loughran et al. (2001) also argue that innovative, creative, and critical thinking practices interns may have learned and developed in their university training may be “severely dampened” (p. 8) by pressures of conformity. In this study, the three participants struggled with reconciling their teaching beliefs, their university training, and the demands of their lead teachers, who were impacted by institutional issues such as compliance with highly structured curricula, implementation of the Common Core State Standards, and meeting assessment expectations. There were points where they demonstrated socialization, but there were also points where the participants showed resistance to socialization processes by taking up positions that countered existing plotlines.

While it was often beneficial for the interns to take up positions as learners within their student teaching contexts, because they were “in the midst” as learners in a new environment, they relied heavily on their lead teachers’ guidance. They often acceptingly followed the lead teachers’ instructional, pedagogical, curricular, and organizational decisions, or they became affected by their lead teachers’ behaviors.

They were sometimes conflicted about this. Bryan explained, "For my own sake, I’d like to take over maybe four weeks of [the ten week internship] because it’s my student teaching. I want to get the most out of it while still making sure her students meet the requirements they need to" (November 7, 2012). He recognized
his lead teacher is positioned as someone responsible for ensuring her students gain certain skills and content knowledge regardless of who is in her classroom. On the other hand, he positioned himself as a student who wants to learn as much as possible from this experience. He reconciled this situation by taking his subverted moral position - student teacher - and conducting himself in line with his lead teacher's decisions.

Allen (2009) points out that many interns must conform to the status quo because their lead teachers are “unaware of or unconvinced” (p. 651) by the knowledge base student teachers bring with them from university training. This appeared to be the case with Bryan, Adele, and Maxwell. While there were attempts on Adele’s lead teacher’s part to learn from the observation tools by which Adele was evaluated by her university supervisor, the flow of pedagogical and instructional learning was predominantly from the lead teachers to the student teachers, with the student teachers having little voice in sharing their training, beliefs, or conceptions. They were relegated to "learner" in the relationship with the lead teacher, and they accepted this positioning in almost all circumstances.

One example was when Bryan was conflicted about the texts used for Lead 21, the first grade, programmed curriculum. He felt, “You can’t get much from the book because it’s so low, even the highest group. The books are maybe 150 words, so there’s only so much you can talk about...The books themselves just don’t have that much. There’s not a whole lot to a basic reader...It’s pretty simple answers, but it’s alright though” (January 21, 2013). Bryan spent several minutes elaborating on
the lack of critical thinking opportunities available in the books he was required to use. While this was obviously bothering him, he dismissed the problem with “it’s alright, though.” This final comment seems to indicate a resignation and acceptance of the curriculum’s limitations. This becomes of particular concern because it is in conflict with the university training Bryan internalized and wants to implement. He made reference to wanting to include engaging and “fun” ways to teach – guided reading, read alouds, group discussions – but the reading program’s time constraints and rigid construction did not allow him the opportunity to elevate the level of instruction. Because his lead teacher used the Lead 21 curriculum, Bryan used it. When I asked him about this, he responded, “It just feels like there’s not a whole lot of breathing room to say, ‘Hey, let’s mix it up.’ So, I’m just going with [my lead teacher’s] flow. I guess I don’t really have an answer” (January 21, 2013).

It was apparent, though, Bryan had better ideas within his repertoire as to how to change the curriculum. He recognized this. “In your [Jennifer’s] class, [we were] doing Book Club or Readers’ Theater. All that seemed like creative, fun ways to teach literacy” (January 21, 2013). He also suggested to me a way to improve the instruction occurring in the classroom, though he did not bring this up to his lead teacher. “I would maybe try something different...The data is showing that they [the students] need work on phonics and they need work with breaking up words and putting [them] together...I would reteach it. I guess, yeah, I’d do maybe something with small groups. That seems to work. [My lead teacher] is doing the phonics and word segmentation as whole group, so maybe that’s not meeting their individual
needs. Maybe because they have the whole – the way it’s set up, like whole group reading where she goes through new words for the week. Maybe that’s not – maybe the kids are losing it in the whole group. Maybe they’re just zoning out, I think. And we’re not picking up on the fact that they’re really not there. Even though they seem like they’re paying attention, the scores are showing they’re not. So scratch whole group and get them through rotation. I think that’d be the only way to me, just for the sheer size of the class, 32 kids, and there’s three of us in there. That’ll definitely, I think, help” (January 21, 2013).

It is apparent Bryan has an understanding of the students, the dynamics of the class, and ideas of how to better implement the curriculum. He also has the desire to implement more engaging, higher order thinking within the class context. Instead, because he is positioned as “learner” and “student teacher” and, therefore, lacks the power to make such changes, he remains quiet and “goes with the flow” of his lead teacher’s classroom. He subordinates himself to the processes occurring within the classroom and defers to his lead teacher in most circumstances. This does not mean he disrespects or dislikes his lead teacher; in fact the opposite is true – “she and I are very similar,” “She’s very good” (January 21, 2013). It does suggest, though, that he is undergoing a level of socialization in order to “survive” this learning experience. The question is, will he be able to retain his training in critical thinking, engaging instruction, and social justice through the student teaching process to implement within his own classroom, or will the institutional pressures of canned curricula and standardized testing socialize these conceptions out of him?
The other question to consider is that by Bryan's keeping his ideas to himself in a desire to “not make waves” (January 21, 2013), is his positioning denying his lead teacher an opportunity to rethink her own practices, learn new techniques, or find ways to help him more? By positioning himself as subverted and “learner,” does he deny his lead teacher the opportunity to position *herself* as “learner” and "co-constructor" of curriculum development?

Adele also grappled with the degree to which she should step forward, speak up, and voice her ideas. Because of her strong sense of how she likes to do things – very organized and proactive - she was initially concerned with her compatibility with her lead teacher simply because she did not know the teacher as she entered her internship – “I'm hoping that [my style] doesn't butt heads with the way my lead teachers are during the internship. I can be flexible when I have to be” (December 20, 2012). While she developed some degree of comfort with her lead teacher, she was still very reticent to counter the ways of the classroom. For example, she said, "I don't particularly like the flipcharts, but if [my lead teacher] is insistent that I use them, then I will. I mean, I would not stand up to her, but I would speak up and say, 'Eh, you know, not a huge fan of these. What do you think about not?"' (January 21, 2013). Adele was positioned as a student teacher in the midst which made her conform to the processes and resources her lead teacher chose to employ. Her positioning herself as a learner made her open to suggestions and new ideas, but when her knowledge and experience - "I'm not fond of flipcharts because it took me several hours to create one" (January 21, 2013) - came in conflict with that
positioning, it caused her stress and tension. While she felt she could perhaps offer a suggestion, she did not feel strongly about being able to stand behind it, and admits she would acquiesce to what her lead teacher wanted if necessary.

However, it was apparent that like Bryan, Adele had ideas about how teaching could be done differently based on university training and philosophical stances. Rather than teach the Lead 21 curriculum as it was established “in the book,” Adele saw herself doing something different. “Mine would be to do some of these projects where it says, ‘Have students create a poster,’ even as a group. Give them a big piece of paper and have each group...create a poster advertising, telling the world how they can protect the earth. They may not be that creative yet, but they could just make a poster with words...I think I would do that to get them to understand how we use and protect earth’s treasures. Or go outside and look around. Do we see trash? Is that protecting the earth? Get involved with the theme more. Interact with it more such that every, we’re not just doing phoneme blending” (January 21, 2013). While not positioned to speak up to her lead teacher, Adele is processing her actions and wanting to break from the conforming curriculum her lead teacher feels bound to follow. Also, like Bryan, because she is positioning herself as a learner and her lead teacher in authority, is her lead teacher losing an opportunity to refine her craft and gather new ideas from a student teacher just emerging from college?
Not My Place to Butt In – To Peep or Not to Peep?

In this section, the participants tended to take up *second order positions* in response to other teachers as they attempted to negotiate team meetings, confrontational individuals, and people who tried to dominate them to maintain structural hierarchies within the school context. The participants’ challenges, however were not always direct or public. Sometimes, they took more subversive action in order to do things in line with their beliefs and philosophies while still remaining professional and respectful to their perceived superiors.

Adele and Bryan experienced tensions within the first grade team’s negotiations in how to implement curriculum and meet testing standards. In these meetings, they felt positioned by themselves and others as student teachers who did not have a voice in decisions or strategizing. It was acceptable for them to have questions, but not to provide guidance or challenge other teachers. Adele shared, "I did go to our PLC meetings on Friday...I took MAP data, and we were all talking. The assistant principal came in and was talking to us, and I didn't hold back. I was like, 'Wait, wait, wait. What are we looking at? What does this number mean?' I didn't hesitate asking. I don't hesitate to ask questions, but when I can tell that there's that little tension or that disagreement, so far, I've stayed quiet because I do feel as the student teacher. When we're in the PLC meetings, I really feel more like a student teacher. Not my place to butt into those things...I do not try to create conflict either. Whereas [my lead teacher] is not afraid to say, 'I disagree,' I more just look down at my paper and wait for them to make a decision" (January 21, 2013).
Adele and Bryan continued to accept the moral position of student teacher, even at times when they believed the instruction occurring was "wrong." At a PLC meeting in February, the team was discussing how to implement guided reading in classes as per the district coach's training from a previous session. As usual, the team was contentious. "This teacher was basically saying - and she got loud during our PLC meeting when she was repeating it. I just put my head down because I didn't want to say anything. She was basically saying, 'The text [Lead 21] is too hard. There's too much. I just read it to them.' That's not guided reading! So, I didn't say anything. But, I imagine that if I were an actual teacher on this team and really had my stuff straight on guided reading - like really had [our literacy class] book out, had articles out about guided reading - I think, then, I would find my strength to stand up for guided reading and students to say, 'No. Here, read this article. This is guided reading'" (Adele, February 27, 2013). Even though Adele had been trained both at the university and district level how to conduct guided reading, and she had successfully implemented it in practicum and internship experiences, her position as a student teacher relegated her to silence. If she had a position that gave her more equal power with the rest of the teaching team, she admits she would find a way to advocate not only for the proper execution of guided reading but also for the students who deserve quality instructional practices. Instead, she chose to remain quiet, and the team lost out on a beneficial learning opportunity.

Eventually, Adele's sense of "doing things right" and the cultural capital she had gained from her parents and university training provided her the voice to speak
out when she simply could not stand by and watch guided reading being done wrongly any longer. As the teacher continued to "defend the way she does things," Adele finally spoke up. "Bryan didn't peep that whole meeting. And I peeped. I said what I had to say in a very respectful student teacher way. Another teacher supported me" (February 27, 2013). By having a teacher back her ideas, Adele felt vindicated and more empowered in her position within the team. She was able to be seen as someone capable of making a valuable contribution. Although she still did not feel positioned as an equal, the veteran teacher's support for her helped her move up a step in the contextual hierarchy.

In this dialogue, Adele shows that both she and Bryan were involved in the same situation, a contentious first grade team meeting with disagreement on how to conduct guided reading. Both Adele and Bryan were in the same literacy class at the university; both implemented guided reading in practicum and internship experiences. Both felt positioned subversively as student teachers. However, Adele's philosophical stance compelled her to "peep," to take up a position of authority with knowledge and experience on this particular subject she felt were important for the other teachers to hear. Bryan's self-described "easy-going" nature and desire to "not rock the boat" compelled him to remain silent. This does not mean Bryan took a passive position on instructional decisions. At one point, Adele described another divisive team meeting where she took up a similar position, resigned but willing to say something, and Bryan took up a similar public position - student teacher and learner. "I think maybe Bryan and I both kind of stay quiet and
let the teachers do the - I don’t want to say they duke it out - but we let them have the more heated discussion. I’ve jumped in and said, 'What about this?’ or 'What if we try it this way.' Then Bryan said, 'Oh, we’ll type it up.' We switched something on the actual paper...We changed that and kind of took command of [the project] on our own” (January 21, 2013). This demonstrates while the interns are relegated to and accept subverted hierarchical positions in public spheres, they also are able to step forward, take on a project, and tailor choices to their classroom vision in more private venues. In this case, Bryan’s second order positioning to challenge the status quo is more subtle and behind the scenes. He volunteers to take on a duty - an act seen as helpful and time saving for the veteran teachers - and then tweaks it in such a way as to meet his desired outcomes.

Maxwell took this idea further, positioning himself on a more equal plane with other teachers, particularly a third year teacher, with whom he had some issues. In his estimation, she attempted to position Maxwell subversively in an attempt to gain authority and power with not just him but other teachers and students as well. He explained, “She felt like she just got run over last year, so she kind of had a chip on her shoulder... She would come into our classroom sometimes when I was teaching to see how my lesson was turning out. My lead teacher would be like, ‘Did you ever notice that because that’s not very professional? She does it a lot more to you than she does to me.’ I’m just like, ‘Why doesn’t she think I can do it? Because I can.’ She’s not the rookie anymore, so she was going to take control over the first year teacher and myself. I’m a student intern...She wanted my students to
know that she had something over me, I felt like...I might have a problem speaking up, but at the same time, if I’m a first year teacher, hey, I’m a teacher! ‘I have just as much say in what we’re teaching as you do’” (December 11, 2012). While Maxwell recognized he was being positioned subversively by the third year teacher, he chose to reject the positioning. He did not confront her, but he also did not succumb to her assertions and, with the support of his lead teacher, took up a position of greater equality. Being a teacher, regardless of years of experience or past leverage, put him on the same level as other teachers because of the officialness of the title and the responsibilities each person carries with children.

**Impacted by Everyone Else’s Positions - We’re All in Transition**

In this section, the participants were again conflicted in their positions and shifted between *first order, moral positioning* as student teachers and learners and *second order positioning* that attempted to challenge individuals and institutions about testing, standards, and curriculum.

The biggest tensions Bryan, Adele, and Maxwell faced dealt with negotiating the effects of standardization and high stakes accountability on their schools and lead teachers. The contexts in which they found themselves were often wrought with prescriptive and restrictive curricula, teachers who feared or did not comprehend the Common Core State Standards, and obsession with standardized test performance. This was a result of the policy cascade (Papola, 2012) everyone in the schools was experiencing, and consequently impacted the student teachers as they transitioned. Because their lead teachers were positioned by curriculum and
assessments, this impacted the degree to which the interns felt they could challenge these existing structures. For the most part, they accepted testing as a component of teaching, but they did not always agree with the means to teach in preparation for tests or the intense focus others placed on it.

Maxwell used one teacher’s difficulty to show how the entire school was in a transitional phase - positioned by shifting federal and local mandates - and having to undergo painful and difficult changes. “The third grade team had never worked with each other before besides this year, so they were still kind of a work in progress. So it’s her [the teacher’s] old beliefs with their [the team’s] old beliefs, and the new directions that we’re heading as a school, and what it needs to look like. She was probably still a little confused of what was expected…I think she’s a good teacher. I just think there’s better techniques and engagement strategies she could do. They’re in transition as well. They’re trying to figure it out, and they’re doing it at different paces and different levels of comfort” (December 11, 2012).

Comparative data was used in meetings where teachers were able to discern how their students had done in relation to others. The teacher Maxwell described was seen as resistant and inflexible by other teachers, but rather than position themselves as competitors, Maxwell saw them as positioning themselves as encouragers. In the meeting, his lead teacher addressed the reticent teacher, “’You need to be able to learn to change and get just good quality instruction.’ It was positive peer pressure, in a teacher to teacher way...The teacher that wasn’t necessarily falling in line or was being resistant – the others were kind of trying to
nudge her and push her to be in line with everybody else” (December 11, 2012).

This statement could be interpreted two ways. On the one hand, the teacher has chosen a position of stasis, remaining with her past experiences and demonstrating reluctance to change in the face of the socializing force of other teachers at her school. However, it also could be said the teachers were positioning themselves as a team attempting to implement school reform for improved performance on standardized tests, and they were attempting to bring this reluctant teacher on board. When I asked Maxwell about his interpretation of this experience, because of his Line Six philosophy – “No one is alone – ever” – he saw this situation as an attempt to get a wayward team member in the car going the same direction to better the school.

All three participants commented on how faculty members were positioned by the institutionalization of testing. Maxwell referenced the stress teachers feel. “Teaching to the test. I feel we do that a lot. We always mention the CRTs, the CRTs, the CRTs. Are [teachers] worried about their jobs? I feel like high stakes testing is crazy” (December 11, 2012). Bryan also referred to the “teaching to the test” (January 21, 2013) that occurred even though first graders did not have a state-mandated test. He explained the school “didn’t make AYP [adequate yearly progress] last year, and to keep this grant – it’s the SIG [school improvement grant] grant – they have to maintain growth. So there’s more testing going on because they have to show growth. All the kids get free and reduced lunch, so there’s snacks coming in. Just the whole dynamics of the school are different than another school”
(January 21, 2013). All three of the participants’ schools are positioned by past test scores and high poverty rates as low-performing schools. Because they are on the district watch list and have been given federal funding for improvement, the administrators and teachers at these schools are subsequently positioned to meet the demands of the grant – adequate student performance growth - which makes them more susceptible to enacting strict adherence to prescribed curriculum and burdensome assessment programs. Maxwell explained, “The administrators are our bosses, and they even have bosses that tell them to enforce stuff” (December 11, 2012). He recognizes that administrators enforce expectations and policy on teachers because these expectations and policies are being enforced on them. As a result, there is increased pressure for teachers to use prescriptive curricula and frequent assessments in order to meet these high stakes demands, often setting aside their own knowledge of classroom best practices in the process.

**Making Data Match vs. Meeting Student Needs**

While Maxwell was able to have some resolution with testing and teaching – “do all the things a good teacher should do, and your scores will take care of themselves” (December 11, 2012), Adele experienced a great deal of tension regarding how testing and teaching decisions were made with her first grade team. She talked at length about one PLC meeting she attended where teachers were trying to decide on what students should know about telling time. “The other first grade teachers want to change the times that we’re asking [the students] to make on the clock to just o’clock and 30 only, not 45 or 15, the quarter ‘tils. I thought, ‘Okay,
[the kids] don't know that.’ I know; I’ve been doing calendar where I say, ‘Okay, draw in quarter ...they can’t even draw in half past two. So, I’m like, ‘Okay, that makes sense to change it.’ But then she said, ‘Wait, let me show you. Here it says they don't have to know quarter past and quarter til. We want to know who does, but they don’t have to have it mastered yet.’ But my lead teacher gets kind of upset; she wants to do it the way the book says. She’s a rules kind of plan follower. But, she can’t do it her way because then data doesn’t match. So, she told me, ‘We’ll do what they want’” (January 21, 2013). This became an important decision because as a result of high stakes testing, schoolwide performance indicators, and personnel comparisons, the two teachers felt their instructional data had to match. As Adele explained, “If [the other teacher] is changing the times she teaches, and we keep it at the 15’s, and all their kids get it right, but we have only three kids that can show us 3:15, it looks like our kids don’t know anything, whereas her class does. But that’s not the case. They changed the questions to make it easier for their kids, so their kids got different questions. So, the questions wouldn't match up. You can’t compare the two if the questions are different. We would have to both be asking the same questions” (January 21, 2013).

As Adele talked through this situation, she began to show tension with the process because it came in conflict with her training for differentiation and meeting individual student needs. “The teachers are all, ‘Oh, your class did well,’ and my thinking is maybe [my lead teacher] just had lower kids. What if her kids are just lower, or maybe – I do like the idea of just following the book through and seeing
who knows what on an individual level. The comparing data came as – not a shock – but all of a sudden, first week, we printed MAP scores, and [my lead teacher] was showing me what they meant...If [the teachers] don’t follow the same thing exactly, then their data can be different. I think their point is when one teacher – she had 100% on questions 3, 4 and 5, [the other teachers] said, ‘Oh, we should ask her what she is doing to teach phonemic awareness,’ or whatever it was. Maybe that’s why they compare them...The other first grade teacher was saying, ‘Our kids just don’t know it, and we don’t want to test them on something they don’t know because that can be frustrating.’ I agreed when she said that, and then my lead teacher said, ‘But they’re not supposed to know it,’ and I kind of agree with her. I see both sides...If you didn’t teach it much, then I guess, yeah, change it...I don’t know. The kids would need – different students would need different supports, so why, why should it all be the same? For consistency? Yeah, I don’t know why there’s – why there’s that – it does feel like a butting of heads at times...Maybe that’s what I don’t understand.

Why are they so concerned with having their kids be able to do the problems to 100% accuracy? Why are they changing it so the students get 100% accuracy? I have to tell myself you can’t create an assessment so that everyone gets 100%. You have to do what the real task is and not everyone’s going to get it. I’ve had to teach myself not to alter the assessments that I make so that everyone does well” (January 21, 2013). Her position shifts from acceptance of the data unity to rejection of the process because it doesn’t sufficiently account for student growth and learning opportunities.
Adele was torn between her internalization of differentiation that meets individual student needs and the desire of the teachers to construct data that could be compared across assessment instruments. The comparative data made sense from a teacher perspective, but not from an individual student perspective, and this disjointedness caused her uncertainty and ultimately her silence – “I just kept my mouth shut” (January 21, 2013). But because she was positioned by what her lead teacher can say about her in observations and evaluations as well as a desire to impress her, Adele felt she had to take sides. “I am definitely seeing the two different sides because they both made good points, but ultimately, I’m with my lead teacher, so I do what she does” (January 21, 2013).

Adele’s student teaching experience was impacted by her lead teacher’s positioning within the high accountability of the school. She observed, “You don’t have to always follow the book exactly, so I agree with the other teachers in that way. But, my [lead] teacher – this is her first year teaching first grade, so I think she may be kind of nervous about it, so that’s why she follows the book so closely. Because she doesn’t want to stray too much because she doesn’t get it, or not that she doesn’t get it, but it’s new to her so she – maybe that’s why” (January 21, 2013). Because the lead teacher is new to the grade, she feels compelled to stick closely to the curriculum. This causes tension with the other first grade teacher. Bryan and Adele, because of their subverted positions as student teachers, align themselves with and defer to their own lead teachers. As a result, they are at times in conflict with one another based on their lead teachers’ positioning against each other. This
positioning also affects the participants’ learning how to be a teacher. To what degree is each socialized into believing his or her respective teacher has the “right” approach? How will Adele’s teaching be affected by her lead teacher’s desire to remain close to a curriculum Adele believes is restrictive, superficial, and lacking innovation? How much will Bryan be impacted by his teacher’s concern with only addressing what students will actually be tested on?

**Socialization Resistance – Rejecting the Apple Metaphor**

In this section, the participants tend to engage in *second order positioning*, intentionally rejecting ideas, beliefs, and feelings others are attempting to consciously or unconsciously impose on the interns in their role as "teacher."

There are points within their transitions when each intern demonstrated a degree of socialization into the ways of their school. There have also been instances when each has demonstrated socialization resistance and attempted to maintain the philosophies, beliefs, and training they brought into the student teaching internships. For example, Maxwell, as a novice teacher, came in contact with the conversations that can occur in the teachers’ lounge and in team meetings. "We have team meetings every couple of weeks. It seems like [the teachers] are kind of negative and just chatty about the kids, and not necessarily in a positive way. It’s just weird. I just kind of sit back and observe. I’m the new guy. I just kind of laugh along because I’m still learning what’s normal interaction between teachers, and wow, they actually say this about students?” (February 23, 2013). When I asked how he responded in these situations, he replied, “They just overpower the
conversation, and I’m just like, ‘Hey, our IEP meeting is this date.’ ‘This guy’s going through the testing. I’ll put it on the Outlook calendar, and I’ll email you the day of.’ ‘What can I do to support your class?’ That’s what my conversations are. Then they talk about a regular general education student that’s just been a pain in the butt to all of them. That’s just an example. ‘Oh, he’s so bad. And then his dad says this. And, yeah, no wonder. Well, the apple doesn’t fall far from the tree.’ You know, stuff like that” (February 23, 2013). Positioned as a new teacher, Maxwell does not feel empowered at this point to confront the other teachers about their discussions or attitudes toward students, but he also does not succumb to their negativity. He chooses to reroute conversations, attempting to reposition them as professionals discussing professional behaviors rather than criticizing students and parents. This is not always successful, but he remains outside these conversations and refuses to become a participant. The question becomes how long will Maxwell be able to demonstrate socialization resistance? Are his philosophies of Line Six and student accountability strong enough to position him away from such toxicity, or, because these are his team members with whom he works closely, will he become socialized into a tolerance, if not an acceptance, of such behavior?

**Socialization Resistance - We’re Not Stressing**

The interns have also become more skilled at recognizing how people around them are being positioned and its effects on them. This has helped them gain some socialization resistance as well. For example, Adele explained how she responded when her lead teacher was feeling stress about DRAs [directed reading
assessments] because of a looming deadline and new technology. “We were putting together something, and everyone was all stressed about it. I think we were doing the DRA assessments on the iPad, which was new to people, and everyone panicked. It had to be done by February 1st. [My lead teacher] said, ‘I’m going home. You should go home. We’re not stressing.’ I said, ‘Oh, okay. I am going to stay and do two things, but then I’ll leave.’ Then she said, ‘Okay, but we’re not stressing.’ I thought, “Okay, I mean, I wasn’t even really stressing but her anxiety over it was kind of going over to me. Why are we – why do I feel this way? Oh, yeah, she’s feeling that way so then I’m getting that vibe.’ So, we’re not going to stress. I thought, ‘Oh, that’s nice because I wasn’t really stressed, but you guys were driving me nuts’” (February 27, 2013). The lead teacher was positioned by the district requirements to complete the DRA testing in a particular way by a particular time, and while she took explicit steps to ameliorate the stress she was feeling as a result by saying aloud, “We’re not stressing,” her demeanor, gestures, and “vibe” betrayed her actual feelings. This is what Adele picked up on, and she tacitly positioned herself aligned with her lead teacher – feeling stress about the testing despite the actual words spoken. However, Adele was able to examine the circumstance and subsequently reposition herself to make a conscious decision about how she wanted to respond. This repositioning allowed her to resist the socialization process – stress over standardized tests – and make her own determination of how she felt.
Summary Analysis of Storyline #2

As participants progressed through their internship experiences, they encountered more conflicts between their moral positions as subverted student teachers and learners and their desired positions as teachers enacting differentiated, engaging, flexible, and critical teaching. They brought with them significant teaching capital - strong core beliefs, student-centered instructional strategies, and implicit knowledge gained through their own observations and classroom experiences (Tomlinson, 1999). However, they often reverted to compliant positions, demonstrating potential socialization in an attempt to make sense of their physical and social environments (Allen, 2009) or survive the multifaceted pressures of the profession (Loughran et al., 2001). There were times, though, when they took up first order positioning in a more intentional manner than with the stops and starts storyline. In these circumstances, they deliberately and consciously "kept their mouths shut," "did not peep," or "did not cause waves" because they realized they personally had considerable risks at stake in terms of evaluations, rapport, and job opportunities if they spoke out against professionals or established organizational structures, such as curriculum and testing processes, within their schools. They were "in the midst" of their respective narrative landscapes' plotlines and often disempowered by program policy, hierarchical structures, and relegation to subverted roles. But they also did not speak up much on their behalf. Perhaps this was because of fear of repercussions; perhaps it was because socialization processes were occurring and they passively accepted their
moral position in an attempt to survive the experience; or perhaps it was because the systems they entered assumed they were "blank" slates. The participants' vacillating and shifting positions demonstrate their attempts to reconcile the plotlines in which they find themselves with the storylines they have lived and desire to see in the future.
Chapter 6 - Implications and Next Steps

My Ongoing Narrative: Why Transition?

I was born in Sacramento, California, but by the time I was nine, I had lived in four states, including Texas, Louisiana, and Virginia, and seven different houses. Because my father was in the U.S. Air Force, and we were frequently reassigned, I was perpetually "the new kid," positioned as an outsider. Sometimes the transitions were positive ones. In Louisiana, because I was new and accelerated, I was popular. I had lots of friends, and we competed to see who could finish their tests the fastest (100% was never a question). But some of the transitions were very difficult. Louisiana, as the state ranked fiftieth in the nation for education at the time, did not prepare me academically. When I moved to Virginia, ranked first, I did not perform well on the entrance tests. I’d never seen double digit multiplication or long division before. I was tracked into the lowest classes without anyone ascertaining why my performance was low. It wasn’t because of lack of ability; it was because I’d moved so much I had glaring skill gaps. But there I stayed, bored beyond belief, until my parents advocated for me and personally addressed the missing pieces.

I also wasn’t always socially savvy enough to figure out the "rules" of each new setting I encountered. So I learned how to be the quiet kid in the back of the room whose best friends were books. I got good grades, and I didn’t cause problems, so teachers didn’t have to pay much attention to me. I became invisible and blended into the fabric of the classroom. When I moved in high school, I spent two weeks eating my lunch under a stairwell so people wouldn’t know I was there.
Even as an adult, I have perpetually moved. The longest I have been anywhere is seven years as a teacher in room 227 of a Maryland high school. I was in that classroom longer than I ever lived in any house. Each move has brought with it exposure to new people, new ideas, and new challenges. Each move has also required me to reconstruct myself when I have been faced with cognitive or social dissonance. My life has been defined by transitions - between states, between jobs, between identities - and my construction of these transitions continues to define the storyline of my life, even as I undergo this most recent of transitions into the field of educational research and academia.

**Purpose of This Chapter**

This dissertation explores the culmination of three participants' transitions from university students to student teachers, however it also is a reflection of my own narrative as I have attempted to understand the nuances of educational research. Just as Bryan, Adele, and Maxwell are products of their lived experiences, currently constructing their storylines in response to and because of the people they have encountered and the beliefs they have built from their pasts, I am too. However, I have already undergone the transition these three preservice teachers are currently experiencing; the task now is for me to understand how those transitions have impacted me now. While my participants are looking forward to where they are going, I am reflecting backward to where I have been. We meet somewhere in the middle of this process. This study serves to inform the field of teacher preparation and how preservice teachers attempt to navigate their
situatedness between being a student and being a teacher, particularly as they manage conflicts between their prior learning and their internship contexts.

In this chapter, I begin by summarizing the key findings of this study from November, 2012, until February, 2013. While Bryan, Adele, and Maxwell's narratives and the study will continue into the future, this dissertation must have an ending point. For Bryan and Adele, that ending point encompasses their experiences through their first internship in general education classrooms. For Maxwell, it is his first months as a professional teacher. I then discuss the pedagogical, theoretical, and methodological implications of the study, situating them within the fields of teacher preparation and narrative inquiry. Next, I address the limitations of the study, and finally, I make suggestions for future research, including extension of the existing study.

**Summary of Findings**

The focus of this narrative study has been to explore the question "How do preservice teachers experience transition from university student to student teacher in systemic organized structures?" In Chapter 4, in line with Clandinin and Connelly's (2000) conceptions of narrative inquiry, I presented three preservice teachers' narratives as they made their initial transitions into student teaching. Each narrative included how the participant came to education, how s/he perceived his/her situatedness within transitional spaces, core beliefs, and how those core beliefs were enacted or challenged within the lived experience. Bryan saw his transition as emotionally linear moving from being "happy and humble" to "excited
and anxious," and he relied on philosophies of caring, strong rapport, and creative, "fun" instruction in his decision-making processes. While this approach often served him well, he also encountered difficulties with tight, prescriptive curricula, low-level reading materials, and a lead teacher who had different dispositions about teaching. Adele considered herself positioned between two spaces competing for her time, energy, and resources - that of being a university student and that of being an intern. Her proactive manner and need to plan and organize demonstrated themselves in her desire for excellent classroom management and routines, while her social and cultural capital, gained from her parents' educational backgrounds, gave her a critical view of her experiences. Her biggest tensions arose from a redundant, unimaginative curriculum and a contentious first grade team, where she felt forced to “take sides” between teachers. Maxwell underwent two key transitions within six months, becoming a full time special education teacher in January. He viewed his situatedness in terms of his existing skill sets - what was motivating him to teach and what was causing him stress or worry. His Line Six philosophy - which encompassed team work, accountability, and responsibility - permeated every aspect of his transition and impacted his interactions with both individuals and institutions. It served as a very powerful means for him to effectively position himself to handle disruptive students, irate parents, dominating co-teachers, and a test-obsessed school culture. As he progressed through his transitions, he found his biggest conflicts were when other people rejected being “on his team.”
In Chapter 5, I conducted a cross-analysis of the three participants’ narratives using Harré and van Langenhove’s (1999) six positioning modes as a framework. The findings were divided into two key storylines that unfolded as Bryan, Adele, and Maxwell progressed through their transitions. The first storyline addressed the stops and starts the participants experienced. These stops and starts were often the result of their attempts to manage dual positions as student teachers/learners and teachers in full control of a classroom. They tended to engage in first order positioning as learners and accepted this moral positioning. They attributed mistakes to being part of the learning process, and therefore did not consider "stops" to be a reflection of their character, ability, or potential. Subsequently, they built failure resistance and were able to “bounce back” from mistakes, learning to be better teachers as a result. However, the second storyline demonstrated the "dark side" of the accepted learner role. Positioned as student teachers, they experienced a power imbalance where they were viewed by other teachers as empty vessels and passive receivers of knowledge. At points of conflict - whether those conflicts were a result of exchanges with individuals, testing mandates, or curriculum structures - they reverted to subversive positions, deferring their own beliefs and expertise to the lead teachers or supervisors who oversaw them. They tended to "keep their mouths shut" and, at times, doubted their training and knowledge base. They struggled with being socialized into the status quo and maintaining their core beliefs to implement differentiated, critical, engaging instruction.
Pedagogical Implications

Equitable Education vs. Socialization and Survival

A common research recommendation to address the implementation of critical pedagogy, democratic education, and social justice is to provide training at the university level for preservice teachers to gain a paradigm and knowledge base aligned with these conceptions (see e.g., Ford & Grantham, 2003; Garcia & Guerra, 2004). The argument is if teacher education programs equip preservice teachers with the knowledge about critical pedagogy and equitable practices, they implement these theories in their own classrooms. Students will benefit; classrooms will be more racially and socio-economically equitable; achievement gaps will close; schools will be places where deficit-thinking wanes (see e.g., Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Miller, 2010; Wolfe & Spencer, 1996; Yoon, 2008). However, this agenda overlaps and "bumps up against" other agendas for teacher education reform, such as professionalization, deregulation to encourage broader privatization, regulation to control requirements and productivity, and increased scientifically-based instruction (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005, p. 46). This line of argumentation also does not take into account the very difficult transition of preservice teachers as they move through their practicum experiences, student teaching internships, and initial teaching years. It also does not take into account their subversive positioning during these transitions and the subsequent implications.

Because student teachers are often positioned as passive learners by supervisors and lead teachers, they have little voice in the curricular, instructional,
or pedagogical decisions that occur within the classroom. Additionally, this situation is aggravated by the fact that often student teachers are dropped “in the midst” of their assigned classroom and school (Brown, 2009; Loughran, et. al., 2001). That is, institutional and personal plotlines have been occurring before they arrive and will continue after they leave. Clandinin and Connelly (1998) remind us that "the teachers and landscape they live in have narrative histories. Each of the teachers and the principal come to the landscape living and telling a complex set of interwoven stories of themselves as teachers, of children in this school, of the community, of the school board, of successes and failures in the long term and in the short term" (p. 160). Student teachers are often not privy to the planning, reasoning, or decision-making that happened before they entered the landscape. The school has experienced success or failure on standardized tests. As a result, it has demonstrated growth, entered School Improvement status, gained SIG grants, or had a new principal appointed. New staff has been hired, teams designated, curriculum selected, content materials chosen, resources divvied, classroom procedures established. Being dropped “in the midst” of such plotlines positions student teachers further into a dependent role, relying heavily on their assigned lead teacher to help them make sense of this complicated labyrinth. Because of this dependency, they are fearful to speak up, speak out, or take up a position challenging the lead teacher or the institutional structures (Liggett, 2011; Margolis, 2006). They also do not know how or are afraid to ask for help or clarification, choosing instead to follow along with the flow of the classroom without necessarily
understanding the rationale behind the mentor teacher's decisions. Horsley and Bauer (2010) found preservice teachers' understanding of social and cultural diversity and global education was well-developed by the time they transitioned into their internships. This dissertation also showed that while preservice teachers could articulate strong philosophies and beliefs about how children should be educated, which include equitable strategies, differentiated instruction, and individual attention, they were often not able to enact these beliefs. One reason may be their subverted positioning. They are driven to accept the status quo on some level in order to “not make waves” or jeopardize their opportunities for good evaluations or future employment (Brown, 2009; Liggett, 2011). This causes tension for them as they attempt to grapple with implementing the training they bring into their internship experiences in an environment where the values and practices may counter this training.

This subverted role also makes them susceptible to socialization processes that can suppress the preservice teachers' social justice and critical pedagogy training. They experience "transition shock" (Cochran, 1981) as they are attempting to learn how to apply their university training in a multitude of ways simultaneously. This includes long-term planning, classroom management, special education services, technology, time management, instructional strategy choice, and building a toolbox of techniques. They are also learning to interact with parents, team members, administrators, and many different children. Interns and novice teachers are trying to gain professional competence while also surviving (Crosswell
& Beutel, 2012; Loughran et al., 2001), and because of this, they often keep their heads down and press on to avoid confrontation as a coping mechanism (Allen, 2009). They tend to follow along with established processes and institutionalized conceptions, accepting the status quo rather than critically viewing or questioning why. Socialization into the workplace happens and is necessary. Student and novice teachers need to have an understanding of how organizations operate, how individuals within an organization work together, how to meet expectations of supervisors, parents, and other entities. It is necessary for them to understand the context in which they are working and make adaptations. However, the question is how do teacher educators and training programs foster the socialization in meaningful ways for the interns? It is problematic when interns accept the status quo without question, in conflict with their university training and beliefs for more equitable education, and at the expense of students who would benefit from these paradigms and practices. Sleeter and Stillman (2005) claim, "Curriculum is being organized scientifically for efficiency, deriving learning objectives from social and economic needs and casting teachers as managers of the process of producing student achievement scores. ...Rather than asking whose knowledge, language, and points of view are most worth teaching children, teachers and administrators are pressed to ask how well children are scoring on standardized measures of achievement" (p. 44). Educators at the school level are positioned by district administrators, who are positioned by policy and federal mandates, which are created in response to political and social power relations and economic pursuits.
The student teacher entering into a classroom context is tacitly positioned by all these factors. What they learn through their lead teachers' modeling and from socialization into their specific workplace is deeply impacted how others are positioned by these factors within the context. This is crucial because what teachers learn in these initial forays into the education field have the power to shape their effectiveness, their practices, their identities, and their intention to remain in the field (Gore & Thomas, 2006; Grudnoff, 2011).

**Addressing Socialization and Building Resistance**

*Managing Restrictive Structures.*

Sleeter and Stillman (2005) use the term "frame" to describe the moral positioning of teachers and students within a set structure and the degree of autonomy they have to define the structure. "Strong framing" allows little room for teacher agency. Compliance with the established structure is enforced through high stakes, standardized testing, textbook adoptions, and highly prescriptive, packed curricula. Often, standards are "presented as if there were no serious ideological debates to consider" (p. 43). Paszek (2012) argues in order for teachers to be able to address important goals of education beyond those measured by test-driven accountability, such as democratic education, a "weaker" frame is needed to grant teachers greater autonomy and agency. "Teaching to the test is harmful and overly prescribed and overcrowded curriculum hinders democratic learning" (p. 219). I found the strong framing preservice teachers encountered significantly hindered the degree they were able to implement equitable practices and critical pedagogy.
For example, both Bryan and Adele were unable to utilize interactive strategies, such as read-alouds or book clubs, or critical thinking strategies because the curriculum they were bound to teach was highly prescriptive and the required texts were too basic.

However, another key theme that emerged from this study's cross-analysis was the participants tended to accept national standards, testing, and accountability as a "normal" and expected part of the teaching occupation. Maxwell summed up this attitude when he stated, "If you teach the Common Core Standards, the state testing should take care of itself. I feel like if you use small groups, engaging your students - you're doing all the things a good teacher should do, your scores will take care of themselves" (December 11, 2012). While this does not indicate the student teachers are critically examining where the standards and assessments are coming from or whose agenda they reflect, it does indicate a belief the process can be integrated with good, quality instruction. The training they gained in the university was sufficient for them to teach well and address standards and testing, but they would benefit significantly from training in how to critically appraise the mandates, standards, curriculum, and assessments they are expected to execute and how to marry them with the best practices they are taught in their university programs.

What the university training did not provide for them was explicit instruction for the student teachers to manage restrictive structures. If student teachers are to resist the socializing forces that can hinder innovative and creative instruction, they need to be explicitly taught how to maneuver and adapt their training and
paradigmatic conceptions of innovative, creative, and engaging instructional processes within the confines of standards, prescribed curriculum, and mandated policies. This does not mean universities should teach programs, such as Lead 21, READ 180, or Everyday Math. It is impossible and improbable to address the specifics of every programmed curriculum student teachers may encounter. However, it does mean universities need to help preservice teachers examine ways to blend, integrate, and mold existing structures to enact critical pedagogy and democratic learning. Skilled teachers can make the standards work in an engaging manner and the assessments become an extension of learning (Schweisfurth, 2006). It also means spaces need to be found to "interrogate the versions presented as to what counts as a 'good' teacher and leader, and to understand the political intent driving such educational agendas" (Bloomfield, 2009, p. 43). Programs that help interns integrate mandates and strategies with critical pedagogy and social justice would assist in their ability to retain these deep concepts through their transitional experiences.

**Two-Way Learning**

Because of the student teachers’ subverted position and lack of power, they are often relegated to being passive recipients of information rather than active constructors of their own and others’ learning. This is problematic for two key reasons. First, by remaining in the position of empty vessels and passive learners, student teachers are not given the opportunity to share their university training, theories, practices, beliefs, or strategies. They bring with them valuable theoretical
and pragmatic knowledge that they must learn to implement and apply. However, because they are dropped into the internship and not given a voice, they are consigned to teach in the manner of their lead teacher. Additionally, they may fear or even experience doubt and rejection of the ideas by their mentor teacher because their pedagogy may not be viewed as "real practice" (Allen, 2009, p. 651). This means they do not learn to actually apply their training – they learn to teach how and what their lead teacher teaches. Additionally, the lead teacher is denied the opportunity to learn new ideas, techniques, and paradigms the student teacher brings into the potential partnership. They are, instead, expected to have all the answers and to effectively model a wide expanse of instructional, behavioral, and pedagogical techniques. The experience becomes a top-down passing of information rather than a collaborative partnership of mutual learning. The deficit thinking in this case is not in the way the student teacher views students, but instead in the way the student teacher is viewed by others. The focus is on what the student teacher does not know, instead of considering what s/he is able to bring to the educational table. This does not mean preservice teachers do not have a lot to learn - they do - but it does mean they enter their internships with constructed schema, beliefs, skills, and dispositions that can be valuable within the internship context. They are not empty vessels; their inexperience is not a "deficit," but a starting point.

The second issue is the assumption that quality educators are provided to mentor every student teacher. Because the student teachers tend to “do what their
lead teachers do," it is critical the examples they follow are good ones. All the participants in this study faced the restrictions of prescribed curriculum and the pressures of high stakes testing. An excellent teacher is able to navigate these obstacles, incorporating them into their processes and teaching storyline without sacrificing student learning or established best practices such as critical pedagogy, global citizenship, or democratic education (Schweisfurth, 2006). They are able to effectively blend standards, higher order thinking, and equitable teaching to ensure all students are benefitting from their instructional choices while still meeting institutional mandates. While based on the participants' constructions their particular lead teachers had some skill at being able to do this, there was also evidence that they tended to defer to the broader plotline of the established curriculum and assessment at points of contention. Not all lead teachers have the skills, knowledge, or desire to integrate standards with critical pedagogy. The criteria for selecting lead teachers are inconsistent and not rigorous, and the "fit" between preservice or novice teachers and their mentors is crucial for success (Grossman & Davis, 2012). In some situations, universities and districts are hard-pressed to find enough willing veteran teachers to accommodate the number of student teachers they are training, let alone enough individuals who have demonstrated high quality performance.

Universities and school districts therefore have a two-pronged responsibility to address the issues with this program model. First, they must effectively conduct screening of potential mentor teachers and encourage the best to step forward as
leaders. Teachers may fear having a student teacher within their classrooms will hinder their students' learning, set them back from their schedules (as seen with Adele's practicum teacher, December 20, 2012), or impact the test scores by which they will be evaluated (Liggett, 2011; Margolis, 2006).

Second, they need to establish or refine processes that encourage more two-way dialogue between the student and mentor teachers. Grudnoff (2011) argues that mentor teachers should be considered full partners within teacher education programs, transforming the internship site from one of hierarchical relationships between university faculty, supervisors, mentor teachers, and student teachers to one of "collaborative endeavor" (p. 231). Bloomfield (2009) asserts changing the learning model is becoming a greater necessity as neoliberal agendas make not only teachers but teacher educators and preservice teachers are increasingly assessed against a set of professional teaching standards. This shared pressure, she claims, allows opportunities "for new forms of learning community, including structures around multiple learning relationships and trajectories" (p. 40). We need to reconceptualize the positioning of student teachers as sole learners and mentor teachers as sole instructors. This can be done through providing training and support for potential mentor teachers and encouraging student teachers to share their training in appropriate, respectful, and collegial manners.

The participants in this study often relegated themselves to passivity and deference to their lead teachers even when they philosophically disagreed with them. With the exception of Adele's speaking out about guided reading, they did
little to advocate for their ideas on a larger scale. This positioning may be in part because they believe the expectation on them is to learn the practice of teaching, which they tend to value as "real" (Adele, interview, December 20, 2012) as opposed to theoretically-based learning they received at the university. Teaching preservice teachers how to better integrate theory and school reality would help them better implement the practices and paradigms that support critical pedagogy and democratic education

Teacher Educators and Apprenticeship Models

Lortie (1975) suggested teachers apprentice through their own teaching experiences and observations. This model is often used in research to explain the replication of outdated and effective techniques (Borg, 2004; Dowling, 2011). However, Mewborn and Tyminski (2006) suggest that Lortie’s model also explains how good teaching is implicitly transmitted to students who have had positive experiences as learners, which subsequently shapes their future teaching practices. They also propose that preservice teachers are able to transform their negative experiences into positive practices and disrupt the transmission of poor procedures. It is therefore crucial that professors, particularly those in education programs, recognize they serve as "master craftsman" models for their "apprentice" students. University classes are the most recent apprenticeship for aspiring teachers and carry significant sway in influencing preservice teachers’ development and socialization resistance.
Teacher education programs are not just about the courses students take; they are also about how the courses are implemented and executed. According to Cook, Smagorinsky, Fry, Konopak, and Moore (2002), teacher educators must be able to teach "durable concepts that withstand conflicting demands of school settings, especially when the concepts themselves are contested and the school settings provide the arena for assessment of teaching competence" (p. 412). It is not enough to talk about critical theories, teaching for diversity, or utilizing technology for global education; teacher educators must demonstrate how to implement these concepts. Margolis (2006) contends preservice teachers are less likely to "embody a transformative stance toward teaching" (p. 40) within their internships or even their own classrooms if they have not experienced one themselves. If professors do not take into account that preservice teachers model from them, they are operating within and providing an impoverished pedagogy.

In this dissertation, participants were clearly influenced by both positive and negative teachers they had encountered within their plotlines. Bryan was impacted as early as the third grade to develop his philosophy of caring. He does not remember specific things his teacher did, but he associates her "with feelings of caring and belong" (interview, November 7, 2012), ideologies that have become foundational to his core beliefs as a teacher. Maxwell’s teacher identity formation happened in college, where he readily used lessons—such as the sludge fleas demonstration of buoyancy—strategies, and techniques he had experienced as a student.
Theoretical Implications

Positioning at the Micro, Meso, and Macro Levels

In this study, the preservice teachers’ university learning was important to helping them construct critical, equitable, and socially just paradigms about students, teaching, and learning. While not the only contributing factor, Bryan, Adele, and Maxwell cite examples of how their experiences with differentiation, critical theory, and anti-deficit thinking about students within their educator program affected their philosophies of how school classrooms should operate. However, this work points to the importance of considering the participants’ positioning not just on a micro, classroom level, but also on a meso (school) and macro (district, national, global) level because their individual narratives are influenced and determined by much larger interpersonal and institutional storylines (Clandinin & Connelly, 1998, 2000; Louis, 2010; Moghaddam & Harré, 2010; Moghaddam et al., 2010). These storylines are actively constructed and contested, dynamic and flexible, and "transdisciplinary," crossing group boundaries with multifaceted understandings (Moghaddam et al., 2010). Popkewitz (2000) argues that "discourses of public policy and the theories of the social sciences generate conceptions of personhood and identity...there is no 'natural' national community, but only communities that are dependent upon the discourses that form individuals into the seam of a collective narrative ... New conceptions of identity are forged out of relations constituted in the new cultural practices" (pp. 168-169). Identity is constructed in relation to the narratives and images that appear to be global, that
are the broad-brushed storyline of a context (Louis, 2010; Mohaddam et al., 2010). Preservice teachers who are transitioning into student teaching develop their new identities as "teacher" in relation to narratives and practices which define the school into which they are placed. These school narratives and group identities are forged from characteristics inscribed within community, national, and global conceptions of being a "good" member of the community (Popkewitz, 2000). If we focus too much on the micro level, we may miss the bigger context in which preservice teachers operate, and we as teacher educators may miss important opportunities to strengthen transference of critical pedagogy from theoretical knowledge to practical implementation (Florio-Ruane, 2011; Louis, 2010).

Iterant Positioning to Internalize Critical and Socially Just Pedagogy

According to Ladsen-Billings and Tate (1995) and Tatum (2003), awareness of societal inequities is only one of the two prongs necessary to generate true socially just pedagogy. The second prong is action. If teacher educators are to prepare preservice teachers to be transformative; if critical theory asks us to not only provide awareness but also opportunity for enactment, we must consider how preservice teachers need to be positioned within their university programs and their transitional stages to be empowered to implement critical pedagogy within their classrooms. It is not enough for us to merely talk about what to do; preservice teachers need to be positioned to practice anti-deficit strategies in authentic ways for these conceptions to develop greater traction within new teachers' schemas and deeper internalization within their philosophies. de Jong et al. (2010) suggest
transference is based on a constructivist process which is "actor-oriented" (p. 51) and dependent upon the degree to which an individual is able to accommodate new knowledge and skills within his/her existing repertoire. This means preservice teachers need to know and practice how to implement anti-deficit practices and embed social justice conceptions into existing contexts. They need to be deliberatively positioned to experience transformative education, perhaps "almost to the point of habit" (Gainsburg, 2012, p. 19), for real social change to occur. If preservice teachers are able to engage in iterative positioning, where they are positioned and repositioned to explore socially just conceptions in practice, these paradigms are more likely to become part of the fabric of their thinking when they leave the university.

While they do not enter their teaching programs and internships as "empty vessels," preservice teachers are still learners who are developing skills, beliefs, and ideas. Just as younger students benefit from a spiral curriculum that introduces conceptions in a recursive manner, increasing complexity and abstraction with each new engagement (Bruner, 1960), so too can adult students, namely preservice teachers. Bruner (1960) suggests, "A curriculum as it develops should revisit the basic ideas repeatedly, building upon them until the student has grasped the full formal apparatus that goes with them" (p.13). This conception is not limited to elementary or secondary learners. Curricula of critical and democratic pedagogy, anti-deficit thinking, and social justice are complex, multifaceted, dynamic, and cannot be internalized within a single course or internship. It is therefore necessary
for teacher education programs to consider ways preservice teachers can be iteratively positioned to observe, experience, and practice such curriculum in multiple ways.

**Methodological Implications**

**Mind Maps to Stimulate Narrative**

One of the things often cited as a potential problem with narrative inquiry is the initial engagement of the participants in specific, episodic storytelling (Chase, 2005; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Riessman, 2008). The beginning stories can be vague or generalized; participants may have difficulty recalling stories; they may experience discomfort or attempt to say things to please the researcher. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) recommend using photographs, "memory boxes," videotapes, or other artifacts to trigger participants' memories and help them retell their stories. Prosser (2007) argues that visual methodology - having participants construct photographs, drawings, or other pictorial representation - can provide greater understanding of "visible but hidden" (p. 13) ideas because it does not privilege linear and hierarchical structures like the written word does. It better accounts for a society that is increasingly dominated by visual, multimodal culture (Kalantis & Cope, 2012; Kress, 2003; Prosser, 2011) and focuses on interconnections and relationships of ideas. Griffin (2011) used body mapping with music teachers to help them construct narratives, and she found the process transformational because it "gave voice to their experiences" (p. 188) which often enveloped fears, sorrows, and deep-seated emotions. Prosser (2011) points out,
"Participants feel less pressured when discussing sensitive topics through intermediary artifacts" (p. 484) because they feel less vulnerable discussing an image or artifact rather than direct recounting of powerful or difficult memories.

In my own teacher training, I learned how to use mind and concept maps (Bennett & Rolheiser, 2001), and I required students in my classes, including this study's participants, to use them as organizational tools. I decided given the complexity of the participants' situatedness within their transitional spaces, a mind map or visual representation would be a good way for them to capture how they viewed their positioning. This was a powerful framework from which the participants constructed their narratives. It gave them ownership of their stories; I provided very little prompting or questioning once they began discussing the components of their illustrations. Additionally, the participants referenced the illustrations in subsequent interviews, continuing to use its framework to construct their discussions of how they had grown or gained knowledge in particular areas they had previously drawn.

Participants also used the illustrations for their personal reflection. Adele continued to add to hers long after we had discussed it in order to make her own experience apparent to herself. While Anne was not a part of this dissertation, she did create an illustration that included a series of growing hurdles she needed to surmount. She hung hers on a bathroom door to serve as motivation and inspiration as she cleared each hurdle that brought her closer to a new summer job and interning next fall.
Constructing visual depictions of their positioning within transitional spaces allowed the participants to think through their stories before our interview and to continue reflecting on their experiences as we continued to talk each month. This meant they owned their narratives, and the power differential that may have existed between us because I had been their teacher was negligible. Allowing participants in narrative inquiry to construct such artifacts helps offset the researcher-researched dynamic because the conversation shifts from questions and answers to storytelling with the participant in control and the researches as listener, a dynamic Riessman (2008) reminds us is paramount. Prosser (2007, 2011) and Clark-Ibáñez (2004) discuss a similar process, called photo-elicitation interviews, where participants take photographs of their environments, lives, circumstances, or other events that are "part of collective or institutional paths" (Clark-Ibáñez, 2004, p. 1511). The participants then explain how and why they came to these choices. Creating a mind map, illustration, or other visual depiction also allows for a third space (Gutierrez, 2008) where the researcher and participant can engage in mutual discussion of the piece, delving into the how, why, and reasoning behind the construction of the illustration, not just the construction itself.

**Use of Technology**

The use of Skype in order to conduct interviews was beneficial for a couple of reasons. First, because the participants could choose the location for interviews (anywhere they could have internet service), they were able to be comfortable and casual in their discussions. Additionally, they did not feel they needed to enact
"teacher" or "professional" roles because they were not situated in schools or other business institutions. This comfort level allowed them to be very open with their stories, and it also allowed them to have a multitude of resources on hand to use in their discussions. For example, Bryan showed me an article his vice principal gave him, and Adele dug out several lesson plans or the spur of the moment as we talked through an issue. Second, it provided some physical "distancing" that helped offset the power differential the participants may have felt with my having been their teacher. Third, it allowed the participants and I to maintain a fairly consistent interview schedule over a five month period because, regardless of where the participants or I were located, they were able to share their narratives with me. For example, Adele Skyped me from her parents' home during her winter break.

**Limitations/Points of Discussion**

One of the strengths of this study was also one of its limitations. The study was designed as a four-year study examining how preservice teachers transition from university student to student teacher to early career teacher. This meant I was able to recruit participants at different stages within their licensure program and transition. Because of circumstantial changes that occurred, three of the participants did not enter student teaching in either the fall of 2012 or spring of 2013 as expected. Since my dissertation research question addressed the transition into student teaching, only three of the participants had met this milestone at the appropriate time. As per IRB approval, I conducted interviews with all six participants. This means I was influenced by what Anne, Rose, and Danielle said in
their narratives of the university program, practicum experiences, and initial contacts with possible lead teachers in preparation for student teaching. While I did not rely on their narratives for data used in this dissertation, I as a researcher still internalized their responses and their themes, which may have played a part in my construction of Chapter 5’s cross-analysis.

A second limitation is because of the amount of time it took for me to gain IRB approval, the study began after Maxwell had almost completed his first ten-week internship. This means I was not able to collect data prior to his student teaching as I did with Bryan and Adele. While he was able to do some reflective reconstruction of his feelings, philosophies, and challenges, he still had seven weeks of student teaching within his repertoire, so his pre-student teaching data does not represent how he was situated as accurately as it would have if I had been able to interview him earlier.

A third item to address here is that I chose to focus on just the participants’ narrative construction of their experience. This means the narratives are reliant on how the participants remember their experiences through their own filters. Chase (2011) recommends researchers take into account the narrative environment in which participants are contextualized in order to gain a broader understanding of the stories. I chose not to account for this environmental analysis. Paszek (2012) points out that while individuals’ narratives, particularly memoirs, are inherently incomplete because they do not represent every available perception of a conceived situation, their narrowed focus instead offers "a window into life" (p. 222). I wanted
to focus on the participants' "window," how they perceived their circumstances, and how they chose to build their personal stories. One reason for this was because I wanted to see what, if anything, changed over time through multiple transitions.

The length of time for this dissertation's data collection was approximately five months, and each participant changed locations at least twice in that period of time. I also have to consider the entire four-year study, and the participants' narrative frameworks and contexts may change significantly in the years to come. While I appreciate and agree with Chase's (2011) assertion, I have opted not to follow it at this time for the above reasons. I may decide to incorporate this aspect if the participants settle into a more stable, permanent situation.

**Future Research**

As stated earlier, this dissertation is situated within a longitudinal, four-year study that will follow participants as they transition to student teaching and the first crucial years of their professional careers. In addition to Bryan, Adele, and Maxwell, I will be following Anne and Danielle as they move into student teaching in the fall of 2013 and Rose as she transitions to her internship 3000 miles away in the spring of 2014. They will provide greater variation and verisimilitude to this study because their environments, circumstances, and timing will represent a broader range of experience. Danielle has an early childhood endorsement, and Anne has a Teaching English as a Second Language (TESOL) endorsement in addition to their dual certification of elementary and special education. All three new participants will be interning in locations away from the university and the district where they
conducted their practicums. In Rose’s case, she will be on the east coast. Additionally, because the narrative landscape of institutions is also in transition (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000), the policies, mandates, expectations, and personnel positioning within those institutions will shift and change, and the new participants may have very different experiences because of these shifts.

As this study unfolds, I will continue to look at how teachers learn to become teachers (Rice, 2011). What do preservice teachers implicitly learn through their "apprenticeship of observation" and explicitly gain through their university training? To what degree can professors utilize the apprenticeship conception to instill educational beliefs, processes, and best practices such as differentiation, flexible grouping, and engaging literacy skills? What part of this learning do they carry with them into their internships and professional teaching, and what portion do they hold onto for an extended period of time? What factors hinder their ability to implement the positive aspects of this learning? These are all lenses I would like to consider as this study continues for the next three years.

Another component I would like to consider would be the inclusion of counter-narratives. The term "counter narrative" is often used in research literature to address cultural competence and issues of racial or social injustice (see e.g., Glenn, 2012; López-Robertson, Long & Turner-Nash, 2010; Milner, 2007; Watson, 2009). However, Bullough (2008) uses the term to address the "double-mindedness," "inauthenticity," and "professional schizophrenia" (pp. 4-5) educators must operate within as they have become more valued for productivity and less
social relations. In his argument, counter narratives examine the eroding of teacher autonomy and agency that have accompanied neoliberal and neoconservative agendas and offer alternative viewpoints of what could be in teacher education. He claims teachers experience divides because they are "compelled to work against what one believes and pulled in multiple directions by conflicting but always insistent claims" (p. 5). Therefore, the work becomes "joyless" (p. 5). He claims this is one contributing factor to a growing shortage of aspiring teachers and a growing number of teachers who leave the field early in their careers; the dominant narrative encourages "performativity" and production, not innovation and agency. The three participants in this study attempted to negotiate the dichotomies of standardization and authentic, engaging instruction. Maxwell, at this point, particularly seemed able to reconcile Common Core State Standards and standardized testing within his own philosophical framework. Could he provide a counter-narrative against the ideas of teacher incompetence and program ineffectiveness? That there is more to teaching than test scores? That individual teachers can work within or despite organizational structures to continue to address issues of social injustice and critical pedagogy? A future series of questions to explore with these participants could involve their construction of counter-narratives that challenge the existing status quo - what would the ideal student teaching experience entail? How are they able to make a positive difference within this divided world?
Conclusion

Callahan, Griffo, and Pearson (2007) argue one reason why educators are under scrutiny is because they are not, as a profession "fulfilling their professional charge" (p. 57) to have highly knowledgeable, adaptive, and reflective teachers. It is imperative we do not just teacher preservice teachers to engage in critical, equitable, and democratic practices; we must ensure they are able to carry this teaching through their intern experiences and into the classroom. These practices should deepen and become enriched through implementation and experience, not dampened and eroded by socialization and survival. Deep conceptual knowledge requires embodied, authentic experiences. After all, if we want to address inequities with students, we must address how our newest and most vulnerable teachers are entering the workforce. "We cannot eliminate the achievement gap in our schools without closing the knowledge gap in our profession" (Cervetti & Pearson, 2005, p. 223).

This dissertation adds to the research literature by exploring the experiences of preservice teachers as they engage in the transition to student teaching. It addresses key components of their preparation: the role "habitus" - background experiences - (Bourdieu, 2007) and the apprenticeship model of observation (Lortie, 1975) play in developing participants' teaching philosophies and identities; positioning as passive learners; and difficulty in implementing critical pedagogy and social justice because of constrictive structures and lack of knowledge to bridge theoretical and practical spaces. I am interested to see how these conceptions
continue to play out in the participants' ongoing journey. What skills become automatic? At what point will they develop enough capacity to drive their instructional cars without stalling out to gain momentum? Will the bumps eventually smooth out for them, as they did for me, or will the participants choose another road entirely?

**My Ongoing Narrative: Why Research?**

I have always wondered. My mother says I was born asking questions. I was the kid who never settled for "because it is" or "because I said so" responses from my parents, teachers, or others who were in charge. My mother tells a story of when I was four years old reading a book about animals that hang by their tails, including an opossum and a monkey. I wanted to know why those animals could hang in that way when other animals I saw such as our poodle could not do this. My mother said, "They have special tails called prehensile tails that allow them to do this." I was fascinated by not only the concept that tails could allow opossums and monkeys to hang from branches, I was also fascinated by the word. I told everyone who would listen, and some people who didn't have a choice, about prehensile tails.

As I grew older and frequently explored the nature trails near my house, I wondered about everything I saw and experienced from which lichens were on which trees, why chameleons changed colors, the difference between frogs and toads, what made each planet special, how stars are formed, the life span of mealy worms, and what the words were that described all these amazing things in my
world. I voraciously devoured books to find the answers, even, to my mother’s chagrin, using a flashlight under the covers to read until odd hours of the night.

I have never stopped questioning, and I have never stopped wondering. In teaching, the question became psychological and sociological in nature. Why is this student refusing to respond to a class assignment? Why are there so few Black students in my AP Language classes? What am I going to do about these things? My research was action-oriented and responsive to the information students were giving me within my classroom context. Now, my questions are global. How can educators influence policy that helps all students, regardless of race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, sexual orientation, gender, or other perceived difference feel like they are included in the American social landscape? How can we ensure their talents are being maximized, and we are not losing the vast potential of our country’s diversity? How can we become a more democratic society, and in what ways can teachers be the beacons of this ideal? That is why research. Because I have so many questions to wonder about.
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Figure 1

*9 Year Olds - NAEP Reading*

Figure 2

*9 Year Olds - NAEP Math*
Figure 3

13 Year Olds - NAEP Reading

![Graph showing NAEP Reading scores for 13-year-olds from 1971 to 2008 for African American, Latino, and White students.](image)

*Denotes previous assessment format
Source: NAEP 2008 Trends in Academic Progress, NCES

Figure 4

13 Year Olds - NAEP Math

![Graph showing NAEP Math scores for 13-year-olds from 1973 to 2008 for African American, Latino, and White students.](image)

*Denotes previous assessment format
Source: NAEP 2008 Trends in Academic Progress, NCES
Figure 5

17 Year Olds - NAEP Reading

![Graph showing reading scores for 17-year-olds by race from 1971 to 2008.

Source: NAEP 2008 Trends in Academic Progress, NCES]

*Denotes previous assessment format.

Figure 6

17 Year Olds - NAEP Math

![Graph showing math scores for 17-year-olds by race from 1973 to 2008.

Source: NAEP 2008 Trends in Academic Progress, NCES]

*Denotes previous assessment format.
Figure 7

*African American and Latino 17 Year-Olds Read at the Same Levels as White 13 Year-Olds*

![Graph showing the reading levels of African American and Latino 17 year-olds compared to White 13 year-olds.]

Figure 8

*African American and Latino 17 Year-Olds Do Math at the Same Levels as White 13 Year-Olds*

![Graph showing the math levels of African American and Latino 17 year-olds compared to White 13 year-olds.]

Figure 9

*Teacher Situatedness in Current Educational Contexts*
**Participant Demographic Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Internship</th>
<th>Major(s)</th>
<th>Other Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>Elementary Education/ Special Education</td>
<td>Sometimes unsure of planning or actions, but willing to put himself out of his comfort zone in order to gain skills and tools to use with students who may not be like him; able to look at a situation that is not working, and ask students their perspectives and solutions for fixing it</td>
<td>Participating. Timeline expectations have stayed the same. Internship will extend two weeks past graduation because of dual requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adele</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>Elementary Education/ Special Education</td>
<td>Parents are both educators - father is a principal - she has a strong background and lots of experience in schools; will ask critical questions regarding purpose, connectivity, rationale</td>
<td>Participating. Timeline expectations have stayed the same. Also working with father who is a retired principal. Internship will extend two weeks past graduation because of dual requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Fall 2012 Completed simultaneously with new job</td>
<td>Elementary Education/ Special Education</td>
<td>Early literacy was problematic; has overcome academic obstacles and hopes to help others do so; has not always valued education, but found purpose in teaching; able to view marginalized students from empathetic position; good listener with students</td>
<td>Participating. Had to ask questions of general ed internship in retrospective manner because of time for IRB approval. Entered study as ending general ed internship and beginning special ed internship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Spring 2013 Fall 2014</td>
<td>Elementary Education/ Special Education/ ESL Endorsement</td>
<td>High level of enthusiasm for students and learning in general; has spent last several summers living in a tent in Yosemite serving as a park guide; uses her lived experiences to make learning engaging</td>
<td>Participating. Decided to take extra courses to avoid overloading this semester, so pushed off internship until the fall. Will intern in another state while living with grandmother because of expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Term 1</td>
<td>Term 2</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Background Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Spring 13</td>
<td>Spring 14</td>
<td>Elementary Education/ Special Education</td>
<td>Mobile background - originally from the east coast and seeks to move back; hard working, strong at lesson planning conceptualization and implementation; strong rapport with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Fall 13</td>
<td>Spring 14</td>
<td>Elementary Education/ Special Education/ Early Childhood Endorsement</td>
<td>From small rural town, hard-working and eager to please; will redo an assignment multiple times to learn from it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Data Collection Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Time/Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Capture participant narratives; capture my interactions with participants</td>
<td>Video tape, Skype, Video conferencing, Telephone</td>
<td>1/month for 5 months 30-60 minute duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Reflections</td>
<td>Allow participants to capture or reflect on key experiences; allow me to &quot;see&quot; internal dialogue</td>
<td>Blog/vlog/typed/handwritten journals, Participants' choice</td>
<td>Participants' choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawings of participant situatedness</td>
<td>Allow participants non-linguistic and non-verbal means to illustrate situatedness within educational contexts; allow for comparison throughout the transition period</td>
<td>Paper, Pen/pencil</td>
<td>3 times during study - 1st, 3rd, and 5th interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic memos</td>
<td>Allow me to reflect on interviews, viewing sessions, study progression</td>
<td>Computer, Word software</td>
<td>After every interview; as ideas come to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing classroom and practicum data</td>
<td>Provide context for decisions/beliefs within student teaching; evidence of educational pedagogy, content, instructional practices, philosophies taught within student program</td>
<td>PowerPoints, Student and instructor lesson plans, Papers, classwork, projects, homework, Instructor feedback Notes, Reader-writer notebooks, Technique toolbox</td>
<td>As needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Log of Skype Calls with Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Interview Session</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time (EST)</th>
<th>Interview Duration (min.)</th>
<th>Point in Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/7/12</td>
<td>11:30 AM</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Final semester of coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12/18/12</td>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Final semester of coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1/21/13</td>
<td>2:30 PM</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>First month of internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2/24/13</td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Week 7 of general education internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adele</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/1/13</td>
<td>7:30 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Week 3 of special education internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/12/12</td>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Final semester of coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12/20/12</td>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Final semester of coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1/21/13</td>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>First month of internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2/27/13</td>
<td>9:00 PM</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Week 7 of general education internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3/30/13</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Week 3 of special education internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/27/12</td>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>End of general ed internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12/11/12</td>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Beginning of special ed internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1/22/13</td>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Special ed internship/Full-time teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2/23/13</td>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Full-time teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/6/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/7/12</td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Second to last semester of coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12/5/12</td>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Second to last semester of coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1/30/13</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Final semester of coursework (early in semester)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2/27/13</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Final semester of coursework with Lit III practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4/1/13</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Final semester of coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/7/12</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Second to last semester of coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2/13/13</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Last semester of coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4/24/13</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Last semester of coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/2/13</td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>coursework/beginning of early ed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 13

Bryan's Illustration #1
Figure 14

*Bryan’s Illustration #2*
Bryan's Illustration #3
### Bryan’s Artifact

#### High Influences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How to develop high expectations for each student</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing formative evaluation to teachers</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to provide better feedback</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-student relationship</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to better meet medial-cognitive strategies</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to accelerate learning</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching study skills</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching learning strategies</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to stop labelling students</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Medium Influences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer influences on achievement</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of home environment</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to develop high expectations for each teacher</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated curriculum programs</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer-aided instruction</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreasing disruptive behaviour</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enquiry-based teaching</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching test-taking and coaching</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Low Influences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School finance</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualised instruction</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing class size</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-curriculum programs</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-school programs</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability grouping/tracking</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male and female achievement differences</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student control over learning</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open vs traditional learning spaces</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 17

_Adele's Illustration #1_
Figure 18

Adele's Illustration #2
Figure 19

Maxwell’s Illustration #1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subheading</th>
<th>Dominant Positioning Mode</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Expectations/Responsibilities</th>
<th>Interaction/Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storyline #1 - Stops and Starts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments, Grades, and Jobs</td>
<td>2nd order, intentional</td>
<td>University student</td>
<td>Complete assignments for coursework</td>
<td>Complete assignments, but sometimes begrudgingly and only to level required. Work to pay tuition and internship becomes more important than university assignments. Move off-campus and quit on-campus job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eager to Teach</td>
<td>1st order, moral, tacit and intentional</td>
<td>Learner, Student teacher</td>
<td>Expect feedback and support from supervisors and lead teachers</td>
<td>Caught between eagerness and fear; what know and can apply with what don’t know. Frustration when supervisors did not provide feedback and guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starts and Stops and Starts Again</td>
<td>1st order, moral 2nd order repositioning (in relation to students)</td>
<td>Teacher Learner</td>
<td>Student learning, conveying information in way students can understand Reflection and improvement</td>
<td>Must straddle both positions simultaneously and sometimes caused problems when others took up 2nd order positions and challenged their roles. Gained failure resilience as result of seeing themselves as learners and mistakes as part of the learning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Adjustments</td>
<td>1st order, Intentional</td>
<td>Reflective Teacher</td>
<td>Student learning and outcomes regardless of other forces</td>
<td>Able to reflect on performance and make changes to improve either at point of use or for later instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Parents</td>
<td>1st order, Intentional</td>
<td>Ally</td>
<td>Work with parent for benefit of child; learn from the parent</td>
<td>Actions taken to benefit students with better services or instruction. Conflict when child was suspected of not being safe with parent - law required different moral position to protect child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subheading</td>
<td>Dominant Positioning Mode</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Expectations/ Responsibilities</td>
<td>Interaction/Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Influences and Models</td>
<td>1st order, moral</td>
<td>University student</td>
<td>Learn content and material presented by instructors</td>
<td>Also learned about how to be and not to be a teacher from observation. Emulated teachers and professors with whom they had affiliation and whose classes they enjoyed; rejected teachers’ and professors’ methods in whose classes they felt frustrated, devalued, or were a waste of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making an Impression</td>
<td>1st order, intentional</td>
<td>Student teacher</td>
<td>Be compliant, follow directions, do a good job in line with university and lead teacher expectations</td>
<td>Sought to impress supervisors and lead teachers for recommendations and job opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Midst - I Do What My Lead Teacher Does</td>
<td>1st order, moral, 2nd order, intentional</td>
<td>Student teacher, Learner</td>
<td>Passive absorption of information from supervisors and lead teachers Fit into existing structures</td>
<td>Confusion, lack of history, lack of power lead to subversion of position and often silence Challenge ideas, but not in public way and even if disagree, coalesce to what lead teacher wants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not My Place to Butt In</td>
<td>2nd order, intentional</td>
<td>Student teacher</td>
<td>Listen, learn</td>
<td>Speak and act out of hierarchical context, challenge status quo in subtle or overt ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We're All in Transition - Making Data Match</td>
<td>Shifting positions between 1st order moral and 2nd order intentional</td>
<td>Student teacher</td>
<td>Raise test scores, followed prescribed curriculum, provide frequent and unified assessments</td>
<td>Positioning influenced by positioning of lead teacher, administrators, and school by federal policy, grant requirements, past student performance, and attempts to raise scores through programs Entire environment affected Challenge fears and dominance of testing, standards, and curriculum regarding meeting student needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization Resistance</td>
<td>2nd order, intentional, personal</td>
<td>Student teacher</td>
<td>Accept the status quo</td>
<td>Rejected negativity of teacher talk and effects of testing pressure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Storyline #2 - Tensions and Conflicts**