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ABSTRACT

This dissertation presents findings from a qualitative discourse analysis study of three pre-service teachers enrolled in the Urban Teacher Residency Partnership Program (UTRPP); a clinical teacher preparation setting at a major southeastern university. UTRPP is a full-time teacher preparation program that focuses on university student achievement through embedded coursework and provides preservice teachers (PSTs) with the opportunity to work with a content coach. Through coaching cycles, these PSTs work one-on-one with a literacy content coaches to enrich their teaching experiences and connect theory to practice through content coaching cycles. A content coaching cycle consists of a pre-conference, video-recorded observation of a teaching event, individualized video coding sessions of that teaching video, and post-conference reflections (Gelfuso & Dennis, 2014). In this study, I focus specifically on the PSTs’ literacy content coaching experiences. The purposeful support and unique structure of UTRPP provide a rich opportunity to study literacy teacher identity construction since PSTs are contracted as full-time teacher residents in urban schools and work one on one with a literacy professional to develop their literacy practices through coaching cycles. This research was guided by the following research question: In what ways do three PSTs develop literacy teacher identity?

Data was only collected during literacy coaching cycles where literacy was explicitly taught, and not during any other content area coaching cycle or subsequent lesson reflection that was not literacy based. The findings showed evidence of: (a) the plurality of identity, in that each participant drew on multiple identity characteristics when reflecting on their literacy practice, (b) connections between participants core sense-of-self and literacy teacher characteristics, (c)
participants deployment of front and backstage dramaturgy to conceal their beliefs and feelings from the literacy coach and children, and (d) connections to student-centered teaching practices. These findings offer insights into how PSTs construct their literacy teacher identities in both a clinical preparation program and through literacy content coaching.

Keywords: pre-service teacher identity, literacy content coaching cycles, teacher residency partnership program, clinical practice
CHAPTER ONE:

TEACHER IDENTITY AND PERFORMANCE

In recent years, there has been a steady decline in the number of individuals who choose teaching as a career. The U.S. Department of Education National Center on Education Statistics (NCES) reports that, between 2010 and 2015, the number of persons enrolled in state accredited or alternative teacher preparation programs declined by 35%. Similarly, ACT Inc. (2016) reported a 16% decrease in high school students interested in education majors. High school graduates are choosing careers that yield higher salaries (Sawchuk, 2014) and greater long-term job security (National School Boards Association (NSBA), 2016). Others associate the decline in the desire to avoid high-stakes teacher evaluations and test accountability measures imposed on the current teaching force (Goldhaber & Walch, 2014). For those teachers who do enter the profession, attrition is high (Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; NCES, 2015; NSBA, 2016).

An NCES (2015) study on beginning teacher attrition found that 23% of teachers who began the study were no longer in the field after five years. Fantilli and McDougall (2009) found that approximately 40–50% of teachers left the profession within their first five years; and the Alliance for Excellent Education (2004) reported that 14% of new teachers leave by the end of their first year, 33% leave within three years, and 50% leave within five years. Many first-year teachers are often hired in urban schools that suffer from economic, social, and/or cultural vulnerability where there are high teacher and student turnover rates (Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; NSBA, 2016). These newly hired teachers are thrust into positions where they are expected to act, analyze, and instruct students like veteran teachers, even though their only prior
pedagogical experiences thus far are from internship settings (Fantilli & McDougall, 2009). In that internship context, supervisors, collaborating teachers (CTs), and university instructors become mediators between pre-service teachers and the real world of education. Ultimately, pre-service teachers end up being responsible for very little of the educational practices associated with the classroom of their placements (Darling-Hammond, 2006). This results in inexperienced teachers entering the profession without the expertise needed to handle interaction and conflict with parents and students, administration and colleagues, or the content and pedagogical knowledge to provide quality instruction (Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; Hong, 2010; Marable & Raimondi, 2007; Nugent & Faucette, 2013).

In an article on new teachers as literacy leaders, Turner and colleagues (2011) recognize the complexities of teaching in today’s schools, where it is demanded that novice teachers do more than just survive their initiation years. They state:

Given complex and sometimes conflicting expectations, it can be tempting for new teachers simply to focus on surviving their first, tumultuous years. But in light of the world-class education that we must provide for our students, we need the newest members of the teaching force to stand strong as literacy leaders (Turner et al, 2011, p. 550).

Turner and colleagues (2011) recognize that the high level of teacher attrition is partially due to a lack of theory to practice connections made by new teachers, and that many of these novice educators enter classrooms unprepared to teach literacy. To counter such issues, these authors call for new educators to be proactive in their induction years and suggest that they develop a vision of literacy pedagogy, be creative in effective literacy instructional strategies, partner with parents from diverse backgrounds, use literacy assessment data to make
instructional decisions, model a lifelong love of reading, and serve as literacy leaders in their schools, as opposed to simply surviving, or leaving the profession during these formidable years (Turner et al, 2011).

Unfortunately, many elementary teachers enter the profession feeling unprepared to teach literacy (Kosnik & Beck, 2008; Moats, 2014; NCES, 2012; Turner, Applegate, & Applegate, 2011). These novice educators express a disconnect between the context in which they intern and their preparation programs (Kosnik & Beck, 2008), or that they are stifled by the hegemony of that internship context (Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Trent, 2010) to the point where they could not enact preferred literacy teacher identity constructs learned in their preparation programs (Thomas, 2005, Trent, 2010; Vetter, Meacham, & Schieble, 2013). These factors, paired with the fact that many novice educators model their educational practices and construct their identities based on past experiences as K-12 students (Feimen-Nemser, 1990; Hammerness, Darling-Hammond, Bransford, Berliner, Cochran-Smith, McDonald, & Zeichner, 2005; Harper & Rennie, 2008; Haverneck, 2008; Ticknor, Anne & Swenson, 2014) serve to limit the informed connections needed to enter classrooms prepared to teach literacy.

Regarding teacher identity, Beijaard, Meijer, and Verloop’s (2004) found three strands of research: (a) studies on teachers’ professional identity formation; (b) studies that identified characteristics of teachers’ professional identity; and, (c) studies of professional identity represented through teachers’ stories. Further, Beijaard and colleagues (2004) posit the need for future studies to focus on the phenomenological development of literacy teachers (that is, how connected relationship between “self” and “identity” evolve in detailed descriptive accounts of professional identity formation). From the standpoint of performance theory (Bell, 2018, Goffman, 1959), to focus on the self and identity in teacher education is to focus on how
individuals negotiate and construct identity while managing the impressions of those in attendance (the audience) during daily classroom interactions (Alsup, 2006; Clarke, 2009; Johnson, 2007; MacGregor, 2009; Tichnor et al., 2014; Williams, 2006). Williams (2006), states that “we perform our identities based on a combination of the social expectations of what a “teacher” should be, along with the local characteristics of culture and the distinctive dynamics of the audience” (p. 537). For PSTs, audience is more than just children. It includes CTs, literacy content coaches, university supervisors, and school principals, who all observe and determine the pedagogical effectiveness of PSTs.

Vasquez and Arzúna (2009) studied PSTs “modes of self-presentation” (p. 1) through the discursive effects of direct reported speech (quote of exactly what was spoken) and direct reported mental states (clear statement of feelings or emotions) on identity construction. They posited that there are often multiple and/or conflicting identities manifested in a single utterance. The source of these manifestations often lies between two hegemonic forces: the expectation of social discourse and practice; and the “individual’s sense of agency” (p. 6). This means that there are institutional expectations that define the role of teachers and determine the level of PST success in meeting expected behaviors. The results of their study demonstrated how PSTs measure themselves against the backdrop of educational institutional expectations for their ability to perform as teacher. The PSTs in their study depicted themselves both as capable educators as evidenced in their direct reported speech, and as incapable educators through direct reported mental states (e.g., thoughts, feelings, and/or emotions).

Vasquez and Arzúna (2009) also noted the contrast in the hegemony of the institution and self in the construction of PST identity, observing the asymmetrical relationship between knowledge and power: PSTs are expected to conform to institutional expectations even when
those expectations contradict their own pedagogical goals, aspirations, and projected
development. Kiesling (2006) posits that these discursive hegemonic models create material for
Bullough (1997) believes that teacher education preparation programs must recognize and study
the teaching-self, and that broad ideologies about identity construction may not get at the
nuanced mobilization of discursive identity markers that manifest in PST narratives. Narratives
and identity markers were directly relevant to this study because I wanted to explore PSTs
language in a way that encompassed a more wholistic interpretation of PST literacy teacher
identity construction. As such, I focused on following question to guide this study:

- In what ways do three PSTs develop literacy teacher identity?

**Contributions to the Field**

The intent of my study was to examine three PSTs’ language to determine how they
construct themselves as literacy educators within a clinical teacher preparation program. I
believe that this study advances the current understanding present in today’s field of research on
PST identity and PST literacy teacher identity. Since novice teachers often feel underprepared to
teach literacy (Kosnik & Beck, 2008; Moats, 2014; NCES, 2012; Turner, Applegate, &
Applegate, 2011), my hope is that if teacher preparation programs better understand PST literacy
teacher identity development, they can account for and foster identity growth in these formative
settings. I feel that my study sheds light onto the development of literacy teacher identity
construction. Using discourse analysis, I explored the process in which three PSTs discursively
developed their literacy teacher identity.
Conceptual Frameworks

Identity, performance theory, and language. For this research, I drew on performance theory. I believe that the enactment of identity is a social and cultural formation of self, where indexed discursive resources are enacted to create positionality and construct meaning for those present in that identity category (Bell, 2008; Blommaert & Varis, 2015; Goffman, 1559; Kiesling, 2006; Van Langenhove & Harré, 1999). In similar and more direct terms, identity is a complex construct that draws on connections between what a person is saying, doing, and being (Gee, 2014). To be something is to discursively enact identity, or to perform an identity in the world depending on the context in which one is situated. Here, the construction of identity is the discursive negotiation of internal and external factors in contextualized situated experiences (Gee, 2014), in conjunction with “daily performances against a backdrop of norms and expectations” (Kiesling, 2006, p. 265) set by society. In other words, the things that individuals say and do depends on context and how they want to be perceived by those around them.

Bell (2008) posits that in general, theory attempts to ask what, why, and how questions to get at the fundamental conceptualizations of the world, the universe, human interaction, nature, etc. Specifically, for performance theory, Bell (2008) states that these questions center on “What is a performance? Why do people perform? And how does performance organize, maintain, and transform lives, communities, and cultures?” (p. 3). She further elaborates that performance theory “attempts to make clear what, how, and why performances are both a ‘key term’ and a ‘key’ to understanding the intricate way we participate in social and political life and create many expressive forms” (Bell, 2008, p. 3). For instance, Williams (2006) claims that individuals play performance roles, where one has multiple and shifting identities depending on the context, need, and their sense of self. As a literacy educator, Williams likens his role in the classroom to
his former experience working in a restaurant as a waiter and bartender. In that context, his identity performances were based on being able to read those present (the audience), to provide mutually beneficial experiences for himself and the patrons; like meeting the needs to the children in classrooms. These performances are predicated on language use, and, in the remainder of this section, I briefly describe how identity performances are mediated through language (Bell, 2008; Blommaert & Varis, 2015; 2008; Gee, 2014; Goffman, 1959).

For Bell (2008), performances are a means of communication and discourse is a facet of that communication. In discourse, there are social, cultural, and political implications to language that are governed by consensual agreed upon “truths” produced by those larger constructs (Bell, 2008). Through lived experience in a discursive social, cultural, and political context, an individual gains access to utterances and grammars specific to an identity category; from which that individual can then later mobilize those discursive tools to be recognized in and by that identity category (Johnstone, 2008; Lave & Wenger, 1991). These indexed experiences create material for later identity performances, where the more lived discursive experiences one has, the more identity characteristics that can be indexed to be discursively mobilized (Gee, 2014; Johnstone, 2008; Lave & Wenger, 1991) to manage the impressions (Goffman, 1959) of those present in social contexts. This is not as simple as collecting different identities but means that indexed discursive resources create “ideological coherence” (Blommaert & Varis, 2015, p. 53) for individuals to discursively use, to be recognized as an authentic member of an identity category. In other words, the process by which we live adds to our development of expertise and that is how we become experts, which favors those individuals who experience more identity making experiences.
Denzin (2015) explains discourse as the intersection between performance and performativity, and that individuals experience themselves through these complex personal narratives. These discursive intersections consist of “mini life stories” and multiple versions of reality where meaning is constantly changing. These life events are what Blommaert and Varis (2015) call micro-hegemonies (language that defines and challenges the emblematic features of an identity category). They posit that the combination of micro-hegemonies is what creates identity as a whole, and can be interpreted through the following four point framework: (a) a broad recognition of discourse orientations towards emblematic discursive features characterized by an identity, (b) these emblematic features are not random, but essential to authentic identity construction, (c) “enoughness,” is when an individual displays the appropriate amount of emblematic features of an identity category, and (d) the dynamic, conflictual, and contested aspect which define and redefine the emblematic features of enoughness for an identity (Blommaert & Varis, 2015). It is important to note that the concept, “enoughness” (the idea that there is a hierarchy or levels of accepted features which allow, or deny, access to an identity category) has oppressive social, cultural, and political implications, all which impact identity construction. The hegemonic structure of a figured world (Holland, Lachiotte, Skinner, & Cain, 1998) in which an individual is attempting to enter (for instance teacher) has in place language and activities that do not always match a newcomer’s (Lave & Wenger, 1991) ideology or beliefs about how they want to participate in that identity category (i.e. student versus test centric teaching practices (Trent, 2010)). In the context of PSTs becoming literacy educators, they face a myriad of discursive influences (preparation program personnel, course instructors, professors, supervisors, collaborating teachers, and principals) that must be accommodated to be accepted into the realm of literacy education.
Research Methods

The purpose of this study was to better understand the process of three PSTs becoming a literacy educator. This is a discourse analysis of interviews; therefore, I collected the following data: audio-recorded initial participant interviews, video-recorded post-conference reflections of a teaching event, and stimulated recall (SR) interviews that used the video-recorded post-conference as artifact for SR reflections. The initial and SR interview data were broadly transcribed, and I analyzed each using discourse analysis related to Gee’s (2014) Seven Building Tasks:

1. Significance: The use of language to make things significant as it relates to a situation.
2. Activities: Based on the situation, how language is used to get recognized as engaging in certain sort of activity in the here-and-now.
3. Identities: What identities discursive participants recognize as consequential and enact through language.
4. Relationships: The use of language as a signal to build social relationships with discursive participants.
5. Politics: How language is used to convey the distribution of social goods.
6. Connections: How language is used to connect things or show their relevance.
7. Sign systems and Knowledge: This consists of the language spoken, and the Discourse in which that language is addressing. Here, privilege and relevance pave the way to knowledge (Gee, 2014).
Operational Definitions

Conversations: Unwritten rules of discursive interactions which are often unconsciously followed (Gee, 2014).

Discourses: The construction of identities and activities through language and other semiotic systems (Gee, 2014).

Enoughness: is when an individual displays the appropriate amount of emblematic features of an identity category (Blommaert & Varis, 2015).

Figured worlds: A theory, story, model, or image of a simplified world that captures what is taken to be typical or normal about people, practices (activities), things, or interactions (Holland et al., 1998).

Hegemony: the valorization of a particular identity that is mobilized in daily interactions and practices at the expense of other identities to control the basic ideologies of society (Brookfield, 2005; Hall, 1997; Kiesling, 2006).

Identity: the discursive negotiation of internal and external factors in contextualized situated experiences (Gee, 2014); in conjunction with “daily performances against a backdrop of norms and expectations” (Kiesling, 2006, p. 265).

Identity Constructs: a theory about identity that is taken to be normal based on the practices, activities, and discourses in social and cultural contexts (Gee, 2014).

Intertextuality: When one’s words allude to or relate to, in some fashion, other texts. Text is either written or spoken (Gee, 2014).

Literacy Content Coach: is a knowledgeable other who assists PSTs in literacy theory to practice connections (Gelfuso & Dennis, 2014).
Micro-hegemony: emblematic discursive features characterized by an identity; b) these emblematic features are not random and essential to authentic identity construction; c) “enoughness;” is when an individual displays the appropriate amount of emblematic features of an identity category; and d) the dynamic, conflictual, and contested aspect which define and redefine the emblematic features of enoughness for an identity (Blommaert & Varis, 2015).

Pre-service teacher (PST): is a higher education student preparing for a career in the field of education through theory to practice connections between coursework, practicums, and mentorship with in-service teachers and university personnel (Cornu & Ewing, 2008).

Power: one’s discursive interpretation and control of practice, ideology, and social structure in relation to the social world in cultural models to satisfy enough meaning to be recognizable by an identity category (Blommaert & Varis, 2015; Keisling, 2006).

Situated meanings: The specific meaning words and phrases take on in specific contexts (Gee 2014).

Social languages: Any variety or style of speaking or writing associated with a socially-situated identity of any sort (Gee, 2014).

Delimitations of the Study

This study was delimited to a cohort of 12 PSTs enrolled at a large research-intensive university, and who elected to participate in an Urban Teacher Residency Partnership Program (UTRPP), working in five urban schools from a large school district in the Southeastern United States, and the Cambridge Schools Experience Study Abroad Program. UTRPP is a full-time teacher preparation program that focuses on university student achievement through embedded coursework and provides PSTs with the opportunity to work with a content coach. Through coaching cycles, these PSTs work one-on-one with science, math, and literacy content coaches to
enrich their teaching experiences and connect theory to practice through content coaching cycles. A content coaching cycle consists of a pre-conference, video-recorded observation of a teaching event, individualized video coding sessions of that teaching video, and post-conference reflections (Gelfuso & Dennis, 2014). In this study, I focus specifically on the PSTs’ literacy content coaching experiences. The purposeful support and unique structure of UTRPP provide rich opportunities to study literacy teacher identity construction since PSTs are contracted as full-time teacher residents in urban schools and work one-on-one with a literacy professional to develop their literacy practices through coaching cycles.

The scope of this research was to study literacy teacher identity development. Although it is understood that the process of identity construction also occurs in the multitude of discursive encounters with education stakeholders (e.g.: math and science content coaches, collaborating teachers (CTs), peers, children, principals, course instructors), this study’s aim was specific to literacy and literacy pedagogy. Therefore, data was only collected during literacy coaching cycles where literacy is explicitly taught, and not during any other content area coaching cycle or subsequent lesson reflection that was not literacy based.

**Summary**

The organization of this dissertation is as follows: In Chapter One, I provided an introduction to this dissertation as well as background regarding identity, performance theory, and a theory of language as it relates to performance theory. In Chapter Two, I detail additional background regarding my theoretical framework and review of current literature. In Chapter Three, I provide a description of the methods used in this study, as well as a detailed description of the study context. For Chapters Four, Five and Six, I report on the case findings from Madon,
Kathy, and Ellie’s data on process of becoming a literacy educator. Finally, in Chapter Seven I discuss the implications for current and future practice across the three cases.
CHAPTER TWO:
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter will provide the seminal theoretical and research background for this study of pre-service teachers (PST) literacy teacher identity and its development. First, I looked at the literature on identity through a performance theory and sociocultural lens. Next, I focused on literature to formulate a theory of language section focused on discourse, performances, and hegemony. Finally, I drew on literature on developing the beginning teacher, teacher identity, and identity and literacy to be able to answer the research question:

- In what ways do three PSTs develop their literacy teacher identities?

Introduction

For the better part of the past two decades, teacher identity research has shifted from the concept of identity as a “single true self” (Leander, 2002, p. 198) to the construction of identities in a lifelong practice where the foci of analyses look at the individual, the context, and the practices in which individuals are engaged (Elliott, 2015; Leander, 2002; Rowsell & Abrams, 2011). The latter perspective takes a comprehensive approach to account for identity formation where context, lived experience, social, political, and cultural considerations all contribute to identity construction (Blommaert & Varis, 2015; Elliott, 2015; Gee, 2014; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Leander, 2002). Though it is not possible to account for all the factors from which individuals might draw to construct their identities, this all-inclusive approach has enabled
scholars to better conceptualize identity construction and the contributing influences. Yet, for preservice teachers (PSTs), identity research typically centers around the relational premise of dissonance and/or deference between the *practicum contexts* (Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Trent, 2010), the *preparation programs* in which they were enrolled (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Kosnik & Beck, 2008; Rogers, Marshall, & Tyson, 2006), and the influences from their past experiences as K-12 students, as they make, or attempt to make, theory-to-practice connections (Feimen-Nemser, 1990; Hammerness, Darling-Hammond, Bransford, Berliner, Cochran-Smith, McDonald, & Zeichner, 2005; Haverneck, 2008). This juxtaposed dissonance/deference dichotomy also prevails as the dominant discourse in research on PSTs as literacy educators (Hall, Johnson, Juzwik, Wortham, & Mosley, 2010; Handsfield, Crumpler, & Dean, 2010; Rogers et al, 2006). Therefore, the primary focus of PST identity research has been to understand the more nuanced and contributing aspects of their pedagogical practices. It is important to keep in mind that these two characterizations for the participants (PST and literacy educator) exist in some tension with each other. Simply put, a “PST” is understood as a role in progress, a developmental niche within which the processes of becoming a more sophisticated version of itself is to occur. In contrast, granting these same participants with the mantle of “literacy educators” confers some notion, however nascent, of professional expertise; the PSTs might not possess or comfortably exercise (no matter how much they might aspire to do so). From the perspective of the current study, it is this duality that fosters productive ambiguity for the participants.

**Performance Theory**

Recently, I took my daughter Maria to see *Wicked* for the first time. Since the play’s debut, I have had the pleasure of attending five different performances over the years, and I was
excited to see Maria’s reaction to the drama and theatrics. This was the first time she had seen a major stage performance, and she loved it. On the car ride home, we excitedly made plans to see *Wicked* again, or the *Lion King*, or both in London during our travels there that summer. What I/we were unaware of was that in the evening performance we saw, the protagonist, Alphaba, was played by an understudy. Not that knowing this tidbit of information would have made a difference towards my (our) feelings about the performance. I am not familiar enough with the world of drama to know that an understudy is a learning, becoming performer until I was sitting in one of my final doctoral courses the following week. I happened to hear two peers (who were versed in drama) criticizing the understudy’s performance. Playing the part of Alphaba meant that this (or any other) understudy had to act the part that had already been established as precedent by the primary actress, mirror her performance after the primary cast member (who apparently my peers had wanted to see), while subtly allowing her own unique style to inform her performance so that the role became her own authentic expression. Accounting for these aspects of performances is similar to how pre-service teachers (understudies) working with collaborating teachers (primary cast) in internship settings (theatre) strive to be recognized as a viable teacher (performer).

For the pre-service teachers in this study, their practices of *performing as literacy teachers* resulted in their demonstrating the aspects, characteristics and competencies expected in emerging literacy teacher identities. For Bell (2008) and Goffman (1959) everyday life is a ritualistic performance where participants follow internalized, scripted codes learned from their participation in society, and that their interactions using these scripts, shape and are shaped by social structures. Therefore, Bell (2008) and Goffman’s (1959) perspectives were useful to conceptualize the social, cultural, and political structures PSTs encountered and performed as
they learned and played the role of literacy educators. Gee’s (2014) perspective on discourse and identity also helped in my development of a theory of language as it pertains to identity performance, and Williams’ (2006) views on how a literacy educators identity shift depending on the needs of the students, further helped to ground this study in performance theory. The following sections describe these performance theories.

In this first section of this chapter, I draw on the important work of Bell (2008), Goffman (1959), Gee (2014), and Williams (2006) to demonstrate how individuals construct their identities as seen through performance theory. These are the theoretical foundations I use in this study. It is important to note the deliberate decision to use performance theory as opposed to performativity theory to ground this research. Though there are similarities between these two theories on identity, it is the nuanced difference of acting like an identity that distinguishes performance from performativity. The concept of acting like an identity category in hopes of becoming that identity is not a performativity construct, but it is one of performance. It is my contention that this is what PSTs do, or are expected to do. They need to be seen as well as see themselves as viable literacy educators. PSTs have to invest themselves in the role so they can develop a true professional identity. To further support the use performance theory for this research, I contacted J. Butler, philosopher and performativity scholar from University California-Berkeley and asked her about the theoretical orientation of this study, as I wanted to know if PST emerging literacy identity is more grounded in performance or performativity. Specifically, I asked: “Can performance of an identity transform into performativity of that identity?” In other words, can you put on a performance and can that act become you, or is it always just a performance? Personally, I do not work under the assumption or stance that this is a mutually exclusive choice. It is not an either or decision. I believe that there are degrees of
performance and performativity in all aspects of discursive identity work. However, for the purposes of this study, it was important to ground the work in performance theory (particularly because PSTs are mimicking, trying, and apprenticing into both teaching and literacy teaching). In J. Butler’s response, she stated the following: “Pascal claims that even if you do not believe, you can kneel and pray, and that through the repetition of the activity, belief can emerge,” and that “Merleau-Ponty claims that even if you cannot sleep, you can get into a sleep position, practice the posture of sleeping, and that this can induce sleep” (J. Butler, personal communication, September 30, 2015). Both Pascal and Merleau-Ponty have philosophical tenets more grounded in performance than performativity, and Butler’s verbal nod toward their work revealed (and I believe was intended to reveal) the impact of believing in one’s performances to bring about the manifestation of a desired, alternate state of being.

This research studied identity through the lens of performance theory. Schechner (2006) states that identity is “performing one’s life roles in relation to social and personal circumstances” (p. 28) where each new circumstance and/or context means the enactment of identity performances based on who is present, or the performer’s perception of their audience (Bell, 2008; Goffman, 1959). Gee (2014) states that, “identity is a performance. Like all performances it will not work unless at least some people recognize what you are and what you are doing in your performance” (p. 24), emphasizing the important role of audience. In a performance, actors play a role, and, in life, acting is crucial to who we are and how we present this to the world (Schechner, 2006). Goffman (1959) posits that all the interactions that take place for an individual is similar to a performance of an actor on stage, and that the believability of the performance is directly impacted by the believability of the actor. These interactions within an identity category are indexed by the individual, allowing for the subsequent
mobilization of the learned identity constructs for future performances for that identity category (Gee, 2014; Goffman, 1959). Therefore, the more experiences one has, the more identity characteristics one can draw on to be recognized as believable by that identity category. Gee (2014) calls this collection of indexed roles an identity “toolkit,” where the more lived experiences one has, the more potential social tools that can be drawn on during identity performances. This is not to say that identity’s, and/or identity characteristics are a collection of categorized constructs to be pulled out and used like tools in a “toolkit.” Rather, Gee’s (2014) “toolkit” construct is a metaphor for identity work that are emergences, becoming’s that are discursively woven into a given context through social interaction (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Many & Cole, 2012). Therefore, language is used to mediate social interactions and identity construction is more fluid (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Many & Cole, 2012; Moje & Luke; 2009; Williams, 2006) than static, or the singular siloed deployment an identity or identity characteristic at any time during social interaction.

An important part of identity construction is understanding the social frame in which individuals are engaged. At this point, the advantages of repeated performance for authentic audiences work in favor of those who have such varied opportunities. However, when the identities in an individual’s toolkit are eventually used with less familiar audience groups (say in early grades classrooms), the match between habituated responses and new contextual demands creates the need for a more sophisticated identify construct that must then be learned through language and activity. For those who cannot adjunct, these experiences become a de facto weeding out system for literacies peripheral have-nots.

Another label for the match up (or the lack of it) is framing. Framing is how individuals make sense of, conceptualize, and interpret social interactions (Bell, 2008; Goffman, 1959).
Goffman (1974) claims that individuals ask themselves the ethnographic bell-ringer: “What is it that’s going on here?” (p. 8) when engaged in discursive situations. Bell (2008) states that “once a frame is understood by participants, then the communicative interaction happening within that frame makes sense to them” (p. 36) or is at least more likely to make sense. This means that, through lived experience in a discursive social, cultural, and political context, an individual may gain access to the common utterances and shared syntax that are specific to an identity category. Learning leads an individual to mobilize those discursive tools more effectively in order to be recognized within that category and by the category members. “I belong” experiences create material for later identity performances, where the more lived discursive experiences one has, the more fluid an individual can discursively enact identity and identity characteristics (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Many & Cole, 2012; Moje & Luke; 2009; Williams, 2006) to manage the impressions (Goffman, 1959) of those present in social contexts. For Schechner (2002), these framed performances are “‘twice behaved behaviors,” “re-sorted behaviors,” performed actions that people train to do that they practice and rehearse” (p. 22), where individuals learn the social and discursive cues to adjust to and engage in social relationships. PSTs draw from their experiences as K-16 students, university methods, and content courses, interactions with supervisors, peers, and collaborating teachers during their time in classrooms. This may or may not be effective with children they teach. These “not quite teachers” must metacognitively sift through those experiences to determine what is the most productive approach at that time, and in that moment to address/teach children based on those previous socially discursive experiences. Their decisions as to what discursive performance of teacher to rely on, is then met with either resistance or acceptance from observing stakeholders (supervisors, collaborating teachers, principals) who judge the PSTs pedagogical performance.
Williams (2006), who drew on his former work as bartender and waiter, reported how the needs of patrons at a table were different from those sitting at a bar. These differences required a shift in his own identity to better meet the customer’s social and (somewhat different) financial needs. Williams (2006) recognizes that his shifts in identity performances in restaurants he has studied, is similar to the shifts he has made in his literacy classroom:

I feel myself acting as an editor, a fellow writer, a father, or even a talk-show host, performing different roles at different moments, with different students, for different ends. In turn, the roles students perform are in constant negotiation with mine. How do we literacy teachers consciously or unconsciously construct our identities, and how are these identities read by students? What happens when our identities shift in the classroom, in conference, or in commenting on student writing? How might more careful reflection on who we think we are and how we got that way help us to better understand how we teach reading and writing and how our students respond to us? (p. 537)

Recognizing that literacy teachers need to shift their identity performances to meet the varied needs of students in classrooms, Williams (2006) further found from his work with literacy teachers that they saw their identity performances shift to a number of roles: “commander, mentor, friend, gatekeeper, coach, talk-show host, writer, con artist, counselor, cartographer, cheerleader, preacher, and guide” (p. 537), just to name a few. The concept of multiple/shifting teacher identity performances is further shared by Hubbard and Power (2003) who surveyed teachers and found they enacted more than 70 different identities, and Moje and Luke (2009) who claim that identity is not a singular construct, but rather a pluralistic one in which “one person might enact many different identities, both across a developmental trajectory or within a variety of different contexts” (p. 418). The literacy classroom is a dynamic environment, where
the teacher needs to perform identities that permit them to teach children in ways that they truly believe are best. Predictably, when teachers “try on” identities that are not congruent with their core beliefs, this may become counterproductive for both teacher and student (Williams, 2006).

Nias (1984) found that many individuals entered the teaching profession identifying as “persons-in-teaching” (p. 267) rather than as teacher; and that for many educators their pedagogical approach was predicated on core values, rather than the approach taken by the schools in which they taught. Therefore, Nias (1984) viewed teaching as a solitary practice where personality and personal preference was the primary catalyst that impacted teachers’ pedagogical decision making. From her theoretical perspective, there was little room, or need, for teachers to collaborate, much less engage in sociocultural aspects of teaching. As a means to cope with this ideological incoherence, Nias (1984) claims that:

As teachers, their behavior was consistent with the notion that these values were a closely-defended part of their substantial selves. Indeed, they adopted various strategies to protect themselves from situational influences. Once they felt technically competent, they changed jobs, moving from one school to another and one sector of education to another (p. 274).

Yet, there is a significant difference in recognizing a role and in using that “recognition” to metacognitively do work with that role as a platform. In fact, when we work with PSTs on their “roles” as literacy educators, we are assuming they can walk the path that is directed toward self-awareness, self-realization, and self-improvement as a way of being in that context. These are the deep, tacit rules of the teaching profession. In the next section, I focus on core ideologies and how this influences identity.
Core identity and sense of self. Of particular importance to this study on identity, is the connection between core identity characteristics and literacy teacher identity characteristics. Hence in this section, I use literature from Cole (2017), Denzin (2002), and Goffman (1959) to create a theoretical foundation for this finding. The connection between core identities and teacher identity is expounded on by Ticknor (2014) where she calls for teacher preparation programs “to engage preservice teachers in identity work by providing opportunities for preservice teachers to engage in cognitive and emotional dissonance while supported in the social context of teacher education programs” (p. 292). She suggests this is done through the exploration of personal biographies. Adding personal biographies to teacher preparation programs provide PSTs opportunity to explore and expose how the historical narrative of self impacts identity construction. As these soon-to-be teachers engage in collaborative relationships with supervisors, content coaches, collaborating teachers, methods and content instructors, children, peers, and all other educational stakeholders, they experience not just cognitive and emotional dissonance, as suggested by Ticknor (2014), but also deference that impacts both their teacher identity construction, manifestation, and mobilization. Denzin (2015) explains discourse as the intersection between performance and performativity, and that individuals experience themselves through these complex personal narratives. This model of dissonance does presage the conflicts teachers will encounter, and, for PSTs who have little or no experience teaching, this could not be more true. As PSTs enter the elementary internship settings armed with their experiences as K-5 students, possibly as babysitters, summer camp or after-school employees, tutors, older sibling or cousin, or any number of tertiary experiences working with children, there is an underlying assumption that they will “feel” some degree of dissonance towards teaching in the structured environment of school. This dissonance could involve any number of things:
English language learners, students with exceptionalities, students from different/varying cultures (maybe different from their own), low socioeconomic environments, urban children, public education, working supervisors or collaborating teachers, or any number of mitigating factors. This is by no means an exhaustive list, nor does the citation in the list indicate anything but difference from the PSTs’ retinue, but it is illustrative of the very conflicts that might arise later. If teacher preparation programs are looking for dissonance, they are sure to find it.

It is through these historical, self-narratives that one individual person almost becomes two people, the frontstage person and the backstage person. The frontstage person is the one performing for those present. The frontstage self that interprets the context and makes discursive decisions that are intended to control that social context. The backstage self remains hidden from those present (though always at work metacognitively) and is tied to one’s core beliefs, identities, and ideologies (Cole, 2017; Denzin, 2002; Goffman, 1959). The backstage self is suppressed by the front stage self to control the context, and intercept conflict in social situations (Cole, 2017; Goffman, 1959). Regarding this phenomenon, Denzin (2002) claims that “persons-as-performers manage impressions, contrive illusions, keep front and back stages separate, and deploy various dramaturgical skills, thereby turning each interactional episode into a tiny moment of staged, dramatic theater” (p. 107). By doing so, one controls both the discourse of the social context and the consequences that might arise if they were to reveal their backstage self. However, it is during these discursive performances where core ideologies begin to seep into the frontstage discourse. Denzin (1992) states that this is where “performance and performativity intersect in a speaking subject” (p. 112). This intersection of intermingling performance/performativity is for positionality (cite van Langenhoven and Harre here), and it is something that PSTs account for as they act the role of teacher in front of collaborating teachers,
supervisors, peers, and students. Here, PSTs may mirror the teaching techniques, perspectives, or beliefs of collaborating teachers, supervisors, or schools that do not align with their core ideologies. In such instances, this misalignment between front stage (what they say in their performance) and back stage (their metacognitive core beliefs), would be hidden within the language they use (Goffman, 1959) in discussions about their pedagogical practices. This provides rationale for using Blommaert and Varis’ (2015) four-point micro-hegemonic framework described in the next section.

**Sociocultural theory: Figured worlds, PST education, and developing literacy educators**

In this section, the ideas that Holland and colleagues (1998) present on the construction of identity through figured worlds will be applied to the world of PST education broadly (Bales, 2006; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Anderson & Stillman, 2013). Then, that will be followed by a narrower focus on developing literacy educators (Kosnik & Beck, 2008; Moats, 2014; NCES, 2012; Samaras and Gismondi, 1998; Turner, Applegate, & Applegate, 2011). This narrowing of the literature allows for the introduction of communities of practice and how these communities factor in both beginning teacher and PST literacy teacher education and identity construction (Gordon and Luke, 2015; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998; Woodside, Ziegler, and Paulus, 2009).

Holland et al (1998) describe the heuristic development of identity from a Vygotskian perspective whereby individuals gain access to identity categories through their interactions with others, their cultural resources, and their situational practice. These interactions then become tools for mediating future activities as “persons develop more or less conscious conceptions of themselves as actors in socially and culturally constructed worlds” (Holland et al., 1998, p. 40). Here, Holland and colleagues (1998) posit that heuristic development of identity takes on four
specific characteristics. First, figured worlds are *historical phenomena* with specific traditions and discourses. Second, these constructs are predicated on *social activity and participation* in those activities. Third, for the perpetuation of figured worlds individuals must organize socially with others to *reproduce the discourses and activities of those figured worlds*. Fourth, the discourses and activities of *figured worlds require personification*; that it only becomes a collective us when it becomes humanized (Holland et al., 1998). Holland and colleagues (1998) state that, “the identities we gain within figured worlds are thus specifically historical developments, grown through continued participation in the positions defined by the social organization of those worlds’ activity” (p. 41). For PSTs, those social organizations consist of both the preparation programs in which they are enrolled and their internship school sites. To a lesser extent, these organizations also include the PSTs’ previous classroom where they participated as students, as well their participation in less structured learning activities. These settings draw on historically developed activities to construct the figured world of “teacher” for these future educators.

The PST situation, however, is imparted upon by the forces who decide what teacher preparation ought to include. A decade ago, Bales (2006) described the battle over control of teacher preparation as a “tug of war” (p. 395) between state and national policymakers. A core argument in the fight for control of teacher training as, described by Bales, was an emphasis on student learning and how student teaching experiences provided opportunities for the manifestation of observed student learning. In line with Bales, student learning in the practicum setting arranged for PST education is very relevant to this study. Further, the recognition that research at that time (and still to this day) suggests best practice is to “create meaningful links between student and teaching practice” (Bales, 2006, p. 405), where the *acquisition of teaching*
skills is replaced with in-depth application of newly acquired knowledge of educational theory and its effects on student learning (Bales, 2006). At the same time Bales was highlighting this battle for control, Darling-Hammond (2006) had written an article entitled, Constructing 21st-century teacher education, where she discussed the inadequacies of traditional teacher preparation programs, which are characterized as “collections of largely unrelated courses” (p. 300). In this article, she argued that strong and effective preparation programs include the following three components: “tight coherence and integration among courses and between course work and clinical work in schools, extensive and intensely supervised clinical work integrated with course work using pedagogies that link theory and practice, and closer, proactive relationships with schools that serve diverse learners effectively and develop and model good teaching” (Darling-Hammond, 2006, p. 300). The similarities between Bales and Darling-Hammond highlight efforts made a decade ago to shift from teacher preparation program efforts that only met the needs of a small population of students to one that actualizes the needs of all students and saw the elementary student learner as both dynamic and diverse (Bales, 2006; Darling-Hammond, 2006).

Unfortunately, nearly a decade later, these critical components that highlight the need for effective clinical practice are still only a partial reality. In fact, the National School Board Association’s Center for Public Education (2016) reported that, of beginning public school teachers with a bachelor’s degree, only 54% had earned student teaching credits. Viewed another way, this means that 46% of those new teachers had not engaged in clinical practice prior to entering their own classroom. For those who were engaged in clinical practice, an important question remains: Are their clinical experiences helping them make the connections necessary to focus on student learning? Bales (2006) claims that best practice is to “create meaningful links
between student and teaching practice” (p. 405), where the acquisition of teaching skills is replaced with in-depth application of newly acquired knowledge of educational theory and its effects on student learning.

Anderson and Stillman (2013) suggest that clinical practice alone does not determine teacher effectiveness. Anderson and Stillman (2013) state “the specific contributions of clinical experiences and student teaching in particular, to PST development remain unclear even in the face of strident calls for ‘clinically rich’ pathways into teaching” (p. 4). Drawing on sociocultural learning theory, these researchers reviewed peer-reviewed articles on student teaching and clinical practice between 1990 and 2010. They found that the research did not support extensive and compelling evidence that PSTs were prepared to meet student learning needs (Anderson & Stillman, 2013).

If we were to apply the Holland and colleagues’ (1998) characteristics of identity construction through figured worlds to this paradigm of clinical practice, we would be left with this question: Have PST preparation programs done their job in educating future teachers? For beginning teachers who have not engaged in clinical experiences prior to becoming a teacher, they may conceptualize the figured world of teaching as a historical phenomenon, but they will have had little or no experiences that allow for the participation or reproduction of discourses and activities needed for the construction of a teacher identity, even the historical one based on their personal experiences and exchanges. Therefore, when entering the profession, their concept of us—the personification of teacher—is rudimentary at best. It is also problematic that the dynamics of these historical encounters with teachers have occurred in unbalanced communication exchanges.
Further, the mere fact that PSTs have engaged in clinical experiences does not necessarily mean that they are better off as educators. As Anderson and Stillman (2013) point out, many new teachers who have had clinical experiences struggle to make theory to practice connections and often fail to focus on student learning once they leave the university setting. Again, it seems that many beginning teachers cannot reproduce the discourses and socially mediated activities needed to be part of the figured world of teacher. Therefore, many new teachers do not feel as members of the world of teacher, and in fact feel unprepared to teach (Holland et al, 1998; Kosnik & Beck, 2008; Moats, 2014; NCES, 2012; Turner, Applegate, & Applegate, 2011). However, for preparation programs that do focus on the sociocultural construct of teacher preparation, the results can be fruitful.

In a case study of 50 PSTs in urban schools, Samaras and Gismondi (1998) investigated PST learning from a Vygotskian perspective. Here, they conceptualized and embedded PST teaching practices that emphasized five Vygotskian principles: situated learning, socially shared cognition, joint activity, zone of proximal development (ZPD), and culture, context and cognition (a framework that matches the Holland and colleagues’ (1998) characteristics of identity construction through figured worlds). Samaras and Gismondi (1998) posit that from this sociocultural perspective of situated learning is learning, there must be an immersion into contextualized activities, where socially shared cognition is both a social and metacognitive event mediated through interaction with others. This suggests that knowing how to be a teacher (plan, talk, teach) is a social competence that is conceptualized through dialogic interactions and activities with others that are doing those same things. Developing an effective teacher identity is not a solitary act; it is a result of being immersed in a rich community of practitioners.
The PSTs in this study participated in discourses and activities within their ZPD, mediated through collaboration and assistance with stakeholders—CTs, supervisors, and peers (Samaras & Gismondi, 1998). Immersed in the culture, context and cognitions of teaching, these PSTs conceptualized important aspects and understandings both of what to teach and how to teach it. Samaras and Gismondi (1998) state that, “through situated engagement and negotiation with practitioners and peers in a teaching community, preservice teachers come to define what it means to be a teacher” (p. 715). Although this study does not follow the participants into their early years as teachers, immersion into the figured world of teacher has the potential for greater conceptualization of this identity. Often, this level of pedagogical contextualization and identity construction occurs on the job once PSTs have left preparation programs and become novice teachers (Clark, Jones, Reutzel, & Andreasen, 2013; Deal & White, 2006; Hopkins & Spillane, 2014; Samaras & Gismondi, 1998; Stanulis, Fallona, & Pearson, 2002).

One aspect of sociocultural theory that can link to classroom practice, is that of constructivist teaching. Constructivism is an epistemology that is used to describe how individuals learn, think, and show their understandings about a given topic (Windschitl, 2002). Windschitl (2002) states that constructivist in education is:

- the complex of concerns and invested activity that binds together teachers, students, administrators, parents, and community members as they participate, in various ways, in reform-oriented education. Constructivism in practice includes the ambiguities, contradictions, and compromises that are part of implementing constructivist instruction—it represents a highly problematized view that takes into account the tensions that characterize reform teaching in general and teaching for understanding in particular (p. 132).
Windschitl (2002), who explored both the historical premise and the broad range of literature on constructivism’s impact on classroom practice that enhances learning, determined that when teaching from this theoretical paradigm, children have a greater capacity to collaborate and “elaborate on or restructure their knowledge” (p. 137) of what they are learning. In this learning environment, teachers mediate the learning experiences by modeling instruction and providing children with problem-based collaborative activities. Children in these classrooms learn to apply knowledge in a wide range of contexts, and “construct arguments based on evidence” (p. 137) to represent what they have learned.

In 2005, Virginia Richardson edited the second and last volume of *Constructivist teacher education: Building new understandings* where she assembled works from educational researchers that discussed the implications of applying constructivist teaching practices in classroom settings. Richardson, and colleagues (2005) vision of constructivist ideals run counter to the transmission model (teacher-centered pedagogy similar to Freire’s (2003) banking model) of education, and define constructivist teaching as:

> a learning or meaning-making theory that suggests individuals create their own new understandings, based upon the interaction of what they already know and believe, and the phenomena or ideas with which they come into contact (p. 3).

Richardson (2005) goes on to state that, “constructivism is a descriptive theory of learning (this is the way people learn or develop); it is not a prescriptive theory of learning (this is the way people should learn)” (p. 3). The definition above is a broad stroke at constructivist teaching, and the authors in this volume who have implemented and researched constructivist teaching highlight the following aspects of this theory in practice: (a) children construct meaning on their own terms regardless of what teachers do, (b) children construct their own idiosyncratic
meanings from content, (c) involves student-centered active learning experiences, (d) requires student-student and student-teacher interaction, (e) children work with concrete materials to solve realistic problems, (f) children create their own meanings based on the interaction of their prior knowledge with peers and instruction, and (g) pre-service teachers purposefully plan with mentors to target student-centered teaching practices (Feiman-Nemser & Beasley, 2005; Peterman, 2005; Robinson, 2005; Vadeboncoeur, 2005; Winitzky & Kauchak, 2005).

The constructivist approach to teaching drawn on in these works, fits emphasizes “sociocultural theories which emphasize the social and situated nature of learning through joint activity” (Feiman-Nemser & Beasley, 2005, p. 107). Constructivist learning, from this lens, provides equitable learning experiences that fit the developmental ability of children and promotes children’s participation in joint activities facilitated by student-centered teachers (Feiman-Nemser & Beasley, 2005; Richardson, 2005). This sociocultural aspect of constructivist teaching, aligns with the sociocultural aspect of apprenticeship described above, in that: if constructivist practices from this perspective are absent from the placements, and the Residency operates as a community of practice that focuses on student-learning, then Resident PSTs learning from the literacy coach to be student-centered, they would then embrace these constructivist teaching practices.

Communities of practice. This next section will focus on novice literacy teachers, and how schools create support systems similar to the one described above in order for these novice teachers to become part of the teaching profession. In order for an individual to be taken seriously by others in an identity category, their performance of that identity needs to be believable by others (Gee, 2015). Wenger (1998) posits that the transition from novice to member of the desired “community of practice” means that participants need to move in three
ways: The first is that they need to possess the ability to communicate with those in that community. The second is that they must have conceptualized the necessary resources needed to negotiate meaning for that desired identity (this includes: understanding the discourses, concepts, and actions of that identity). And third, they must feel accountable to the purpose of the practices which define that identity category. This section will provide necessary background theory for the conceptualization of figured worlds (Holland et al., 1998) as individuals progress from peripheral boundary dwellers (Woodside et al., 2009), to the center of important identity categories as they work within a community of practice. Further, I will make connections between identity, communities of practice, and figured worlds to the ways PSTs identify as literacy educators. I will also include the Urban Teacher Residency Partnership Program and its support structures as described by the program founder Dennis (2016) in my presentation.

Lave and Wenger (1991) assert that communication within an identity category allows an individual access to the internal, situated activities where knowledge is shared with them by others within a community of practice. Gordon and Luke (2015) state that “a community of practice is not simply a collection of people, but rather a web of participants mutually engaged in a shared enterprise” (p. 3). Thus, the social and cultural aspects of an identity category can be learned and negotiated. Therefore, participants in a community of practice become “located in a social world” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 36), in which a discursive encounter becomes a situated activity where a novice works towards full membership or legitimate peripheral participating (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Legitimate peripheral participation means the negotiation of social, cultural, and cognitive dichotomies, such as: cerebral and embodied activities, contemplation and involvement, and abstraction and experience within each individual’s action through speech knowledge, and learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Therefore, full participation in a community of
practice is social, where all human activity must be situated and associated with sociocultural circumstances. Lave and Wenger (1991) state that, “participation is always based on situated negotiations of meaning in the world” (p. 51), which is mobilized in and through language. The process of becoming, or “enoughness,” is central to the sociocultural context described above, in which learning occurs and knowledge is acquired. For Bakhtin (1981), this is called “ideological becoming” (p. 341).

Bakhtin (1981) states that, “the ideological becoming of a human being…is the process of selectively assimilating the words of others” (p. 341) and that, “our ideological development is…an intense struggle within us for hegemony among various available verbal and ideological points of view, approaches, directions and values” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 346). Within a community of practice, these worlds collide through discourse in what Wenger (1998) calls “regimes of competence” (p. 137). To participate within an identity category, an individual needs to become versed in the language and actions of that identity, where their performance must then be believable by other members of that community of practice. For those who newly enter a community of practice, they find themselves on the outskirts, or boundary, of the desired identity category. Woodside and colleagues (2009) call these newcomers “boundary dwellers” (p. 21). As newcomers to a community of practice, one has limited access to Wenger’s (1998) “regimens of competence” (p. 137), and it is through the collaborative enterprise of apprenticeship where shared meaning results in generated knowledge for and of an identity category. Therefore, newcomers receive help from other members, learn social and cultural practices, and negotiate meaning as elements of competence, all of which allow them to display the proper amount of emblematic features to be accepted as a full participating member; or “enoughness.” Woodside and colleagues (2009) state that, “participation and reification are not discrete entities: rather,
they are blended together as a way for members to engage with one another in a community of practice” (p. 22), and, for Woodside et al. (2009), the internship is ripe for participation, reification, and regimes of competence. For PSTs, the internship or practicum setting, is a place where both dissonance and deference manifest as these novice educators enter the elementary education literacy community of practice.

**The development of beginning teachers as literacy educators.** The concept of on the job training does not escape teachers and teaching. Many states require either student teaching experiences and/or mentorship programs for new teachers (TEACH, 2016). Often, to fill the theory-to-practice void, classrooms become the space where new teachers learn the skills necessary to meet the needs of children and to connect theory and practice (Clark, Jones, Reutzel, & Andreasen, 2013; Deal & White, 2006; Hopkins & Spillane, 2014; Stanulis, Fallona, & Pearson, 2002). The school becomes a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) for these novice educators. For example, in an exploratory mixed methods study, Hopkins and Spillane (2014) used social interview data on social networking to identify factors of how the school becomes the site for teacher education. Their study looked at how beginning teachers in 24 schools across two districts learned about literacy instruction. In these schools, support structures for novice teachers included consistent and frequent interaction with grade level teams, instructional leaders, and administrators. These structured interactions were designed to help beginning teachers develop grade specific literacy instructional strategies, to lesson planning, and reflect on their teaching practices. Hopkins and Spillane (2014) found these interactions useful for beginning teachers to acquire literacy pedagogical skills and strategies and make theory to practice connections that escaped them as PSTs. Here, the figured world and
identity construction of literacy teacher was conceptualized through discourses and activities from structured interactions with education professionals within school settings.

Deal and White (2006) as well as Stanulis, Fallona, and Pearson (2002) reported findings similar to those of Hopkins and Spillane (2014) in that intensive school support structures were present for beginning teachers to assist in preparation of more in-depth literacy teaching practices. However, these two studies placed further emphasis on student-centered learning as a measure of pedagogical competence. These support structures allowed new teachers to further develop philosophies of learning and adapted as PSTs to new philosophies of learning constructed as beginning teachers. Deal and White (2006) state that the “school context [h]as an important influence on novice literacy teacher development” (p. 326) where support structures become “factors that contributed to a more secure identity” (Stanulis et al., 2002, p. 78). The beginning teachers in the studies of novice teacher literacy development in school contexts (Deal & White, 2006; Hopkins and Spillane, 2014; Stanulis, Fallona, & Pearson, 2002) became the collective us-both teacher and literacy teacher-described by Holland and colleagues (1998) making the school a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). However, these novice educators also had to forfeit their PST status to safeguard against undeveloped pedagogical conceptualizations. They are now the teacher of record and responsible for educating the children in their care. Therefore, these novice educators must rely on school community members to develop their philosophies of teaching and learning. The figured worlds and identity construction for these beginning teachers were conceptualized through working in a community of practice.

Gelfuso and Dennis (2014) recognized the importance of support structures for PSTs similar to those described above. They stated that “it seems as though much is riding on the idea that pre-service teachers can/will/do create professional understandings about teaching and
learning from their extensive time in field experiences” (p. 10). The identity construction of PSTs in extensive field experiences working within literacy rich support structures is directly relevant to this study.

**Theory of language: Discourse, performances, and hegemony**

Understanding how identity is constructed in communities of practice is also directly relevant to this study. In the next section, communities of practice will be conceptualized and how these communities become catalysts for identity construction. This study is concerned with how identity is a performance mobilized and mediated through language. In this section, I draw on Gee’s (2014) constructs of language and identity, which will be connected to Goffman’s (1959) theories of identity construction to construct the theoretical foundation of this study. This will then be related to the work of Blommaert and Varis (2015) and how micro-hegemony impacts the nuanced aspects of identity construction of figured worlds.

Gee (2014) states that “identity is a performance,” (p. 24) and, in order to be seen as a member of an identity category, an individual’s discursive performance must be believable to others of that same identity category. Therefore, discourse is the foundation of human communication where language manifests life, and life manifests language through spoken units of speech, and that the reciprocal nature of this relationship is identity construction (Bakhtin, 1986; Gee, 2014). To understand language is to understand how that language is used in context to mobilize an identity, and how this act, or performance, is the recognition of an identity. Gee (2014) states, “building different identities in language always implicates different social languages, since it is in and through different social languages (as they are embedded in different Discourses) that we enact, perform, and recognize different socially-situated identities” (p. 179). For Goffman (1959), the enactment of identity is to control a socially-constructed situation
through the management of impressions of those present in a social situation. Impressions management is therefore to speak, behave, do, and use tools that make the identity performance believable (Gee, 2014; Goffman, 1959).

Individuals need first to “define the situation” (Goffman, 1959, p. 1) of the discursive encounter and then make decisions as to what discourses they will manifest to control the impressions of the audience present. For Gee (2005), these interactions are called “Discourse models;” and for Bakhtin (1986) “speech genres”. These synonymous terms allow the speaker to position him or herself during discursive interactions. To talk either from a model (a set of ideas that describe the past, present, or future state of something) or genre (a category characterized by a particular style, form, or content) means that the speaker has espoused language specific to that context, has evaluated the circumstances pertinent to the discursive moment, and then manifests language (Bakhtin, 1986; Gee, 2014; Gee, 2005; Lave & Wenger, 1991) to control both internal and external factors to perform that identity. Goffman (1959) defined performance as “all the activity of a given participant on a given occasion which serves to influence in any way any of the other participants” (p. 15). The enactment and performance of identity is therefore shaped by social and institutional positioning through the valorization of norms that define and control a particular identity category. Therefore, to “define the situation” (Goffman, 1959, p. 1), individuals negotiate both internal and external factors to control societal ideologies for the defined context, and then position themselves around these conceptualizations to perpetuate the maintenance of a social order for an identity category through hegemonic performances (Blommaert & Varis, 2015; Goffman, 1959).

Goffman (1959) posits that, within an identity category, there emerge certain actions and discourses that attend to that desired identity; and that individuals will draw on “expressive
equipment of a standard kind intentionally or unwittingly employed by the individual during his performance” (Goffman, 1959, p.22). In other words, the language an individual uses during identity performances perpetuates the dominant discourse of that identity category in order to be seen as a viable member by those in attendance. Language then becomes the catalyst for identity construction; of which it is both a sphere for, and component of, human activity (Bakhtin, 1986). Therefore, language is the ideological manipulation of semiotic domains for the purpose of communication and identity construction (Lave & Wenger, 1991). A speaker makes linguistic decisions based on their historical interpretation of language within an identity construct, as it relates to what they wish to communicate (Bakhtin, 1986) and what identities they wish to enact. Therefore, discourse has emblematic features characterized by an identity, which intentional rather than random, and in fact are to promote their performance of the desired identity (Blommaert & Varis, 2015; Gee, 2014; Goffman, 1959; Lave & Wenger, 1991).

For Gee (2005), this is called the speaker’s “story line.” A story line is an individual’s experience with a Discourse model, where those experiences allow for dialogic interaction. The speaker then relies on historical moments of their lived experiences, and the patterns of former discursive interaction for an identity category to then position themselves in the conversation. According to Lave and Wenger (1991), “the generality of any form of knowledge always lies in the power to negotiate the meaning of the past and future in constructing the meaning of present circumstances” (p. 34). Therefore, the ability to construct an utterance which addresses an identity category is dependent on, but not limited to, the historical interaction between the individual and words, phrases, and the social construction of identities. This is then true of all discourse on Discourse where all experiences allow an individual reflexivity with language to participate in social contexts from a more informed stance when enacting an identity (Lave &
Discourse is both social and linguistic, as it is a way to both behave and make sense of the world through language, social norms, and values within a shared space (Florio-Ruane & Morrell, 2004). Further, the social influences on a speaker become that speaker’s background and historical conceptualization for an identity in conjunction with personal perspective, acquired and situated meaning(s), power, status, political implication, and the implication of the utterance on social goods (Gee, 2105) influence the speaker prior to and during discursive interaction (Lave & Wenger, 1991). These language that is used are hegemonic valorization of an identity as one attempts to control, and is, in fact, controlled by, societal ideologies for the identity construct in which they are performing (Brookfield, 2005; Hall, 1997; Kiesling, 2006).

Gee (2015) makes the distinction between these discursive constructs through the use of big D-Discourse as the sociocultural institutional ideological influences on identity and that little d-discourse is language in use. This upper/lower case dichotomy is further elaborated on by Roswell and Adams (2015) who use big I-Identity to describe the discursive idiosyncratic agentive ways of being for an individual and little i-identity as one’s developed sense of self. Though the contrastable nature of upper/lower case representations make for easy distinction between overarching social structures and their influences on an individual, when that individual enters into discourse there is no separation between D and d, or I and i. They are, in fact, one and the same at the moment one mobilizes language. This is not to say that conceptually these constructs do not exist. Having them makes it easier to articulate issues of power. However, the moment an individual mobilizes language of any sort, they are enacting and performing an identity in which all influences—both hegemonic and/or benign—are drawn upon. Therefore, a different conceptualization for identity, one that is micro-hegemonic, as opposed to dichotomous,
is called for. Blommaert and Varis (2015) posit that modern identity is earmarked by what they call “superdiversity” (p. 4); and that individual identities are a patchwork of different hegemonic constructs. For modern identity work, there is not one hegemonic influence that dominates the actions and discourses of an individual, but a mosaic of micro-hegemonies, which constructs that individual’s identity. This hegemonic web of. For example: “language structures, practices, performances, biology, individual psychologies, and ideologies” (Kiesling, 2006, p. 268), but an intricate and encompasses systems of ideas around the discursive enactment of identity (Kiesling, 2006). Gee (2015) states that, “identities are more fluid than labels” (p. 23), and that identity is a performance which “will not work unless at least some people recognize what you are and what you are doing in your performance” (Gee, 2015, p. 24). For Gee (2015), language is a way of communicating identity through social activities, and that discourse analysis is a way to seek out the “liberating moments” in the storyline, cultural model, conversation and narratives of that individual. He discusses the importance of context and that some aspects of context are fixed, while others are not; the fixed aspects—social, cultural, political, and institutional discourses—are represented in language and how power comes into play. Yet, it is how the individual uses language to negotiate this power that creates the micro-liberating moment as opposed to how the larger social institutional structures oppress individuals.

Blommaert and Varis (2015) posit that in those performances, the enactment of identity is not a singular construct, but is in fact the mobilization of multiple micro-hegemonic identities. They further provide a four-point framework to describe this complex concept. Here, a fuller nature of identity construction is conceptualized to account for all aspects of lived experiences and how then individuals situate themselves in different contexts. Blommaert and Varis (2015) state that, “micro-hegemonized niches is ultimately what would make up ‘the’ identity of
someone” (p. 5) and that their proposed four point framework is a means to understand how language and practice coalesce in their utility by individuals to be seen as, and taken seriously as members of an identity category, or a community of practice. The next section will describe the process of becoming in a community of practice as individuals move from the outskirts, to a more centralized position of an identity category as they display discursive features of enoughness. Blommaert and Varis’ (2015) four point micro-hegemonic framework is as follows:

a. Identity discourses and practices can be described as discursive orientations towards sets of features that are seen (or can be seen) as emblematic of particular identities. These features can be manifold and include artefacts, styles, forms of language, places, times, forms of art or aesthetics, ideas and so forth.

b. To be more precise, we will invariably encounter specific arrangements or configurations of such potentially emblematic features. The features rarely occur as a random or flexible complex; when they appear they are presented (and oriented towards) as ‘essential’ combinations of features that reflect, bestow and emphasize ‘authenticity’.

c. We will inevitably encounter different degrees of fluency in enregistering these discursive orientations. Consequently, identity practices will very often include stratified distinctions between ‘experts’ and ‘novices’, ‘teachers’ and ‘learners’, and ‘degrees’ of authenticity. In this respect, we will see an implicit benchmark being applied: ‘enoughness’. One has to ‘have’ enough of the emblematic features in order to be ratified as an authentic member of an identity category.

d. Obviously, these processes involve conflict and contestation, especially revolving around ‘enoughness’ (s/he is not enough of X; or too much of X) as well as about the particular configurations of emblematic features (‘in order to be X, you need to have
1,2,3,4 and 5’ versus ‘you can’t be X without having 6, 7, 8, 9’). And given this essentially contested character, these processes are highly dynamic: configurations of features and criteria of enoughness can be adjusted, reinvented, amended. (p. 5-6)

This framework was a critical component to the analysis of data for this study. This, in conjunction with the seven building tasks (Gee, 2014), allowed me to target the different traits that emerged to construct each participant’s literacy teacher identity. In the next section, I discuss the literature on teacher identity, followed by a section on literacy teacher identity.

**Teacher Identity**

To conceptualize teacher identity for this study, I looked first at Beijjard, Meijer, and Verloop’s (2000, 2004) framework along with the work by Nias (1989), and how micro-identities are constructed once drawing on the work of Lave and Wenger (1991) and Blommaert and Varis (2015).

Beijjard and colleagues (2004) determine the need for more consistency and greater conceptualization of identity, teacher identity, and teacher professional identity. Their early framework (Beijaard et al., 2000) looked at influential factors that impacted what a teacher does in the educational context. Here, teachers described three distinct areas of expertise: content knowledge, pedagogical decisions, and didactical experiences. Beijaard and colleagues (2000) posit that *content knowledge* is the extent to which teachers understand subject areas content which then impacts teacher effectiveness. More effective teachers have a greater conceptualization of what they are teaching, where less effective educators do not. *Pedagogical decisions* is a teacher’s conceptualization and pedagogical expertise based on the populations of students in their classrooms. Teachers show awareness of students’ social, emotional, and developmental needs paired with understandings of the broad societal issues that affect learning.
for that population of children. The third aspect of their framework is the reflections teachers make in regard to didactical experiences. Here, teachers reflect and adjust their practice based on what works and what does not work during instruction as it pertains to student learning and achievement.

In their later work on teacher identity, Bejjard and colleagues (2004) posit that identity is a process that is ongoing and ever changing. They describe teachers as having sub-identities that may or may not be linked to one’s overall core teacher identity. In Nias’s (1989) research on teacher’s substantial self, she found that teacher’s personal values did not always match the values of the school in which they worked. This created internal tension with these teachers and caused a sense of isolation and a need to protect themselves and the core values they cherished (Nias, 1989). These competing discourses caused teachers to seek outside support from likeminded individuals. Nias (1989) further found that this dissonance directly affected their performance, resulting in many leaving schools that contradicted their core values for schools that better matched that of their own (Nias, 1989). Based on Nias’ (1989) findings, this idea that these sub-identities may only be a peripheral part of the overall identity of a person proposed by Bejjard and colleagues (2004) is rudimentary and seems to contradict their point that “professional identity is not something teachers have, but something they use in order to make sense of themselves” (Bejjard et al. 2004, p.123). All lived experience is linked to an individual’s core sense of self and impacts the subsequent decisions they make (Gee, 2014; Wenger, 1998). Wenger (1998) claims that identity cannot be viewed as an abstract collective of compartmentalized constructs and that “generalizations and stereotypes miss the lived complexity of identity” (p. 146). Sub-identities, or micro-hegemonic identity characteristics were at the core of this study. Bejjard et al. (2004) posit that sub-identities must be in harmony and
balance for teachers, and that “the more central [conflict and change] a sub-identity is, the more costly it is to change or lose that identity” (p. 122). Once an identity construct is conceptualized, it cannot be taken away. The residual effect is permanently embedded as part of one’s life project (Blommaert & Varis, 2015).

Beijard and colleagues (2004) point out that teacher identity research uses the concepts of self and identity as interchangeable related constructs. This idea that identity is different from core self is highlighted in Gee’s (2015) work with language in that identity is “ways of being in the world at different times and places for different purposes” (p. 228), and this is different from “your core sense of self” (p. 228). Oyserman, Elmore, & Smith (2012) describe the differences between self and identity as:

the self is an important motivational tool both because the self feels like a stable anchor, and because the identities that constitute the self are, in fact, dynamically constructed in context. The self is useful because people look to their identities in making choices and because these identities are situated, pragmatic, and attuned to the affordances and constraints of the immediate context. (p. 70)

The *dynamically constructed* identities depicted above are predicated on the indexed lived experiences of the individual. This means that “the self” can be leveraged and manipulated by others to be able to control the impressions of those in attendance within a social context. Lave and Wenger (1991) consider conceptualizations of identity that do not position the individual at the center of situated activities where lived experiences construct the *whole* person “akin to naïve views of indexicality” (p. 33). Conversely, it is the culmination of these indexed interactions that create “ideological coherence” (Blommaert & Varis, 2015, p. 53) for individuals, and the mobilization of discursive resources required to be seen as an authentic member of an identity
category (Bell, 2008; Goffman, 1959). Therefore, the micro-hegemonies attached to these discursive features are part of an individual’s construction of self and identity. Micro-hegemonies are: a) the emblematic discursive features characterized by an identity category; b) these emblematic features are not random and essential to authentic identity construction; c) “enoughness;” is when an individual displays the appropriate amount of emblematic features of an identity category; and d) the dynamic, conflictual, and contested aspect which define and redefine the emblematic features of enoughness for an identity (Blommaert & Varis, 2015).

The Beijjard framework is also useful in that, in this seminal work on teacher identity, content knowledge, pedagogical decisions, and didactical experiences highlight evidence of being and becoming a literacy teacher for this present study. Equally important to this study is the concept of sub-identities that were previously recognized as tertiary and unlinked to one’s overall core teacher identity, and the connections between self and identity that may be drawn upon by individuals to make sense of the world around them.

**Literacy Teacher Identity**

To better understand literacy identity, this section looks at Moje and Luke (2009) and Lewis and Del Valle’s (2009) frameworks to better understand theories of identity. In this section, the relationship between identity and literacy is conceptualized and how each has social implications of power and agency for research and learning.

Moje and Luke’s (2009) framework was developed through their comprehensive review of literature on what they recognized as an interdependent reciprocal relationship between literacy and identity. Specifically, this seminal work reviewed studies of how identity shaped visions of literacy as well as its converse—how views of literacy shape conceptualizations of identity.
Moje and Luke (2009) found that identity research conceptualized identity with the following three assumptions: (a) identity is constructed socially as opposed to individually, (b) identity is not a singular construct that begins at childhood and is complete at adulthood, but rather a pluralistic one, in which “one person might enact many different identities, both across a developmental trajectory or within a variety of different contexts” (p. 418), and (c) that identities are recognizable by others. This theoretical perspective on identity, along with the aforementioned reciprocity between literacy and identity, informed their five conceptions of identity; they are: (a) identity as difference, (b) identity as sense of self/subjectivity, (c) identity as mind or consciousness, (d) identity as narrative, and (e) identity as position; a particular lens that has been expanded to a psychological approach called “positioning theory” as written down by Harrè and van Lagenhove (1999) where in social encounters there is a mutually determined trio of positions, storylines, and speech acts that work as constituents to identity formation. See Table 1 for a detailed description of each identity metaphor.

In the development of this framework on identity and literacy, Moje and Luke (2009) found that a limited number of literacy/identity studies recognize the breadth and depth of perspectives to theorize and conceptualize identity. Yet, those different theoretical perspectives had significant impact on both the implications and assumptions of relational factors between literacy and identity. In other words, how do these concepts inform one another? This is a perspective that at that time Moje and Luke (2009) felt had not been sufficiently theorized and/or conceptualized and should be the focus of future research on the topic.
Table 1
Moje and Luke five metaphors of Literacy and Identity

*Identity as difference*: the primary emphasis is on national, race, ethnic, and/or cultural identities, and how people relate to, and distinguish themselves through group membership and how this provides them with beliefs, knowing, and doing shape individuals.

*Identity as self*: this metaphor is primarily concerned with how selves come to be, and what constitutes a self. And requires a certain essentialization of the self, that is, self as a self-evident object.

*Identity as mind or consciousness*: here the emphasis is on how lived experiences, or activity, shape individual reality which in turn shape consciousness, which in turn, creates a new reality, and thus new activity based on this new conceptualization. This is a perpetual process due to the continued engagement in activities experiences.

*Identity as narrative*: here identity is represented and constructed through the stories one tells about oneself.

*Identity as position*: here identity is concerned with power relations and is displayed through discourse and other semiotic systems. (Moje & Luke, 2009, pp. 419-431)

Lewis and Del Valle (2009) also published a work that depicted scholarly, sociocultural conceptualizations of identity based on the era (both chronologically and thematically organized) in which the research was conducted. They posit that identity research since the 1970’s can be segmented into three waves of theoretical perspectives on identity that in turn impacted the research. Lewis and Del Valle (2009), claim that these three waves consist of: (a) research
produced in the 1970’s and 1980’s that theorized identity unified and stable, (b) research produced in 1990’s to the present theorize identity as a negotiated performance, and (c) current research (they do not denote an era for this final wave of identity conceptualization) that theorizes the hybridity of identity as improvisational and meta-discursive. Lewis and Del Valle (2009) are clear that these time stamped waves are rough generalizations of the period, but research conducted in these windows denote specific characteristics of identity across studies. To section identity research in such a concrete manner leaves room for skepticism in regard to the trustworthiness of the sequencing proposed by Lewis and Del Valle (2009); or even the discreteness of underlying intents associated with research agendas. After all, in earlier treatment of performativity versus performance, these constructions of identity performances were hybrid based an individual’s perception of the social context (Bell, 2008; Goffman, 1959); which means that the developmental trajectory introduced here by Lewis and Del Valle (2009) would only be a matter of choice of framing by the interpreter.

For this study of pre-service teacher identity, these broad sweeping conceptualizations were useful to the understanding of different theoretical approaches to identity research. Lewis and Del Valle (2009) first looked identity and literacy where studies theorized identity as a relatively stable construct based on cultural affiliations. Here cultural conflict took center stage as the institution of schooling was challenged by research that now saw home cultures as stable from an identity standpoint even if it was perceived as non-dominant. Next, they identified studies that identity was seen as socially-mediated performances that are context bound. Here, identity was a discursive social negotiation of lived experiences in which agency and power play different roles depending on those present during social interactions. Finally, Lewis and Del Valle (2009) discussed studies that found identity as hybrid, meta-discursive, often
improvisational due to social positionality, and conceptualized based on local and global discursive activities. Here, online identities, sexual orientations, and genders are examples of identity constructs that individuals draw upon but are not limited by. Building on the concept of positionality, Harrè and van Lagenhove (1999) elaborated on premise that interlocutors situate themselves in conversations through jointly determined positioning within the storylines of conversations. Though degrees of ambiguity may exist between the speakers (What is she thinking? What does she think of me? What will he say next? Is what I said believable?), this act of placing oneself in the social contexts while accounting for the hegemony of social structures mirrors earlier discussions on Goffman (1959) and Bell’s (2008) perspective of framing—how individuals make sense of, conceptualize, and interpret social interactions—and performance theory. For PSTs, positioning themselves as literacy educators is a matter of accounting for the factors (what were their former experiences as literacy students? Are they more comfortable teaching math or science? Who are they performing for: collaborating teacher, principal, or supervisor) that impact how they will be perceived by those in attendance in order to become a member of the literacy teaching club.

Lewis and Del Valle (2009) recognized that theoretical conceptualizations of identity shape the study of literacy and identity, and that, moving forward, studies that address identity should account for the afore mentioned epistemological perspectives on identity.

Summary

Chapter Two of this dissertation has provided background information about the various theories that ground this study. First, in the performance theory thread, I focused identity construction from the perspectives of Bell (2008), Goffman (1959), Schechner (1997, 1998, 2006), and Williams (2006). For the sociocultural strand, I drew on Holland et al. (1998), Bell
CHAPTER THREE:

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to better understand the processes in which three pre-service teachers (PSTs) became literacy educators. Case study design and discourse analysis were used as the research method for this study to better understand how PSTs mobilize discursive hegemonic identity constructs. My study was designed to derive a better understanding of literacy teacher identity and the different characteristics that PSTs draw on to construct themselves as literacy educators. This chapter consists of information related to the research design, participants and the residency setting, data and collection methods, data analysis procedures to answer the following research question:

- In what ways do three PSTs develop their literacy teacher identity?

Rationale

The rationale for this study was to provide insight through discourse analysis (Gee, 2014) into the processes three PSTs draw on to construct their literacy teacher identity when reflecting on their literacy pedagogical practices. The following data were collected for analysis:

1: Initial participant interviews: At the onset of the academic school year, I contacted participants to schedule initial interviews. I then conducted semi-structured interviews in a setting that was selected by the participant with the contingency that the space was quiet so as to eliminate distractions. The interview questions (see appendix A) ranged from introductory
questions on participant experiences as K-12 students and their motivations to become teachers, perceptions of current literacy practices taking place in schools, their perceptions of self as literacy educators, their literacy teaching philosophies, and their descriptions of what literacy teachers are and what literacy teaching is.

2: Stimulated recall (SR) interviews: SR, a metacognitive strategy, calls for the recording of an observed event, followed by interviews prompted by those recordings, where the video is used as a stimulus to prompt recall of the event, and where the participants verbalize the thoughts and feelings they have during that viewing (Calderhead, 1981; Lyle, 2003). These introspective verbalizations are oriented towards cognition and what the participant was thinking at the time of the event (Calderhead, 1981; Lyle, 2003); and/or reflections of the event at that moment of the interview (Geiger, Muir, & Lamb, 2015; Lutovac, Kaasila, & Juuso, 2015; Schepens, Aelterman, & Van Keer, 2007). Lyle (2003) states that one of the advantages of SR “is the comparison of the introspections of experts and those of novices” (p. 874). Lyle’s observation is directly relevant to this study since the participants’ metacognitive introspective verbalizations were made about their literacy practices.

Participants

The participants for this study were three female resident PSTs (Madon, Kathy, and Ellie) who were part of a larger cohort of 12 PSTs (all female) in their final practicum year in an urban undergraduate elementary teacher residency partnership program at a large university in the Southeastern United States. These participants had several similarities among them: Each was in their early 20’s, had married parents, came from a middle-class background, and were PSTs in urban Title I partnership schools. These participants were also part the Cambridge School Experience (CSE), a four-week study abroad program. Both the Urban Teacher Residency
Partnership Program and the Cambridge School Experience are discussed later in this section after a brief description of each individual participant. Madon and Kathy were in the same placement school, different and that school was from Ellie’s school. You will need to mention how you came to select these three out of the population

*Madon* came from a white middle-class background where both of her parents were educators. She was the middle child between two older and two younger brothers. Madon felt as though she spent much of her adolescence living in the shadows of two older brothers, and that they were the benchmarks that she was held to by her parents. This pattern continued as she grew older because she then became the benchmark standard for her younger brothers. Having teachers for parents had both a positive and a negative impacts on Madon. She recognized the value of quality family time from having both parents present in both her academic and her home lives. With teacher parents, they were involved in her education and spent time together during school breaks for vacations and family activities as well. However, being a student in the school where her parents taught, also had a negative impact on her. During the initial interview, she recalled several instances in which she felt “tortured” by them in school. Throughout her K-12 experiences, Madon was active in clubs, sports, and even earned a scholarship to play soccer at a small state college in the southeast; an experience marked by negative circumstances where she again felt “tortured.” This time by the head soccer coach. These negative circumstances and life experiences were what Madon felt gave her “voice.” It became a voice that she drew on to resist her parents, her peers, and eventually, the educational policies she did not ascribe to in her practicum placement. She even resisted the idea that she was part of a culture as Madon told me, “I’m like middle class white. Don’t really have a culture. I’ve identified as that recently; that I’m not… I don’t have all this culture stuff to back me up. So, I have negative experiences that I’ve
turned into leadership opportunities.” Madon was in a third-grade placement with two CTs who combine and coteach their assigned classes at the time of this study.

*Kathy* had a younger teenage brother, and came from a married, upper-middle class household. Her mom was Thai and her dad was American. She considered herself half Asian, and, in her own words, she saw herself as, “pretty American.” Kathy described her family as open and supportive, and she could discuss life circumstances and work through problems with a good deal of parental input. As a K-12 student, Kathy went to a foundational school where she was with the same, relatively small group of students for her entire educational experience. This school had a high level of parent involvement, and she felt as if her parents had high educational expectations for her. Before choosing her major in education, Kathy attempted a career path in medicine, but she switched to teaching when she struggled with chemistry early in her coursework. Kathy described herself as an indecisive person who tries to avoid conflict by using passive aggressive strategies when conflicts arise. Finally, Kathy was on an action plan that addressed the areas in which she struggled. She was told to focus on: (a) how to analyze and apply data from multiple assessments and measures to diagnose student need, in order to inform instruction based on those needs, (b) to explore ways to demonstrate that she was emotionally stable and could make mature judgments, (c) to collaborate with stakeholders in order to support student learning and professional growth, (d) to deliver engaging and challenging lessons, and (e) to identify gaps in students subject matter knowledge and to modify instruction to respond to student needs. Kathy was in a second-grade placement at the time of this study.

*Ellie* was the oldest of three girls born in the United States to Dominican immigrants who had settled in a large city in the Northeast. Ellie described herself as an “overachiever” and “perfectionist” who was very committed to her education. A significant influence for Ellie, and
much of the reason she claimed to have such determination and work ethic, was her relationship with her family. In her initial interview, she described how her mom and dad made a lot of sacrifices to ensure that she and her sisters received quality educations. She reported that they frequented the public library on nearly a daily basis to provide access to English-based resources for them because their parents were Spanish monolingual. Ellie also explained that she struggled with her cultural identity and questioned whether she was Dominican or American. Finally, Ellie described herself as a very dedicated and calculating person when making life decisions, and that, when deciding on which teacher preparation program to attend, she chose the residency program because it would provide her superior advantage in preparing her as a novice teacher. Ellie was in a kindergarten placement at the time of this study.

In Chapters Four, Five, and Six, each of the participants was treated as a case to address the research question. In the remainder of this section, I describe the context of the Urban Teacher Residency Partnership Program (UTRPP), followed by a description of the Cambridge School Experience (CSE) and its relevance to this study.

*Urban Teacher Residency Partnership Program (UTRPP):* UTRPP was designed in response to The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Report of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Learning (2010). This report calls for teacher preparation programs to be “grounded in clinical practice” (p. ii) in order to enhance, and better develop the pedagogical conceptualizations of PSTs. The report asserted that clinical practices would better prepare teachers to collaborate with colleagues, would focus more effectively on the school and community context, and would support the development of rigorous teaching skills (NCATE, 2010). In terms of how preparation programs would bring theory to practice, the NCATE (2010) report states, “It is time to fundamentally
redesign preparation programs to support the close coupling of practice, content, theory, and pedagogy” (p. iii). In regards to this residency program, Dennis (2016) stated that “UTRPP is a community focused on high-quality, integrated, clinical experiences that create collaborative connections to better prepare partners in urban schools to meet the needs of children“ (p. 15). Incoming teacher candidates who further apply to this program must meet the following requirements:

- Evidence of at least 50 hours working with children (daycare, after-school, summer camp, babysitting, etc.) with references from these experiences.
- A letter of intent describing their interest in joining UTRPP
- A signed contract indicating that they agree to enroll in the program from 7:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. Monday through Friday throughout the two-year program. This contract aligns with the teachers’ contract in counties public schools and encompasses coursework and clinical practice, including a yearlong residency in their second year (Dennis, 2016, p. 15)

Once admitted, PSTs spend more than 2000 clinical hours in the practicum setting—twice that of the other teacher preparation program at the same university (Dennis, 2016). Other UTRPP features include the merger between coursework and clinical practice through integrated assignments, a co-teach model between the PST and collaborating teacher (CT), teaching rounds and content coaching, and a quad model of clinical practice. Each of these features is discussed below.

Course content for undergraduates in UTRPP is based on a collaborative design between the school district and the university with an emphasis on K-5 student learning. Dennis (2016) states that “using what we refer to as the i4 model (innovation, integration, inclusion, and
inquiry), we plan coursework that includes these components while addressing the developmental trajectory of a preservice teacher” (p. 16) where, depending on each semester’s emphasis, one component may be stronger than the others but all components are always present through the entire two-year program. Many of the course assignments are predicated on data-driven instructional practices and emphasize interdisciplinary methods to teaching and learning (Dennis, 2016). To further enhance the teaching and learning developmental trajectory of both PST and K-5 student, a co-teach clinical practice model was embraced. Dennis (2016) described this collaborative approach:

mentor teachers learn about varying models of coteaching and how to support residents as they navigate the terrain of teaching together. What’s more, university-based teacher educators coteach with residents and their mentor teachers on a regular basis as a means of modeling and supporting this practice (p. 16).

This different approach to the practicum experience is one half of what UTRPP calls the quad model of clinical practice, which includes the resident PSTs, the CTs, content coaches, and the partnership resource teachers (PRTs).

In this quad model, the content coach is a “knowledgeable other” (Gelfuso & Dennis, 2014; Vygotsky, 1978) who has specialized knowledge of their literacy, math, and science content and pedagogy (Gelfuso & Dennis, 2014), and the PRT position is a hybrid one, where the individual acts as a liaison between the university and the practicum school. These individuals are involved in the day-to-day experiences of the resident PSTs. Dennis (2016) describes the quad model in the following way:

In pursuance of a UTRPP goal to deeply support residents’ content knowledge development, it is essential for the coach to be a member of this team in order to address
challenges presented during the content-focused coaching and to allow for consistent communication between all parties responsible for developing the resident as a professional. The content coaches and partnership resource teachers collaborate and provide mentor teachers with information and materials related to the coaching cycles, as well as to offer job-embedded professional development for mentor teachers who continue to improve their mentoring practices and their content knowledge (p. 17)

As indicated even in the brief description above, the emphasis is on the collaboration and communication among all parties of the quad to enhance and improve the learning environment for all stakeholders. A distinct component to the UTRPP structure is content coaching.

Content coaching, which occurs during the PSTs second and final year in the program, builds on the teaching rounds PSTs experience in their initial year. Teaching rounds provide space for PSTs to observe live or video-recorded expert teaching practices followed by a debrief of those observations with peers, faculty, and teacher educators (Dennis, 2016). The resident PSTs then work with those same stakeholders to plan their own lessons, practice those lessons in the university context, receive feedback on those practiced lessons, and then actually teach those lessons to children. Those teaching events are themselves video-recorded, coded, and conferenced about to provide feedback on that lesson’s effectiveness (Dennis, 2016). Content coaching is a unique facet of the residency program where the PST works one-on-one with math, science, and literacy content experts to deepen their conceptualization of content and pedagogy theory-to-practice connections. These coaches work together to provide clear expectations, consistent pedagogical feedback, and individualized goal setting for each coaching cycle and for each resident PST. A coaching cycle involves the analysis of elementary student assessment data during a pre-conference or lesson planning session, a video-recorded observation of the
residents’ instruction with elementary students, individualized coding of those lessons, and a video-recorded post-conference between the coach and the resident (Dennis, 2016; Gelfuso & Dennis, 2014). The data I collected for this study came from the literacy content coaching cycles.

**Cambridge School Experience (CSE):** The participants for this study also participated in CSE, a four-week study abroad program where participants taught and lived in Cambridge, England in June and July. Of the 18 undergraduate teacher candidates that participated in 2016 CSE, five were UTRPP residents. This program was an alternative field placement for participants and was supervised by a university literacy faculty member and two literacy studies graduate assistants. I was a supervisor for this program during the summer that the participants for this study took part in CSE. With an emphasis on literacy and the integration of literacy in all content areas, these PSTs participated in two literacy content coaching cycles (pre-conference, video-recorded literacy lesson, video-coding for eight categories for effective literacy instruction, and post-conference) as part of the CSE structure (Dennis, Branson, Flores, & Papke, 2016). These coaching cycles were identical to what they experienced in their final year in the residency program described above. This meant that they were exposed to, and became familiar with the coaching framework that was used in their final year in the residency—an experience that their peers who did not participate in CSE did not have. Further, because the literacy coaching cycles used in CSE mirrored those of the residency program, I conducted a pilot study for this dissertation research with all five residency participants. As a result of this familiarity with the literacy coaching cycles, this study’s protocol, and the participation of these five UTRPP residents in my pilot study, I had more in-depth conversations about literacy teaching and learning with Madon, Kathy, and Ellie. I felt that this would promote more in-depth reflections
during data collection sessions. It was or these reasons that these three PSTs were asked to participate in this research.

**Role of Researcher**

It is important to note that I acted as the literacy coach for UTRPP as well as for CSE in both 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic years. This enabled me to study not only my own practice as a literacy content coach, but also the practice of other content coaches in the program. For this study, I supported Julie, the literacy coach in developing her understanding of the coaching framework, and I was a part of her literacy coaching development during the summer of 2016 as it occurred during the CSE study abroad program. The video-recorded post-conferences were provided to me immediately after those scheduled post-conferences except for Ellie’s coaching cycle. For her cycles, I acted as her literacy coach and provided the video-recordings to Rachel (the program coordinator, creator of UTRPP, and my Major Professor) after the post-conferences, where she then conducted the SR interview. For participant interviews, I utilized and followed the interview guide (Appendix A), and chose a semi-structured protocol, because I asked potentially relevant follow up questions not found on the interview guide. For the SR interviews I conducted, I watched the video-recorded post-conference with the PST participant within 1 to 4 hours of the conclusion of that post-conference and followed the interview guide in Appendix C.

**Data and Data Collection**

Data gathered during the 2016-2017 academic school year included:

1. Participant interviews prior to literacy content coaching.
2. Video-recorded post-conferences with the literacy content coach after coaching cycles (This was only used as the stimulated recall artifact and not analyzed for this study).

3. Stimulated recall interviews of the video-recorded post-conferences.

Table 2 below shows the data collection timeline for the initial and SR interviews as well as the duration of each interview session. The initial interviews were conducted early in September 2016 and before any of the SR data collection. The SR data collection was contingent on when the residents were involved in literacy content coaching. Table 2 shows the coaching schedule.

### Table 2

**Data collection timetable and duration of each interview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Type</th>
<th>Madon</th>
<th>Kathy</th>
<th>Ellie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial interview</td>
<td>Date: 9/2/2016</td>
<td>Date: 9/7/2016</td>
<td>Date: 9/7/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration: 72:17</td>
<td>Duration: 36:59</td>
<td>Duration: 37:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR interview 1</td>
<td>Date: 9/12/2016</td>
<td>Date: 9/22/2016</td>
<td>Date: 11/16/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration: 49:56</td>
<td>Duration: 38:26</td>
<td>Duration: 33:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR interview 2</td>
<td>Date: 9/23/2016</td>
<td>Date: 9/23/2016</td>
<td>Date: 12/7/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration: 43:15</td>
<td>Duration: 34:40</td>
<td>Duration: 30:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR interview 3</td>
<td>Date: 1/23/2017</td>
<td>Date: 1/23/2017</td>
<td>Date: 1/27/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration: 35:15</td>
<td>Duration: 35:13</td>
<td>Duration: 25:35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three content coaches conduct five-week coaching cycle rotations in schools, or in a pair of schools. Table 3 shows the coaching rotation timeframe for each of the participants. Throughout the entire data collection timeframe for this study, the participants were engaged in some form of content coaching, and, by the end of data collection, they had worked with all content coaches at least once.
Table 3

2016-2017 UTRPP Content Coaching Calendar During Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week of</th>
<th>Special dates</th>
<th>Content Coach Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant’s begin preplanning with CTs at placement schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug 10 students’ first day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 22-Sept 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 26-Oct 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 31-Dec 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 9-Jan 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Literacy</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-participant</td>
<td>Madon</td>
<td>Ellie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools</td>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-participant</td>
<td>Madon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools</td>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-participant</td>
<td>Madon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools</td>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-participant</td>
<td>Madon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools</td>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial participant interviews. At the onset of the academic school year, I contacted participants to schedule initial interviews. I then conducted semi-structured interviews in a setting that was selected by the participant with the contingency that the space was quiet to eliminate distractions. The interview questions (Appendix A) ranged from introductory questions on participant experiences as K-12 students, motivations to become teachers, perceptions of the current literacy practices taking place in schools, perceptions of self as literacy educators, literacy teaching philosophy, and descriptions of what they feel is a literacy teacher. The questions were designed to elicit responses that gave me insight into the participants’ core
identities. This information later helped me address the research question and make sense of their SR data. These questions were adapted from identity research conducted by Holland et al. (1998), and the Cambridge School Experience Study Abroad program participant interviews. Therefore, interviews conducted prior to the participants working with a literacy content coach provided insight into the identities and identity characteristics they drew on before working with a literacy expert and other content coaches.

**Coaching cycles.** Content coaching is a unique facet of the residency program where the resident PST works one-on-one with a content expert (literacy, math, and science) to deepen their conceptualization of theory-to-practice connections. The math, science, and literacy coach work together to provide clear expectations, consistent pedagogical feedback, and individualized goal setting for each coaching cycle and for each PST. A coaching cycle involves the analysis of elementary student assessment data during a pre-conference or lesson planning session, a video-recorded observation of the PSTs pedagogy with elementary students, individualized coding of that video-recorded lesson, and a post-conference between the coach and the PST where they discuss the nuanced aspects of the lesson. Figure 1 below shows the coaching cycle. For literacy content coaching, Cunningham and Allington’s (2011) eight pillars of effective literacy instruction (described in detail later in this next section) are used as the reflective framework.

The above description of content coaching is a general description of the coaching structure in the residency program. In the remainder of this section, I will describe the literacy content coaching cycles used for this study.
Pre-conferences. In pre-conferences, lesson planning was a key component to the discussion between the coach and the participant. The literacy coach had a variety of options to assist the resident PST in developing a well-planned literacy lesson. The coach and participant often discussed the logistics of an already developed literacy lesson (such as, the objective of the lesson, the literacy standard that addressed that objective; whether the lesson was small or whole group; step-by-step procedures, questioning strategies, gradual release of responsibility, and assessment to determine student learning after the lesson). The pre-conference was also used to assist the participants with planning literacy lessons. In such instances, the participant provided the objective of the lesson, district curriculum planning tools, and other relevant materials, while the coach assisted in the development of the lesson based on interpretations of K-5 student needs as indicated in the assessment data in conjunction with the pedagogical developmental needs of each participant.
**Literacy lesson observations.** Observations of literacy lessons were video-recorded by each participant, as the literacy content coach took anecdotal notes on student learning and lesson effectiveness across Cunningham and Allington’s (2011) eight categories of effective literacy instruction. These eight categories suggest the following performance standards:

- The most effective classrooms provide huge amounts of balanced comprehensive instruction;
- Children in the most effective classrooms do a lot of reading and writing;
- Science and social studies are taught and integrated with reading and writing;
- Meaning is central and teaching emphasizes higher order thinking;
- Skills are explicitly taught and children are coached to use them while reading and writing;
- Teachers use a variety of formats to provide instruction;
- A wide variety of materials for instruction;
- And, classrooms are well managed and have high levels of expectations

(Cunningham & Allington, 2011, pgs. 8-10)

Cunningham and Allington’s framework was adapted from nine research studies of effective classrooms and classroom practices where children learn to read and write (Cunningham & Allington, 2011). Based on these findings, they concluded that, “we can draw some firm conclusions about what it takes to create classrooms in which all children learn to read and write” (Cunningham & Allington, 2011, p. 8). These conclusions resulted in the construction of the eight-category framework described above. This framework is also used for literacy instruction across the elementary education program by the university.
Participants then uploaded the video-recorded literacy lesson to Edthena, a secure video observation and reflection tool. This secure online software allows for those with shared access to add time stamped feedback and comments. This software permits both literacy coach and PST to mark and comment on the exact evidentiary moment (minute and second) they felt was relevant to future discussions about literacy pedagogy in post-conferences. Figure 2 shows an example of the Edthena software. In the image, the vertical yellow slashes are the different places the video was coded, and below the text of those codes, and the timestamped evidence of that code.

Figure 2: Edthena software video coding tool
Schechner (2006) describes viewing video-recordings as “another performance existing between the original event, the video of the event, the memory…, and the present moment” (p. 30). According to Schechner (2006) the first performance is the action that is initially video-recorded. For this study, this was the literacy lesson. The second performance was the reception of the first performance. Participants watched, interpreted, and responded to their video, and subsequent first performance in respect to their actions, interactions, and relationships evidenced in the video. This process continues with each new view of the video. The more times the video was viewed, the more performances that were enacted, and thus, the potential for more identity and identity characteristics being mobilized during these performances and reflective performances. These performance identities were also influenced by those who were present at the time of the video viewing: Were viewers alone? With the content coach? With CT? With fellow resident PST? And/or myself as researcher? These social configurations obviously impacted the reception, the perception and interpretation of the video. Since identity is “performing one’s life roles in relation to social and personal circumstances” (Schechner, 2006, p. 28), each new circumstance and/or context means that the enactment of identity performances might (and most likely would) vary based on who is present, and what identity construct is being enacted (Gee, 2014) to meet the needs of the individual at that time. Then, the video-recording of post-conferences, where content coach and participant discussed a video-recorded literacy lesson provided the basis for the SR interview. Next, the framework for post-conference reflection will be discussed followed by a section on the SR interview protocol used for this study.

**Post-conferences.** Post-conferences were opportunities for the participating PSTs, literacy content coach, and, if available, the PRT and CT to discuss the observed lesson. It is important to note that the PRT and CT were always invited, but not always able to be present at
post-conferences. The following describes the procedures prior to and during post-conferences. The participants watched their video-recorded lesson and coded it for evidence of the eight pillars of effective literacy instruction (Cunningham & Allington, 2011), along with areas in which they felt they could have provided more effective instruction. The literacy content coach also watched the video-recorded lesson and coded it in Edthena for evidence of the eight categories of effective literacy instruction. At post-conferences, the literacy content coach used the facilitating reflective conversations framework found in Table 4 and encouraged participants to lead the conversation, where they reflect on the coaching cycle (Gelfuso, 2016).

In this framework, Gelfuso (2016) includes two major strands of reflection that need to be conceptualized by the literacy content coach: dissonance and warranted assertability. For dissonance, Gelfuso asserts that:

One must have an experience in which dissonance is felt followed by an immediate interpretation of the experience. Without dissonance, one would not be compelled to engage in reflective thought, rather one would continue on with what she/he were doing without creating new understandings (Gelfuso, 2016, p. 69).

In terms of warranted assertability, Gelfuso (2016) posits that PSTs need to engage in dialogic interactions with a knowledgeable other to ascertain new conceptualizations of literacy teaching and learning theory and practice. These discursive descriptions ground themselves in experience and emerge in the language used to describe those experiences. It is within these narratives that identities emerge. This data collection also provided insight into the social aspects of identity development. Therefore, for this study, participant discursive descriptions of their literacy practices during post-conferences provided data that answered the research question.
Table 4

Framework for facilitating reflective conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting the Stage</th>
<th>Literacy Coach’s Moves and Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking onto the stage: The literacy coach invites the pre-service teacher to share her/his hypothesis and initial thinking about the validity of the hypothesis. This focuses the conversation on literacy teaching and learning and positions the pre-service teacher as thinking agent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displaying the props: The pre-service teacher refers to her/his time-stamped notes calling attention to the moments of the experience that she/he judged to be important. These isolated bits of experiences will be juxtaposed to create dissonance later in the conversation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying course content: The literacy coach refers to course content, provides examples of course content, and explains how course content is related to the isolated bit of experience the preservice teacher noted as important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Opening the Curtain: The Play | Posing a question to create dissonance: The literacy coach poses a question that was carefully crafted while viewing the video in preparation for the reflective conversation. The question is intended to create dissonance and begin the reflective process. |
|-----------------------------| Actively listening: The literacy coach actively listens for words, phrases, or ideas shared by the pre-service teacher in response to the initial question with the intention of using those fragments of language to create juxtapositions. |
|                             | Creating juxtapositions: The literacy coach puts next to each other (juxtaposes) two or more ideas the pre-service teacher shared and poses additional questions. |
|                             | Keeping the aim in view: The literacy coach continues to select thoughts shared by the pre-service teacher that can be used to pursue a particular line of thought. |
|                             | Asking for clarification: The literacy coach asks the pre-service teacher to make more explicit her/his thinking. |
|                             | Restating preservice teacher thinking: After each new idea is formed through dialectic interaction, the teacher educator restates that idea and presents another question. |
|                             | Circling back around: The literacy coach refers to the moment in experience that spawned the creation of the question that ‘opened the curtain’ and asks the pre-service teacher to imaginatively apply the new ideas to that situation. |
Table 4 (continued)

| The Curtain Closes | Transitioning into synthesis: The literacy coach provides a metaphor (the reading of a story and creating a theme) to begin the synthesis process.  
Crafting the ‘warranted assertability’: The literacy coach and pre-service teacher write together to create the ‘warranted assertability’ about literacy teaching and learning.  
Playing with the ‘warranted assertability’: The literacy coach poses some prompts for the pre-service teacher to consider as they write a paper about the newly created ‘warranted assertability’. |
| The Bow | Calling attention to the reflection process: The literacy coach calls attention to the reflection process by asking the pre-service teacher to describe what just happened during the reflective conversation (Gelfuso, 2016, p. 73). |

**Stimulated Recall (SR).** SR, a metacognitive strategy, calls for the recording of an observed event, followed by interviews prompted by those recordings, where the video is used as a stimulus to prompt recall of the event where the participants verbalize the thoughts and feelings they have during that viewing (Calderhead, 1981; Lyle, 2003). These introspective verbalizations are oriented towards cognition and what the participant was thinking at the time of the event (Calderhead, 1981; Lyle, 2003); and/or reflections of the event at that moment of the interview (Geiger, Muir, & Lamb, 2015; Lutovac, Kaasila, & Juuso, 2015; Schepens, Aelterman, & Van Keer, 2007). Lyle (2003) states that one of the advantages of SR “is the comparison of the introspections of experts and those of novices” (p. 874). Lyle’s observation was directly relevant to this study since participants’ metacognitive introspective verbalizations were made across four areas in a single interview: (a) as the SR interviewee; (b) as the PST who discussed their video-recorded literacy lesson with the literacy content coach; (c) as the teacher teaching the lesson; and (d) as the PST who watched and coded their video for evidence of effective of literacy instruction.
SR interview sessions were conducted between one and four hours after the post-conference discussions between the participant and literacy content coach. Each post-conference was viewed in its entirety with the participants, where the interview protocol described below (appendix D) was followed. This protocol reflected the focus of the study as it pertains to the participant’s reflective thoughts and feelings towards their literacy practices. The SR semi-structured interview protocol:

- Explain the purpose of the SR interview: For this interview, we are going to use the video-recorded post-conference as a prompt to recall the critical events of that meeting. The objective is for you to verbalize what you were thinking and feeling during those events, as well as what you are thinking and feelings now while watching the post-conference on video.
- Prior to watching the video, I ask: “Before watching the video, what do you remember of the given literacy content coaching cycle?”
- Once the first question has been addressed and prior to playing the post-conference video, I prompt: “Now we will relive the content coaching cycle. Please stop the video at critical moments during the post-conference discussion with [name of literacy coach], and describe what you were you thinking and feeling at that moment and what you are thinking and feeling now watching it on video? Also, while watching the video, I may also stop the video to reflect on that moment?
- Play video
- If, there is no recall initiation after either the utterance of the coach or participant during discussion literacy coaching discussions, stop the video and ask the
following question: *What were you thinking and feeling at this point in the coaching conference? And what are you thinking and feeling now watching this now?*

- After the conclusion of the interview, ask: *Were you able to relive what you thought and felt during the pre-conference?* (Adapted from: Geiger, Muir, & Lamb, 2015; Lutovac, Kaasila, & Juuso, 2015; Schepens, Aelterman, & Van Keer, 2007)

Due to extenuating circumstances with scheduling in the literacy content coaching, Julie, the assigned literacy content coach for UTRPP, could not be the literacy content coach for Ellie’s placement school—although she was the coach for Madon and Kathy. Therefore, this responsibility fell to me since I had two years of literacy content coaching experience in the Residency program. This then became problematic for how to coach Ellie and research her coaching at the same time; I could not coach her and conduct the SR interviews. Since Rachel was my mentor, my committee chair, as well as the person who developed both the Residency program and content coaching, and who was serving as Ellie’s literacy content coach for CSE, I felt that Rachel was the person who was most qualified to step into the role of literacy coach for Ellie. Although this was most viable option, it was also problematic. Part of coaching in a school is creating a community of practice amongst the CTs and Residents within that site, and if there were two coaches, this would make that difficult. There were other logistical issues as well. Since Rachel had mentored me through the design of the pilot study for this research and for this dissertation study, it was decided that I would be Ellie’s literacy content coach and Rachel would conduct the SR interviews. I was the SR interviewer for the other participants.
**Data Analysis**

Each of the participants for this study were first studied as their own case and then the data was reexamined for themes across cases. The data was transcribed and analyzed using discourse analysis (Gee, 2014). I used broad transcription techniques adapted from Gee’s use of poetic stanzas where I used free verse poetics to represent the data. Figure 3 below represents how I narrowed in on the data analysis for this study to answer the research question. First, I used the initial interview data to make broad generalized conceptualizations about each participant’s core identity characteristics. Then I narrowed the analysis for the SR interview data to uncover and make claims about the identity characteristics they mobilized during these interviews in the construction of their literacy teacher identities. The goal of this data analysis was to identify discourse markers of micro-hegemonies in the construction of literacy teacher identity and literacy teacher identity characteristics. I also used Blommaert and Varis’ (2015) micro-hegemonic framework in conjunction with Gee’s (2014) seven building tasks to understand the data. Gee (2014) states that “we make or build things in the world through language” (p. 32), and that there are “seven areas of reality” (Gee, 2014, p. 32) which he calls *building tasks* to use for discourse analysis. Figure 3 shows the building tasks and their guiding questions to use for discourse analysis.
Figure 3: Data analysis funnel

Table 5 and 6 contain the building tasks and four-point framework that were printed and used for constant reference during data analysis. They were kept as a side-by-side reference as I worked through the data analysis.

Though this study is concerned with identity, which is the third building task, the other six tasks could not be disregarded as possible guiding principles at any point during data analysis. Most identity characteristics had to be extracted from the data by applying one or more of the other six building tasks. I read sections of the transcript several times, each time applying the lens of a different building task to draw out the literacy teacher identity characteristic embedded within. Discourse analysis is both a cyclical, reciprocal, and recursive process that requires the analyst to be reflexive as they look for patterns in language to construct a hypothesis and to build a case that answers their research question. Therefore, I listened to, read, and analyzed the transcribed data for this study multiple times to ensure trustworthiness.
Table 5

Building Task and Their Respective Guiding Questions

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Significance</td>
<td>The use of language to make things significant as it relates to a situation. Guiding Question: How is this piece of language being used to make certain things significant or not and in what ways?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Activities</td>
<td>Based on the situation, how is language used to get recognized as engaging in certain sort of activity in the here-and-now. Guiding Question: What activity or activities is this piece of language being used to enact?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identities</td>
<td>What identities do discursive participants recognize as consequential and enact through language. Guiding Question: What identity or identities is this piece of language being used enact?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relationships</td>
<td>The use of language as a signal to build social relationships with discursive participants. Guiding Question: What sort of relationship or relationships is this piece of language seeking to enact with others?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Politics</td>
<td>How language is used to convey the distribution of social goods. Guiding Question: What perspective of social goods is this piece of language communicating?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Connections</td>
<td>How language is used to connect things or show their relevance. Guiding Question: How does this piece of language connect or disconnect things; how does it make one thing relevant or irrelevant to another?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sign systems and Knowledge</td>
<td>This consists of the language spoken, and the Discourse in which that language is addressing. Guiding Question: How does this piece of language privilege or disprivilege specific sign systems or different ways of knowing and believing or claims to knowledge and belief? (Gee, 2014. pgs. 32-35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows the Blommaert and Varis framework.
Table 6

**Blommaert and Varis four-point micro-hegemonic framework**

| a. | Identity discourses and practices that can be described as discursive orientations towards sets of features that are seen (or can be seen) as emblematic of particular identities. These features can be manifold and include artefacts, styles, forms of language, places, times, forms of art or aesthetics, ideas and so forth. |
| b. | To be more precise, we will invariably encounter specific arrangements or configurations of such potentially emblematic features. The features rarely occur as a random or flexible complex; when they appear they are presented (and oriented towards) as ‘essential’ combinations of features that reflect, bestow and emphasize ‘authenticity’. |
| c. | We will inevitably encounter different degrees of fluency in enregistering these discursive orientations. Consequently, identity practices will very often include stratified distinctions between ‘experts’ and ‘novices’, ‘teachers’ and ‘learners’, and ‘degrees’ of authenticity. In this respect, we will see an implicit benchmark being applied: ‘enoughness’. One has to ‘have’ enough of the emblematic features in order to be ratified as an authentic member of an identity category. |
| d. | Obviously, these processes involve conflict and contestation, especially revolving around ‘enoughness’ (s/he is not enough of X; or too much of X) as well as about the particular configurations of emblematic features (‘in order to be X, you need to have 1,2,3,4 and 5’ versus ‘you can’t be X without having 6, 7, 8, 9’). And given this essentially contested character, these processes are highly dynamic: configurations of features and criteria of enoughness can be adjusted, reinvented, amended. (Blommaert & Varis, 2015, p. 5-6) |

**Initial participant interview analysis procedures**

According to Gee (2014), in interview data, participant’s language take on narrative qualities. These narratives are sense-making devices that build socially situated identities that provide the texture for an individual’s figured world(s) (Holland et al., 2008). In these narratives, the stories and the figured world of the teller are mutually supportive of each other (Gee, 2014). Gee (2014) claims that “in deep narratives, people do not focus on logical consistency, rather,
they focus on the theme they are attempting to instantiate and develop” (p. 182), which was the case for each participant initial interview.

Gee (2014) recognizes that discourse analysis of narratives in interviews are mutually supportive: The interview supports the narrative and the narrative supports the interview. In order to broadly identity the motifs in those narratives, he suggests using building tasks 6: *connections*, and 7: *signs systems and knowledge*. Therefore, as a result of the purpose of the initial interviews (which was to get a general sense of the identify characteristics that each participant drew when answering the interview questions), I used those building tasks to make broad claims about the participants discourse. Those building tasks and guiding questions are:

**Task 6 Connections:** How language is used to connect things or show their relevance?

**Guiding Question:** How does this piece of language connect or disconnect things? How does it make one thing relevant or irrelevant to another?

**Task 7 Sign Systems and Knowledge:** This consists of the language spoken, and the Discourse in which that language is addressing.

**Guiding Question:** How does this piece of language privilege or disprivilege specific sign systems or different ways of knowing and believing or claims to knowledge and belief? (Gee, 2014. pgs. 32-35)

**Stimulated recall interview analysis procedures**

To analyze the stimulated recall data, I used Gee’s (2014) seven building tasks in conjunction with Blommaert and Varis’ (2015) four-point micro-hegemonic framework. Once I identified potential identity characteristics, I juxtaposed those findings with the literature to support my claims. Like the initial interview data, I first used building task 7, *Sign Systems and Knowledge: This consists of the language spoken, and the discourse in which that language is
addressing (Gee, 2014) and its guiding questions to first look broadly at the data. Once I began to determine different themes in the data, I used any of the other six building tasks in conjunction with the four point micro-hegemonic framework to provide a more narrow interpretation of the data.

To do this I first looked for key words and phrases that were relevant to the figured world (Gee, 2014; Holland et al., 2008) of teacher, and how this situated meaning was relevant to the context. I then applied the other building tasks to narrow the analysis and connect participants language to constructs found in literature. This allowed me to narrow those findings and make a claim about the identity characteristics that emerged from the data. To support those claims I used the Blommaert and Varis’ (2015) framework. Specifically, I confirm my interpretation that mapped onto the literature to determine if: (a) participants language had discursive orientations towards sets of emblematic features found in that literature, (b) determined if participants language showed “combinations of features that reflect, bestow and emphasize ‘authenticity’” (Blommaert & Varis, 2015, p. 6), and (c) based on the context participants utterances in context and conjunction with other utterances in participants language that displayed “emblematic features” of authenticity towards the construct they enacted (Blommaert & Varis, 2015).

Each utterance in the participants interviews were analyzed in this way with the understanding that after I applied building task 7 (Sign Systems and Knowledge: This consists of the language spoken, and the Discourse in which that language is addressing (Gee, 2014)) to participants language, any of the other building tasks along with the four point framework (Blommaert & Varis, 2015) could be utilized to get at the salient claims in the data. Each participant chapter begins with an example of these analytics to show the process that I took to make the claims found in this dissertation study.
Ethical Considerations

Ethically, I drew on a Principlist framework (National Centre for Research Methods, 2016; Wiles, 2013) for this study. Based on this framework, this study ensured autonomy because participants first had to agree participant in the study. Secondly, all interviews were conducted in a quiet private place of the participants choosing. And third, participants and other key personnel were given pseudonyms. Maintaining the anonymity of participant’s along with maintaining the data in a secure location addressed the Human Research Protection Program at the University of South Florida.

Discourse analysis is a researcher’s interpretation of an individual’s interpretation about the world that draws on other researchers’ interpretations of discourse to build an argument and make claims about the data. Gee (2014) posits that validity is the juxtaposition of both past and future research in the field of discourse analysis that answers the guiding questions associated with the building tasks, the tools of inquiry, and four elements of validity. The four elements of validity are: (a) convergence: the analysis is more valid when it answers both the building task questions in conjunction with the six tools of inquiry; (b) agreement: the analysis is more valid when the claims about the data is tied to other research; (c) coverage: the analysis is more valid when it can then be applied to other related sorts of data; and (d) linguistic detail: the data is more valid the tighter it is tied to details of linguistic structures (Gee, 2014, pp. 142-143).

When referencing the validity of literacy and identity research, Moje and Luke (2009) state that:

The key to rigorous literacy-and-identity studies seems to lie in the recognition of what particular theories can do for our understanding of how literacy and identity work to develop one another and of our awareness of the limitations of a given metaphor and its
methods of analysis and representation. If scholars hope to take identity-and-literacy studies seriously, then we must clarify what it means to write about and study people’s identities in relation to their literate practices (p. 423).

This research is grounded in performance theory and tied to both theories of identity and language (Bell, 2008; Blommaert & Varis, 2015; Goffman, 1559; Kiesling, 2006; Van Langenhove & Harré, 1999). Moje and Luke (2009) further state that, “by linking identity (whatever the metaphor) to learning in multiple domains, the power of the research becomes more visible as the material consequences become more evident” (p. 434). Identity is based on the premise that discursive performances are a means of communication and language is the mediating factor in that communication. Through discourse, there are social, cultural, and political implications to language that are controlled agreed upon language and activities produced by larger constructs of figured worlds (Bell, 2008; Holland et al. 2008); thus, all participants language was transcribe and analyzed to produce the claims made in this dissertation study. This means that, by having looked at the totality of identity characteristics that the participants of this study mobilized, the implications of this research become more far reaching.

**Summary**

To summarize, this study utilized discourse analysis to research the literacy teacher identities of three PSTs in a clinical teacher preparation program. Three participants language was examined and analyzed through data that included: initial participant and stimulated recall interviews. After each of the participant’s data was analyzed, I looked at similar themes across the data sets was examined with a specific view towards global significance and implications for both theory and practice.
CHAPTER FOUR:

PRELUDE TO PARTICIPANTS IN CHAPTERS 4-6

It is important to recognize the discrepancies between the length of Madon’s chapter versus the chapters for Kathy and Ellie. The length of Kathy and Ellie’s chapters are shorter than Madon’s, but the total amount of data collected during Madon’s interviews was significantly greater than that of her peers. Madon’s initial and stimulated recall interviews totaled 200 minutes resulting in 25,475 transcribed words. In contrast, Kathy had 145 total interview minutes that resulted in 16,175 transcribed words, while Ellie’s totaled 127 minutes with 12,875 words. To shorten Madon’s chapter to be more congruent in length with those of the other participants would be to sacrifice some of the robust findings pertinent to this study.

Introduction

In this chapter, I analyzed the data from Madon’s initial and stimulated recall interviews to answer the research question:

- In what ways do three PSTs develop literacy teacher identity?

The structure of this chapter is as follows:

1. Introduction

2. Initial interview data analysis
   a. What is the data?
   b. Means of analysis
      i. Narratives in interviews
ii. Building task 6: connections

iii. Building task 7: sign systems and knowledge

3. Stimulated recall interview data analysis

   a. Introduction of the data

   b. Means of analysis

      i. Gee’s seven building tasks

         1. Building task 6: connections

         2. Building task 7: signs systems and knowledge

      ii. Building tasks 1-5

      iii. Blommaert and Varis’ micro-hegemonic framework

4. Conclusion

Figure 4 below represents how I funneled the data analysis for this chapter to answer the research question for this study. First, I used the initial interview data to make broad generalized conceptualizations about Madon’s core identity characteristics. Then I narrowed the analysis for the SR interview data to uncover and make claims about the identity characteristics she drew on during these interviews in her construction of her literacy teacher identity.

![Figure 4: Data analysis funnel](image)
By first looking at Madon’s language in the initial interview, I was better able to understand and analyze the data from her stimulated recall interviews.

**Part I: Initial interview analysis**

**Madon.** The purpose of the initial interview and its subsequent analysis was to get a sense of who Madon was, her core sense of self, and how she made sense of her life experiences surrounding her familial background and relationships, her experiences as a K-12 student, and her perspectives on teaching and education based on the following questions:

- Who is Madon? What is your story?
- Describe your literacy experiences as a k-12 student.
- Why did you want to become a teacher? Is it what you expected? Explain
- Why did you choose the residency program? (possible follow up question) Is it what you expected?
- Describe the current state of literacy education as you see it?
- Where do you fit in in that description?
- Where do children fit in?
- What is your literacy teaching philosophy? How have you been able to enact that philosophy when teaching literacy?
- What style of teaching do you see yourself using when teaching literacy?
- Who and/or what are your primary influences as literacy teachers?
- Do you feel prepared to teach elementary level literacy?
- What is your vision of a literacy teacher? Has this changed overtime?
Madon’s discourse consisted of story-like narratives that connected and illuminated four motifs that constructed her core ideologies based on the questions asked during this interview. Figure 5 below shows those motifs as they emerged from this data.

Figure 5. Themes that were present in Madon’s initial interview data

For Gee (2014), in interview data, narratives are sense-making devices that build socially situated identities that provide the texture for an individual’s figured world(s). In these narratives, the stories and the figured world of the teller are mutually supportive of each other (Gee, 2014). Gee (2014) claims that “in deep narratives, people do not focus on logical consistency, rather, they focus on the theme they are attempting to instantiate and develop” (p. 182), which is very much the case for Madon in her initial interview. There were multiple instances in this interview where Madon’s language became ungrammatical and lacked precision and accuracy in her linguistic form (“I’d rather, um…do a lot of banking where they can…I can just kind of give it to them “), she often used profanity (“said fuck it and started a revolt”), and in her “stories,” she continuously wove the motifs into one another as the topic of discussion changed with each question. This last point is what Gee (2014) refers to as “the principle of echo” (p. 193), where a recurring theme is interwoven and loops into the discourse of the speaker.
Gee (2014) recognizes that discourse analysis of narratives in interviews are mutually supportive: the interview supports the narrative and the narrative supports the interview. In order to broadly identity the motifs in those narratives, he suggests using building tasks 6: *connections*, and 7: *signs systems and knowledge*. Therefore, since the purpose of the initial interviews was to get a general sense of the identity characteristics each participant drew upon when answering the interview questions, I used those building tasks to make broad claims about Madon’s discourse. Those building tasks and guiding questions are:

**Task 6 Connections:** How language is used to connect things or show their relevance.

**Guiding Question:** How does this piece of language connect or disconnect things; how does it make one thing relevant or irrelevant to another?

**Task 7 Sign Systems and Knowledge:** This consists of the language spoken, and the Discourse in which that language is addressing.

**Guiding Question:** How does this piece of language privilege or disprivilege specific sign systems or different ways of knowing and believing or claims to knowledge and belief? (Gee, 2014. pgs. 32-35)

The remainder of this section is the result of that analysis.

**Madon Jones: The tortured, cursed resident with no culture**

Madon was in her early twenties and came from a white middle-class background where both of her parents were educators. She was the middle child of five who felt as though she spent much of her adolescence living in the shadow of her two older brothers. Madon felt that having educators for parents had both a positive and negative impact on her. She recognized the value of having both parents present in her home life, a life that was afforded to her by having parents who were teachers. However, she was also a student at the school in which her parents taught,
and she recalled several instances that she felt “tortured” by them in school. Throughout her K-12 experiences, Madon was active in clubs, sports, and even earned a scholarship to play soccer at a small state college in the southeast. Interestingly, this soccer experience was also marred by negative circumstances where she felt “tortured” by the head coach. Madon felt that she gained her “voice” from the perceived negative circumstances and experiences in her life. She identified herself as not being part of any culture, and she recognized the power that her personality and body language had on other people and their perception of her. In the remainder of this first section, I look more closely at Madon’s language to focus on the different identity characteristics that she drew on when discussing different aspects of her life.

The Resistor

Throughout the initial interview with Madon, there were multiple instances where she drew on resistance identity characteristics. She expressed resistance as a sibling, and she saw herself as an antagonist to others—at work, to God, and even to the concept that you must like children to be a teacher. Here, I discuss Madon the resistor who resented her older brothers while growing up, and who pushed back against authority figures, thriving even on the anger and angst of the circumstances.

Madon was the only girl of five children with two older and two younger brothers. When she was in kindergarten, her older brother, Tristan, was a high school senior and Terry was a high school junior. Tristan excelled in academics and became a nuclear scientist. Terry, on the other hand, “was a real fuck up,” who ran away, got tattoos, and did drugs in high school. As a youth, she began to resent both Tristan and Terry. Tristan was resented because he was “perfect” and she felt that she “lived in the shadow of Tristan.” The family mantra seemed to be: “Tristan is perfect, and Terry is not. And that is how my family is run; is that if Tristan can do it, like
everyone should be able to do it.” Though Madon specifically references why she resented Tristan (“Why aren’t you good at math? Why are you getting C’s in math when Tristan got A’s? Tristan didn’t have a problem.”), she did not do the same for Terry. Instead she mentioned how he disclosed secrets to her that she was not to “tell mom and dad,” and references his shortcomings and imperfections. She told me that he, unlike Tristan, was not “perfect” and was a “fuck up” that had recently gotten a girl “knocked up,” but she never specifically and overtly stated her animosity towards Terry. On the other hand, Tristan and the “shadow of Tristan” became the catalyst for her early resistant characteristics.

To develop her “voice” and to “escape Tristan,” Madon strove to excel in academics, sports, and school clubs. Her determination to escape Tristan caused her to “annoy every one of her peers” and she “lost a lot of friends” in the wake of her determination to excel. The result of this new-found determination was that she then became Tristan to her younger brothers as her parents began comparing them to her—just as she was compared to Tristan. This resulted in her becoming “the teacher” when she realized she was perpetuating the cycle of parental comparisons: she had been compared to Tristan, and now her younger brothers were being compared to her. In the initial interview, there were three instances that she referenced “becoming the teacher” as she realized that she had begun to cast a shadow over her younger siblings. To Madon, this was an important realization. Therefore, to help her younger brothers subvert those comparisons, she did their school work for them. For her, this was teaching. She resisted her parents’ inclination to compare her brothers with her as much as she resisted any comparison to Tristan. Her resistance took the form of doing their school work for them. If her younger brothers were successful students, then they would not be expected to perform like she did academically.
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There are two instances early in the interview where Madon mentioned being “tortured.” This caused her to resist those who she felt were oppressing her. The first was by her parents in elementary school (they were teachers in the elementary school she attended); and the second, was by her college soccer coach who she said “held the like this invisible gun to our heads.” Madon referenced her mother making fun of her in school during specials class over a boy that liked her “oh Madon loves Nico,” and further being embarrassed by her father who had her “rub his shoulders when taking attendance.” To her, this was a form of both embarrassment and torture and she told me that, “both of my parents were teachers. Um, and I was basically tortured and um, mentally tortured in elementary school by my parents.” Though she did not mention how she resisted her parents, in the discursive exchange, she described similar interactions with her college soccer coach, “again, was tortured and embarrassed by a coach.” The result of this was that she firmly resisted anything she perceived as “oppression.” She told me that she “said fuck it. And started a revolt with my team” as a result of the coach’s negative comments about why he did not recruit a girl to play soccer for him, and it was due to her physical features (“her face was messed”), and his demands that the entire team get tattoos of the school logo, where she stated, “he held the like, this invisible gun to our heads.” This resulted in her getting the entire squad to quit the team.

To control social situations, she claimed to have what she called, “RBF, resting bitch face,” and told me that, in circumstances when others have differing opinions than hers, “they won’t open their mind to try and find out why I’m wrong, or why I’m right,” which meant she would argue the point she wanted to make even if she knew she was wrong. Regarding her RBF, she told me that this angry, ‘don’t mess with me’ expression was designed to get things done on her terms while avoiding vulnerability. This was a concern of hers.
When working with persons whom she sees as having power over her (content coaches, other teachers and collaborating teachers [CTs]), she was either intentionally vague, or came “fully prepared” for lesson planning meetings to spare herself from being “judged” and “critiqued” for her pedagogical decisions, while, at the same time, showing that she did not need the help of others. Professionally, she resisted both judgment and assistance. She was intentionally vague when sharing her lesson ideas with peers and other classroom teachers because she claimed that, “for planning for instance you tell someone all of your ideas then you’re left there for them to judge,” while also remaining in possession of her own teaching ideas, “if I take what she wants me to do, it’s no longer mine.” This need to control the situation was further perpetuated by her claim that she was not part of any culture. She told me that she did not “really have a culture; I’ve identified as that recently. That I’m not…I don’t have all this culture stuff to back me up.” To be a part of a culture means to have a connection to others. Therefore, if she were to identify with a culture, she and those in that culture would need to rely on one another. This would mean sharing collective discourses for the perpetuating of that culture. By claiming to not have a culture, she would not set herself up to be judged for her actions, and she would not need assistance from others. In this next section, I discuss how Madon was resistant to the idea that elementary teachers should love children.

**Nurturing versus teaching: Madon’s perspective on caring for children.** An area of elementary education that remains highly theoretical is the aspect of nurturing as an elementary teacher (James, 2010). The notion of developing an affective relationship with children contrasts with the notion of teacher professionalism and feminist perspectives of education, where there is a division between nurturer and teacher (Vogt, 2002). For Madon, her discourse revealed her feelings towards children, where she expressed a more professional than nurturing approach to
teaching. When I asked her why she wanted to become a teacher, she told me, “um, it’s not…most people say, ‘oh I love kids.’ It’s not my reason. I actually find kids really irritating.”

She went on to tell of an interaction with a child that was separated from his mother in a department store. She proceeded to get this child back to his mother in what she called, “my teaching moment” and continued by stating, “I was helping this child rather than just loving him. I like helping rather than just finding them cute.” In this example, Madon described an instance where she helped/taught a child without buying in to the notion that a teacher must “love” or find a child “cute.” Here, Madon resisted what she felt was the typical discourse of teachers built on the idea that a teacher must love children and created a profile of her own that resisted those ideals. Although getting a lost child back to his parent may not necessarily be considered teaching, it was an important teaching moment for Madon. This interaction is important to an understanding of Madon’s perspective of children and what she considers teaching: contact with this child fits into a savior narrative that is evident in many aspects of Madon’s life from teaching to her work as a bartender. In the next section, I discuss how Madon often saw herself as a savior.

**Madon’s Savior Characteristics**

Earlier in this chapter, I stated how Madon resisted her parents by completing her younger brothers’ homework to prevent them from being compared to her academically. In this section, I will delineate how Madon’s descriptions of events also have traits connected to a savior narrative. Savior narratives in teaching are not uncommon (Rushton, 2004). These approaches to education and social interactions are earmarked by evidence of a person or institution, saving, or trying to save, the underprivileged (Rushton, 2004). In the following excerpt, Madon claimed to be a teacher/leader, while at the same time mobilizing savior
characteristics in that she will guide children “the right way” resulting in her having done something “well for the world.” She told me that for her,

Teaching comes naturally, leading comes naturally, and if I can teach or lead young kids the right way, or you know, what I see is the right way. Cuz you know it might not be the right way to everybody; Then I’ve done something well for the world if I can get them to where they need to be then I’ve done something good.

This narrative allows her to have done a service to society (“there are problems in the world that can be fixed, and I would like to be one of them to help fix it”).

In her practicum school, Madon was in a third-grade classroom where she worked with two veteran collaborating teachers (CTs) in a combined co-teach classroom. Those CTs had followed this teaching model for several years. At the beginning during pre-planning, Madon recounted the instance when her CTs discover they were going to have a younger sibling of two former students. In the following exchange, Madon narrated the account that occurred between her and the CTs after making this discovery. She told me that:

They were like, ‘oh boy’ they saw the last name, like ‘oh my goodness!’

And it was like, ‘we have one of them again…’

And I was like, “what’s going on?”

And like ‘oh they’re all low they’re all so low like they can’t do anything.’

According to Madon, once the school year started, the child in question displayed behavior issues, and Madon saw this as an opportunity to intervene. She began providing him with positive feedback while giving him more accountability in the classroom. This resulted in, what she described as positive changes in his behavior, which caught the attention of the ESE specialist who said this child had made a “huge turnaround.” Due to this recognition, she felt
validated to make the claim that this had impacted the child in a way that set him aside from his brothers even though she did not have firsthand knowledge of his sibling’s behavior. She claimed that, “it’s like this huge turnaround just from his brothers to him.”

This also distinguished her from her CTs. She was able to constructively shift this child’s behavior from negative to positive—something the CTs could not do with his older brothers. This was evidenced in her description of interactions with the boy, his new-found propensity to work in class, the perceptions of the ESE specialist, and has mom’s newly found faith in her child. She told me that, “He comes up and gives me a hug. He doesn’t hug anyone else. He just hugs me. He works with his partners and he listens to the first thing he does. And I talked to the ESE specialist and he’s like ‘Your buddy’s doing really well.’ And she says ‘Its cuz you’re complimenting him. You’re promoting like these good behaviors.’” And “Mom is sitting there doing homework with him now because she sees that he’s excelling in class and she wants to help him out.” This turnaround in the student’s behavior is common in education based on reversing the expectations for the child (Kuklinski & Weinstein, 2001). Yet, it was significant enough for Madon to recount because these interactions with this child in fact modified her behavior to “care” about him; which was a shift from her earlier claims that she found children irritating and did not have to care for them. I reported earlier that Madon claimed she was not a nurturing teacher, but, in recounting the interactions with this child, she claimed that one of the signifiers of this student’s turnaround was that he hugs her, and her alone; a gesture that she accepted with a sense of accomplishment. Here, the hug was significant, not as a token of affections (though it could have been given in that vien), but for Madon that it represented a shift in both the child’s and Madon’s ideological stance towards schooling. The child became a focused student, and Madon became his savior.
At work. Madon was a self-proclaimed “utility person” and “problem solver,” and a benefit to the restaurant where she bartended. Her teaching/training created employees who she felt were more efficient at their job. She also claimed to do all tasks at work, “I do everything at work. If the kitchen is backed up, I go back and cook. Um, I like that I’m a utility person there.” For Madon, there is a right and wrong way to teach and work, and she felt a sense of power and control over situations where she assumed a leadership role.

As an adult sibling. Madon also had the opportunity to be savior to her younger, gay brother who she called her “charity case,” along with the pregnant girlfriend of older brother, Terry. Here, Madon described the circumstances of her gay homeless brother, and her parent’s plea to her for help, “He was like really messed up. He was like living on his friend’s recliner for a couple of months just ‘tokin’ it up. And my mom and dad were like ‘Madon can you please help?’” Madon took him in, helped him get a job, and helped him straighten out, which she described as “I took him under my wing” and “Taught him a good way.”

At the same time, she was saving her younger gay brother, her older thirty-one-year-old brother had gotten a girl the same age as Madon “knocked up.” When they were younger and living at home, Terry shared secrets about running away and getting tattoos with Madon. Now that his younger girlfriend was pregnant, she recounted how she stepped up to help him and her. She stated, “She just needs the support in her life.” This resulted in her going shopping for the soon to be mother. Once again, Madon found herself in a situation with a young child where she asserted herself as savior. Interestingly, she also called this a “teaching moment.” In the following excerpt, Madon described her interaction with that child while shopping for her brother’s pregnant girlfriend:
Yesterday I was shopping, and this child walked up to me. Was just staring at me while he picked his nose. And he’s like two maybe, if that. Lookin’ around and there’s no parent anywhere to be found. I’m like “Hey, where’s your mommy?” I’m lookin’ around, grab his hand and this kid came walking with me. And I’m profiling everyone in this store, trying to find out where this kid’s mom could be. I find a woman who looks kind of like him and I’m like “Is that your mommy?” And he goes running to her and she just looks at him looks at me and continues to shop. Mind you, he was two. He was nowhere near her. And that was just like…that for me, that was my teaching moment. I was helping this child rather than just loving him. I like helping rather than just finding them cute.

Madon’s account of the encounter depicted the severity of the situation from her perspective in that she denoted the child’s age (“mind you, he was two”), his toddler demeanor (“this child walked up to me was just staring at me picking his nose”), in conjunction with the absence of a parent (“there’s no parent anywhere to be found”); thus, her need to act.

Madon provided concrete examples of how she enacted savior characteristics with the child in her classroom, at work, with her younger brother, with her older brother and his pregnant girlfriend, and the lost child in the store. These characteristics map onto her grounding philosophy for why she wants to become a teacher (“then I’ve done something well for the world if I can get them to where they need to be. Then I’ve done something good”), and that teaching, which she also saw as leading, comes naturally (“teaching comes naturally, leading comes naturally”). Madon’s savior characteristics were present in different circumstances and interactions with both adults and children. In the next section, I show how she drew on Freire’s
notion of banking education when she discussed her preferred approach to teaching, which extended beyond the classroom.

**Madon the Banker**

Freire (2003) stated that in a banking model of education, “education thus becomes an act of depositing” (p. 72), where “knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable” (p. 72). For Madon, this was not only her preferred approach to teaching children, but also how she approached many situations in her life, including her approach to resistance against her parents by doing her brothers’ homework for them. In this section, I look at Madon the Banker, and how she claimed this approach by name but also how this banking model is evidenced in her job as a bartender as well as in her teaching children in the classroom.

When I asked Madon what style of teaching she preferred, her answer was clear—banking. She told me that, “I’d rather, um, do a lot of banking where they can…I can just kind of give it to them.” This conceptualization of what is meant to teach manifested early in Madon’s life. For her, it was about what she can give the students, “give them these tools rather than have them come up with false tools” because for her wrong answers were “false tools.” It was similar to the ways in which her younger brothers were compared to her and as she was compared to Tristan For Madon, the right tools were to help her younger siblings be successful: she simply did their work for them. In her description of why she wanted to become a teacher, she stated, “I thought before that teachers just get to make up the stuff they do. I didn’t…I didn’t even think about standards there were to follow.” This perspective on how and what a teacher teaches was further elaborated on as she described her own coming of age experiences within the teaching profession and her initial interpretation of it, reaching as far back as high school.
In her practicum classroom, Madon recognized that the children she was teaching struggled academically, (“the students are so behind as of right now”), and that this played perfectly into her desired form of teaching—the banking model. This was evident in her description of a teaching moment she discussed early in the interview. In this literacy lesson, she describes teaching the students about nouns, verbs, and adjectives and that she “taught this lesson five different times, five different ways because they weren’t getting it.” However, in each description of the different approaches she used, the students were always passive bystanders to the learning, and she was the one playing an active role. She told me that, “I was jumping around running through the room. I was doing call and response things. I had them taking notes.” Freire (2003) posits that in banking education the role of the learner is passive, and the role of the teacher is active depositor of knowledge, which was evident in Madon’s description of the literacy lesson above. In that lesson, she is the active depositor of knowledge and her students were passive absorbers of that knowledge. She further elaborated on that instructional moment: “I literally just gave them this call response. I gave them a memory.” At the same time, Madon was frustrated by the fact that the result was the same with every instructional approach: “they still couldn’t get it.” This frustrated Madon, and, instead of taking an introspective inventory of her pedagogical approach, she blamed the students’ former teachers for the lack of learning “because they’re not being taught when they’re supposed to be.” Blaming others manifested itself in several instances throughout the interview.

While in college, Madon worked at a large restaurant chain where she was both a bartender and new employee trainer. In these positions, she claimed “teacher” in her approach to working with others stating, “I’m a teacher by day and a teacher at night.” Here, she described her didactic approach and explicitly stated how she trained newly hired employees: “I train new
employees the right way things are supposed to be ran,” and she further talked about what frustrated her at work when training new employees:

what I don’t like… this is one thing that makes me tick, um, when people question me and it’s like when I know for a fact that it’s right. Like this is how you do it and they question me. It drives me freaking crazy ‘why are we doing this I’m not driving you off a bridge. I’m telling you this is what we are doing because this is what we’re gonna do next.’ But at work, when people question like ‘are you sure?’ ‘Yes, I am sure!’ Drives me nuts.

An important characteristic of banking education is creating a group consciousness that is dictated by the teacher (Freire, 2003). This is an approach Madon took more with the adults she worked with than with her elementary students, and her discourse was harsher towards adults, than it was towards children. This was, in part, due to how she saw children as somewhat innocent moldable entities ready for her to instruct: “they’re not little evil…they’re not evil yet. And they don’t have their own minds set at this point. Like you can still mold them to like doing what you want them to do.” For Freire (2003), being able to mold the individuals one is teaching is an integral component of banking education.

The Conflicted Nepotist

Growing up in a small town with parents as educators had afforded Madon several nepotistic opportunities that she both resists and embraced simultaneously. With graduation nearing, Madon began to consider her options for the best place to establish a teaching career. In this section, I discuss how she drew on nepotistic characteristics when she discussed her teaching options after graduation. She could either stay where she was and teach in urban schools or go
back home to the small town she grew up amid where everyone knew her based on her last name and the reputation of her parents.

When Madon told me about the possibility of going home after graduation to seek employment, she claimed that, “I could get a job back home, but I would get that job on my last name. I wouldn’t get it on me.” When I asked her what she thought about getting a job based on her last name, she responded by negating the value of such a job acquisition: “I don’t like that at all, because I like to work for what I have and getting it on my last name wouldn’t be anything.” Madon went on to describe what she expressed was an opportunity to get a job on her own merits, removed from the influence of her surname. However, but her language seemed to suggest otherwise.

Growing up, Madon’s “good friend’s” mom was the principal of an elementary school, and, while in high school, she completed an internship at that elementary school. Upon completion, the principal told her to “come back to me when you’re done, when you graduate,” and promised her a job. Madon felt this opportunity presented itself because of her merits outside of the influence of her last name, but, as she continued to tell me about this opportunity, she made several comments with distinct markers indicating that she realized her original beliefs were not fully accurate.

First, she told about an interaction with this principal at an awards ceremony where the principal sat next to Madon’s parents and discussed Madon coming to work for her after graduation: “At an awards ceremony she and her sister sat next to my parents, and they were like, ‘Oh we want her we want her at our at our school.’” She went on to tell of another, more recent, interaction at a Christmas party, where she informed Madon that she had recently retired, but had influence with the current administration, “So I’ll still put in a good word in for you.”
is at this point that Madon’s language became disjointed and she started and stopped this exchange several times:

but it's like she just knows me, she doesn’t know my teach…she doesn’t really know my teaching and she didn’t know it then. But I know I’ll have a good job anywhere I go. But I want it because of Madon not because of Miss Jones.

In the first part of the utterance, she enacted resistance to nepotist characteristics: “she just knows me,” but the realization of the situation begins to emerge the more she told of these circumstances. Since this principal sat next to Madon’s parents at an awards ceremony when Madon was in high school, she clearly knew her parents. She also only knew Madon as a high school intern with no teacher training. The next utterance shows this realization as she did not complete it, leaving the -ing off teach (“she doesn’t know my teach…”) only to then complete the realization that this principal did not know her as an educator at all, “she doesn’t really know my teaching and she didn’t know it then.” Madon did not want a teaching position based on her name is. She wanted it based on her individual efforts and hard work. It was in this moment that Madon’s language showed the realization that this job would not be based on her teaching ability, “but I know I’ll have a good job anywhere I go.” “Anywhere” means it could be at home through nepotistic channels, but all that mattered was that it was “good.” To recover from this realization and reassert her resistance to the idea of nepotism in this argument, she ended this discursive turn by restating her original claim: “but I want it because of Madon not because of Miss Jones.”

Throughout the discussion of the initial interview, I have shown how a resistant Madon exhibited core identity characteristics that were grounded in a banker, savior, and nepotistic domain. The purpose of this interview and its analysis was to get a broad sense of who Madon
was (her core sense of self) for me to better conceptualize her identity construction during the SR interview data analysis. In the remainder of this chapter, I show the identity characteristics Madon drew on during reflections of her practice as a literacy educator to answer the research question: In what ways do three PSTs develop literacy teacher identity?

**Part II. Stimulated recall data analysis**

**Madon’s literacy teacher identity characteristics.** In this section of the chapter, I discuss how Madon enacted the identity characteristics in Figure 6, the construction of her literacy teacher identity.

**Figure 6. Madon’s literacy teacher identity characteristics**

To analyze this stimulated recall data, I used Gee’s seven building tasks in conjunction with Blommaert and Varis’ four-point micro-hegemonic framework. Once I identified potential identity characteristics, I juxtaposed those findings with the literature to support my claims. The following findings are the result of those juxtapositions. Like the initial interview data, I first used building task 7: *Sign Systems and Knowledge: This consists of the language spoken, and the Discourse in which that language is addressing* (Gee, 2014. pgs. 32-35) and the guiding questions to look broadly at the data. Once I determined key word or phrases within utterances in the data, I used the other six building tasks in conjunction with the four-point micro-hegemonic framework to provide a narrower interpretation of the findings.
For example, in the language below, Madon expressed relief that she was able to seek alternative assessments that would better meet her student’s needs because she wanted to provide them opportunities to represent their understanding of content that was different from the assessments the school district provided. Therefore, my interpretation of this first utterance maps on Cochran-Smith’s (1991) construct that Teachers adjust, adapt, discard, and construct the curriculum. Madon stated:

*I’m happier right now talking about what an alternative is because I'm not happy with the current expectation.* I was thinking of other ways that they could do, create a product that can be assessed based on the content that they’ve learned, and if they’ve met the objective. But I’m trying to find the different way’s that they can do it that are…uh…appropriate at the moment cuz right now it's not appropriate.

To derive at that interpretation, I first applied building task 7: Sign Systems and Knowledge: *This consists of the language spoken, and the Discourse in which that language is addressing* (Gee, 2014) and looked for key words and phrases that were relevant to her literacy teacher identity characteristics, and how this situated meaning was relevant to the context teaching and the SR interviews.

For that first sentence, the key word and phrase that stood out to me were ‘alternative’ and ‘not happy with current expectations.’ For this particular piece of transcript data, I applied Building Task 5 Politics: How language is used to convey the distribution of social goods to understand the larger political implications of breaking away from the districts, and/or school’s expectations for classroom assessments. Here, I recognized language that connected to Teaching against the grain, in that, Cochran-Smith (1991) discussed situations in schools where “the curriculum and assessment policies of the school district are traditional” (p. 294) resulting in:
“increased emphasis on standard procedures and curriculum uniformity” (p. 294). Cochran-Smith (1991) tells how the teachers resisted and developed student-centered alternative to “standard procedures,” which led to her construct of *Teachers adjust, adapt, discard, and construct the curriculum*. To apply this construct to the data, I had to rely on Building Task 1: *Significance: The use of language to make things significant as it relates to a situation* and Blommaert and Varis’ (2015) framework.

Specifically, I confirm my interpretation that this mapped onto *Teachers adjust, adapt, discard, and construct the curriculum* (Cochran-Smith, 1991) in that: (a) Madon’s language had discursive orientations towards sets of emblematic features (Blommaert & Varis, 2015) found in Cochran-Smith’s (1991) *Teaching against the grain*, (b) Madon’s language (‘alternative’ and ‘not happy with current expectations’) showed “combinations of features that reflect, bestow and emphasize ‘authenticity’” (Blommaert & Varis, 2015, p. 6) in that she sought alternative ways other than what was mandated for children to represent their understanding of the content, which is consistent with Cochran-Smith’s position that calls for teachers to break away from standardized curriculum when it is in the students best interests. Further, based on the context of this utterance in conjunction with other utterances in this discursive turn (‘I’m happier right now talking about what an alternative is’) this reflected both Blommaert and Varis’ (2015) former, and later point that, (c) this was an authentic feeling and her language displayed “emblematic features” she had towards what she felt was unfair curricular decision being imposed onto her students.

This is just one example of the analytic process that I used to show how I applied both Gee’s (2014) building tasks, and Blommaert and Veris’ (2015) four point framework. Each utterance in Madon’s SR interviews were analyzed in a similar way with the understanding that
after I applied building task 7 (*Sign Systems and Knowledge: This consists of the language spoken, and the Discourse in which that language is addressing* (Gee, 2014)) to her language, I then applied any of the other building tasks that I felt was relevant based on the context of the utterance and Madon’s use of language, along the four point framework (Blommaert & Veris, 2015) to get at salient claims in the data.

**Apprentice: Boundary Dweller**

The notion of situated learning through apprenticeship, Lave and Wenger (1991) state, is “that learners inevitably participate in communities of practitioners and that the mastery of knowledge and skills requires newcomers to move towards full participation in the sociocultural practice of a community” (p. 29). To enact apprentice traits is to show that there are gaps in knowledge of/and acumen for the community of practice in which an individual is working towards full participation. Madon enacted apprentice identity characteristics by recognizing gaps in her own knowledge and practice as a literacy educator. Further, she worked with the literacy content coach (Julie) to learn the knowledge and skills necessary to participate in a literacy teacher community of practice.

Specific to Lave and Wenger’s (1991) sociocultural theory of communities of practice and apprenticeship, Madon performed apprentice characteristics by drawing on the following five constructs: (a) Engaging in social relationships, to become a full participant requires engaging with technologies of everyday practice, participating in social relationships, production processes, and other activities in communities of practice, (b) Situated learning, or learning through apprenticeship, (c) Knowledge: renegotiated meaning of the past and future in constructing meaning, (d) Engaging congruence: not possessing direct representations but engaging in performance in congruent ways, and (e) Peripherality: access to sources of
understanding through growing involvement. Table 9 shows Madon’s discursive enactment of apprentice identity characteristics.

Madon drew on the concept of *engaging in social relationships* aspect of apprenticeship in the following two ways: First, she sought the literacy coach’s expertise to help plan literacy lessons, which showed a significant shift in her approach to being coached. In her initial interview, she explained that she went to the first few coaching meetings with fully developed plans to show that she did not need help. Second, she recognized how responsive the literacy coach was toward students during co-teaching events, and she wanted to emulate that practice.

To participate in a community of practice, an individual’s social performance needs to become proficient with the language and activities of that identity category (Lave and Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). For Madon, engaging in a social relationship with the literacy coach provided her access to better planned literacy instruction and more responsive interactions with students during instruction, as well as an initial move away from the periphery.

**Table 7**

**Madon’s discursive enactment of apprentice characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in social relationships: to become full participant requires engaging with technologies of everyday practice, participating in social relationships, production processes, and other activities in communities of practice (p. 101)</td>
<td>I just wanted some support in how to make it into a lesson plan.</td>
<td>Recognized literacy content coach as a resource and sought her expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The way Julie talks to them, she's, she knows exactly why she's asking those questions, but I don’t know why I'm asking them yet. I don’t know what the method behind it is.</td>
<td>Recognized the literacy coach as a responsive, knowledgeable other in situated learning events, someone she could learn questioning techniques from.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Utterance</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situated learning: learning through apprenticeship</td>
<td>We co-taught this lesson.</td>
<td>Engaged in collaboration in a literacy community of practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The way Julie talks to them, she's, she knows exactly why she's asking those questions, but I don’t know why I'm asking them yet. I don’t know what the method behind it is.</td>
<td>Recognized the literacy coach’s responsiveness to students when teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge: renegotiated meaning of the past and future in constructing meaning</td>
<td>We talked about some things that we would like to focus on for another time. It, like, we set some hypotheses to go forward.</td>
<td>Reflected on past practice to prepare for future teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I will be thinking it, but I don’t know if it's right. But she’ll say something, and I'll be like “ok that’s where I want to go with it.”</td>
<td>Enacted co-construction of reflections and the articulations of pedagogical practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>She like, elicits my, my, my, thought process like, or gets me to think of it a different way.</td>
<td>Enacted co-construction of reflections and the articulations of pedagogical practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This coaching cycle was a lot of me telling Julie things and then her just talking to me through my thoughts.</td>
<td>Enacted co-construction of reflections and the articulations of pedagogical practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I want to have all that knowledge, so I don’t ever have to be confusing again.</td>
<td>Recognized her need for growth and that the literacy coach can mentor her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If I have all that knowledge when it comes to literacy and math and science, that will just transform me as a teacher.</td>
<td>Recognized her need for growth and that the literacy and other coaches can mentor her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Utterance</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging congruence: not possessing direct representations but engaging</td>
<td>She like elicits my, my, my, thought process like, or gets me to think of it a different way.</td>
<td>Recognized co-construction of congruence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in performance in congruent ways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can like, use Julie and mold what I want out of it.</td>
<td>Saw the value of congruence in what she learned from a mentor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working with Julie, having these ideas, is a lot of things I wouldn’t do; but I’m seeing that my kids like it and can do it.</td>
<td>Recognized the dichotomy and inherent value of both her and the coaches approaches to teaching and its effect of children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I'm a very...I do things my way all the time, and I think she does things her way all the time, and I think we have the...a nice like kind of a meshing where we can do each other’s ways some of the time.</td>
<td>Recognized the dichotomy and inherent value of both her and the coaches approaches to teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yeah because it's like, “wow it's a lot easier if I don’t do it my way all the time.” Like people, like, she clearly has all these ideas and experiences and it's like I don’t have those yet.</td>
<td>Recognized the dichotomy and inherent value of both her and the coaches approaches to teaching, the power differential between them, and the coach as knowledgeable other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mainly what we focused on, because if I find that negative, I need to find a way to turn the positive and which is what we did.</td>
<td>Recognized the value of the literacy coach as a mentor to enhance pedagogical performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Utterance</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripherality: access to sources of understanding</td>
<td>Working with Julie having these ideas is a lot of things I wouldn’t do, but I’m seeing that my kids like it and can do it.</td>
<td>She shifted from engaging congruence to the mobilization of peripherality as it pertains to student’s literacy abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through growing involvement (Lave &amp; Wenger, 1991)</td>
<td>If I have all that knowledge when it comes to literacy and math and science, that will just transform me as a teacher.</td>
<td>Recognized that working with content coaches will enhance her teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7 (continued)**

Apprenticeship through situated learning is the cornerstone to learning by doing in communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). A unique aspect of the Residency and the literacy coaching model is the opportunity to co-teach lessons with the literacy coach. In such situations, the coach and PST co-plan, co-teach, and post-conference about the literacy coaching cycle. Madon and the literacy coach enacted such a coaching cycle. This experience allowed for Madon to engage in collaboration with a knowledgeable other about literacy practice before, during, and after a literacy teaching event. Wenger (1998) describes these discursive interactions of mentorship in a community of practice where the mentee has opportunities through that apprenticeship to gain competencies.

This learning-by-doing literacy coaching practice gave Madon access to a co-constructed knowledge of literacy pedagogy. Here, she was able to see how the literacy coach intended to meet the literacy needs of children both behind the scenes (planning and reflecting on a teaching event), and during the teaching event itself as well as the implications for future practice. Based on Lave and Wenger’s (1991) sociocultural theory of apprenticeship, in a community of practice,
knowledge is the renegotiated meaning of the past and future for that community of practice. Madon’s language associated with knowledge showed her micro-hegemonic mobilization of this construct as she reflected on her pedagogical practices that related to past, present, and future pedagogy. It was also significant that Madon’s language reflected her self-actualized need for growth in areas that she felt were weak. These realizations came from watching the performance of the literacy coach and wanting to emulate her practices. Working with a literacy coach through the established structure set forth by the Residency provided Madon with multiple apprenticeship opportunities to learn from a knowledgeable other.

The reification of such knowledge learned about, and in a community of practice, is a quintessential feature of apprenticeship (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Woodside et al., 2009). Yet, it is not about direct representations of that knowledge being duplicated in practice, but more about the mentee’s interpretation of that knowledge, and how it is in harmony to the community of practice during engaged application (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). Madon’s micro-hegemonic interpretation of knowledge learned from working with the literacy content coach showed that she recognized the co-construction of meaning as an apprentice, saw the literacy coach as a means to learn new knowledge about literacy content and pedagogy, recognized the dichotomous, yet inherent value of both her own and the coach’s approaches to teaching, its impact on children, and how this apprenticeship/mentor relationship could enhance her literacy pedagogical performance.

Madon’s dawning awareness addresses the concept of peripherality, and Madon’s further mobilization of apprentice identity characteristics as she moved more towards the center of a literacy teacher community of practice. Woodside and colleagues (2009) refer to newcomers in a community of practice as “boundary dwellers” (p. 21). As a newcomer, or novice to an identity
category, the learner gets ample opportunity to operate within, but at the outer edge of this newly entered community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). Peripherality, access to sources of understanding through growing involvement, becomes a significant part of the learning journey for an apprentice as they move towards legitimate peripheral participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Madon drew on elements of peripherality as she performed different apprentice characteristics. In these instances, her language showed her shifts from congruence (not possessing direct representations but engaging in performance in congruent ways (Lave & Wenger, 1991)) to peripherality in relation to her student’s literacy abilities. She also recognized that working with the literacy content coach enhanced her literacy instruction. This developing understanding of literacy and literacy instruction, where she was more focused on the individual child and student learning was a direct representation of a core ideology of the Residency program (Dennis, 2016).

The Residency’s collaborative structure (working with a literacy content coach) provided Madon access to shared meaning making opportunities that resulted in the sociocultural construction of knowledge of literacy teacher identity. The micro-hegemonic mobilization of apprentice characteristics showed how Madon had worked with a knowledgeable other and learned social and cultural practices of a literacy teaching, negotiated meaning as elements of literacy teacher competence, and moved towards full participation as an elementary literacy teacher.

For Madon, the sociocultural approach to learning through apprenticeship intertwined with her literacy teacher identity performance. From the perspective of performance theory, apprenticeship can be likened to the concept of mimesis. According to Schechner (1997), mimesis is a strand of performance theory that takes a critical and philosophical look at the act of
expression where an individual imitates or mimics the actions of others. This mimetic act, or resemblance between what Madon learned from the coach, and how she appropriated learned literacy teacher techniques into her own practice can also be linked to Goffman’s (1959) presentation of self, in that she wanted to be seen as an authentic member of the teaching community. Madon saw value in the pedagogical knowledge of the literacy coach; knowledge she also wanted to have as her own. In the next sections I show how Madon’s apprenticeship with the literacy content coach offers to peripheral participation in a literacy community of practice, and its impact on her construction of her literacy teacher identity.

**Peripheral Participant**

Within the structures of communities of practice such as the Residency program, the literacy content coaching cycles provides resident PSTs opportunities to work closely with a literacy coach to learn in generative social practices, in order to create symbolic reproducible actions that have the potential to accelerate PST learning. For Lave and Wenger (1990), legitimate peripheral participation is “a descriptor of engagement in social practice that entails learning as an integral constituent” (p. 35), where an apprentice learns through engagement, interaction, and collaboration with a mentor to gain the knowledgeable skills necessary for full participation within that community of practice. In this section, I discuss how Madon enacted characteristics associated with peripheral participation because of working with the literacy coach. Table 8 shows Madon’s discursive enactment of apprentice identity characteristics.

For Madon, working with content coaches (literacy, mathematics, and science) meant she was more adept at meeting the needs of the students in her classroom. She saw both the content and pedagogical knowledge of the coaches (“if I have all that knowledge when it comes to literacy and math and science”) as tools that she could add to her pedagogical tool belt (“I want
to just have all of that I my tool belt”) to make her a better teacher (“that will just transform me as a teacher”) who could then better meet the needs of her students (“being able to vocalize it to my students”).

Table 8

Madon’s peripheral participant characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate Peripheral Participation</td>
<td>Um, I still feel fine about the lesson. I still feel it was implemented nicely, but it's like, now if I did this same one again I could, I would have to know my students, obviously I would. I would have these other ways to do it if I wanted.</td>
<td>She expressed that from literacy coaching cycle she now has learned other techniques use when teacher her students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>oh yeah for sure, then we talked about how like, and that was my hypothesis, was that how can I do this again in another lesson.</td>
<td>She recognized that the techniques learned from the literacy coach could be duplicated in further instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I went back after this conference and, I'm there at specials, and I'm looking at their desks, and I'm looking at the papers that they wrote, and I'm like, “they can't, they are not ready to write an essay.” So now I can see that they are just copying those notes</td>
<td>After a discussion with the literacy coach, she now had a new lens to look at student data to make instructional decisions. A perspective she did not have prior to the coaching cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If I have all that knowledge when it comes to literacy and math and science that will just transform me as a teacher. And being able to vocalize it to my students, I want to just have all of that I my tool belt.</td>
<td>She expressed that working with the different content coaches provided her the tools to be a better educator.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a peripheral participant, Madon’s teaching performance had to be transformed from that of apprentice. The construct of tools in a tool box draws on the concepts of indexicality, where lived experiences create ideological coherence and discursive resources for an individual within an identity category (Blommaert & Varis, 2015, Gee, 2014) to be used in future interactions within a figured world in an attempt to be seen as an authentic member of that identity category (Gee, 2014; Johnstone, 2008; Lave & Wenger, 1991). Further, in communities of practice, newcomers who enter a figured world, move towards full participation through

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After working with the literacy content coach, she now was more adept at making data driven decisions</td>
<td>I think the biggest moment was when I was able to…Julie said, ‘well what would you do?’ like ‘what would you do differently?’ And I’m able to take the…the..you know, my passionate anger into a like, a new idea. Something that would be more beneficial than just repeating those same mistakes. And I would probably be more…also have more data in order…to that way I could project what will, what’s likely to happen or what's likely not to happen. Cuz if I see that all of my students score low in, you know the comprehension, I…on FAIR, then I’ll know that comprehension isn’t something I should expect immediately.</td>
<td>After working with the literacy content coach, she now was more adept at making data driven decisions instructional decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
legitimate peripheral participation, where they can function within that identity category (Lave and Wenger, 1990). Through the literacy coaching cycles, Madon learned to make data-driven decisions which led to better planned instruction along with different pedagogical techniques to use in future literacy instruction (“how can I do this again in another lesson” and “I would have these other ways to do it if I wanted”). To make data-driven instructional choices is to place the child at the forefront of pedagogical decision-making, which according to Richardson (2005) is a component of constructivist teaching practices. Thus far, it is through the sociocultural tenets of apprenticeship and peripheral participation in a community of practice that Madon has constructed her literacy teacher identity performances. In the next section, I discuss evidence of constructivist teaching traits that were in opposition to her preferred teacher-centric educational approach emerged after working with the literacy coach.

**Constructivist**

A theme that emerged from both the apprentice and peripheral participant sections was an emphasis on student-centered instruction. Teaching from a constructivist paradigm means that learning occurs through dynamic student-centered interactions where those involved make meaning and construct knowledge collectively (Richardson, 2005; Windschitl, 2002). In such learning environments, teachers facilitate and guide the learning experience as students collaborate to learn and make meaning of content. Therefore, the classroom becomes a community of learners where meaning is socially constructed through discursive interactions. Richardson (2005) stated that in constructivism “individuals create their own understandings, based upon the interactions of what they already know and believe, and the phenomena or ideas with which they come in contact” (p. 3). In this section, I show how Madon espoused
constructivist literacy teacher identity characteristics after engaging in literacy content coaching cycles. Table 9 shows Madon’s discursive enactment of constructivist identity characteristics.

**Table 9**

**Madon’s constructivist characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct (the idea)</th>
<th>Utterance (what she said)</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socially constructed meaning.</td>
<td>so we did two pre-conferences the first one was um with this list of ideas I had I just didn’t have a lesson plan because it was just ideas I had come up with and what I talked about with Julie ‘oh those all sound good' bounced a few new things off each other and then she said “oh why don’t we co-teach this” and I was like “sure why not” and then she said “well then lets meet another day to actually plan the lesson now that we’re gonna co-teach” met at James and was there for two hours to bounced like multiple things off each other</td>
<td>She recognized and engaged in the co-construction of meaningful literacy instruction with the literacy content coach. She described the process of planning and co-constructing meaningful instruction as a volleying of ideas between herself and the literacy content coach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared instructional responsibility for knowledge generation and meaning making between two educators.</td>
<td>luckily, my students are, were catching on like today was supposed to be a model day and they ended taking over the model and it was like wow thank you so, you have to have all those ideas when I’m talking about what happened because it will help me for the next one and I it will help me plan a whole nother unit if I think about it all as one as a unit as a team</td>
<td>She told of the co-teach approach that will allow them to co-construct literacy instruction and its subsequent implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community of learners and social construction of meaning and knowledge.</td>
<td>I’m thinking if they could do this like maybe as a warm up for the essay tell a friend something that you’ve learned for the day or something so that way they are able to you know write these ideas that aren’t just notes they’re putting the notes into their</td>
<td>She was reflexive, and instead of continuing to model instruction herself; instead, she released the responsibility for instruction to the students for knowledge and meaning of the content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Madon embraced constructivist characteristics in that she came to see the students in her classroom as a community of learners (Feiman-Nemser & Beasley, 2005), and she began to recognize the social construction of meaning and knowledge that occurred once she deployed this paradigmatic stance towards teaching. She also became willing to share instructional responsibilities for planning and teaching with the literacy content coach, which she formerly resisted. Madon made it clear in her initial and SR interviews that her preferred approach to teaching was banking (“I’d rather um…do a lot of banking”), and that she was resistant to getting help with instruction at the onset of the literacy coaching cycle (“so like, for my coaching cycles, the last two I have come fully prepared and have needed no extra coaching”). Therefore, for her to draw on constructivist characteristics that release instructional power to the students, provide space for student collaboration, and rely on the coach for help, were significant shifts in her literacy teacher identity. Cunningham and Allington (2011) state that, “the word
constructivist is currently in danger of death from overuse, but it names a simple and powerful concept” (p. 123). At no point did Madon claim to be a constructivist. Yet, as shown in Table 11, this construct was embedded in her discursive descriptions of interactions with children during teaching events and was evident in her literacy lesson planning. Specifically, Madon did not claim to be a constructivist and then provide different examples of how she was one. Instead, she drew on these characteristics (a stance that was in fact in opposition to her authoritarian/banking approaches to knowledge) by means that showed she had indexed these identity characteristics into her literacy teacher identity toolkit (Gee, 2014) after working with the literacy coach.

Goffman (1959) claims that the social interaction that take place for an individual are a performance within an identity category that become indexed to be used for later performances within that figured world (Gee, 2014; Holland et al., 2008). In other words, the more experiences an individual has with an identity category, the more discursive identity traits they can draw on to be recognized as believable member of that identity category. For Madon, there was discursive evidence that she had added constructivist characteristics to her pedagogical toolkit after engaging in literacy coaching cycles with a literacy coach. Through apprenticeship with the literacy coach, Madon gained access to language and activities specific to constructivist ideologies.

In the next section, I discuss how Madon’s language showed evidence of adaptive teacher identity characteristics related to constructivist ideals in that she: (a) was innovative in her instruction, (b) adapted her pedagogical practice to target the needs of the children, and (c) enhanced student understanding of literacy content.
**Adaptive Teacher Characteristics**

Adaptability in education means that teachers modify their pedagogical practices based on the instructional needs of the children, are reflexive, are responsive during teaching events and act based on unanticipated student responses, divert from planned instruction when necessary, and/or change/adjust pedagogical practices based on reflexive, responsive, reflective practices (Vaughn & Parsons, 2016; Parsons & Vaughn, 2013). In this section, I discuss how Madon’s language in Table 10 targets the characteristics of an adaptive teaching stance (Vaughn & Parsons, 2016).

As a responsive educator, Madon recognized the reciprocal relationship between reading and writing. Cunningham and Allington (2011) explicitly describe the interrelated interconnections between reading and writing where teachers develop readers and writers simultaneously. Madon backed up her claim about the discrepancies between her students reading/writing abilities (they were more adept readers than writers) with data provided by her CTs. She recognized the need to be responsive to her students, find alternative means of instruction to develop their writing abilities, and sought out the advice of the literacy content coach on how to do this.

Madon viewed aspects of her teaching that she felt were deficient as “negative,” but was prepared to discuss those negative components with the literacy content coach to, “find a way to turn the positive.” Parsons and Vaughn (2016) posit that an integral aspect to teacher growth is being reflective of one’s own pedagogy as it relates to student learning, and responsiveness to adjust teaching practices that better meet the needs of students. Madon accomplished this with the help of the literacy coach and turned the “negative” aspects of her teaching into a “positive” that she could draw on in the future.
Table 10

Madon’s Adaptive, reflexive and responsive characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>I see what my students writing abilities are, and they’re not the same as their reading abilities. So, it's... I learn every day what my kids can and can't do.</td>
<td>She recognized the reciprocal relationship between reading and writing. She recognized her need to be responsive to student’s learning abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My notes on paper this time. So just opened it up with what I remember about the lesson, and of course I remembered the negative parts of my lesson, and that’s mainly what we focused on because if I find that negative, I need to find a way to turn the positive and which is what we did.</td>
<td>She recognized and is responsive to areas she needs to improve in her literacy instruction and relied on the literacy coach to determine ways to address those pedagogical weaknesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well, I just put data behind what a trend that’s being seen. And that was on the spot too because I just was given that data like ten minutes before.</td>
<td>She realized she can back up her claim about student’s literacy capabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexivity</td>
<td>Yeah, my technology today wasn’t working again so I ended up throwing in their text. I'm like “aa everyone get their textbooks but let’s do it this way.” So, it was like, can't always rely on the multimedia to to teach your lesson. So, I'm like, happy we do have textbooks in our class.</td>
<td>She was reflexive and could navigate the resources of the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yeah because it's like, “Wow it's a lot easier if I don’t do it my way all the time.”</td>
<td>She expressed relief in releasing power over pedagogical decisions to literacy coach who she can learn from.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Like people like, she clearly has all these ideas and experiences and it's like, I don’t have those yet, but I have the knowledge of my classroom behind it, and I have the knowledge of where I want to go as a teacher so then I can like use Julie and mold what I want out of it.</td>
<td>She recognized how her knowledge of the children in her classroom could be leveraged with the knowledge the coach has for literacy pedagogy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My post has always been like either immediately after or…I taught my lessons on Friday with a post on Friday and so I felt like so disconnected from my lesson because I taught on Tuesday and this week has seemed really long.</td>
<td>She recognized the need for immediate feedback to be more reflexive and responsive after a teaching event.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Madon’s adaptive performance characteristics were also espoused in her pedagogical reflexiveness. In four instances, she enacted adaptive reflexive characteristics, where she either diverted from planned instruction due to issues with technology, released pedagogical control to the literacy coach to better address coteaching learning outcomes for students, leveraged her knowledge of the students’ literacy abilities in content coaching, and expressed the need for immediate feedback after a teaching event.

In the exchange below, Madon described how she had intended to do a shared reading lesson where she wanted to display the text electronically using the SMART Board and projector to give all students simultaneous access to the text. This technology did not work, so she reflexively shifted the instruction to the textbooks where each student now had individual access to the text (“Yeah my technology today wasn’t working again. So, I ended up throwing in their text I'm like, ‘uh, everyone get their textbooks’”). The switch from digital to paper-based text does not seem overtly reflexive, but it was what happened because of this switch that proved fruitful to Madon’s learning as an educator; she told me,

That’s when I learned that my students… they can do what I'm asking them to do and it's right in front of them and it's probably more helpful that it's in front of them today because they had, they had, the ability to flip to another page if it supported their idea.
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And one kid asked when we moved on, one goes ‘can we go back to that page I found another idea.’ And if we were just using the um... e-text he wouldn’t have been able to have that idea. Again, I don’t… that’s not a first thought of mine to have to use different types of materials within the same lesson.

This small reflexive move, to switch from digital to paper text, turned into a significant learning experience for Madon that showed she learned new ways to teach; in that: a) she realized through student actions, that access to the text was imperative so they could navigate the pages on their own. This resulted in individualized meaning making (“more helpful that it's in front of them today, because they had... they had the ability to flip to another page if it supported their idea”); b) she recognized that if this reflexive move had not happened she would not have had this experience (“and if we were just using the um, e-text. He wouldn’t have been able to have that idea”); and c) she shifted her understanding of what materials were needed during instruction to better meet her students’ needs (“that’s not a first thought of mine to have to use different types of materials within the same lesson”). Cunningham and Allington’s (2011) seventh pillar of effective literacy instruction calls for “a wide variety of materials to be used” (p. 10). For Madon, this realization about multiple resources and materials, and how these impact learning are indicative of her transformational growth.

Madon’s SR data also revealed something about the constructs proposed by Vaughn and Parsons (2013). Specifically, Vaughn and Parsons (2013) liken adaptive educators to “collage artists” (p. 81) who innovate instruction, adapt pedagogical practices to target the needs of the children in their classroom, and enhance understanding of literacy content, pedagogy, along with a sense of self. Clearly, Madon demonstrated grown in all of these constructs.
**Resistant Reformer Characteristics**

Bell (2008) states that “performances are always marked by references to former ways of doing, acting, seeing, and believing. Those references can uphold the status quo, critique the status quo, or contain the potential to change the status quo by performing anew” (p. 17). Madon enacted resistant teaching characteristics proposed by Cochran-Smith (1991), in which the status quo of district and school based educational policy were critiqued and challenged by her. In this section, I discuss how the depth and breadth of Madon’s resistant reformer identity characteristics relate to her conceptualization of the child and lend to her literacy teacher identity. Table 11 shows Madon’s discursive enactment of resistance characteristics.

For Madon, much of her language centered around dissonance towards district and school site mandated instructional expectations that enforced instructional pacing (“I'm literally cramming everything we haven’t got to because I was told”), timeline expectations (“now I have two days to teach a four day lesson, one day to teach a three day lesson, and all because they have this test,” “how can I expect them to learn this information when the district says they at least need four days and I'm only able to give them two,” and “we were told dates, each date we have to do this, and then date to date we have to do all these other things so it's like, UGH,”) and school-based grade-level planning that did not account for her students’ different learning trajectories (“following what the whole team is doing, which is also a problem because my kids are not the other third grade class. They’re different. They have different needs”). Her dissonance primarily centered on the static conceptualization of student learning.
### Table 11

**Madon: Teaching against the grain**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problematics: The language, practices, and policies of teaching and schooling are socially constructed and evolving, not given and static.</td>
<td>whereas right now your kind of following what the whole team is doing, which is also a problem because my kids are not the other third grade class. They’re different. They have different needs. We have all third grade ESE in my class and so it’s…I just I I can't expect them to do the same things that others should do and what we’re doing right now doesn’t have any creative outlet and we’re just asking them to be strictly informational, but we haven’t done much informational…like informational anything this whole semester, so why why am I just expecting them to produce a research essay?</td>
<td>She described that the current approach in her school is for all classes in a grade level was to teach the same content at the same time as one another. She recognized the logistical issues with this approach in that, not all children were the same, and that her students had different needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: Students are individual learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformers’ visions: Seek alternative ways of documenting and measuring learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td>She realized the need for children to represent their understanding of content in creative ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students: Interpreting children’s strengths and vulnerabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>She recognized the unrealistic expectations imposed on the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge for Teaching: Teachers draw on outsiders' and insiders' expertise as well as on their own knowledge of the politics of schooling to make decisions.</td>
<td>I love her, I love myself there, because I'm seeing that my students aren’t doing…or aren’t able at this moment what’s expected across the board. And I'm trying to find a way for them to do the same thing, just something that’s more appropriate for what they can do.</td>
<td>Through conversations with the content coach, she expressed that she has come to new understandings of her students and their learning trajectory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction: Teachers adjust, adapt, discard, and construct the curriculum so that it builds on the resources of their student.</td>
<td>I'm about to talk about how they can connect it to what they’ve already learned cuz they haven’t learned how to write a research paper or do research. They haven’t learned that yet so that’s the background knowledge their missing. When they come up with this they know how to write a letter, they write letters each week to me. They know how to write notes to their friends. So why am I expecting them to do this academic language when they’re used to social language writing?</td>
<td>She recognized the need for her students to meet the objective in a way that was more appropriate for them as it connects to their schema. She stated the specific gap in understanding for her students that was causing them to be unsuccessful. She stated what her students were proficient at, which she felt would be more appropriate for them to show their understanding of the content being taught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction: Teachers adjust, adapt, discard, and construct the curriculum so that it builds on the resources of their student.</td>
<td>I’m happier right now talking about what an alternative is because I'm not happy with the current expectation. I was thinking of other ways that they could do, create a product that can be assessed based on the content that they’ve learned, and if they’ve met the objective. But I'm</td>
<td>She expressed relief in seeking alternative assessments that better meet her student’s needs. She expressed the need to seek alternative assessments that opposed the current mandated expectation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction: Teachers adjust, adapt, discard, and construct the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction: Teachers adjust, adapt, discard, and construct the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Madon resisted the notion that the students in her classroom had the same instructional needs as other students in that grade. She resisted the district and school mandates that resulted in oppressive instructional practices. And she resisted the formulaic means students were allowed to represent their understanding of the content. These nuanced micro-hegemonies that
Madon enacted support resistant reformer characteristics in the construction of her literacy teacher identity. To this end, her perception that the expedited literacy timeline imposed by the district and school administration was not appropriate for her learners was validated by the literacy coach. Madon told me that:

I love her, I love myself there because I'm seeing that my students aren’t doing or aren’t able at this moment what’s expected across the board, and I'm trying to find a way for them to do the same thing. Just something that’s more appropriate for what they can do.

Cochran-Smith (1991) posits that for teachers who are resistant to the hegemonic constructs of education and who embrace a reformer vision of teaching must draw on the expertise of outside researchers, administrators, and specialist to “challenge others' decisions to protect and support their students” (p. 306). For Madon, it was the literacy content coach’s expertise that validated her perspective.

From a resistant performance identity perspective, Bell (2008) tells how individuals or groups advocated different forms of protests to resist hegemonic constructs that do not align with their own political, moral, or ethical views. Building on the concept of resistance, Cochran-Smith (1991) calls for teacher preparation programs to show PSTs how to advocate for children as agents of change through the social, intellectual, ethical, and political activity of teaching. Attending to this climate means addressing assumptions about knowledge, power and language of the teaching terrain. Like the apprentice, peripheral participant, constructivist, and adaptive characteristics, the conceptualization of inequity resulting in Madon’s resistance can be linked to both the literacy coaching events, and Madon’s core ideologies revealed in the initial interview.

This meant that, through the combined experiences of Madon’s past experiences, teaching, and coaching, Madon had conceptualized the social, cultural, and political implications
of inequity. These experiences provided her access to language and activates specific to resistant identity characteristics. In Madon’s initial interview, there was evidence of resistant identity characteristics during instances that she felt herself, or others close to her, were being treated unfairly and, this in turn, caused her to act out against those hegemonic oppressive structures. This propensity for resistance in her SR interview data aligns with her core resistant ideologies.

Further targeting Madon’s core ideologies, the final section of this chapter discusses her preferred banking approach to teaching, and the conflict she now felt towards this method of instruction.

The (Conflicted?) Banker

Banking education from a Freirean (2003) perspective sees the teacher as the keeper of knowledge to be deposited into the idle passive students. In contrast to constructivist ideologies, the students are seen as empty, knowledge-less vessels that acquire knowledge when the teacher bestows it upon them (Freire, 2003). In her initial interview, Madon told me that banking was her preferred approach to teaching children. Her rationale was that she wanted students to be successful and not misinterpret the content or get answers to questions wrong. In effect, this success at doing that would make her successful. Madon told me that:

I don’t like frilly. I don’t like the explorative stuff because kids can come up with their own wrong answers. I’d rather um do a lot of banking where they can…I can just kind of give it to them and then they can apply it from there.

She believed that, if she provided them with the knowledge to get the right answer, then they would duplicate the process she showed them, and they would always be right (“so, I would rather give them these tools they need, rather than have them come up with false tools”).
In this section, I show that Madon continued to draw on banking characteristics when reflecting on her literacy practices during the SR interviews; however, working with the literacy coach created a level of tension between Madon the banker and Madon the constructivist. Table 12 shows Madon’s discursive mobilization of banking characteristics, and in some instances the tension this cause her as a teacher trying to shift to student-centered instruction.

**Table 12**

**Madon’s paradigmatic shift from banking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher talks, and the students listen</td>
<td>I do a lot of, about procedure because they’re following procedure. They can listen, so I was, I saw myself going “we’re being respectful we’re listening” and um…I didn’t realize how often I did those things. We have a lot of kids who shout out too, and they shout out, and then another child will pick up their answer when I don’t want them to pick up their answer because I want them to find the answer on their own. I would rather I do more…I prefer more talking to them, and having them int…like, interact with me, than having them talk, and they interact with each other and back with me. Like that’s not a natural thing for me. Like the more they talk, like more turn and talks happen, the more it breaks up the reading.</td>
<td>She recognized her discursive power for wanting the students undivided attention to be on her and Julie; because if they are talking to one another they cannot focused on instruction and not learning. She wanted to control the flow of information, so each child can come to their own individual understanding of the content. She wanted control of the educational conversation and preferred talking to, rather than talking with, or having students interact with one another. She does not want to impede individual meaning making for the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teachers chooses and enforces her choice and the students comply</td>
<td>Um…well, I still don’t know when it's appropriate to turn and talk, and when it's not appropriate to turn and talk. Like, I…it goes crazy, and I don’t want a crazy lesson if I didn’t plan for a crazy lesson, so it's um…that’s also a control issue I have with the class.</td>
<td>She recognized her conflict with constructivist meaning constructs which she sees as disruptive; therefore, she needed to control the flow of information to counter this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Utterance</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But that wasn’t ever a thought that I had because it was like, “but I'm doing it for this reason.”</td>
<td>She recognized her own conflict with different student-centered approaches.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wouldn’t do it on the first day of a read. It could work but I wouldn’t. It would not be something I would do.</td>
<td>She recognized the value of a newly learned student-centered approach but would not draw on this at the onset of new content.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeah, I was like “yeah that’s what I thought” like “well probably could work but I probably wouldn’t do it that way.”</td>
<td>She recognized the value of a newly learned student-centered approach but would not draw on it as a pedagogical option.</td>
<td>She wanted the coach to just tell her what she needed to do instead of leading her there through questions and conversations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher teaches, and the students are taught</td>
<td>I kind of wanted Julie just to tell me what I was missing but she didn’t.</td>
<td>She had shown them what to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm physically modeling it for them. -I get that they have to have all of these things in order to get there, but again, this was the last day of notes. They didn’t need that much background knowledge. They had a lot, and then they all know how to write.</td>
<td>She recognized that her CTs had influenced her to see students as static learners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher is the Subject of the learning process, while pupils are mere objects</td>
<td>But I don’t know how like else I…is there…where they’re expected to take notes. And I don’t know what other way I could have approached it. They need to physically write these notes, so I don’t know what other way I could have done it so still, not answered.</td>
<td>She is recognized her role in teaching the children and she has done her job (she makes six I statements) and blames the students for not performing. She referred to the class as they as opposed recognizing the levels of understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher teaches, and the students know everything</td>
<td>I purposefully sat my students around, the ones who needed my help around me, and I kind of was going to let the rest like, that’s how we…we came up with their carpet seats. Like, that’s where…why they were chosen. Ones further back can work more independently.</td>
<td>She realized that her CTs had influenced her to see students as static learners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Madon, control over classroom conversations meant that students interacted with her more than each other. This ensured that they received accurate information and learned the content. Madon did not see this as an oppressive construct. On the contrary, if she controlled the flow of information through limited student-to-student interaction, then each child could come to individualized understandings of the content. For her, if students interact, they cannot achieve self-discovery of what she was teaching. Instead they would simply be given knowledge from their more informed peers (“another child will pick up their answer when I don’t want them to pick up their answer because I want them to find the answer on their own”).

Like the last section when Madon learned how to better target her student’s needs, working with Julie meant that Madon was exposed to different constructivist approaches that ran counter to her preferred banking traits. Freirean (2003) banking further claims that, “The teacher chooses and enforces her choice and the students comply” (p. 73). Madon recognized the polarities of her banking teaching philosophy and constructivist alternatives to instruction she learned during content coaching. Yet, she was clear that she would not draw on these newly learned constructs during certain teaching events since: a) she saw student collaboration as disruptive whenever she could not control the flow of information; and b) she recognized the value of a newly learned student-centered approach but would not draw on this as an option at the onset of a new unit of instruction where students were introduced to a new text, because she did not want her students to be distracted from engaging the text.

Although Madon claimed that she would not utilize these constructivist approaches during certain instructional instances, she did see their inherent value. Prior to the literacy coaching cycles, she did not even consider these student-centered approaches as instructional options for her teaching; as she also stated, “but that wasn’t ever a thought that I had because it
was like…but I'm doing it for this reason.” Through the literacy content coaching cycle, Madon created new meaning and came to new student-centered conceptualizations about teaching children. Yet, she reiterated that she would not utilize these techniques at the onset of instruction because she wanted the children to engage in individualized meaning making opportunities, and collaborative engagement would impede that. She told me that:

I wouldn’t do it on the first day of a read. It could work, but I wouldn’t… it would not be something I would do…I think I go into talking about how it breaks up like the more they talk like, more turn and talks happen, the more it breaks up the reading and it might hinder comprehension rather than add to it. Because that’s the whole point of the turn and talk: to add to their comprehension. But if they’re constantly reading and then talking reading and then talking, there’s no fluid like, read.

Brian: So, when you said maybe, what were you thinking? Because you didn’t say yes, and you didn’t say no. You said maybe.

Madon: Yeah, I was like, ‘yeah’, that’s what I thought like, ‘well, probably could work but I probably wouldn’t do it that way.’

In post-conference conversations between Madon and Julie, Madon enacted performance theory characteristics set forth by Bell (2008) and Goffman (1959) in that she used language to control the social context and was agreeable with the literacy coach’s suggestions, even though she knew she would not use them. Although she ascribed to most of Julie’s suggestions that ran counter to her banking approach to teaching, she was also agreeable with Julie’s suggestions where that she did not ascribe to or use in her future teaching. For the coach, she wanted to appear receptive to all suggestions, and, yet for me in the SR interview she was willing to disclose where she had pacified the coach.
Freire’s (2003) banking construct that “the teacher teaches, and the students are taught” (p. 73) emerges in Madon’s descriptions and rationale when she told me about how and where she positioned students in proximity to her during whole group literacy instruction. Prior to the literacy coaching cycle, she had arranged students based on perceived learning ability. She told me that, “I purposefully sat my students around…the ones who needed my help around me,” and “like, that’s where...why they were chosen; ones further back can work more independently. But I never get up because I'm always talking to the ones in front of me because they’re the ones who need that support.” In this description, she had identified the students who she felt would need the most help, grouped them by ability, and saw this learning environment as static in that this seating arrangement never changed. Madon felt that the same (“chosen”) students would always need her support always during all instruction—just as the same students would always be able to work independently. Though this justification (“low students in the front, high students in the back”), and the immobility of perceived learning abilities of her students (“the same students will always need my support”) were rooted in her oppressive perceptions of the child learner, even though Madon claimed that she was doing this to “help” and “support” her students.

A closer look at Madon’s language further showed that she: a) came to realize her collaborating teachers (CTs) were origin of this hegemonic fixed-performance frame (an ideological perception of learning that assumes intelligence and ability are fixed, and that this is unchangeable even with effort (Dweck, 2006)) means to perceive her student’s ability to learn, and b) that her fixed-performance frame (Dweck, 2006) ideological conceptualization of students was challenged by Julie, and resulted in her learning more constructive ways of seeing students. In the following utterance she stated that,
Well I hadn’t thought of it in that perspective because I purposefully sat my students around the ones who needed my help around me. And I kind of was going to let the rest like…that’s how we…we came up with their carpet seats. Like that’s where…why they were chosen. Ones further back can work more independently. But I never get up because I’m always talking to the ones in front of me because they’re the ones who need that support. So that like I really liked what she said but that wasn’t ever a thought that I had because it was like but I'm doing it for this reason.

First, she revealed that the environment she was teaching in perpetuated a static fixed-frame (Dweck, 2006) perspective and justification for student’s abilities. At the onset of the utterance, she used I statements to describe the positionality of students: “because I purposefully sat my students around…the ones who needed my help around me,” but her language shifted to we statements before she completed her statement on what other students would do while she was working with the struggling group: “and I kind of was going to let the rest, like…that’s how we…we came up with.” In mid-utterance, she realized that her CTs were the origin of this oppressive hegemonic, fixed-frame conceptualization of the students learning abilities and shifted her language from a singular to a plural pronoun:

because I purposefully sat my students around…the ones who needed my help around me, and I kind of was going to let the rest like…that’s how we…we came up with their carpet seats. Like, that’s where…why they were chosen...

In her claim she stated we twice: “that’s how we…we came up with their carpet seats” as she first realized the origin of the frame of reference (her CTs), and then again to reiterate that this was not her idea.
Julie, the literacy coach suggested that the same students will not necessarily struggle with all content, and that different students have different strengths, and need different supports. Madon could either adjust the seating arrangements so different groups of children could interact with one another or circulate more to work with all students. This suggestion was a welcome alternative to what Madon had previously been taught. She told me that, “I, well, I hadn’t thought of it in that perspective” and “I really liked what she said but that wasn’t ever a thought that I had because it was like…but I'm doing it for this reason.” Madon experienced two competing perspective from two different mentorship relationships. In both sociocultural and performance theory, identity is constructed within a figured world by the things an individual learns to say and do from other members of that same identity category (Bell, 2008; Gee, 2014; Goffman, 1959; Holland et al., 2008; Lave and Wenger, 1991). In Madon’s case, these dichotomous perspectives provided her with competing variations for how to address the needs of children.

In the residency program, the literacy coach is an authority figure in a pseudo-supervisory role. In past experiences when Madon did not agree with those in power, she found ways to resist them. She subversively undermined her parents by doing her younger siblings homework and started a revolt against a former soccer coach. Though Julie was a person of authority over Madon, Madon also saw Julie as an asset to her as a mentor with knowledge of literacy content and pedagogy that she had not conceptualized prior to the coaching cycles. Madon saw Julie as an individual that she wanted/needed to learn from to gain access to membership into the literacy teaching community of practice (“If I have all that knowledge when it comes to literacy and math and science, that will just transform me as a teacher”). What was present in her language was a snapshot of Madon’s backstage self. Goffman’s (1959) claims that backstage is an individual’s
metacognitive core belief, and frontstage is the language and actions of an individual that conceals those core ideologies from those in attendance during social encounters. Madon was careful to use language that would not trigger uncertainty in the coach, that she was not vested in all the counter banking suggestions she was making. Instead, this revealed itself in the SR interviews when she disclosed her true thoughts and feelings about the coach’s suggestions to me in that interview. This supports the performance theory construct proposed by Denzin (2002) and Goffman (1959) that an individual’s core identity seeps into their discourse.

Conclusion

To answer the research question: In what ways do three PSTs develop literacy teacher identity? I first used the data from Madon’s initial interview and applied Gee’s (2014) building task 6: connections, and 7: sign systems and knowledge, to broadly understand her core characteristics she drew from when discussing different aspects of her life. This data targeted her past experiences and influences about: family, school, schooling, teaching, and children. What emerged from my interpretation of that data was a broad understanding of the following core identity characteristics: resistant, banker, savior, and nepotistic traits.

In the second section of this chapter, I narrowed the analysis for the stimulated recall interview data to capture and make claims about Madon’s literacy identity characteristics. For this analysis, I first drew on building task 7, but intermittently used the other five building tasks (Gee, 2014), in conjunction with Blommaert and Varis’ (2015) four-point micro-hegemonic framework. Building task 7 showed words and/or phrases that I then used the different building tasks to then begin to make a claim about identity characteristics found in those words and phrases and used Blommaert and Varis’ (2015) four point micro-hegemonic framework to further make the case for the identity characteristics found in the data. The result of that analysis
that answered this studies research question showed that Madon identity performances drew on apprentice, peripheral participant, constructivist, adaptive, resistant, and banker characteristics in the construction of her literacy teacher identity.

This discourse analysis further showed the sociocultural impact on Madon’s literacy teacher identity from working in a community of practice with a mentor. Based on the structures of the Residency program, Madon’s constructed literacy teacher identity was influenced by the literacy coach, a knowledgeable other. The resulting analysis also showed a connection between Madon’s core identity characteristics and her literacy teacher identity.
CHAPTER FIVE:
DATA ANALYSIS

Part I: Initial interview analysis

The purpose of the initial interview and its subsequent analysis was to get a sense of who Kathy was, her core sense of self, and how she made sense of her life experiences surrounding her familial background and relationships, experiences as a K-12 student, and perspectives on teaching and education based on the following questions:

- Who is Kathy? What is your story?
- Describe your literacy experiences as a K-12 student.
- Why did you want to become a teacher? Is it what you expected? Explain
- Why did you choose the residency program? (possible follow up question) Is it what you expected?
- Describe the current state of literacy education as you see it?
- Where do you fit in in that description?
- Where do children fit in?
- What is your literacy teaching philosophy? How have you been able to enact that philosophy when teaching literacy?
- What style of teaching do you see yourself using when teaching literacy?
- Who and/or what are your primary influences as literacy teachers?
- Do you feel prepared to teacher elementary level literacy?
What is your vision of a literacy teacher? Has this changed over time?

Kathy’s language in her initial interviews revealed four themes that constructed her core ideologies based on the questions asked during this interview. Figure 7 below shows those motifs that emerged from this data.

![Figure 7. Themes that were present in Kathy’s initial interview data](image)

For Gee (2014), in interview data, narratives are sense making devices that build socially situated identities that provide the texture for an individual’s figured world(s). In these narratives, the stories and the figured world of the teller are mutually supportive of each other (Gee, 2014). Gee (2014) claims that “in deep narratives, people do not focus on logical consistency, rather, they focus on the theme they are attempting to instantiate and develop” (p. 182), which is very much the case for Kathy in her initial interview.

Gee (2014) recognizes that discourse analysis of narratives in interviews are mutually supportive: the interview supports the narrative and the narrative supports the interview. To broadly identity the motifs in those narratives, he suggests using building tasks 6: connections, and 7: signs systems and knowledge. Therefore, since the purpose of the initial interviews was to get a general sense of the identify characteristics that each participant drew when answering the
interview questions, I used those building tasks to make broad claims about Kathy’s discourse. Those building tasks and guiding questions are:

**Task 6 Connections:** How language is used to connect things or show their relevance.

**Guiding Question:** How does this piece of language connect or disconnect things; how does it make one thing relevant or irrelevant to another?

**Task 7 Sign Systems and Knowledge:** This consists of the language spoken, and the Discourse in which that language is addressing.

**Guiding Question:** How does this piece of language privilege or disprivilege specific sign systems or different ways of knowing and believing or claims to knowledge and belief? (Gee, 2014, pgs. 32-35)

The result of that analysis is in the remainder of this section.

**Kathy**

Kathy was in her early twenties, had a younger teenage brother, and came from a married, upper-middle class (“I consider my family middle/upper-middleish class”) household. Her mom is Thai, Dad is “American,” and she considered herself “half Asian.” However, she continued to say, “I consider myself pretty American. I like hot dogs and baseball.” She described her familial experiences as “open” where she was “free to just kind of... just talk about however I felt” in moments she felt troubled or “upset.” Kathy reported that her parents had “very like high expectations for grades and you know, like, behavior and all that stuff,” and that the entirety of her K-12 experiences were spent at a fundamental school, where, she stated, “it was the same exact group of kids from when I started kindergarten to when I graduated high school. Even though there were three different schools, but you just kinda like, transferred to each one of them. And I met maybe like, five new people like my whole entire K-12.” In this
setting, academics took precedence over social and communal aspects of school and schooling. This was a perspective that significantly influenced her current vision of what a constructivist classroom should be like.

Kathy described herself as immature and child-like. She claimed to be “basically immature for someone who is in college about to graduate,” and who liked things that “five-year olds like,” such as dogs, ice cream, bubbles, playgrounds, cotton candy, and fair rides. In Kathy’s exchange where she described her immature and childish inclinations, she also claimed to have a hard time focusing during conversations: “I have a hard time gathering my thoughts at any point in time. So, I feel like when I talk to someone my conversations are just like all over the place. Um, yeah.” In this claim, she did not directly state that she sees her self-prescribed immaturity or childish inclinations directly influencing her inability to focus, but, since it is described in the same utterance, this leaves the question as to whether she views children (“five-year old’s”) as having this the same inattentiveness. If she did feel this way about children, this lends to questions as to whether this would impact her approach to teaching. Kathy did claim that she wanted–and is attempting to change–her maturity, independence, and behaviors towards others.

I'm trying to be an adult not a baby. I, I'm like, I'm trying to ok now I'm trying to be more independent because like, the whole passive aggressive thing, I kind of do whatever everyone tells me to do. And the whole like sassy side is just not…not a mature thing to do. And so, I'm trying to be more of an adult…an adult and be more independent and be like just…yeah.

In the next section, I describe how Kathy’s self-diagnosed passive aggressive characteristics influenced her decision making in her educational and personal life.
Passive aggressive characteristics

Kathy claimed to be passive aggressive. She noted, “um [laughs] I'm very passive aggressive. I'm getting more out of that because I realize being passive aggressive most of the time does not solve the conflict. It just kind of makes it worse.” She did not finish this utterance but went on to tell me that during conflict she was “either extremely sassy, or extremely passive aggressive.” Whitson (2013) posits that passive-aggressive behavior is an indirect means to express aggression and hostility in social situations. This behavior is manifested through procrastination, failure to complete tasks or responsibilities, stubbornness, morose behavior, sarcasm, and indecisiveness (Whitson, 2013). In this section, I show how Kathy drew on self-recognized passive aggressive traits, in both her personal and professional lives.

Kathy recognized that passive aggressive behavior was not productive in solving conflict (“I realize being passive aggressive most of the time does not solve the conflict, it just kind of makes it worse”), and that, when conflict did arise, it caused her to become “overwhelmed,” “shut down,” and “cry.” Her passive aggressive tendencies, along with her need to avoid conflict made her very indecisive. She reported that:

I'm very indecisive, too. So that does not help solving conflicts because I’ll be like ‘oh maybe I should do this?’ ‘Oh, just kidding.’ ‘You should do this instead.’ And I'm like oh I don’t know what to do.

In the following discursive turn, Kathy described a recent experience planning an event as vice president of her sorority where her passive aggressive indecisiveness significantly impacted her, and how she handled conflict during this process:

I [laughs] I hate conflict. I I just went through this like…I um…so I'm the vice president of new member education in my sorority. And so, I just had to plan this like huge event
yesterday. And I have so many girls come up to me and they’re like ‘I want to do it this way.’ Or ’I don’t like how you’re doing this.’ And it made me really, like I cried a lot and I just kind of like passed up a lot of um like responsibilities to like other people because I was like I can't do this I want to please everyone and that’s not realistic under any circumstance. So, what I don’t know where I'm going with this but it's like um so yeah like I cannot handle conflict. I don’t like talking about conflict I don’t like it just makes me uncomfortable. Because I want everyone to be happy and you can't do that in most cases. So, it just makes me uncomfortable.

She was fully aware that this approach to handling challenging situations was not productive, and that it was unreasonable to please everyone. Yet, this approach to handling conflict carried over to her professional life and had significant implications for her as an educator.

In discussing these passive aggressive tendencies and how Kathy handled current conflict in the classroom, she and I began to discuss how she would handle conflict in her future classroom. She proceeded to tell me her description of situations where students are moved from grade to grade without having their required needs for grade level promotion met–an approach she saw as a viable option for her in her future classroom.

The *passive aggressive educator*. At the time of this interview, when conflict arose with students, she relied on the CT to “handle it”:

so that’s why like going back to the whole relying on my CT thing, is like, now when there is a conflict I'm like, ‘ok you can kind of handle it.’ I kind of brush it off and I know that that’s not goo- realistic. So yeah, bottom line, I don’t handle conflict very well at all sometimes.
A PST relying on her CT to resolve behavior management and concerns in the classroom is not uncommon phenomenon; many PSTs are unprepared to handle classroom management issues and rely on the classroom teacher to deal with challenging circumstances (Freeman, Simonsen, Briere, & MacSuga-Gage, 2014). Therefore, in this regard, Kathy’s circumstances were not that uncommon, although her passive aggressive tendencies must be accounted for in her avoidance of classroom conflict and potential growth in this area.

**Passive aggressive traits in conjunction with students and learning.** Kathy described an interaction with a student that led to an exchange between Kathy and me in which I asked her to describe how she would handle students at risk of retention once she had her own classroom. Before exploring the exchange on this topic, it is important to contextualize the data from this interview and her timeline to graduation. This interview was conducted at the onset of her final year as a PST, which meant at that point she had not engaged in any content coaching and that she had only taught intermittently prior to our conversation. The following excerpt from Table 13 is the entire exchange between Kathy and me on this topic:

Kathy was unsure of how to help struggling children who needed extra support. Her language told two stories. First, she was clear to tell that she did not know how to help these children, but she never discusses avenues to figure out how to help them. This lack of commitment to this is potentially problematic in that this would impact children in her future classrooms. In fact, her language in this regard was noncommittal (“um I think well, I want to be a teacher who is kind of aware of every student’s needs. Um, and then in turn takes that and is like kind of looking for supplemental things”). Second, unlike her noncommittal language discussed above, her discourse about children and how to address
their below-grade-level outcomes was so very decisive: “He honestly should be in kindergarten. Like, he’s so below level and it's hard for him to keep up.”

**Table 13**

**Passive aggressive traits towards students and student learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exchange</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kathy:</strong> Um I think well, I want to be a teacher who is kind of aware of every student’s needs. Um and then in turn takes that and is like kind of looking for supplemental things that they can do that are on their level to help them…um, you know, advance and hopefully come on level. But I feel like now my internship, I'm realizing like even today I realized after I did it to a kid, he was like-he honestly should be in kindergarten-like he’s so below level, and it's hard for him to keep up. And we’re moving on from like reading to…I think we were going to science and he hadn't finished like his summary. And they were supposed to label all these text features and he asked me if his summary is ok and honestly it wasn’t up to second grade standards, and I was like ‘no it's fine we’re going to science now’ and just kind of left him there and didn’t give him the help that he needed on his summary, because we were you know like moving on to something else. And so, I don’t want to be that way, but I feel like in the classroom like, I just end up being someone who is like ‘um no your fine for being you’ which is awful. But like you know…</td>
<td>Her use of <em>I think</em> and <em>kind of</em> in this utterance shows she was unsure of herself as a responsive educator. She knew she was supposed to be aware of student need, and to then find ways to support those needs, but her language was passive and non-committal to what to do with struggling students and if she would do it. She told how a student in her second-grade class should be in kindergarten because he’s so below level. Not instructed at a remedial kindergarten level, but she made the determination that he needs to not be in second grade, or even in first grade, but in kindergarten. She recognized that she was not responsive, did not meet this student’s needs, and in fact abandoned him. She justified not helping the student. She was accepting of him as a unique individual but recognized that this is unacceptable behavior for an educator. I probe this idea further to see how she will respond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brian:</strong> So, you get to the end of the school year and that student doesn’t meet the expectation to go to 3rd grade and you’re the teacher; what do you do?</td>
<td>Here again she was passive in her language with what to do with a struggling student. She also used language that showed she was surprised that the end of the year was nearing, grade level expectation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exchange</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kathy: Um probably cry and [laughs] um…and, I don’t know. I, I think that at the…as the end of school year got closer I would be like ‘oh my gosh this kid is not ready for 3rd grade at all’ and so kind of try to spend extra time helping him get there. But like, some of these kids I know if it got to like April and they were as far behind as they are now, I would be like ‘you’re not getting there.” And so, I don’t [five second pause]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian: What would you do?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy: Uh, I wouldn’t want to pass him to 3rd grade because it’d be useless for him to sit in a classroom where everything is just going over their head. But there are certain kids like students that I have now who I’m like I could explain this to them in so many different ways in so many different times and something’s not sticking, and I don’t know how to help that. And so like, even now I’m trying to help the kids and I’m like ‘I don’t know how to help you’ and my CT is like “don’t baby them because they’re supposed to be second graders” even though they’re not academically like, they have to get used to second grade. And so, if it was the end of the school year and I’d be like ‘oh my gosh you know you can’t go to 3rd grade’ but like uh…uh…I don’t know. That’s a tough question.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And “Uh, I wouldn’t want to pass him to 3rd grade because it’d be useless for him to sit in a classroom where everything is just going over their head.”

Kathy was passive towards her own learning trajectory, in that she recognized the gap in her knowledge, but does not allude to any means she could pursue for solutions to that
information variance. And conversely, she was very assertive toward the children who are not meeting grade level expectations—particularly those who are significantly below level. For those students in her current practicum classroom, she pacified them instead of addressing their educational needs.

In the next section, I show how Kathy had a clear vision of a constructivist (‘fun’) classroom environment, even though she did not espouse those ideals in her own approach to teaching in her practicum classroom.

**Constructivist beliefs**

Feiman-Nemser and Beasley (2005) describe constructivist teaching practices that espouse learning environments that draw on sociocultural theories which “emphasize the social and situated nature of learning through joint activity” (p. 107). This premise places the student as the centerpiece of learning (Feiman-Nemser & Beasley, 2005; Robinson, 2005). Kathy’s language demonstrated that she had conceptualized a fun, student-centered constructivist classroom environment where students enjoy and were excited about reading. In her description of this ideal learning space, Kathy described an environment where students communicate, collaborate, and have a deep sense of community. In this section, I show how Kathy drew on this sense of community multiple times in her description of the constructivist classroom.

In a constructivist classroom, the learner is the primary stakeholder who plays an active role in the negotiation of learning goals and objectives and where the teacher becomes facilitator and mediator of instruction that has real world implications (Peterman, 2005; Richardson, 2005; Windschitl, 2002). Kathy recognized that current instructional practices, such as scripted literacy lessons, stifle student learning and their desire to read. Kathy stated that:
Um, I think that children should be…they should enjoy reading. and I feel like, I mean in second grade now, they are still kind of excited about reading, but like, when I was in fifth grade, kids did not want to read.

Kathy backed this claim with the following evidence:

So, I think that they should, like people should consider children more when they’re making curriculum. And they’re doing like you know cuz we haven’t done them yet in second grade but in fifth grade when new did like LDC [literacy design collaborative (scripted literacy lessons)] books and stuff like that it was like there was stuff that kids did not want to read at all. It was boring and there was no way to kind of make it more interesting for them. And so, I feel like kids should have a better say and like what they’re reading in the classroom. I don’t know if I answered the question…

Here, she recognized that children are not accounted for when making such curricular decisions, and that the individual interests of the child need to be accounted for, so children see the value in instruction. Kathy also saw value in teachers evaluating the literature children read during instruction and supplying supplemental materials to better match student interest to more effectively meet their instructional needs. In the next excerpt, Kathy described how her former year CT addressed these concerns for fifth grade students,

Um, so my CT last year was really great about pulling different articles like we were reading about. Parts like functions of the body and the articles that she was given were so boring. And she's like “they are not reading this.” So, she put in so much time trying to find you know articles and books that are interesting for them. And she went to like the public library and got books brought them in. And she was like “take them home but you got to bring them back.” And um so she provided a lot more like supplemental articles for
kids to read. And so that made it more exciting. Um and so I think things like that would help you know like taking… I don’t know how realistic for a first-year teacher to go like off of the what the district gives you. But I think just putting in the extra time to you know still hit standards but not just relying on what they give you. And um you know like putting in the extra time to find interesting stuff so yeah.

Here, she described an experience in her practicum setting where the teacher sought outside resources to enhance the learning experience of the children (“she put in so much time trying to find you know articles and books that are interesting for them”), which was done to offset the mandated resources she was given by the district (“the articles that she was given were so boring and she's like ‘they are not reading this’”). This was a reflexive move by the teacher who, according to Kathy: a) recognized that the students were not reading the text, and b) gathered other texts that she felt would better engage her students. Kathy ascribed to this student-centered mindset, but also set herself up to avoid this extra work at the same time (“I don’t know how realistic for a first-year teacher to go like off of the what the district gives you”). She knew she should be bringing in the elaborating texts but did not want or know how to do the extra work. This approach to letting herself “off the hook” is also manifest in her SR interviews described later in this chapter.

Kathy espoused constructivist beliefs in that she knew children needed to be both challenged and to learn to overcome challenges as a community that works together to “create projects” and focus on “problem-based learning” that connects to the “real world.” She felt that this allowed students to “see the development of what they’re learning,” “gives them a purpose,” “gives them something to work towards,” and “helps motivate” them to invest in their own learning. For Kathy, this was predicated on students feeling a sense of community in the
classroom. She told me that, “I think that it's really important for kids to feel like, the community aspect within the classroom” where students “feel like, the classroom is like, a second home,” and that this was important to meet the diverse learning needs of each child (“I think that is really important to focus on not just the academics but all the other community aspects of a classroom and I think that kids learn in so many different ways”).

To this point in the analysis of initial interview, Kathy had claimed to be a passive aggressive person, and her language supported that claim. She also told the story of a perfect constructivist classroom, albeit a hypothetical perspective, and how she wanted to enact those qualities. In the final section of the initial interview analysis, I show Kathy’s influences and rationale for choosing to teach as a career.

To be a teacher: Mom’s influence, Kathy’s idea, or the path of least resistance?

In this initial interview, I asked Kathy why she wanted to become a teacher, and her answer to this question showed three different reasons she wound up deciding to become a teacher. First, she claimed that this was a childhood ambition that just “popped” in her head. Next, she told of her mom’s own dashed ambitions to become a teacher. Finally, she described her early experiences in college, where she first attempted to major in medicine and quickly changed to elementary education. Kathy stated:

Um, good question. [laughs] So when I was little I just wanted to be a teacher and it was just kinda like the career path that just popped in my head. I think I liked the idea of just having my own classroom and getting to do my own things. Um, and then as I got older um, so my mom wanted to be a teacher. Back track a little. But her dad told her she couldn’t be a teacher cuz they didn’t make enough money. And so, she picked a new profession. And she does not like her job. Like she went back to school to be a teacher
but it's really hard for her to find a job. So, she's still stuck at this job she does not like. She hates going to work. And I'm like I do not want that to be me. I want something that’s different every day that you know is just not sitting at a desk for eight hours a day. and um but then I was like uh teachers don’t really make that much money so of course I feel like every college student now, and I was like going through like the whole medical thing, and then I started into to chem and I was like ‘I'm not really a science person’ so I went back to teaching. And for my psychology class we either had to write this really long-term paper or we could um volunteer at like a school or some sort of kids-oriented thing and write a much shorter paper, and I was like I'm gonna do that. And so, I volunteered at a school and I really liked it and I felt that was just kind of what I was supposed to be doing with my life. So yeah.

Her initial answer to this question was that teaching was a childhood ambition, “so when I was little I just wanted to be a teacher.” And that “I think I liked the idea of just having my own classroom and getting to do my own things um and then as I got older um.” Kathy never finished this utterance. She stopped with “um,” and then went on to tell how her mom had wanted to become a teacher but was not permitted to by her father because teachers did not make enough money. This caused mom to take a career path that she was unhappy with until later in life where she was, at the time of this interview, pursuing her dream to be a teacher. Though she did not name her mom as a driving force in her decision to become a teacher, she did not name anyone as influential in this career decision. The next question I asked explored her primary influences to become a teacher, and she claimed no one affected this decision for her.

Kathy considered herself to be passive aggressive and that mirrored many of the life choices she made were congruent to her taking the path of least resistance, and her choice to
become a teacher followed this pattern. After telling about her mom’s experiences to become a teacher, she did say that teachers do not make a lot of money (“um but then I was like uh teachers don’t really make that much money”), and that she, like many college students, choose other careers prior to switching to teaching as a second choice: “so of course I feel like every college student now, and I was like going through like the whole medical thing. And then I started into chem and I was like, I'm not really a science person, so I went back to teaching.” It was not clear as to whether she is referring to the fact that all college students change majors at some point, or if it was teacher education majors who had aspirations of other careers but switch to teaching as their second option.

Kathy also explained an assignment in her psychology course where she chose the easier option that placed her in front of children. The experience from this course further reinforced teaching as a viable career option. She stated that, “we could um, volunteer at like a school or some sort of kids-oriented thing,” and that “I really liked it, and I felt that was just kind of what I was supposed to be doing with my life. So yeah.” Kathy hedged just prior to her claim that teaching was what she was supposed to do with her life (“just kind of what I was”), which at first glance would seem to give her decision to become a teacher less credibility, but in fact it lends itself to Kathy’s passive aggressive tendencies. When an individual hedges, they are careful not to sound direct or forceful (Cambridge, 2016; Johnstone, 2008), and the hedge kind of is used to lessen the impact of, or soften the things we say (Cambridge, 2016). Kathy’s hedge in her claims to why she chose teaching as a career was not surprising in that this softer language allowed her presentation of self to be passive.

Throughout the initial interview analysis, I have shown how Kathy espoused a familial/home, passive aggressive, and constructivist core identity characteristics. The purpose of
this interview and its subsequent analysis was to get a broad sense of who Kathy was (her core sense of self), and how she made sense of her life’s experiences to better conceptualize her identity construction during SR interviews. In the remainder of this chapter, I show the identity characteristics Kathy drew on during reflections of her practice as a literacy educator.

Part II: Stimulated Recall Data Analysis

Kathy’s literacy teacher identity characteristics. In this section of the chapter, I show how Kathy enacted the identity characteristics in Figure 8 in the construction of her literacy teacher identity.

![Figure 8. Kathy’s literacy teacher identity characteristics](image)

To analyze this stimulated recall data, I used Gee’s seven building tasks in conjunction with Blommaert and Varis’ four-point micro-hegemonic framework. Once I identified Kathy’s potential identity characteristics, I juxtaposed those findings with the literature to support my claims. The result of those juxtapositions is contained in the proceeding findings. Like the initial interview data, I first used building task 6, Connections: How language is used to connect things or show their relevance, and 7, Sign Systems and Knowledge: This consists of the language spoken, and the Discourse in which that language is addressing (Gee, 2014. pgs. 32-35) and their guiding questions to first look broadly at the data. Once I determined different themes in the
data, I utilized the other five building tasks in conjunction with the four-point micro-hegemonic framework to provide a narrower interpretation of the data.

For example, in the language below, Kathy told how she co-taught a lesson with Julie, the literacy content coach, something she had not had an opportunity to do up until the lesson at hand. In this first utterance, Kathy engaged in collaboration in a literacy community of practice and mapped onto Lave and Wenger’s (1991) construct of Situated learning: learning through apprenticeship.

*So, this time um, we co-taught um, a lesson about inferencing. Which at first, I was kind nervous about co-teaching just because I have never actually like really been a part of that.* and um…and also, inferencing is like, it's a tough topic for me. So, having to um… explain that to children I feel like it’s tough because it's kind of …you know, abstract. Like it's not really a definite answer or anything. So, um…I was kind of nervous about that too, but going through the lesson and like, watching it again afterwards, I felt pretty confident like my kids did really well and they were excited about the lesson.

To derive at this interpretation, I first applied Building Task 7: *Sign Systems and Knowledge:* This consists of the language spoken, and the Discourse in which that language is addressing (Gee, 2014) and looked for key words and phrases that were relevant to the figured world (Gee, 2014; Holland et al., 2008) of teacher, and how this situated meaning was relevant to the context. For that first sentence in Kathy’s language, salient word and phrase were ‘*co-teaching*’ and ‘*never actually like really been a part of that.*’ Next, I applied building task 6: *Connections: How language is used to connect things or show their relevance,* because of the connection that Kathy made with Julie, and the importance of this coteaching moment in her own understanding of literacy content and pedagogy, which led to the construct of apprenticeship in a community of
practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). To apply the construct of apprenticeship to the data, I relied on building task 1: *Significance: The use of language to make things significant as it relates to a situation* and Blommaert and Varis’ (2015) framework.

Specifically, I confirm my interpretation that this mapped onto *Situated learning: learning through apprenticeship* in that: (a) Kathy’s language had discursive orientations towards sets of emblematic features (Blommaert & Varis, 2015) found in Lave and Wenger’s (1991) construct of apprenticeship in that, (b) Kathy’s language (‘co-teaching’ and ‘never actually like, really been a part of that’) showed “combinations of features that reflect, bestow and emphasize ‘authenticity’” (Blommaert & Varis, 2015, p. 6) to the concept of apprenticeship. Kathy was teaching/apprenticing with Julie who had specialized knowledge about literacy content and pedagogy. Based on the context of this utterance in conjunction with other utterances in this discursive turn ‘but going through the lesson and like, watching it again afterwards, I felt pretty confident like my kids did really well’ reflected both Blommaert & Varis (2015) former, and later point that, (c) this was an authentic feeling Kathy had towards what she felt was saw as an opportunity to teach with a literacy expert, and that she saw the benefit to this in the fact that she saw the rewards of working with Kathy in that she witnessed student success from a lesson she was a part of.

This is just one example of the analytical process that I used that shows how I applied both Gee’s (2014) building tasks, and Blommaert and Veris’ (2015) four point framework. Each utterance in Kathy’s SR interviews were analyzed in this way, with the understanding that after I applied building task 7 (*Sign Systems and Knowledge: This consists of the language spoken, and the Discourse in which that language is addressing* (Gee, 2014)) to her language, any of the
other building tasks could be utilized along the four point framework (Blommaert & Veris, 2015) to get at salient claims in the data.

At this point, as I discuss Kathy’s literacy teacher identity characteristics, it is important to recognize that she was placed on an action plan because she struggled to find her footing as a teacher. Her action plan addressed her inability to: a) analyze and apply data from multiple assessments and measures to diagnose student need, to inform instruction based on those needs, b) demonstrate that she was emotionally stable and could make mature judgments, c) collaborate with stakeholders to support student learning and professional growth, d) deliver engaging and challenging lessons, and e) identify gaps in students’ subject matter knowledge and modify instruction to respond to student needs. The findings in this section were impacted by the factors in her action plan.

The following is the result of that analysis where I show how Kathy drew on an apprentice, performer, and fixed-performance frame identity characteristics when reflecting on her literacy practice.

**Apprentice: Boundary Dweller**

To enact apprentice characteristics is to show that a mentee is learning from a mentor to gain access to the language and activities of in a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Specific to Lave and Wenger’s (1991) theory of sociocultural communities of practice and apprenticeship, Kathy enacted apprentice characteristics by mobilizing the following three constructs: a) Engaging in social relationships: to become full participant requires engaging with technologies of everyday practice, participating in social relationships, production processes, and other activities in communities of practice; b) Situated learning: learning through apprenticeship; and c) Knowledge: renegotiated meaning of the past and future in constructing meaning. Kathy
enacted apprentice characteristics in that she recognized gaps in her knowledge of literacy content and pedagogy as a literacy educator. In the SR interviews, Kathy disclosed how the literacy coach assisted her to better understand second grade literacy content and how to teach that content to her students. Table 14 shows how Kathy’s language in the SR interview date enacted apprentice characteristics, and the discursive means by which that construct was espoused.

For the construct *engaging in social relationships*, Kathy adopted this component of apprenticeship by the following micro-hegemonic means. She felt comfort in the social relationships that were created in her program, and that all the teaching support was helpful. Kathy felt that working with the literacy content coach and the partnership resource teacher ((PRT) a hybrid position where the individual acts as a liaison between the university and the practicum schools and are heavily involved in the day-to-day experiences of the resident PSTs) in tandem was productive for her growth as a literacy educator. Kathy found the verbiage of literacy standards ambiguous, so Julie provided her with different literary tools to help her unpack the meaning of literacy standards (“I read the standard and I'm like, *uh, I'm not really sure what they want me to do with that*”). According to Lave and Wenger (1991), a characteristic of social relationships with a mentor is the use of technologies of everyday practice. In education, the standards and the extant tools to interpret the meaning of those standards are such technologies. The standards are the cornerstone of what teachers are supposed to teach, so when Kathy describes that she relied on Julie’s support in these instances, she was drawing on apprentice characteristics.
### Table 14

**Kathy’s apprentice characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situated learning: learning through apprenticeship</td>
<td>When they’re really excited about what their learning like, Julie and I co-taught a lesson this week and um, she got the kids like really excited.</td>
<td>She engaged in collaboration in a literacy community of practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in social relationships: to become full participant requires engaging with technologies of everyday practice, participating in social relationships, production processes, and other activities in communities of practice (p. 101)</td>
<td>I think I guess like, comforting knowing that there is like a second opin… opinion um, and another perspective because, you know, Julie’s like the content coach so she’s looking at literacy, but then when James comes in he can help the…the…um, like everything else. And um, he also has been in my class you know, like almost every day. So, he knows the kids, he knows kind of like, the dynamic of the classroom so um, it's really helpful to have that aspect coming together with like, the content. So yeah.</td>
<td>She felt comfort in the social relationships that were created in her program, and that all the support was helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge: renegotiated meaning of the past and future in constructing meaning</td>
<td>It was super cool to watch the video because um, like I kind of mentioned before, the whole hypoth…hypothesis thing, Julie kind of like, understood where I was coming from even if I couldn’t put it into words, or exactly describe what it was. So, like even at the end when she was showing me the book she was like, “you might like this one better um, because it's more concise and it makes more sense and it’s what</td>
<td>Reflected on past practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in social relationships: to become full participant requires engaging with technologies of everyday practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drew on the co-construction of reflections and the articulations of pedagogical practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>She told how the coach provided her with different tools to help her better understand literacy standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Situated learning is the foundational construct to learning by doing in communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991), and Kathy was able to co-teach a literacy lesson on inferencing with Julie. This meant that they co-planned, co-taught, and post-conferenced about this collaborative literacy coaching cycle. Having Julie’s assistance with this lesson helped Kathy because she was uncomfortable with the teaching of inference. She felt that this concept was “tough” and “abstract” and that it made her nervous to teach it on her own. Kathy told me that:

Also, inferencing is like, it's a tough topic for me. So, having to um, explain that to children I feel like it's tough because it's kind of...you know abstract. Like it's not really a definite answer or anything. So, um, I was kind of nervous about that too. But going

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situated learning: learning through apprenticeship</td>
<td>you are looking for.” And so, um, it was cool to watch that because I didn’t really pick up on the fact that when I was sitting in there with her that like, the things she was telling me was like personalized to what I needed. So, I mean obviously because like, the conversation was centered around what I was saying but it was like um, she really was taking into account what I needed and was giving it back to me in like every way possible. So, this time um, we co-taught um, a lesson about inferencing. Which at first, I was kind nervous about co-teaching just because I have never actually like really been a part of that.</td>
<td>She came to understand that the literacy coach was targeting her needs as an individual. Engaged in collaboration in a literacy community of practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situated learning: learning through apprenticeship</td>
<td>She came to understand that the literacy coach was targeting her needs as an individual. Engaged in collaboration in a literacy community of practice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
through the lesson and like watching it again afterwards I felt pretty confident. Like my kids did really well and they were excited about the lesson. So, it's kind of what we talked about um, in our post-conference.

Having the literacy coach equally involved in teaching event made it easier for Kathy to recognize the positive attributes of the instruction. In this next excerpt, Kathy articulated the lesson’s impact on student learning and engagement, as well as what she felt was different about this lesson from others she had taught:

And like, with that engage piece, it was really cool because I…a lot of the times it's just a really quick kind of ‘look at this picture preview the text.’ Or you know, ‘today we’re learning about this what do you know about deserts or something.’ Um, but kind of starting off with something that was fun for the kids—it was something really basic like I said- ‘oh my friend has a really cool job and he goes in, and you know he…he um, helps people blah blah blah.’ It was a firefighter, and they were really exited listening to the clues and trying to get at that. So, um, I think starting off with something really exciting kind of um, like set the mood for the whole entire lesson which is cool to see that difference.

Kathy recognized that having student engagement resulted in a positive impact on student learning. The micro-hegemonic construction of apprenticeship allowed Kathy to make new meaning for her knowledge of literacy content and pedagogy. Yet, missing from the micro-hegemonic construction of an apprentice are two quintessential components of the apprentice/mentor relationship that lend themselves to individuals moving towards legitimate peripheral participation: first, engaging congruence, or not possessing direct representations but engaging in performance in congruent ways, and second, peripherality, access to sources of
understanding through growing involvement (Lave & Wenger, 1991). It is very possible that these components of apprentice were present in Kathy’s literacy pedagogical practice, but they were not evidenced in the SR interviews.

Both sociocultural and performance theory draw on the belief that an individual’s enactment of identity is a measure of integration to the discourses and activities of an identity category. Those discourses and activities are then replicated in the things that individual says and does in an attempt to be seen as an authentic member of that figured world (Bell, 2008; Gee, 2014; Goffman, 1959; Holland et al., 2008; Lave & Wenger, 1991). Kathy’s subsequent struggle to translate what she learned through coaching cycles into her own literacy teaching practice proved problematic in that she showed evidence of only playing the role of teacher, as opposed to using what she was exposed to, that enhanced her performance as a teacher. In the next section, I show how Kathy played the role of teacher as a performer.

**The performer**

Schechner (2006) claims that rituals are performances that “are performed on schedule, at specific locations, regardless of weather or attendance” (p. 613), and Osipovich (2006) states that, in theatrical performances “the performers pretend that the interaction is something more than it actually is and that the observers are aware of this pretense” (p. 461). Whether rituals or theatre, each comes with its own form of script, so actors know exactly what to do say for the benefit of the audience. The following excerpts in Table 15 show how Kathy espoused characteristics of a performer in that she relied on a school district’s Planning Support Tool as a script to guide her teaching performance; yet, when teaching she was unaware of how her audience (children) were responding (learning) to her as she played the role of teacher.
Kathy told me that she only performed the act of teaching when she had to for Residency programmatic reasons (“I'm honestly just been doing it because I have to for content coaching”), or was told to teach a lesson by her collaborating teacher (“or because my CT was like ‘hey you want to do this’”), and that she strictly stuck to script for those lessons to guide her instruction (“um honestly, I've really been like, sticking to just the PST [planning support tool] stuff”).

Sticking to the script of a lesson is not an egregious act against best practice. Scripted curricula are beneficial guides for teachers who struggle to develop pedagogical acumen (Reeves, 2010). In Kathy’s case, it was her lack of focus on student learning that is call for concern. The above excerpts showed that Kathy was performing the act of teaching with no regard to that performance’s impact on the audience; an application of identity performances that runs counter to the grounding theory for this study. Performance theory is about enacting the language and activities of becoming and being (Bell, 2008; Goffman, 1959) a literacy teacher, not just playing the part of literacy teacher. Kathy was not comfortable with her role as teacher, so she relied on the script lesson as a tool to help her get through teaching events. Schechner (2006) points out that the novice stage actor often plays their assigned role with little regard for how their performance impacts the audience, and that as they become more comfortable performing, they then begin to account for the audience in their performance.

Bell (2008) and Goffman (1959) believe that everyday life is a ritualistic performance where participants follow scripted codes to be received as an authentic member of identity categories by the audience in attendance. As was the case for Kathy, she told me that, “I haven’t really been focused on if the lesson was effective or not, and I think also, a lot of the lessons that we’ve been doing I haven’t really been seeing the day to day connections,” and “I like, I teach lessons but I don’t reflect on lessons and like ‘how did that go did they actually learn?’” Kathy
played the role of teacher for her performance, and she hoped that the children in turn played the role of student learner, but she had no evidence of the effectiveness of the performance (she “taught,” but did the children learn?). Goffman (1959) posits all interaction that takes place for an individual is a performance like that of an actor on stage, and that the believability of each social performance is directly impacted by the believability of the actor.

Kathy struggled learning to be a teacher. This resulted in her being placed on an action plan that provided her more intense support for teaching practices. This action plan was specifically designed to account for the children in her classroom. Therefore, with more intensive teaching support, she would learn how to perform her role as a teacher with more attentiveness to her audience (children).

Part of the issue that influenced Kathy’s approach to literacy teaching was how she perceived the child learner. In the next section, I show how Kathy viewed many of the students in her classroom from a fixed-performance frame.

**Fixed-performance frame characteristics**

A fixed-performance frame mindset is an ideological perception of learning that assumes intelligence and ability are fixed, and/or that an individual is born with certain skills (or the lack there of) in distinct areas, and that this is unchangeable even with effort (Dweck, 2006; Johnston, 2012). Kathy drew on a fixed-frame mindset in her perceptions of the child learner. Table 16, shows Kathy’s mobilization of this fixed-frame ideology, although she was careful to conceal this belief from the literacy coach.
Table 15

Kathy’s performer characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performer</td>
<td>With a lot of the lessons I've been doing um, I'm honestly just been doing it because I have to for content coaching, or because my CT was like ‘hey you want to do this,’ and I'm like ‘yeah sure,’ but I haven’t really been focused on if the lesson was effective or not. And I think also, a lot of the lessons that we’ve been doing I haven’t really been seeing the day to day connections. I like, I teach lessons but I don’t reflect on lessons and like, how did that go? Did they actually learn? I noticed that not each student was like um, kind of participating in the lesson. But I didn’t notice until she said it, that it was…because like, they were so beyond what we were doing. And that it was like, they did not need to be sitting down on the carpet like that. Sometimes, especially with the PSTs [planning support tool], it's really easy to like kind of, stick with uh…like set plan. Um, honestly. I've really been like sticking to just the PST Stuff. Looking at the PSTs, or like hearing what you're supposed to be doing, it's just kind of like, that like, guided release kind of like, I do we do you do. So.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripted performer</td>
<td>She played the part of teacher for the content coaches.</td>
<td>She performed the act of teaching when handed a script from the director; her CT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice performer</td>
<td>She performed these teaching acts with no regard for the audience.</td>
<td>As the performer, the teaching event was about what she was doing and not the audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice performer</td>
<td>She played the part of teacher with no regard to the audience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice performer</td>
<td>She recognized that the script told her the different teaching moves she needed to make when performing the role of teacher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Utterance</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed mindset</td>
<td>I didn’t know how to phrase my response because I didn’t want to make it seem like I didn’t like, believe that student couldn’t do it. Kind of because when Julie was like, “oh did you sit down and talk er” like, I didn’t because I…I knew he was not getting there. But he’s one of those students that like, it takes so much extra work to help him. And sometimes there’s just not the time to. So, uh, he’s just kind of left by himself. And so, I really struggle with the response that like, was not awful kind of. Um, yeah. So. I again just kinda…just like, assumed that he’s so below level that it's just all around tough for him. But um, I think that it would have been so beneficial to kind of sit down and have that conversation with him. Like does he not understand inferencing? Does he not understand the text? Does he not understand like, how to take what he’s thinking and write it down? Um, and I think that also like, it was hard having this conversation because I think these were all things that could help him. Could help him. But again, it’s hard to find that time to sit down with that one student um, and that conversation alone could have taken like ten fifteen minutes. You know? And that’s not really time that we have. And so, it was tough knowing that like, again great suggestion. Great ideas and great thoughts but finding a way to actually implement it was tough to talk about.</td>
<td>She knew her audience and chose her words carefully to control those in attendance. She did not want the coach to know that she did not believe the student was not learning. She told about how she did not work with a student because he regularly struggled during instruction. She left a struggling student to fend for himself but did not want this to be perceived as “awful” by the literacy coach. She had identified this student as below grade level expectation and that she did not feel time spent with him would help him. Yet, she does feel that it would have helped the child had she worked with him. She did not like knowing that she was oppressing this child, but she felt this was not time she could give up meeting this child’s needs and was dismissive of the coach’s suggestions to accommodate this learner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 (contined)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I noticed that um, not every student had…not every student had the chance to be engaged in the lesson. So, it was just like, if they were paying attention then they raised their hand and that was cool. And if they weren’t then that was also cool too ’cause I didn’t have to do anything.</td>
<td>She felt that if the students were not paying attention to her that she was off the hook from teaching them. That she then could do less as a teacher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel it is important to focus on the care that Kathy took to conceal this fixed frame vision of children from the literacy coach, and that she was dismissive of the coach’s suggestions for how to meet her struggling student’s needs. First, she told me that, “I didn’t know how to phrase my response because I didn’t want to make it seem like I didn’t like, believe that student couldn’t do it,” followed by “I really struggle with the response that like was not awful kind of. Um yeah, so.” Both statements showed her micro-hegemonic construction of fixed-performance characteristics, and that she was careful to conceal this from Julie, in an attempt to control that social interaction. Goffman (1959) posits that in social performances individuals use language to control discursive interactions and the impressions of those in attendance. In other words, Kathy did not want Julie to know that she felt this way, and that her suggestions for how to meet struggling student’s needs (although viable), was not something that she ascribed to or would use in the future (“again. Great suggestion. Great ideas and great thoughts. But finding a way to actually implement it was tough to talk about”), because she felt there was not enough time to do so (“there’s just not the time” and “that’s not really time that we have”).

This conversation did cause tension for Kathy. She stated that these discussions were: a) “tough to talk about”; and b) a “struggle” to have. What was unclear is whether these tensions
would cause enough dissonance for Kathy to change her beliefs about struggling children. This is particularly so because, in her initial interview, she expressed a strong desire to be a student-centered constructivist that created a safe classroom community for children to learn and express themselves—an environment where she met each child’s needs as individuals.

The literacy coach had provided Kathy with new experiences that drew on student-centered constructivist concepts, which could have impacted Kathy’s teaching and approach to working with children. In her initial interview, Kathy claimed that she believed in constructivist teaching ideals for what she wanted her future classroom to be like, but this was not evident in her discourse when she reflected on her literacy practice in the SR interviews.

In this section I show how Kathy played two roles, each of which can be linked to Goffman’s (1959) front and backstage dramaturgical skills. Goffman’s (1959) claims that frontstage is what individuals say and do in their outward performance in front of others, and backstage is an individual’s metacognitive core beliefs. First, her performance for the literacy coach was a role predicated on care and concern where she wanted Julie to see her as a student-centered teacher, a teacher exactly like she described in her initial interview. Gee (2014) states that, “identity is a performance. Like all performances it will not work unless at least some people recognize what you are and what you are doing in your performance” (p. 24). In a performance, actors play a role—and in life—our acting is crucial to who we are and how we present this to the world (Schechner, 2006), and Kathy wanted Julie’s perception of her to be one of a compassionate teacher, so she used language in her post-conference meeting with Julie to conceal her deficit beliefs about children—beliefs she later not only revealed in the SR interview, but also the care in which she took to not let this be perceptible by Julie.
Second, her performance for me during the SR interview was one centered on confessing her true feelings about the students Julie was talking about, the suggestions Julie was giving her, and the fact that she intentionally concealed these feelings and beliefs from Julie, so she would not appear uncaring. As a literacy coach, Julie was in a supervisory role and held power over Kathy. Therefore, Kathy chose language in her conversations with Julie to show she was on board with her suggestions, even though she was not.

A grounding construct for performance theory is the belief that an individual’s identity performance is based on who is present during social interactions, and how language is used in those conversations is designed to control those in attendance (Bell, 2008; Gee, 2014; Goffman, 1959; Schechner, 2006). Further, part of identity construction is understanding the social frame in which individuals are engaged in (Bell, 2008; Goffman, 1974). This single topic of helping struggling students provided two frames for Kathy that resulted in two different discursive performances. Her first performance in the post-conference predicated on being perceived as a dedicated student-centered teacher. Her second performance was in the SR interview where she revealed what she was truly thinking during the post-conference that she hid from Julie.

Conclusion

To answer the research question: In what ways do three PSTs develop literacy teacher identity? I first used the data from Kathy’s initial interview and applied Gee’s (2014) building task 6: connections, and 7: sign systems and knowledge, to broadly understand her core characteristics she drew on when discussing different aspects of her life. This data targeted her past experiences and influences about: family, school, schooling, teaching, and children. What emerged from my interpretation of that data was a broad understanding of the following core
identity characteristics: home influences, passive aggressive traits, a desire to pursue the path of least resistance, and constructivist ideologies about teaching children.

In the second section of this chapter, I narrowed the analysis for the stimulated recall interview data to capture and make claims about Kathy’s literacy identity characteristics. For this analysis, I first drew on building task 7, but intermittently used the other five building tasks (Gee, 2014), in conjunction with Blommaert and Varis’ (2015) four-point micro-hegemonic framework. Building task 7 showed words and/or phrases that I then used the different building tasks to then begin to make a claim about identity characteristics found in those words and phrases and used Blommaert and Varis’ (2015) four point micro-hegemonic framework to further make the case for the identity characteristics found in the data. The result of that analysis that answered this studies research question showed that Kathy identity performances drew on apprentice, peripheral participant, constructivist, adaptive, resistant, and banker characteristics in the construction of her literacy teacher identity. The resulting analysis that answered this studies research question showed that Kathy’s identity performances enacted apprentice, performer, and fixed-performance frame characteristics in her construction of literacy teacher identity.
CHAPTER SIX
INTERVIEW ANALYSIS

Part I: Ellie’s initial interview analysis

The purpose of the initial interview and its subsequent analysis was to get a sense of who Ellie’s was, her core sense of self, and how she made sense of her life experiences surrounding her familial background and relationships, experiences as a K-12 student, and perspectives on teaching and education based on the following questions:

- Who is Ellie? What is your story?
- Describe your literacy experiences as a K-12 student.
- Why did you want to become a teacher? Is it what you expected? Explain
- Why did you choose the residency program? (possible follow up question) Is it what you expected?
- Describe the current state of literacy education as you see it?
- Where do you fit in in that description?
- Where do children fit in?
- What is your literacy teaching philosophy? How have you been able to enact that philosophy when teaching literacy?
- What style of teaching do you see yourself using when teaching literacy?
- Who and/or what are your primary influences as literacy teachers?
• Do you feel prepared to teach elementary level literacy?

• What is your vision of a literacy teacher? Has this changed over time?

Ellie’s language in her initial interviews revealed four themes that constructed her core ideologies based on the questions asked during this interview. Figure 9 below shows those themes that emerged from this data.

Figure 9. Themes present in Ellie’s initial interview data

For Gee (2014), in interview data, narratives are sense making devices that build socially situated identities that provide the texture for an individual’s figured world(s). In these narratives, the stories and the figured world of the teller are mutually supportive of each other (Gee, 2014). Gee (2014) claims that “in deep narratives, people do not focus on logical consistency, rather, they focus on the theme they are attempting to instantiate and develop” (p. 182), which is very much the case for Kathy in her initial interview.

Gee (2014) recognizes that discourse analysis of narratives in interviews are mutually supportive: the interview supports the narrative and the narrative supports the interview. To broadly identity the motifs in those narratives, he suggests using building tasks 6: connections, and 7: signs systems and knowledge. Therefore, since the purpose of the initial interviews was to get a general sense of the identify characteristics that each participant drew when answering the
interview questions, I used those building tasks to make broad claims about Kathy’s discourse. Those building tasks and guiding questions are:

**Task 6 Connections:** How language is used to connect things or show their relevance.

**Guiding Question:** How does this piece of language connect or disconnect things; how does it make one thing relevant or irrelevant to another?

**Task 7 Sign Systems and Knowledge:** This consists of the language spoken, and the Discourse in which that language is addressing.

**Guiding Question:** How does this piece of language privilege or disprivilege specific sign systems or different ways of knowing and believing or claims to knowledge and belief? (Gee, 2014. pgs. 32-35)

The result of that analysis is in the remainder of this section.

**Ellie: #didIchoosetherightcareer**

In this section, like Madon and Kathy, the analysis of her initial interview was intended to get at questions and topics that would provide insight into the identity characteristics Ellie drew on in her descriptions when reflecting on different aspects of her familial, educational, and other pertinent lived experiences to better make sense of her SR interview data. Basically, I wanted to know: who is Ellie, and what are her primary beliefs, sociocultural influences, and perspectives on teaching and learning?”

At the time of this study, Ellie was in her early twenties, came from a family of five where she had married parents and two younger sisters. Both of her parents were Dominican immigrants. Her mom came to the United States in her early twenties with her parents who, as Ellie told it, “were looking for a better future.” Ellie’s mother and great grandparents settled in New York City and started a business. Ellie’s parents eventually married, and her father then
moved to the U.S. and they settled in Philadelphia, where Ellie spent her adolescent and early adult life until she left to be an education student in the Residency teacher preparation program.

Ellie described herself as an “overachiever” and “perfectionist” who was “committed to education,” whose “teaching philosophy is ever changing,” and, when she set goals for herself, she was fully committed to seeing it through: “when I decide to do something I stick with it give my 100%.” One of Ellie’s significant influences, and much of the reason she had such determination and work ethic, was her family. When asked about why she felt she was so committed to the goals she set, she told me that: “that’s largely influenced because of my family. Because they made a lot of sacrifices so that I could have an opportunity for an education. So, I really value that a lot. Um, I'm a very committed person.” Ellie also felt she made very intentional, calculated decisions. In the excerpt below, she described the care she took to determine what teacher preparation program she would attend, and why the Residency became her primary choice:

Well I chose it even before deciding to come to USF. So, like I said before, I can be a little like, overachieving and very like, when I stick to something I wanna do like the best I can in it. So, when looking for programs and stuff like that, I looked kind of like, all throughout the east coast; Long Island New York, Pennsylvania and then here. And then what I did was look at specifics in their education programs, and then I compared them all. And then I found the residency program, which was here, and I was like ‘this is amazing!’ Like “I'm gonna be in the classroom starting from like the moment I get in the program and then it increases. And then I get coaching. This is I'm gonna be one of the best.” So, then that’s what kind of made me decide to come to USF. And then it was like never a question, and it was never a question whether I was gonna do residency. Like as
soon as I came here I knew that’s what I wanted cuz I wanted…I feel like I owed it to those kids who I have for my first year; to be as prepared as possible. Do I think that I'm going like to be the version of myself that first year that I will be, hopefully, by like my tenth year? No. Like, I hope to grow and improve and all those things, but I definitely wanted to like start off as strong as I could for those kids. Like I didn’t want to be one of those stories of those people that said ‘yeah, I didn’t know anything that is going on. Like I totally screwed up that first group.’ Like, I didn’t want to feel like that, because it…I felt like that wouldn’t be fair to them because I've experienced that. Like especially throughout high school. You have those people who come in ‘oh yeah I can teach’ and “no, no, that’s not happening.’ So, I felt like I owed it to the kids to be as prepared as possible, so that’s why I chose the residency.

In that exchange, Ellie stated three different utterances that her preparation program decision was based on her future students, because she felt as though she owed it to them “to be as prepared as possible.” The Residency provided her experiences to, as she told it, come into her “teacher identity.” In the remainder of this section, I show how Ellie drew on constructivist characteristics, how she embraced family and culture, and how she was resistant to oppressive test preparation educational policies that perpetuated sameness amongst diverse students.

**Resistance: Oppressive Educational Hegemony**

Ellie was fully aware that a teacher’s presence remained in the minds of individuals for a lifetime. In the following excerpt, she told me that her current placement in a kindergarten classroom caused her to reflect on her past experiences as a kindergarten student, and how this impacted her approach to teaching, because she recognized teachers as “influential” and “powerful people:”
It’s legit scary. Like I really think about it, and I’m like I remember my kindergarten teacher. I remember stories, I mean obviously not as vividly as like high school and middle school teachers, but I still remember her. If…if like, I saw her on the street I’m pretty sure I could tell you who she was. Um and I remember like certain things that we did that really stood out. And our classroom, and everything like that. So, I think I seriously think about it a lot and I’m like “oh my gosh. Like, these kids are gonna remember us. Like me and Miss Jones and like what do I want to remember?” I think about that all the time. I'm like “what do they…I want them to…when they think back on this sixteen years later, do they…do I want them to remember me as someone who yells at them all the time, or someone who encouraged them and showed them that they could when they felt that they couldn’t.

Before entering the college of education, she thought that teachers taught, and students learned. As she reflected on this novice perspective, she told me that:

I thought that just because I have the desire to teach, and just because I had that passion, that…that 100 percent be enough. That the kids would all meet the objectives, and the kids would all be engaged, and the kids would always get it. And just because I really wanted that to happen, that somehow it would happen because I was so dedicated to it.

In her first year as a Resident PST, she was in a third grade placement where she quickly learned that this perspective was not accurate (“that all your students aren’t going be at the same pace”), and, as she began working with children in the classroom setting, she developed a constructivist stance towards teaching the child as a unique learner that grows at their own pace—in and through social interaction. This builds on Winitzky and Kauchak’s (2005) stance that “constructivist teaching typically involves more student-centered, active learning experiences”
(p. 62), where “students still create their own meanings based on the interaction of their prior knowledge with instruction, and the meanings they make” (p. 62). In regard to students, Ellie claimed that: “I feel like they...they kind of like should always be the thing that you think about when thinking about teaching.” Third grade is the first academic year students encounter high-stakes standardized tests where they are at risk of retention for not meeting “cut-score” expectations (Dennis, Kroeger, O’Byrne, Meyer, Kletzein, Huddleston, & Gilrane, 2012). Ellie saw first-hand what this did to the educational expectations for children, and how this influenced the approach her CT took with children during instruction.

She witnessed firsthand how “test scores” took “control” of the learning environment, and how this impacted the approach her CT adopted towards teaching, because learning then became “attached to test scores.” In this environment, she felt “it was really difficult to challenge that whole ‘oh there’s not one right answer’” exploratory philosophical stance to education. Instead, she told me that, “everyone’s given the same passage that they have to annotate the same way every single day. And they’re looking for a specific answer. It's either a, b, or c, or d.” When I asked how she resolved this ideological conflict, her response was:

I’ve personally resolved it is honoring that thinking, and that even if it's really, really abstract and completely nowhere near what we’re talking about, you know, still making them feel like it wasn’t something stupid. Like there is no such thing as a stupid question or stupid comment or stupid thought.

In her placement context, she resisted the “one right answer” approach when working with students in “small guided groups” where she felt she had “more freedom” to work with them in ways that allowed them to explore “abstract” thoughts about topics. In small group settings, she taught them how “to bring it back to whatever the text or passage or guide tells you.” In Chapter
Four, I showed how Madon espoused resistant reformer characteristics during SR interviews to resist the hegemonic policies imposed on children. Similarly, Ellie felt that the classroom practices in this third-grade classroom did not allow them to experience and express learning on their own terms. Therefore, this builds on Cochran-Smith’s (1991) critical dissonance and critical resonance. Critical dissonance is designed to advocate for children from a critical theoretical perspective in that it is, “intended to be transformative, to help students broaden their visions and develop the analytical skills needed to interrogate and reinvent their own perspectives” (Cochran-Smith, 1991, p. 282). Whereas, collaborative resonance that bridges the theory to practice gap to evaluate procedures, and then make adjustments to what they feel is not appropriate where teachers “call into question the policies and language of schooling that are taken for granted” (Cochran-Smith, 1991, p. 283). Ellie enacted both constructs in that she: a) saw the oppression children were subjected to when they are all expected to do the same thing, at the same time, and come up with the same answers (collaborative resonance); and b) advocated for those children and their unique interpretations of text in small group settings while simultaneously teaching them to target the “right” answer for test-based expectations (critical dissonance). Essentially, she taught them to switch between exploratory expression and test-based hegemony. In the next section, I show how moving to a kindergarten placement as a final year Resident provided her the space and freedom to foster her constructivist philosophical and ideological teaching platform.

Constructivist traits

To teach from a constructivist stance means that teachers create an educational environment that focuses on high levels of hands-on student-centered teaching practices (Winitzky & Kauchak, 2005). Ellie enacted many of the themes central to the constructs of
constructivist teaching espoused by both Windschitl (2002) and Richardson, and colleagues (2005). These included the following: (a) children construct meaning on their own terms regardless of what teachers do; (b) children construct their own idiosyncratic meanings from content; (c) involves student-centered active learning experiences; (d) requires student-student and student-teacher interaction, (e) children work with concrete materials to solve realistic problems; and, (f) children create their own meanings based on the interaction of their prior knowledge with peers and instruction. In this section, I show how Ellie drew on constructivist teacher characteristics in her initial interview.

Woven through Ellie’s discourse in this initial interview were a sizable number of utterances that centered on constructivist practices (Richardson, 2005; Windschitl, 2002). Ellie was doing more than hypothetically describing her ideal teaching approach. Instead, her language revealed of situations where she had either enacted or was currently enacting student-centered teachings in her practicum placement. In the final two sections of the initial interview analysis, I break away from Ellie’s discursive descriptions of teaching and learning to focus on two quintessential aspects of her core sense of self, culture and family.

Table 17

Ellie’s constructivist characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Constructivist construct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The importance of them being able to apply what they’re learning, because if they can’t apply that then they won’t be able to read. They won’t be able to write. So, kind of making it more real, more like, engaging and honoring their differences.</td>
<td>She recognized that students need to understand the purpose behind instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utterance</td>
<td>Constructivist construct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Um, you have to like kind of recognize that all your students aren’t going be at the same pace. So, like planning for that when you’re planning.</td>
<td>She recognized that planning must be purposeful where student individuality was accounted for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My philosophy is that kids should see the purpose of what they’re learning. They should definitely be involved in the process of what they’re learning. They shouldn’t just…it should definitely be centered around them and like encourage inquiry and questions.</td>
<td>She recognized the need for quizzical student inquiry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's kind of like opening for them to like, have curiosity and encouraging that.</td>
<td>She recognized the importance of children being quizzical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And um, collaboration being a really key part of that learning from each other. A…</td>
<td>She recognized the need for dynamic student-centered interactions where meaning and knowledge construction was collaborative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like taking the time to build the community and like make them feel comfortable, and build that confidence is really important. So, I really value that um,</td>
<td>She strived to be a facilitator and guide to classroom experiences where she was more of an education equal to the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really value kids feeling like…not like below me, but that we’re like equals, and we both don’t always know the answer, but that’s ok. Um, and just accepting that and owning that I feel like is really important to me.</td>
<td>She recognized the need for students to see the purpose behind instruction, and that instruction should have real world application for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's definitely more…I feel like um, more application, more like real world. I feel like it kind of goes like with anything, not just learning a b c d e f g. It’s like um, the sound and like how can we apply that sound. What words can we find-words that have that sound. Like looking beyond just like the surface.</td>
<td>She recognized that planning must be purposeful where student individuality was accounted for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>She recognized the need for students to see the purpose behind instruction, and that instruction should have real world application for them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 (continued)
Also like the differentiation within the ELA instruction I feel like is definitely um…the fact that you have kids who are reading at a four right now in kindergarten, and you still can't tell the letters in their name going on in your classroom, where …you can have those range of needs being met at the same time. I feel like is really cool.

Recognizing the importance of it, the importance of just like, going beyond just like, um drill and kill kind of thing. The…the importance of them being able to apply what they’re learning because if they can't apply that, then they won’t be able to read. They won’t be able to write. So, kind of making it more real, more like engaging and honoring their differences.

Um, you have to like kind of recognize that all your students aren’t going be at the same pace. So, like planning for that when you’re planning.

I feel like um, I don’t like to be in the front talking a lot. It's not me. I much rather the kids explain things to each other. Um, even obviously guiding them, like not just being like ‘Alright teach yourselves bye I’ll be back there reading a book peace.” Um, obviously being really involved in the process, but kind of like letting them take like that ownership of their learning. So, kind of like taking the back burner and not seeing myself as this all-knowing person. Um, but kind of just making them feel like they can lead conversations, they can learn from each other, they co…cooperative learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Constructivist construct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Also like the differentiation within the ELA instruction I feel like is</td>
<td>She recognized the need for students to see the purpose behind instruction, and that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definitely um…the fact that you have kids who are reading at a four</td>
<td>instruction should have real world application for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right now in kindergarten, and you still can't tell the letters in their</td>
<td>She strived to be a facilitator and guide to classroom experiences where she was more of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>name going on in your classroom, where …you can have those range of</td>
<td>an education equal to the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs being met at the same time. I feel like is really cool.</td>
<td>She wanted the learning environment to be democratic where children take ownership in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>认化 the importance of it, the importance of just like, going beyond just</td>
<td>a social learning environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like, um drill and kill kind of thing. The…the importance of them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being able to apply what they’re learning because if they can't apply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that, then they won’t be able to read. They won’t be able to write. So,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind of making it more real, more like engaging and honoring their</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Um, you have to like kind of recognize that all your students aren’t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>going be at the same pace. So, like planning for that when you’re</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like um, I don’t like to be in the front talking a lot. It's not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me. I much rather the kids explain things to each other. Um, even</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obviously guiding them, like not just being like ‘Alright teach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yourselves bye I’ll be back there reading a book peace.” Um, obviously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being really involved in the process, but kind of like letting them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take like that ownership of their learning. So, kind of like taking the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back burner and not seeing myself as this all-knowing person. Um, but</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind of just making them feel like they can lead conversations, they</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can learn from each other, they co…cooperative learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Culture and Identity: “Juggling between like, am I American or am I Dominican?”

In this section, I show how Ellie drew on cultural identity characteristics, and how those cultures by which she defines herself, create both dissonance and deference on cultural identity in her discussion of this topic. Both Ellie’s parents were immigrants from the Dominican Republic, but she was born in the United States. In the following exchange between Ellie and I, she described how she “juggles” two cultural identities; Dominican and American. After listening to her struggle with these cultural worlds, I had a sense that she felt as though she had to choose one over the other. That she could not identify as both. To continue this dialog with Ellie I asked her what she was: American or Dominican? My opinion then, and now, is that she (or anyone else for that matter) can identify as any number of cultural identities. The result was Ellie wavering, as she felt she had to choose, but wanting to embrace both:

Ellie: All my life it's kind of been like, going back and forth all the time and like juggling between like ‘am I American or am I Dominican’ cuz when I go over there they’re like, “oh your American.” And when I'm here I'm like…they’re like, ‘oh, your Dominican.’ So, it's like juggling the two identities has always been like a struggle.

And:

Ellie: Who knows…I haven’t decided yet. Um, I mean personally, I feel like it's a little bit of both. Like, I can't say that I'm 100% percent like Dominican or 100% like, what is that? I don’t even know. I have things from both sides. Like, I love Fourth of July; that’s like my favorite holiday. So, but I also love celebrating Christmas like the Dominican way where we wait um, until like twelve o’clock and then we
open presents. Like it's not like we go to sleep and wake up. So, it's like a different way, but it's like, I like traditions from both sides and so…

Ellie saw these two “two identities” as a “juggling” act where people in the Dominican see her as American, and those in America recognize her as Dominican. For her, the maintenance of two cultural identities without being able to stake a claim in either; yet, at the same time it was important to her that she kept both intact. In the following utterance, she stated she was: “a little bit of both. I can't say that I'm 100% like Dominican, or 100 percent like what is that I don’t even know.” In this utterance, she omitted what I have to assume was the word “American,” and instead asked a rhetorical question (“what is that”), and then answered that question with a non-answer (“I don’t even know”). She then claimed the different traditions she enjoyed from each culture (“I love fourth of July; that’s like my favorite holiday. So…but I also love celebrating Christmas like the Dominican way”).

This cultural “juggling” theme was further perpetuated in other discursive markers from her language that run counter to her claim that she was “a little bit of both.” Here, she used language that tells that she had to choose a side: “in all my life it's kind of been like, going back and forth, am I American or am I Dominican,” and “who knows, I haven’t decided yet.” In contrast to the last exchange where I named the American and Dominican cultures to prompt further discussion on this identity conflict, in this next exchange I ask if she had to choose one over the other:

Brian: Do you have to choose?

Ellie: Do I ever have to choose? Well, I feel like as I'm getting older and like, making like my own life I feel like sometimes I have to choose. Especially like now that I have like a boyfriend who is like African American. So, he has different traditions
so it's like choosing between do I do my Christmas my way or do I go over to his family’s house for Christmas? So, it's like juggling between the two I feel like I've never had to do that until I've become more of an adult.

Holland and colleagues (1998) state that “we focus on the development of identifies and agency specific practices and activities situated in historically contingent, socially enacted, culturally constructed worlds: recognizing fields or frames of social life” (p. 7) For Ellie, her socially constructed world allowed her to construct frames of social life that were grounded in traditions that allowed her to construct identities in two different cultural worlds–even if those were in conflict with one another. It was from the pressure she felt trying to merge those worlds with her adult partner that pressured her to feel as if she had to choose. For Ellie, this choice meant she not only had to decide between Dominican and American, but she also had to decide which traditions to keep as hers in this new life with a partner who also had cultural traditions:

Brian: Is there conflict with you and that?

Ellie: There definitely is because I feel like even though my family doesn’t say, I feel like I'm disappointing them because family is so important. So, like I feel like if I don’t go or like…I miss out on that, it's like…Il…like I'm turning my back on my family even though it's like I'm trying to make an effort to join another family and to like strengthen those sides, because like I value family. So, it's like, it's all about family and at the end of the day that’s like the biggest conflict. So, it's like a lot of stress but like even yesterday I was talking to my boyfriend like “what are we going to do for Thanksgiving?” He was like “L it's September” like “why are we worrying about?” I was like “because like you have to think about this and blah blah blah.” And he’s like “it's September, like the first week of September.
Like we don’t have to worry about Thanksgiving. We don’t even have flights yet.” Cuz he goes to school in California. So, it's like that’s just me my life, but yeah.

For Ellie, the choice of flight was more than just *where they were going*. It was a choice that involved whose family she would be with, what traditions would she follow, and what culture she was choosing. If identity is predicated on the arrangement of social activity in a figured world (Holland et al., 1998), this Dominican/American cultural identity conflict was further complicated by the possibility of having to give up one, parts of, or possibly both of those cultural identities up to make room for this new family and their traditions.

This section is by no means an exhaustive exploration into the world of culture and cultural identity construction. Instead, it is a brief insight into this robust topic to better understand Ellie’s core sense of self because it emerged as a theme in her stimulated recall interviews. In the final part of this section, I show the lengths that Ellie’s parents, who could not read English, went to ensure educational success for Ellie and her sister.

**Literacy and Family: An Ideological Literate Foundation**

In the study of teacher identity, Beijaard et al. (2004) posit that the construction of identity is a conglomerate of “knowledge sources” (p. 114) one such is personality, which is influenced by one’s immediate family (Sugrue, 1997). In the following exchange, Ellie described how literacy was an important aspect of her upbringing. Here, Ellie told me how her parents read Spanish books to her and her sisters until she went to school, where they were then told that they had to begin reading to their children in English. Something they could not do:

We, for one, we went…we had a lot of Spanish books like, my parents read to me all in Spanish growing up, but then once I went to school the teacher was like, “yeah, they have
to be exposed to like English and like, you have to read to them in English.” Well, my parents don’t know how to read in English, so that was a bit of a challenge but...so my dad-I remember-got us like, those cassettes. Like readers...We would go to the library and get those. I don’t even know if they make them anymore, but the ones that you put the cassette and you flip a or b side and it reads to you. So, we used to get those a lot. So, our parents used to take us to the library and we used to go to their read alouds or their activities at the library. We checked out books like, once we started reading on our own and they used to take us like every day. Like, I remember like living in the library at one point. Like I could tell you from my memory each section of that library, it's not that big, so it's not that dramatic but um, it was definitely a pretty big deal and like, we never got prizes for it. Our parents never told us like, ‘if you read this amount of books you get ice cream.’ Like, it was kind of like, just a love. Like, I used to read thick chapter books just for fun. I was like...my mom at one point like...I got so obsessed with the Twilight series-don’t judge me-in high school that she was like, “you can only read a chapter a day because you’re driving me crazy,” and she limited me to like a chapter a day because I was like taking it too far. But um, I just...we just always had exposure to it, even if my parents couldn’t afford to buy Barnes and Noble for us in our house; they just made it happen by taking us to the library or teaching us.

Ellie’s parent’s response to expose her and her siblings to English in literature when they themselves could only read in Spanish, showed a great deal of appreciation towards the value and importance education. In this excerpt, Ellie explained going to the library (“they used to take us like every day like I remember like living in the library at one point”) where her parents there were resources to meet her and her sister’s literacy needs. She told me that her parents would get:
a) “cassette[s] you flip a or b side and it reads to you”; b) “we used to go to their read alouds or their activities at the library”; and c) “we checked out books like once we started reading on our own.” Earlier in this section, I showed how Ellie described herself as an “overachiever” and “perfectionist” who was “committed to my [her] education,” whose “teaching philosophy is ever changing,” and that when she decides to do anything, she is fully vested: “when I decide to do something I stick with it give my 100 percent.” I also showed how she was fully aware of the sacrifices her parents had made for her education, “because of my family because they made a lot of sacrifices so that I could have an opportunity for an education. So, I really value that a lot. Um, I'm a very committed person.” These familial influences of determination were manifest in her previous descriptions of resisting hegemonic test preparation procedures (“I've personally resolved it is honoring that thinking and that even if it's really really abstract and completely nowhere near what we’re talking about, you know still making them feel like it wasn’t something stupid”), and in her vision and approach to constructivist teaching (“recognizing the importance of it, the importance of just like going beyond”); and may be a contributing factor to her struggle to assimilate into her partner’s family.

In this section, I have discussed how Ellie drew on her lived experiences to represent how she embraced and was conflicted by her cultural identity, how she had a deep sense of family, and how she saw education through a constructivist lens. In the next sections, I discuss how Ellie’s discourse in the stimulated recall interviews enacted an apprentice, peripheral participant, constructivist, and social constructivist identity characteristics when reflecting on the performance of her practice as a literacy teacher.
Part II: Stimulated Recall Data Analysis

Ellie’s literacy teacher identity characteristics. Before getting to the analysis of this section, it is important to contextualize the literacy coaching cycle data collection for Ellie’s stimulated recall (SR) interviews, as they were significantly different than the other participants. Due to extenuating circumstances with scheduling, Julie could not be the literacy content coach at Ellie’s placement school. Being a graduate assistant in the Residency program with two years literacy content coaching experience, I agreed to coach Ellie. This proved problematic regarding conducting the SR interviews; logistically I could not coach and then interview Ellie. Consequently, Rachel, who was Ellie’s literacy content coach for the Cambridge School Experience (CSE) was the person who was most qualified to conduct the SR interviews.

In this section of the chapter, I show how Ellie drew on the identity characteristics in Figure 10 in the construction of her literacy teacher identity.

![Figure 10. Ellie’s literacy teacher identity characteristics](image)

To analyze this stimulated recall data, I used Gee’s seven building tasks in conjunction with Blommaert and Varis’ four-point micro-hegemonic framework. Once I identified potential identity characteristics, I juxtaposed those findings with the literature to support my claims. The result of those juxtapositions is the proceeding findings. Like the initial interview data, I first
used building task 6, *Connections: How language is used to connect things or show their relevance,* and 7, *Sign Systems and Knowledge: This consists of the language spoken, and the Discourse in which that language is addressing* (Gee, 2014. pgs. 32-35) and their guiding questions to first look broadly at the data. Once I began to determine the different themes in the data, I used the other building tasks in conjunction with the four-point micro-hegemonic framework to provide a narrower interpretation of that data.

For example, in the language below, Ellie told Rachael that she understood that meaning was made, and knowledge was constructed through discursive interactions. For Ellie, this happened through social interactions that surrounded each coaching cycle literacy lesson. In the embolden and italicized utterance below, Ellie described how meaning is made through social interactions, and this mapped onto Lave and Wenger’s (1991) construct that *meaning and knowledge construction through lived experience in a discursive social context.*

I just thought about this just now, like how we always share in these videos. Like ‘oh yeah, we talked about that we talked about’ like, at different moments like, how the reflection doesn't happen just during our post conferences, *but right after, or like Marie and I were on the phone last night talking about it after I had coded for the video, and just how it's like a constant conversation.* And you, gain, something every single time and especially how like all three of us have like, have different perspectives or pieces to share and just like, makes the reflection as like a teacher just like, deeper I feel.

To derive at this interpretation, I first applied Building Task 7: *Sign Systems and Knowledge: This consists of the language spoken, and the Discourse in which that language is addressing* (Gee, 2014) and looked for key words and phrases that were relevant to the figured world (Gee, 2014; Holland et al., 2008) of teacher, and how this situated meaning was relevant to the context.
For this utterance, I felt that the key phrases were ‘Marie and I were on the phone last night talking’ and ‘how it's like a constant conversation.’ Next, I applied building task 6: Connections: How language is used to connect things or show their relevance, because of the connection that Ellie made with her CT Marie and the idea of other conversations (though she does not specifically name me, the literacy coach as an interlocutor, it is implied that she was referring to literacy coaching conversations since she was talking about literacy coaching cycle events. This then would lend to the application of building task 2: Activities: Based on the situation, how language is used to get recognized as engaging in certain sort of activity in the here-and-now), were important to social construction of knowledge that mapped onto Lave and Wenger’s (1991) construct that meaning and knowledge construction through lived experience in a discursive social context. I then applied building task 4: Relationships: The use of language as a signal to build social relationships with discursive participants, in that, Ellie described the conversations she was having with others surrounding literacy teaching. Building task 3: Identities: What identities discursive participants recognize as consequential and enact through language was also directly relevant to this utterance, in that, Ellie recognized the social construction of her teacher identity.

To further apply the construct of sociocultural identity construction to the data, I used Blommaert and Varis’ (2015) framework. Specifically, I confirm my interpretation that Ellie’s language mapped onto Lave and Wenger’s (1991) construct that meaning and knowledge construction through lived experience in a discursive social context in that: (a) Ellie’s language had discursive orientations towards sets of emblematic features (Blommaert & Varis, 2015) found in Lave and Wenger’s (1991) construct of sociocultural construction of knowledge and identity. Lave and Wenger’s (1991) state that social constructivist theory:
Emphasizes the inherently socially negotiated character of meaning and the interested, concerned character of the thought and action of persons in-activity. This view also claims that learning, thinking and knowing are relations among people in activity in, with, and arising from the socially and culturally structured world. This world is socially constructed; objective forms and systems of activity, on the one hand, and agents’ subjective and inter subjective understanding of them on the other, mutually constitute both the world and its experienced forms. Knowledge of the social constructed world is socially mediated and open ended (pp. 50-51).

(b) Ellies’s language (‘‘Marie and I were on the phone last night talking’ and ‘how it's like a constant conversation’’), specifically the words ‘talked’ and ‘conversation’ showed “combinations of features that reflect, bestow, and emphasize ‘authenticity’” (Blommaert & Varis, 2015, p. 6) to the concept of sociocultural identity construction. In her SR interview Ellie told that she made meaning from the multitude of conversations she had about literacy teaching and pedagogy. Based on the context of this utterance in conjunction with other contextualizing utterances in this discursive turn ‘have different perspectives or pieces to share’ and ‘makes the reflection as like a teacher just like, deeper’ reflected both Blommaert & Varis (2015) former, and later point that, (c) the constructs that Ellie enacts in her language showed “emblematic features” of social constructivist characteristics

This is just one example of the analytical process that I used that shows how I applied both Gee’s (2014) building tasks, and Blommaert and Veris’ (2015) four point framework. Each utterance in Ellie’s SR interviews were analyzed in a similar way, with the understanding that after I applied building task 7 (Sign Systems and Knowledge: This consists of the language spoken, and the Discourse in which that language is addressing (Gee, 2014)) to her language, I
then applied any of the other building tasks that I felt was relevant based on the context of the utterance and Ellie’s use of language, along the four point framework (Blommaert & Veris, 2015) to get at salient claims in the data.

**Apprentice Characteristics**

In this section, I show Ellie’s micro-hegemonic mobilization of apprentice characteristics. Her enactment of these characteristics can be linked to the following four traits of apprenticeship proposed by Lave and Wenger (1991): a) Engaging in social relationships (to become full participant requires engaging with technologies of everyday practice, participating in social relationships, production processes, and other activities in communities of practice); b) Situated learning (learning through apprenticeship); c) Knowledge (renegotiated meaning of the past and future in constructing meaning); and d) Peripherality (access to sources of understanding through growing involvement). Table 18 represents Ellie’s language used in the interviews, the apprentice constructs that language was linked to, and the subsequent interpretation of that language use based on the context of the coaching cycle.

Regarding apprenticeship, Ellie adopted apprentice characteristics during *situated learning* experiences (literacy coaching) in a community of practice (Residency practicum setting) to target literacy pedagogy that resulted in more impactful instruction for her student. While *engaging in social relationships*, she used “we” pronouns to show how I, the literacy coach, was part of the learning culture and climate of the classroom, and that she was able to come to new understandings of how to address objectives based on our conversations in pre-conference planning sessions (“Brian and I sat down and looked at the book and just like, analyzed the purpose and what we were going to do to get that purpose across.”) and “that was also something that like, I don't really think that I would've had thought of doing if we hadn't had
planned”). The meaning made in this mentor/mentee *social relationship* impacted her *knowledge* of how she had presented objectives to students in the past (“often like, we just do ‘oh what do you see?’ Like not naming exactly the strategy that we're using and how is it that it's helping us understand the story”), how this new explicit approach was different from what she had previously done during literacy instruction (“I don't really think that I would’ve had thought of doing it if we hadn't had planned like the naming the strategies that we're using”), and how this resulted in new knowledge of literacy pedagogy (“I did that throughout the lesson. I noticed that the kids like were able to apply it” and “they were able to name it. So, I feel like it was just more power for them and they're learning, and they were able to like…it was just higher order thinking”).

**Table 18**

*Ellie’s apprentice characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in social relationships: to become full participant requires engaging with technologies of everyday practice, participating in social relationships, production processes, and other activities in communities of practice</td>
<td>Brian and I sat down and looked at the book and just like analyzed the purpose, and what we were going to do to get that purpose across. So, I feel like I really, in that moment reflect on the fact that how powerful like, purposeful planning is. And how that helped carry out the objective throughout the lesson. So just like, the part of planning and thinking through like ‘how it is you're going to get that point across’ because just doing it and reading it and asking like, just basic questions I don't think would have been as powerful as the plan that we did. So…</td>
<td>She recognized that working with a knowledgeable other, a mentor, to assist in understanding the content of a text, how that texts connects to the objective, and how planning for students to make deeper connections to that content was a powerful experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Utterance</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripherality: access to sources of understanding through growing involvement</td>
<td>That was also something that like I don't really think that would've had thought of doing if we hadn't had planned like, the naming the strategies that we're using because sometimes like, often like. we just do ‘oh what do you see?’ Like not naming exactly the strategy that we're using and how is it that it's helping us. Understand the story, but when I did that throughout the lesson I noticed that the kids like were able to apply it and you know that they were doing that, and when we would ask like &quot;oh how do you know?&quot; ‘Because blah blah blah.' They were able to name it. So, I feel like it was just more power for them and they're learning. And they were able to like…it was just higher order thinking, I feel like because we purposely planned for that to happen.</td>
<td>She described how, through coaching, she learned the effectiveness of planning and using explicit vocabulary in that she told students the exact strategy they were using that day by naming it, then modeled them how to use it, followed by letting them apply it on their own. This was powerful because she saw that students then used higher order thinking skills when they applied that same vocabulary to understand the story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in social relationships: to become full participant requires engaging with technologies of everyday practice, participating in social relationships, production processes, and other activities in communities of practice</td>
<td>This was such an interesting exercise that I know what Brian intended it to be…to do, because in…I would know like in math and science coaching it's always like, ‘what could've been improved and what is your next goal’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situated learning: learning through apprenticeship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge: renegotiated meaning of the past and future in constructing meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripherality: access to sources of understanding through growing involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Utterance</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in social relationships: participating in social relationships,</td>
<td>and it felt like it was so different, and kind of what went so right. And like writing it</td>
<td>She recognized the difference between setting goals that target areas she needs to improve her instruction, and a hypothesis that focused on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production processes, and other activities in communities of practice</td>
<td>down and like, ‘how can you do this again?’ So, that it can go right again. So, it was just</td>
<td>constructive parts of the lessons to further impact future instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that…going through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situated learning: learning through apprenticeship</td>
<td>what can be improved, anything by all means but like that was a really powerful exercise to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do, I think. For myself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge: renegotiated meaning of the past and future in constructing</td>
<td>It was so hard to think of like putting this in literacy terms. Makes sense in math an</td>
<td>She recognized that generating a hypothesis was easier to do in quantitative circumstances, and more challenging in qualitative ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaning</td>
<td>science, but it was hard to put it into a hypothesis cuz they’re not tangibly doing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>something. It’s more like a discussion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through the mobilization of apprentice characteristics, Ellie gave credit for the paradigmatic shift to student-centered instruction to her content coaching experiences (“It's like after the different coaching and different subject areas, I’ve come to realize like, it's ok, like that's just part of the learning process. They have to debate it and they have to figure it out for themselves. Make sense of that on their own”). Based on this data, Ellie’s shift from teacher to student-centered practice was evidence of peripheral participation after engaging congruence (not possessing direct representations but engaging in performance acts in congruent ways) and peripherality (access to sources of understanding through growing involvement) (Lave & Wenger, 1991) lends to the sociocultural theoretical strand this study is grounded in, strongly due
to the direct link between her growing understanding of literacy content and pedagogy related to our mentor/apprentice relationship.

A component of the coaching cycle post-conference was the formulation of a hypothesis based on our reflective discussions (Gelfuso & Dennis, 2013; Gelfuso, 2016). The purpose of generating a hypothesis is to focus “the conversation on literacy teaching and learning, and positions the pre-service teacher as thinking agent” (Gelfuso, 2016, p. 73), to inform participants future instructional practice. In other words, the coach and the PST determine: what went well in this lesson; why it went well; and how this understanding can impact future instructional practices. Prior to one of the post-conference sessions, Ellie and her CT had generated a hypothesis that centered culturally responsive teaching—a pedagogical strength of Ellie’s. Though successful in generating a hypothesis, Ellie and Maria (Ellie’s collaborating teacher) found it difficult to recognize how being culturally responsive educators impacted student learning and engagement (“it was so hard to think of like putting this in literacy terms makes sense”).

In this next set of exchanges, Ellie’s used language that enacted apprentice traits when she discussed how we co-constructed a hypothesis that did in fact extend her original hypothesis and get at student-centeredness. Ellie recognized that the question I asked about student engagement in the post-conference was one that required “deep” reflection. Twice she stated, “Brian’s deep question” and “deep questions. I’m like uh Brian,” but that this was an important apprenticeship moment for us because of the high levels of student engagement present in the lesson. She told Rachel that, “I feel like that definitely was one of the biggest take away, the fact that they had an opportunity to interact and engage with the concept and make sense of it on their own.” For Ellie, the concept of student-centered engagement was easy to conceptualize in “science and math” but not “literacy.” Therefore, to generate a hypothesis that targeted
constructivist practices that she could easily identity (“they had an opportunity to interact and engage with the concept and make sense of it on their own” and “real debates real kindergarten debates”) was difficult (“they’re not tangibly doing something is more like the discussion”). In that instance, there was evidence of apprenticeship characteristics in that Ellie conceptualized the knowledge of student-centered practice in her literacy teaching, a content she had difficulty recognizing constructivist teaching traits prior to that post-conference reflection.

These micro-hegemonic constructions of apprenticeship led to peripherality, (access to sources of understanding through growing involvement), as Ellie was able to enact student-centered literacy practices through growing involvement in the community of practice. A critical constituent of the Residency program structure. Further, Ellie’s language revealed that developing student engagement understanding impacted her teaching beyond the coaching cycles, thus providing evidence of peripheral participant characteristics.

**Peripheral Participant Characteristics.**

Peripheral participation is when an individual can function within that identity category, and disseminates knowledge learned from a mentorship (Lave and Wenger, 1990). As described in the last section, Ellie’s showed evidence of a shift from an apprenticeship to peripheral participant. It was clear that the literacy practices she learned in the coaching cycles carried over into her teaching performances beyond the coaching event:

And then make the hypothesis. And then keep that going into our shared and just keep that going into something else, like ‘what do we think that a…kids needs or what do we see as something that we need to address.’ So, just always like, it just layers, not just forgotten and we do something different. It's just like continuously building. So that's why I feel like it’s just gone to the level that it is.
Not only did she state that this continued as a classroom practice during shared reading and other literacy teachings, but in her use of the pronouns “we” and “our,” she showed that her CT also aspired to constantly grow as an educator (“keep that going into our shared [reading]”). This was also evident in that Maria was the only CT to attend each component of the coaching cycle. For the other two participants, their CTs did not participate in any part of the coaching cycles. For Ellie and her CT, learning new and/or better ways to teach their students was something that “continuously builds” and embedded in their day-to-day approach to teaching.

Woodside and colleagues (2009) call new comers apprenticing into a community of practices “boundary dwellers” (p. 20). This language, boundary dwellers, provokes a sense of not belonging, and represents the discontinuity between a novice and their relationship with the community of practice they are attempting to become a member of. Moving towards the center of a community of practice, and acceptance into an identity category is about learning, and then performing the discourses and activities of that figured world; or legitimate peripheral participation (Bell, 2008; Gee, 2014; Goffman, 1959; Holland et al., 2008; Lave and Wenger, 1991). For Ellie, literacy content coaching cycles provided her and her CT access to new, and different aspects of literacy content and pedagogy that was then enacted in their day-to-day literacy planning and teaching practices. Thus, evidence she moved towards the center of the literacy teacher community of practice as a legitimate peripheral participant.

One aspect of Ellie’s growing literacy teaching acumen, were the concepts surrounding student-centered instruction. Teaching from a constructivist paradigm was a quintessential facet of the coaching cycle and discussed below.
Constructivist characteristics

When teachers provide instruction from a constructivist paradigm, they see the classroom as a community of practice where knowledge construction and meaning making occurs when children are collaboratively and actively involved in the learning environment, see their students as thinking agents, and are responsive to student’s needs (Feiman-Nemser & Beasley, 2005; Richardson, 2005). When students collaborate, and make meaning in a community of practice, the expected/anticipated answer to questions is not often what teachers get in return when students produce answer (Feiman-Nemser & Beasley, 2005). In a student-centered environment, children make meaning in their own way through interactions with peers and a growing understanding of the topic at hand, and teachers need to be comfortable and prepared for uncertainty (Richardson, 2005). For Ellie, the complexities of student-centeredness in literacy instruction was challenging to conceptualize and facilitate but became a reality that she learned to embrace because of the literacy coaching cycles. Feimen-Nemser and Beasley (2005) investigated the mentor/mentee relationship between experienced and novice teachers as they co-planned, co-taught, and co-reflected on constructivist teaching practices. They state that, “the mentor and novice develop shared understandings about the meaning and purposes of these activities, and the novice gradually internalizes ways of thinking, problem solving and acting needed to carry them out” (Feimen-Nemser & Beasley, 2005, p. 107), which accurately depicts how Ellie described the coaching relationship. Table 19 shows Ellie’s utterances that are linked to constructivist characteristics.
Table 19

Ellie’s constructivist characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The importance of student buy-in, schema, and meaning making.</td>
<td>Just how we've gone from just, overall just engagement, to now like these critical thinking of like real-world issues or community like things that connect to the students.</td>
<td>She recognized that the lessons taught from the coaching cycles had gotten more complex and student centered over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community of learners and social construction of meaning and knowledge.</td>
<td>We've just built upon it more and more.</td>
<td>She used we pronoun to show constructivism in coaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The importance of student buy-in, schema, and meaning making.</td>
<td>How our uh, conversations in planning have just gotten more I feel like…how do I explain…more complex.</td>
<td>She showed the complexity of planning for student-centered instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community of learners and social construction of meaning and knowledge.</td>
<td>Oh, we can ask this question…this question…</td>
<td>She used we pronoun to show constructivism in coaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentional developmentally appropriate student-centered planning.</td>
<td>Like, we really had to sit there and think about it.</td>
<td>She used we pronoun to show constructivism in coaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The importance of student buy-in, schema, and meaning making.</td>
<td>How we were just gonna take this thing into like kindergarten talk.</td>
<td>She used we pronoun to show constructivism and growth for all stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community of learners and social construction of meaning and knowledge.</td>
<td>I feel like we've all grown through the whole process.</td>
<td>She used we pronoun to show constructivism and growth for all stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I’ve come to realize like, it's ok like, that's just part of the learning process. They have to debate it and they have to figure it out for themselves. Makes sense of that on their own.</td>
<td>She showed she had learned the importance of student-to-student interaction; especially when there was tension, which in turn was important makes meaning opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ellie recognized that the lessons from the coaching cycles and her subsequent teaching had gone from a focus on student engagement (“just how we've gone from just overall just engagement, to now like these critical thinking of like real-world issues or community like things that connect to the students”) to more cognitively complex collaborative instruction, and that this was something that “we” (herself, coach, CT, and students) had “built upon it more and more” over time. This was evidence of her own ideological development as a teacher, in that she “struggled” to see the effectiveness of the lesson immediately after the teaching event (“this is awful, I hated it” and “I was just so in the moment I was just so frustrated”) as student collaborative classroom practices sometimes appear chaotic, and unproductive. It took stepping away from the teaching event and watching the video from the lens of observer to truly see the rich learning that had taken place during the teaching event (“I looked back at it through the video, then I was able to see all that because that other piece was taken away”).

Regarding self-viewing video-recordings, Schechner (2006) describes this phenomenon of performance theory as “another performance existing between the original event, the video of the event, the memory, and the present moment” (p. 30). According to Schechner (2006) the first performance is between the action that is initially video-recorded, followed by all subsequent viewings of the video adding layers to the performance. Each viewing becomes an additional performance or interpretation of that same event. In Ellie’s case, her initial interpretation of the teaching event was that the lesson as ineffective. Then, after watching the video-recording of the lesson, she shifted away from her initial deficit vision of her instruction and recognized the strengths of her teaching practice based on what she observed in relation to student learning. Ellie’s shifting perspective lends to Schechner’s (2006) claim that these performances surrounding video-recorded events help construct performance identities.
In Ellie’s initial interview, she recognized her need for pedagogical growth over time, and that even-though she would add to her teaching toolkit with experience, it was important to her that the Residency teacher preparation program accelerate that early growth:

I feel like I owed it to those kids who I have for my first year to be as prepared as possible. Do I think that I'm going like, to be the version of myself that first year that I will be hopefully by like my tenth year? No. Like, I hope to grow and improve and all those things, but I definitely wanted to like start off as strong as I could for those kids.

Taking a student-centered approach to classroom practices that break away from the traditional transmission approach to teaching is a fundamental feature of both Richardson (2005) and Feiman-Nemser and Beasley (2005) vision of a constructivist classroom constructivist. Although constructivism is not a core feature of the Residency or the literacy coaching cycles, this approach to teaching was an important conceptualization for Ellie’s development as an educator.

Concerning constructivist teaching, Ellie described how her kindergarten students debated the topic of skin color, if in fact, skin color held social and cultural meaning, and a mitigating factor that impacted a person’s life. Based on the scope of Ellie’s lesson, she wanted students to understand that skin color was an important factor to an individual’s identity. During instruction, she did not interject and insist they ascribe to her beliefs on this topic. Instead, she accepted student thinking and justifications on the subject even when it ran counter to her own. For her, she realized that the importance of the lesson was student interactions with one another as they discussed and debated this topic.

Ellie learned an important realization from this experience regarding the conceptualization of student-centered teaching. She recognized that, when learning was facilitated in a way that allowed her children to stake a claim in the learning process and engage
each other in meaningful discussions on the topic of skin color, the result was that her students demonstrated differing, yet complex views on this topic that linked to the conversations they had engaged in with peers. This pedagogical approach required her to be an architect of facilitative learning: “I’ve come to realize, like it's ok like that's just part of the learning process. They have to debate it and they have to figure it out for themselves. Make sense of that on their own.” Her language showed her growth as a teacher. She felt her former teacher self would not have been so open to perspectives and learning outcomes that did not align with what she had intended, “because I feel like before I’d be like I know like they're supposed to say that it does matter; I’m freaking out.” This shift was important to Ellie’s development as a literacy teacher in that she learned and practiced constructivist pedagogical ideals that placed students as the centerpiece to the learning environment. Regarding novice teachers, Feimen-Nemser and Beasley (2005) attribute shifts towards constructivist teaching practices to the mentor/mentee relationship when the children are the focus of planning, teaching, and reflecting.

In the teaching event described above, Ellie’s language showed evidence of Goffman’s (1959) frontstage (what individuals say and do in their outward performance in front of others) and backstage (and individuals metacognitive core beliefs) aspect of performance identity. In that teaching event, there was misalignment between Ellie’s frontstage performance (the things she was saying and doing as the students discussed the relevance of skin color) and backstage self (she wanted the students to know that the color of your skin was an important aspect of one’s identity), but had to suppress her backstage self and perform the role of constructivist teacher to provide her kindergarten students the space to collectively and individually make meaning this topic.
Ellie’s deployed dramaturgical skills (Denzin, 2002; Goffman, 1959) to be responsive to student discussion that did not completely align with her predetermined instructional purpose or beliefs. By acting this new role of teacher, Ellie’s discourse builds on Denzin’s (2002) notion of dramaturgy where he states that “persons-as-performers manage impressions, contrive illusions, keep front and back stages separate, and deploy various dramaturgical skills, thereby turning each interactional episode into a tiny moment of staged, dramatic theater” (p. 107). In performing the role of a constructivist teacher, her language showed evidence of a student-centered teaching platform in that she: a) focused on the social construction of meaning in a classroom setting; b) was more of a teacher facilitator than didactic presenter; c) shared instructional responsibility for knowledge generation and meaning making with her students, me (coach), and CT; and, d) saw the children and the classroom as a community of learners (Vaughn & Parsons, 2016; Parsons & Vaughn, 2013).

Social Constructivist

In this final section of chapter 6, I show how Ellie’s language revealed evidence of social constructivist characteristics when she discussed the different layers of meaning that were made from discussions about her teaching practice with the CT and I at different instances leading up to and including post conferences. Ellie recognized that in a community of practice as individuals enter into discourse with others within the same figured world (Holland, et al. 1998) (in her case literacy teaching and learning), there were different opportunities to construct knowledge and meaning about literacy content and pedagogy (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Table 26 shows the language Ellie used that was evidence of social constructivist traits.
Table 20

Ellie’s social constructivist characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Utterance</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meaning and knowledge construction through lived experience in a discursive social context (Lave &amp; Wenger, 1991)</td>
<td>Just now thinking about it...just like, in like...I just thought about this just now. Like how we always share in these videos, like ‘oh yeah, we talked about that. We talked about…’ Like at different moments like, how the reflection doesn't happen just during our post conferences.</td>
<td>She recognized that meaning is made through social interactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>But right after, or like Marie and I were on the phone last night talking about it after I had coded for the video, and just how it's like a constant conversation. And you gain something every single time.</td>
<td>She recognized that meaning was made, and knowledge was constructed through discursive interactions and the more you have, the more meaning that can be made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And especially how like all three of us have...like have different perspectives or pieces to share.</td>
<td>She recognized that when she enters discourse with others on the same topic, each person will have a different perspective. She recognized that each meaning making experience was constructing her teacher identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And just like makes the reflection as like a teacher, just like deeper I feel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ellie recognized that the more social interactions she had with different stakeholders with literacy expertise, the more meaning that she be made about literacy practices. She told Rachel in the SR interview that, “like how we always share in these videos like, ‘oh yeah, we talked about that, we talked about’ like at different moments like how the reflection doesn't happen just during our post-conferences,” that for her, it also occurred: a) “right after” the lesson; b) through
further reflection and conversation about the teaching event, “like Marie and I were on the phone last night talking about”; and c) how each discursive interaction was an opportunity to glean knowledge about literacy teaching and learning, “just how it's like a constant conversation, and you gain something every single time.”

She also recognized that each individual had varying perspectives of the same event. This meant that each social interaction was unique, in that distinct, nuanced meaning could be made from each conversation she encountered on the same teaching event; she told Rachel that: “especially how like all three of us have like…have different perspectives or pieces to share.” For Ellie, these different discursive interactions that addressed the teaching event and her teaching practice, provided her access to multiple perspectives and meaningful conversations about the figured world (Holland et al., 2008) of literacy teacher (“and just like makes the reflection as like a teacher just like deeper I feel”). For Ellie, this conceptualization of sociocultural theory showed her growing understanding associated with the social and cultural formation of self that lends to the identity performances where indexed (Blommaert & Varis, 2015; Kiesling, 2006) discursive resources are first learned, and then used to create positionality (Van Langenhove & Harré, 1999) and construct meaning.

These discursive resources are indexed and stored like tools in a toolbox. This lends to identity construction where lived experiences create “ideological coherence” (Blommaert & Varis, 2015, p. 53) for individuals, through the acquisition and mobilization of discursive resources required to be seen as an authentic member of an identity category (Bell, 2008; Gee, 2014; Goffman, 1959). Through lived experience in a discursive social context, an individual gains access to the language of an identity category (Johnstone, 2008; Lave & Wenger, 1991); which is exactly what occurred for Ellie. Ellie simply did not say she learned something from
talking with her coach or her CT. What she articulates here was a growing understanding for how meaning was made in and through discourse and social interaction. She also recognized that individuals with different lived experiences and agendas within figured worlds (Holland et al., 2008) impacted her knowledge and meaning making experiences differently.

**Conclusion**

To answer the research question: In what ways do three PSTs develop literacy teacher identity? I first used the data from Ellie’s initial interview and applied Gee’s (2014) building task 6: connections, and 7: sign systems and knowledge, to broadly understand her core characteristics she drew on when discussing different aspects of her life. This data targeted her past experiences and influences about: family, school, schooling, teaching, and children. What emerged from my interpretation of that data was a broad understanding of the following core identity characteristics: resistance, constructivist, and cultural identity traits, along with an appreciation for the impact her family had on her and her sisters’ educational and literate lives.

In the second section of this chapter, I narrowed the analysis for the stimulated recall interview data to capture and make claims about Ellie’s literacy identity characteristics. For this analysis, I first drew on building task 7, but intermittently used the other five building tasks (Gee, 2014), in conjunction with Blommaert and Varis’ (2015) four-point micro-hegemonic framework. Building task 7 showed words and/or phrases that I then used the different building tasks to then begin to make a claim about identity characteristics found in those words and phrases and used Blommaert and Varis’ (2015) four point micro-hegemonic framework to further make the case for the identity characteristics found in the data. The result of that analysis that answered this studies research question showed that Ellie identity performances drew on apprentice, peripheral participant, constructivist, adaptive, resistant, and banker characteristics in
the construction of her literacy teacher identity. The resulting analysis that answered this study’s research question showed that Ellie espoused apprentice, peripheral participant, constructivist, and social constructivist characteristics in the construction of her literacy teacher identity. This discourse analysis further showed the sociocultural impact on Ellie’s literacy teacher identity from working in a community of practice with a mentor. The resulting analysis also showed a connection between Ellie’s core identity characteristics in her development of literacy teacher identity.
CHAPTER SEVEN

DISCUSSION

The main purpose of this study was to examine in what ways PSTs construct and develop their literacy teacher identities when reflecting on their literacy practice in the final year of a teacher residency program. In addressing this purpose, the following research question was explored:

- In what ways do three PSTs develop literacy teacher identity?

Driving the rationale for this study on PST literacy teacher identity was the concern for teacher attrition (Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; NCES, 2015; NSBA, 2016) and unprepared literacy educators entering the profession (Kosnik & Beck, 2008; Moats, 2014; NCES, 2012; Turner, Applegate, & Applegate, 2011). Although this study does not address the attrition rates of the PSTs in this study or in the Residency program, it does address the preparedness of the participants in the study to teach literacy. This study provides some insight into why the University Teacher Residency Partnership Program attrition statistics do not match other findings. For instance, Alliance for Excellent Education (2004) reported that teachers left the profession at the following rate: 14% after the first year, 33 percent after three years, and 50% after five years; whereas Dennis (2016), who initiated the Residency program in 2011, published statistics showing that 62 of 64 graduating Resident PSTs were still teaching after five years; most of them working in urban schools. That is less than 4% attrition. Therefore, through the
lens of literacy teacher identity construction, the data from this study provides a glimpse into why this program is successful at preparing and retaining teachers.

Before discussing these findings, it is important to disclose my relationship with each participant, as well as the influence this may have had on the data, data analysis, and findings.

Addressing my influences over the data

Madon. The protocol for SR interviews was that participants were to stop the video and discuss their thoughts and feelings when they felt there were key events from those post-conference reflections. During Madon’s SR interviews, she did not stop the video to reflect. Instead she seemed to get caught up in watching herself in the video—when she would nod, smile, laugh, or say things like: yup, yeah, and ugh. A contingency put in my SR interview protocol that addressed such instances (a drawback to video-recorded SR interviews according to Geiger, Muir, and Lamb, 2015), was the ability (power) to stop the video and ask for reflections. The protocol specifically states that: If there is no recall initiation after either the utterance of the coach or participant during discussion literacy coaching discussions, I stop the video and ask the following question: What were you thinking and feeling at this point in the coaching conference? and, what are you thinking and feeling now watching this now? Therefore, I took her nonverbal, and interjections cues as indicators to exercise this contingency.

As a graduate assistant who specialized in being a literacy content coach, I worked in the both the Residency and Cambridge School Experience study abroad programs. I had extensive training and experience coaching PSTs. As a result, I have been trained to recognize and deploy different coaching moves that might influence the pedagogy and pedagogical content knowledge of PSTs. Consequently, I recognized key coaching activities while Madon and I watched the post-conference recording together. This resulted in my stopping the video and asking for
reflections more often than she did, which makes me wonder if I created my own findings. Though this may be true especially from an interpretive perspective, the counter argument to this is that I consistently monitored my decisions based on my prior training and degree of expertise in both coaching and identity construction. This expertise allowed me to recognize integral moments that I felt both coaching and identity construction were occurring. I specifically did not want to miss what I believed would be an important moment during data collection. As for what this realization means for my findings, the claims made in this study are my interpretation of the participants’ interpretation of what was happening in the coaching event. Gee (2014) claims that all discourse analysis is an interpretation of language that is generated based on the analyst’s experiences with the topic under examination, and that any findings should come under some degree of scrutiny from other analysts. Gee (2014) further suggests that, when researchers feel dissonance and/or deference towards another analyst’s claims, this promotes growth in the field of discourse and discourse analysis. While analyzing Madon’s data, I found that I first targeted moments where she needed help or leaned on the coach to assist her when teaching, reflecting on her pedagogy, and/or when generating hypotheses to inform future instruction. I felt these moments were salient because she claimed to prefer a banking teaching approach and was adamant about not needing help at the onset of coaching cycles. As a result, I wanted to know what was happening when she did ask for help. In those moments, I used the building tasks (Gee, 2014) to target what her language was doing; made sure that I was not making a cognitive claim; and I looked for similar language across her SR interviews to generate themes that could be tied to her literacy teacher identity characteristics. By applying this approach to validate my analysis, paired with the fact that each participant read, and agreed with my interpretation of their respective chapters, I do not believe that I generated my own findings.
Kathy. For Kathy, there were several instances in which I recognized my influence during the SR interviews and in the subsequent data analysis. Kathy struggled to find her footing as a teacher and had to be placed by Residency’s Leadership team on an action plan that addressed her abilities to: (a) analyze and apply data from multiple assessments and measures to diagnose student needs, and then teach the students based on her findings; (b) demonstrate that she was emotionally stable and could make mature judgments; (c) collaborate with stakeholders to support student learning and professional growth; (d) deliver engaging and challenging lessons; and (e) identify gaps in students’ subject matter knowledge and modify instruction to respond to student needs.

Knowing that Kathy was on an action plan, I needed to be sure during the analysis of her interview data that I was not providing feedback to her that she was either successfully and/or unsuccessfully meeting the contingencies of her action plan, but rather that I was focusing on the research questions for this study. In other words, I needed to be sure that I was focused on my study, and not generating findings beyond the scope of this research. On a few occasions, I felt myself being too critical of her teaching practices that did not meet the action plan’s contingencies, and this influenced my interpretation. Consequently, I had to be sure that after making a claim about Kathy that it was focused on her literacy teacher identity construction. Although I continually applied the building tasks (Gee, 2014) to her data for analysis, it was the application of the four point framework (Blommaert & Varis, 2015) that ensured I was not making a cognitive claim or imposing analysis onto the data that was not warranted. The building tasks (Gee, 2014) provide interpretive freedom when used on their own that I could intervene problematically. Therefore, by applying the four point framework (Blommaert &
Varis, 2015), this helped me to move away from pedagogical concerns in her action plan and target language that emphasized her literacy teacher identity construction.

**Ellie.** Regarding Ellie, since Julie (the literacy content coach) could not coach at Ellie’s placement school, I was given this assignment as a result of logistics. This meant that there were several instances where my additional influence over the study was present. First, because I was Ellie’s literacy coach, I had to ensure that I followed the coaching procedures established for this study and that I also focused on Ellie’s literacy pedagogical abilities, literacy teaching goals, and her learning trajectory. Since there were two other Resident PSTs in this school that I was also coaching, I was sure to follow the same coaching procedures for them as well. During data analysis, I used the building tasks to make sure that I did not make cognitive claims or impose analysis onto the data that was not warranted.

**Finding 1: Identity as Plural**

This study was concerned with a comprehensive understanding of how PSTs construct their identities as literacy teachers. The findings show that PSTs drew on multiple characteristics as they reflected on their literacy pedagogy. Moje and Luke (2009) claim that identity is not a singular construct, but rather a pluralistic one in which “one person might enact many different identities, both across a developmental trajectory or within a variety of different contexts” (p. 418). The first discussion topic of this summative chapter focuses on the plurality of identity, in that each participant drew on multiple identity characteristics when reflecting on their literacy practice (Bell, 2008; Elliott, 2015; Goffman, 1959; Leander, 2002; Rowsell & Abrams, 2011). Below Figure 11, 12, and 13 taken from Chapters Four, Five, and Six show each participant’s literacy teacher identity characteristics gleaned from the SR interviews.
Consequently, the multitude of characteristics discursively enacted to construct participant’s literacy teacher identity is congruent with that of Moje and Luke’s (2009) assertion that, in literacy education, individuals enact different identity constructs. This finding also aligns with claims made by Williams (2006) who recognizes that classrooms are ever-changing, and comprised of multiple individuals with distinct identities, which means that a teacher may need to draw upon different identity characteristics (metaphors according to Williams) depending on the moment-to-moment interactions. This point remains abstractions until we apply them to the specifics of the three subjects in this study. The data represented in Figure 11 showed that Madon drew on an apprentice, peripheral participant, constructivist, adaptive, resistant, and banker identity characteristics.

![Figure 11. Madon’s literacy teacher identity characteristics](image)

Kathy’s SR interview data showed that she enacted an apprentice, performer, and fixed performance frame identity characteristics.

![Figure 12. Kathy’s literacy teacher identity characteristics](image)
And Ellie’s SR interview data showed that she enacted an apprentice, peripheral participant, constructivist, and social constructivist identity characteristics.

**Figure 13. Ellie’s literacy teacher identity characteristics**

Based on this study’s findings, these characteristics allowed for the micro-hegemonic construction of participants’ literacy teacher identity, where each participant drew on: a) characteristics that either connected to their core sense of self (Gee, 2014; Goffman, 1959) (for example: Madon’s banking, Kathy’s passive aggressive, and Ellie’s cultural characteristics); or b) to characteristics that manifested because of the Residency’s programmatic structure (for instance, apprenticeship characteristics were present in all three participants, and peripheral participant, adaptive, and constructivist characteristics present for Madon and Ellie). This study is grounded on the philosophical belief that identity is a plural term, where individuals draw on multiple constructs to make sense of the world around them (Bell, 2008; Blommaert & Varis, 2015; Elliott, 2015; Gee, 2014; Goffman, 1959; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Leander, 2002). The multiplicity of identity is the next discussion topic in this summative chapter.

**Finding 2: Participants Literacy Teacher Identity Development over Time**

For this study, both “context” and “developmental trajectory” (Moje & Luke, 2009) are relevant concepts that impacted this study’s findings. Although the context for each participant
would appear to remain the same (the participants remained in the same school, taught with the same classroom, with the same children, and had the same coach for the entire experience), at no point is a social context a static environment. This meant that participants identities showed evidence of plurality as well as development over the time within the context of their placement classrooms.

Though there were many aspects of the context that stayed consistent for the participants, a classroom is an unstable, ever-changing, and unpredictable context. The setting for this study did not involve a variety of different contexts. Instead, it involved variety and difference in context–classrooms are a that are a dynamic environment.

Both Madon and Ellie’s language showed a shift in their development as literacy teachers from apprentice (a novice or newcomer in a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991)), to peripheral participant (an experienced member in a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991)). Madon learned to make data-driven decisions that led to better planned instruction, and she also learned and implemented student-centered literacy pedagogical methods that both complimented and challenged her preferred banking approach to teaching. Ellie’s shift to peripheral participant centered on what she learned from generating hypotheses in post-conferences about productive elements of her literacy teaching practice, and how this impacted both her, and her CTs’ instruction beyond the coaching events. For Kathy, though there did not appear to be evidence of peripheral participation in her language, she did show growth along a developmental trajectory in that co-teaching with Julie provided her opportunities to participate and recognize the value of placing the student at the center of instruction, and that having student engagement resulted in a positive impact on student learning.
Of the characteristics that were similar between Madon and Ellie, that of an apprentice, peripheral participant and adaptiveness can all be linked to working with a mentor or knowledgeable other in the residency (a community of practice [Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998]) within the elementary school context. To participate within an identity category such as teacher, individuals need to become versed in the language and actions of that identity (planning, presenting content, assessing content, etc.), where their performance must then be believable by other members (principals, supervisors, other teachers) of that community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). For those who newly enter a community of practice, they may find themselves on the margins of that figured world. Woodside and colleagues (2009) call newcomers to a community or practice, “boundary dwellers” (p. 21). As newcomers to a community of practice, the participants in this study had limited access to Wenger’s (1998) “regimens of competence” (p. 137), and it is through the collaborative enterprise of apprenticeship where shared meaning between the PST and literacy content coach resulted in generated literacy content and pedagogical knowledge that manifested in participants language across multiple literacy teacher identity characteristics. Therefore, these PSTs (newcomers) received mentorship from the coach to learn social and cultural practices and negotiate meaning as elements of competence as a literacy educator. All of which allowed Madon and Ellie to display emblematic features of apprentice, peripheral participant, constructivist identity characteristics that targeted their developmental trajectory as literacy educators. Madon and Ellie also had identity characteristics that were different from one another that also showed similar pedagogical growth. This was the case for Ellie and social constructivist characteristics, and Madon’s adaptive and resistant traits.

For Woodside et al. (2009), the internship or practicum setting is ripe for participation, reification, and regimes of competence to be conceptualized in the construction of identity. Gee
(2014) states that “identities are more fluid than labels” (p. 23), and labeling these characteristics for this study is productive in that it can inform the field of both pre-service teacher and literacy pre-service teacher education to better understand how this context—specifically a teacher residency program with its specific structures—enhanced the literacy teacher identity formation for these participants. This is particularly important given the claim made by Anderson and Stillman (2013) that “the specific contributions of clinical experiences and student teaching in particular, to PST development remain unclear even in the face of strident calls for ‘clinically rich’ pathways into teaching” (p. 4). Clinically rich preparation programs focus on the school and community and support the development of thorough teaching skills through careful and deliberate alignment between “practice, context, theory, and pedagogy” (NCATE, p. iii). The Residency (UTRPP) is an answer to this call (Dennis, 2016), and this study begins to better understand the impact of this clinical program.

The Residency program was designed as a community of practice where the resident PSTs engage in content coaching with a knowledgeable other to enhance K-5 student learning experiences and potentially accelerate their theory to practice connections in urban schools (College of Education, 2017). In order to create a school-based community of practice, there must be in place intensive school support structures to assist in the preparation of more in-depth literacy teaching practices, student-centered learning as a measure of pedagogical competence to enhance the development of philosophies of teaching and learning (Deal & White, 2006; Hopkins & Spillane, 2014; Stanulis, Fallona, & Pearson, 2002). In such contexts, teachers work closely with key personnel in situated learning experiences.

In the next section, I combine and discuss Finding 3: Connections between core sense of self and literacy teacher characteristics; and Finding 4: Deployment of front and backstage
dramaturgy due to the interconnectedness between these two findings. Goffman’s (1959) performance theory dramaturgical front and back stage constructs were present in SR interviews for in participant reflections as literacy teachers, which were connected to characteristics they disclosed in initial interviews.

**Finding 3: Connections between core sense of self and literacy teacher characteristics; and**

**Finding 4: Deployment of front and backstage dramaturgy**

Two findings for this study centered on the connection between a participant’s core identity characteristics uncovered in the initial interviews and the literacy teacher identity characteristics found in SR interviews. For each participant, connections between their literacy teacher reflections and core identity characteristics were aimed at mitigating factors that caused them tension with what they saw as the oppressive structured environment of school. To make sense of these discursive occurrences, it was helpful to apply Goffman’s (1959) dramaturgical concepts of front and backstage because participants were careful to conceal those core ideologies and their feelings about situations and circumstances that were happening to, or around them, from those in attendance. Therefore, I discuss both findings in this section: first, a brief discussion of participants’ language that drew on their core ideologies when reflecting on their literacy practices; and, second, how participants concealed those core characteristics from the literacy coach and students when reflecting in SR interviews.

**Finding 3: Connections between participants’ literacy teacher identity and core identity characteristics.** The crossover between core identity traits present in initial and SR interview literacy teacher reflections is similar to findings by Ticknor (2014) where she called for teacher preparation programs to provide PSTs opportunities to engage in dissonance (Ticknor’s synonym for teacher stress) towards predispositions of education, and educational
topics through exploring personal narrative biographies in order to better understand identity formation. The initial interviews got at participant’s core sense-of-self and how they made sense of life experiences surrounding family, family background and relationships, experiences as K-12 students, and perspectives on teaching and education that were then present and influenced the participant’s language in SR interviews. This finding is also consistent with Beijaard and colleagues’ (2004) claim that teachers have sub-identities linked to one’s overall core identity.

Each participant had fundamental identity characteristics that manifested themselves in the discourse of their overall literacy teacher identities. Each core identity characteristic that participants drew on helped them make sense of the teaching moment and/or post-conference reflections with the literacy coach. Yet, both Madon and Kathy were careful to conceal their core ideologies from the literacy coach Julie, while Ellie concealed her core beliefs from her students during instruction but revealed this in both the post-conference and corresponding SR interview. Concealing core beliefs in social contexts reflects Goffman’s (1959) views of front and backstage. This seems to warrant the application of this dramaturgical construct to participants discourse to better understand these discursive interactions.

Performance theory is based on the belief that identity is a performance that reflects the impressions of who is present during social interactions and that language is used to control those present in social settings (Bell, 2008; Gee, 2014; Goffman, 1959; Schechner, 2006). Consequently, identity performances are about how interlocuters conceptualize the social frame they are in or about to engage in (Bell, 2008; Goffman, 1974). During these performances discursive decisions are made that reveal (frontstage) and conceal (backstage) from those with whom they are talking.
**Finding 4: Deployment of front and backstage dramaturgy.** In this section I first discuss how Madon and Kathy hid certain core beliefs about teaching and learning from Julie—the literacy content coach. In her initial interview, Madon claimed that she preferred a “banking” style of teaching children. This core teaching belief was also present throughout her SR interviews. In her SR interviews, I found that Madon’s language showed evidence that this core banking teaching platform became conflicted as she began to learn student-centered techniques from Julie which did, in-fact, translate into teaching practices that were student-centered and constructivist. As for Kathy, she claimed to draw on passive aggressive core identity characteristics. In that initial interview, she told me that she used this core ideological stance to control circumstances in her personal life when there was conflict, challenging circumstances, and/or stressful interactions with other people. She told me that this resulted in her being indecisive (particularly with what she considered to be complicated decisions). Ellie on the other hand drew on dramaturgical impression management (Goffman, 1959) very differently than her peers. For Ellie, she sought to manage the impressions of her students when they did not ascribe to her ideology on culture and identity. This use of front- and backstage was in stark contrast to that of Madon and Kathy who drew on dramaturgical skills to assuage Julie, and her impressions of them.

It is important to note that Madon became open to being coached by Julie and that this, in turn, resulted in her embracing many of Julie’s teaching suggestions, there were instances in her discourse where she revealed that she would not use Julie’s student-centered suggestions but was careful to conceal this from her in her post-conferences. In such instances, Madon used language that suggested she would espouse Julie’s suggestions. However, in SR interviews, she disclosed that on these occasions she was pacifying Julie and would not use several of her suggestions.
Presumably, Julie was unaware of what Madon came to know as banking educational practices (in her initial interview with me she stated that she preferred banking). To Madon, banking meant providing the accurate means of direct instruction for students to understand and practice the content she taught, which, in turn, led to their academic success. The seeds to this banking practice as a core ideology were planted when Madon’s parents first compared her to her older brother (who is now a nuclear scientist) when she struggled academically (“if your brother can do it why can’t you”). It then became more entrenched when Madon’s younger brothers were compared to her in exactly the same way when they were not doing well in school. To help her younger brothers, she did their work for them as opposed to showing them how to do their school assignments accurately and becoming academically proficient in their own right. Madon simply did not want them to live with the comparison of “if you sister can do it, why can’t you?”

Madon learned that struggling academically had negative social and emotional consequences, and that academic proficiency meant less pressure to alter behaviors to fit a valued stereotype. Madon deeply felt he need to deposit accurate content knowledge into her students. Theoretically and practically, banking teaching runs counter to constructivist educational practices. So, when Julie made suggestions to Madon in post-conferences that pointed out areas of her teaching where she could be more constructive, Madon was careful to use language that hid her core banking teaching ideology from Julie and revealed this to me in her SR interviews.

By drawing on front- and backstage dramaturgy (Goffman, 1959), Madon was able to appease Julie, while managing Julie’s impression of her as a literacy teacher by maintaining control of the conversations between them. Madon told me in her initial interview that she
wanted to acquire the math, science, and literacy coach’s knowledge of content and pedagogy to be a better teacher. She also made it clear in the SR interviews that she learned a variety of pedagogical techniques from Julie. Yet, for several of the teaching suggestions recommended to her by Julie, she claimed in her SR interviews that she would not use those ideas but used language in her post-conferences that made it seem as if she would. Madon told me that she would prefer to draw on practices that align more with her core banking approach to teaching. As individuals construct their identities in a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991), they ultimately determine what activities and discourses they choose to accept or reject. Madon recognized the value of the literacy coach’s suggestions and kept those she valued for her teaching practice and rejected others that did not match her preferred teaching style.

Although Kathy, like Madon, drew on front- and backstage to conceal her core beliefs and feelings from Julie in post-conference conversations, her use of dramaturgical skills (Goffman, 1959) was very different from that of Madon’s. In her SR interviews, she revealed that she viewed children from a deficit fixed-frame perspective, and she told me that she was careful to conceal these views about teaching below level readers and writers from Julie, which was not the case for Madon. Madon did not see the students from a deficit mindset, her, on the other hand, did not believe that some of Julie’s suggestions on how to instruct students would work for her. As the literacy content couch, Julie played a supervisory role in the Residency because she oversaw and evaluated the PSTs literacy teaching practices. Kathy was afraid of how Julie would perceive her true feelings and beliefs about struggling students, and that she would most likely relay this to other Residency program supervisors. To meet the requirements of her action plan, she needed to be observed addressing each of the designated areas of concern.
In this way, Kathy could show pedagogical progress, be removed from the action plan, move forward in the Residency program, and ultimately graduate.

The structure of the Residency program was designed to provide PSTs with experiences that teach them to meet the needs of urban children through intensive scaffolded immersion in schools where there is emphasis on theory to practice connections (Dennis, 2016). This programmatic configuration would potentially lessen the likelihood of concerns stated in the introduction of this study with regard to the high levels of novice teacher attrition (Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; NCES, 2015; NSBA, 2016). Furthermore, this program was designed to quite specifically prepare program graduates to meet the needs of students in urban schools (Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; NSBA, 2016). Overall, the program sought to enhance PST theory to practice connections that so often eluded many beginner teacher (Kosnik & Beck, 2008; Moats, 2014; NCES, 2012; Turner, Applegate, & Applegate, 2011).

Instead of being transparent to Julie (the person who could have helped her address her areas of concern–at least in literacy) about her feelings (insecurities) and subsequent practice towards/with below level readers and teaching suggestions, Kathy and Madon chose to hide these core beliefs (backstage) in coaching conferences. Thus, they used language to manage the impression (Bell, 2008; Goffman, 1949) Julie had of them (frontstage). For Kathy, it was to appear a competent equitable literacy teacher; and for Madon it was about the rejection of suggested ways to teach children. In essence, Kathy managed her frontstage language, to hide her backstage core beliefs, and consequently did not adequately address the issues described in her action plan, although she did maintain her image as a teacher. This image seemed to be more important to her than actually being a competent teacher in reality. Consequently, she remains at risk. She might well become the victim of attrition. Long term success in classrooms is a matter
of “being competent” and not simply “appearing competent.” In trying to hide from issues important to her development, Kathy denied herself the opportunity to prepare for success.

This is not to say that Kathy could never become a sound and competent teacher. That well might happen at some point in the future—if and when Kathy learns to better align her frontstage language with her backstage core beliefs. Kathy tended to procrastinate, to use self-deprecating language, and to resist becoming acclimated as a teacher in her practicum classroom. These behaviors resulted in her being placed on an action plan that addressed Residency staff concerns for her teaching. Action plans are used by Residency stakeholders (collaborating teachers, partnership resource teachers, content coaches, etc.) to provide more intense scaffolded support for PSTs who struggle with any of the many different aspects of teaching. As far as this study is concerned, Kathy and Madon missed opportunities to use the Residency program to their best advantage. Had Madon expressed her true feelings about Julie’s suggestions, this may have provided her even greater opportunities to grow professionally; more so than what she already disclosed. She clearly claimed in her SR interviews that she was open to, and embraced other pedagogical suggestions by Julie, but did not want to discuss the ones she rejected. Instead she appeased Julie. Had Madon not passed on opportunities to engage Julie further in conversation about suggestions that she did not ascribe, she may have missed out on different ways of teaching children that better suite her teaching style.

Ellie’s use of dramaturgy (Goffman, 1959) was very different from that of Madon and Kathy. Ellie heavily drew on culture and cultural identity as a foundational ideology. In the initial interview, she disclosed that she felt tension between her own American and Dominican cultural background. She felt some stress as she tried to merge (and, most likely forfeit) her cultural background with that of her African American boyfriend. In SR interviews, she revealed
that many of her coaching cycle lessons centered on culturally responsive teaching, and on inherent socioeconomic, sociopolitical, and socioemotional impacts of race and culture on individual and group identities. For example, during a class debate on whether skin color was a mitigating factor in identity formation, several of her students took the stance that: ‘no, skin color does not matter.’ That what matters is the type of person you are and how you treat others. She wanted her students to know and feel as she did: that skin color does matter and that it makes a difference to individual and cultural identities. However, she never imposed that opinion on her students. Instead, she provided her students the space to work together and draw their own conclusions (“I’ve come to realize like it's ok like that's just part of the learning process they have to debate it and they have to figure it out for themselves makes sense of that on their own”).

Ellie drew on front- and backstage dramaturgical impression management (Goffman, 1959), during literacy instruction that focused on culture and identity, when she claimed that she was careful not to impose her core personal beliefs and feelings for this topic on to her students. This was very different from how Ellie managed the impressions of Julie about her beliefs about student’s ability to learn, and Madon’s concealment about techniques to teach children. Ellie told Rachel several examples of her interactions with students where she took a neutral stance and let them debate the concept of culture and identity amongst themselves to then generate their own opinion on this subject. Although she disclosed in an SR interview that she wanted to tell students her attitudes towards this topic, she understood that imposing views of this sort would run counter to her student-centered teaching platform, and she wanted to be a teacher who nurtured student-to-student interactions, debates, and self-discovery of content. Therefore, she concealed her core beliefs. Ellie quite consciously chose not to impose her core feelings on students. She created a better teaching environment by demonstrating a disciplined constructivist
setting. There is no evidence in her SR interview data to show that she refrained from imposing her beliefs on the students to manage the impressions of the adults in the room at the time of the teaching event.

Using dramaturgical skills, Ellie concealed her core beliefs from her students. However, since this study is grounded in the belief that language is used to control the impressions of those in attendance, it could very well be the case that, in Ellie’s SR interviews, she told Rachel what she wanted to hear (Bell, 2008; Goffman, 1959) and that she focused on student-centered practices instead of imposing her own needs and beliefs on her students (which if this was the case, it would then be more in line with both Madon and Kathy’s use of dramaturgy to control the impressions of the literacy coach). Since I was Ellie’s literacy coach, Rachel conducted her SR interviews, and Rachel not only created the Residency teacher preparation program in which she was enrolled but was Ellie’s literacy coach during the Cambridge School Experience study abroad program. Although there is no evidence of this in Ellie’s language, it could be the case that having worked with Rachel as her literacy coach in Cambridge and understanding student-centered philosophy of the Residency program, that Ellie wanted to be recognized as a student-centered educator by Rachel, who was a very influential person in the Residency program. It might also indicate that Ellie truly exhibited an authentic constructivist position. To determine whether this was the case would necessitate analyzing Ellie’s teaching event video-recordings to validate or refute her claim. Yet this was not done as it was not part of the study’s design.

Although all participants drew on Goffman’s (1959) construct of front- and backstage to conceal core beliefs from those in attendance, it is the participants’ rationale for deploying front- and backstage behaviors and language that is important to and understanding of how they constructed their literacy teacher identities. Both Madon and Kathy concealed their core
ideologies to attempt to manage Julie’s impressions of them. Bell (2008) and Goffman (1959) point out that identity is about how individuals are perceived, based on the language they use to manage the impressions of others, so that they can be perceived as authentic members of an identity category. Julie, Madon and Kathy’s literacy coach, not only had access into the Residency program, but also into the figured world (Holland et al., 2008) of literacy teacher. Whereas Madon hid her beliefs about the teaching practices which Julie had offered as viable alternatives to what Madon had done during instruction, Kathy actively concealed her core attitudes towards children who struggled with literacy in her practicum classroom.

The difference between what Madon and Kathy concealed from Julie is significant. Whereas Madon had a clear understanding of what and how she wanted to teach (resulting in her concealing from Julie that she did not want to apply her teaching suggestions to her pedagogical practice), Kathy suppressed her fixed-frame beliefs about the children she was teaching. She either did not believe she could meet the expectations of the grade-level (based on limited amount of time required to address all students’ needs), or her passive aggressive core traits were deployed to mask her true insecurities about meeting struggling students’ needs.

Goffman’s (1959) performance theory constructs of front- and backstage, and impression management were helpful to conceptualize how, what, and why Madon and Kathy concealed their core beliefs from the literacy coach. Denzin (2002) suggests that dramaturgical skills may have provided these three individuals with the capacity to “contrive illusions” (p. 107) that conceal their core beliefs from an interlocuter they are trying to impress. In Madon and Kathy’s case, they used language to successfully elude Julie’s queries on matters that challenged their core beliefs. Julie, either did not pick up on the discursive cues that concealed Madon and Kathy’s backstage self, or she did not want to press them further on this topic. This study,
however, is restricted only to the evidence as it stands. However, drawing on dramaturgical skills seemed to work for these two participants. They avoided conversations with the coach that would have challenged their beliefs and feelings about teaching and learning.

This does in fact have implications for the University Teacher Residency Partnership Program (UTRPP, or Residency) in which these participants were enrolled. Although Madon and Kathy were careful to conceal some of their core beliefs and feelings about circumstances and situations regarding teaching and learning from Julie, they also openly accepted many of her pedagogical suggestions. This suggests that the Residency provides PSTs a rich context for identity construction based on Goffman’s (1959) vision of performance theory.

**Finding 5: Student-centered teaching practices**

The final finding that I will discuss in this summative chapter are the student-centered instructional practices that were espoused by the participants after working with the literacy content coach. Teaching from a constructivist paradigm means that teachers and students collaborate in a classroom community of practice, where the generation of knowledge and meaning making occur in a communicative, active, and collaborative learning environment (Parsons & Vaughn, 2013; Richardson, 2005; Vaughn & Parsons, 2016). Further, teachers are responsive to student needs and espouse the belief that children are thinking agents (Parsons & Vaughn, 2013; Richardson, 2005; Vaughn & Parsons, 2016). Participants’ language use surrounding the literacy teacher identity characteristics of apprentice, peripheral participant, and adaptive characteristics lend to student-centered constructivist teaching practices for Madon and Ellie. As for Kathy, in SR interview reflections, she recognized the strengths of student-centered literacy practices in a lesson she co-taught with Julie, but she did not discursively enact these characteristics in reflections of her own teaching practice.
This does not mean that Kathy’s teaching practice was void of constructivist characteristics. She very well may have drawn on student-centered practices, but she either did not reflect on them in SR interviews, or they may have been present in other content areas like math and science. Based on the components of Kathy’s programmatically prescribed action plan, she struggled to determine students’ needs, and then providing instruction to meet those needs. Kathy stated in her initial interview that she ascribed to constructivist teaching practices and wanted to be a teacher who instilled a sense of community in her classroom. Williams’ (2006) believes that teachers who perform identities or identity characteristics that others believe they should possess, but is “incomprehensible” or “does not work” (p. 537) for an individual become problematic and impedes their teaching performance. Therefore, since Kathy was on an action plan that targeted student-learning outcomes, that constructivist teaching practices was not the best pedagogical fit for her teaching style, and that a more curriculum centered approach to student-centeredness may be more suitable for her.

The concept of student-centered teaching was an important theme for both Madon and Ellie as they espoused adaptive (reflexive and responsive), peripheral participant, and constructivist identity characteristics of their literacy teacher identities. Through these traits, Madon and Ellie enacted student-centered teaching techniques congruent with Beijaard and colleagues (2000) teacher identity development surrounding pedagogical decisions (a teacher’s conceptualization and pedagogical expertise that is based on the populations of students in their classrooms). Both participants’ reflections showed awareness of students’ social, emotional, and developmental needs, paired with understandings of the broad societal issues that affect learning for the population of children in their classrooms, and both were resistant to the social structure of schooling policies that were oppressive to the children in their classrooms (e.g. instructional
expectations that enforced grade-level pacing that did not account for the developmental learning trajectory of all children, and subsequent grade level planning that promoted sameness among children and did not account children who were not meeting curricular expectations).

**Holistic overview of findings**

Beijaard and colleagues (2000) posit that a critical component to identity construction is the reflections teachers make to their *didactical* experiences (reflections and adjustments to practice based on what is working and what is not working during instruction). Madon and Ellie drew on adaptive literacy teaching practices and adjusted their instruction based on what was and was not working during instruction. They each learned to anticipate interactions with students that they did not plan, and then make responsive decisions based on student thinking and responses. Kathy and Madon witnessed responsiveness as they watched Julie respond to children in co-taught literacy lessons. For Madon, there was discursive evidence that she drew on these techniques beyond the coaching cycle regardless of her preferred banking teaching philosophy. Ellie’s discussions of responsive constructivist teaching centered around the level of complexity of the instruction. She told Rachel in her SR interviews that with each iteration of literacy coaching the planning for instruction became more complex to account for student-centered learning outcomes, and that she and her CT drew on these teaching practices beyond the coaching cycles.

This finding runs in contrast to that of Anderson and Stillman (2013) who largely found that PST in clinical preparation programs struggled to make theory to practice connections and were unprepared to meet student learning needs. Between the years of 1990 and 2010, these researchers did not find extensive and convincing evidence that PSTs were prepared to meet student learning needs once the left clinical programs (Anderson & Stillman, 2013). My findings
both support and extend claims made by Dennis (2016) who cited Gelfuso and Dennis, (2013) when she stated that “Emerging research from UTRPP’s content coaching shows it as a promising practice for accelerating residents’ pedagogical content knowledge and in supporting their [resident PSTs] ability to meaningfully reflect on their teaching practices” (p. 17). Through literacy coaching, all three participants did show evidence of accelerated pedagogical content knowledge, but Madon and Ellie’s language further indicated evidence of agency in relation to student-centered literacy practices because of accelerated pedagogical content knowledge through literacy coaching.

Holland and colleagues (2008) posit that figured worlds are historical phenomena, where identity is about the inculcation of language and activities in relation to situations in/of practice. When these identity categories that “to the extent that these productions are used again and again, they can become tools of agency” (p. 40). Although this study was concerned with identity and not necessarily agency, the evidence of agency in relation to Madon and Ellie’s conceptualization and perpetuated practice as student-centered teaching is worth noting. First, both participants (Madon and Ellie) shared learned constructivist teaching practices with the assistance of the literacy coach. Further, they both shared that their development of student-centered teaching practices became more complex over time through coaching cycles. Finally, Madon and Ellie both reported that they drew on these practices in their approach to teaching beyond the required literacy coaching cycles; and Ellie noted that these practices were even taken up by her collaborating teacher.

In the next section, I discuss the areas I plan to explore next, including identifying evidence of PST literacy teacher agency within this current data set, as well as research ideas that address PST identity construction beyond this data set.
**Current research on PST identity.** The purpose of my current research is to conduct a study that uses the same methods as my dissertation study in the Elementary Education Cohort program (often shortened to Cohort), a different state-approved pathway to teacher certification from the Elementary Teacher Residency program. This means that, within the College of Education at the same university where this dissertation study was conducted, there are two different teacher preparation programs for incoming juniors to choose from. Unlike the Residency, the Cohort follows a supervision model, as opposed to coaching model for observations of PSTs teaching practices. For observation cycles, supervisors and PSTs also engage in pre-conferences, video-recorded lessons, and post-conferences, but this model uses core standards for effective educational practices called the Florida Educators Accomplished Practices (Florida Department of Education, 2018) as a reflective tool instead of Cunningham and Allington’s (2011) eight pillars of effective literacy instruction. Though there are several differences, one noteworthy variation is the amount of time PSTs are in practicum classrooms. That time is less than half that of Residency PSTs (Residency PSTs receive more than 2000 clinical hours, whereas students in the Cohort program receive about 700 hours). The internship and supervision observation cycle experiences for the PSTs in this two-year teacher preparation are as follows:

- **Junior year: Internship levels 1 & 2**
  - One day a week in classrooms
  - Two supervisor observation cycles per level
- **Senior year: Internship level 3**
  - Two days a week in classrooms
  - Two supervisor observation cycles
Senior year: Internship level 4

- Full-time final internship (Contract day of district teachers)
- Three supervisor observation cycles

The cohort iteration of my study includes three participants that are in their level 4, final internship. Therefore, they are full-time interns in an elementary classroom. The data generated from these participants will be analyzed as its own case, and then a cross-case analysis will be conducted to compare the Residency and Cohort programs.

By further exploring these research agendas, I believe that this will lend to the generation of a framework that can be utilized by teacher preparation programs to enhance the awareness and construction of both teacher and literacy teacher identity for pre-service teachers.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter I presented the findings from a discourse analysis study of three PSTs' reflections as literacy educators. Through the exploration of identity through the lens of performance and sociocultural theory, I was able to explore PST literacy teacher identity and found that within participants’ language, there were connections between core identity characteristics that were revealed in their initial interviews, and their literacy teacher identities. The data also revealed the impact that the structure of this full-time Residency clinical teacher preparation program had on participant’s literacy teacher identity construction.

This community of practice provided PSTs with opportunities to collaborate with a knowledgeable other through literary content coaching cycles (pre-conferences, video-recorded literacy lesson observations, individualized video-coding sessions, and post-conference reflections). The data revealed that each participant enacted multiple literacy identity characteristics when reflecting on their literacy practice, and that the micro-hegemonic
mobilization of those identities could be juxtaposed against the literature to verify these traits. This study showed the pluralistic nature of identity, the importance of self in literacy teacher identity construction, and how working in a community of practice provides PSTs opportunities for identity and agency construction.

Since the data for this study was collected, each participant has graduated from UTRPP and secured positions as elementary teachers. Madon and Kathy both teach in the school district where they interned, and Ellie is teaching on the West Coast. The design and structure of the Residency program addresses many of the systemic issues that plague beginning teachers; such as attrition (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2004; Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; NCES, 2015; NSBA, 2016), teachers limited, or lack of literacy theory to practice connections and readiness to teach literacy (Kosnik & Beck, 2008; Moats, 2014; NCES, 2012; Turner, Applegate, & Applegate, 2011), and teacher’s unpreparedness to meet the needs of children in urban schools (Fantilli & McDougall, 2009; NSBA, 2016). The extensive amount of time PST spend in elementary classrooms, in conjunction with the emphasis on theory to practice connections in coursework and literacy coaching that focus’ on the student learner, in conjunction with a broader understanding of how Resident pre-service teachers construct their literacy teacher identity, may lend insight into the reason for the impressively low attrition rate of less than 4% for graduates from this program.
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Appendix A

Semi structured initial interview protocol

Who are you?

Describe your literacy experiences as a k-12 student.

Why did you want to become a teacher? Is it what you expected? Explain

Why did you choose the residency program? (possible follow up question) Is it what you expected?

Describe the current state of literacy education as you see it?

Where do you fit in in that description?

Where do children fit in?

What is your literacy teaching philosophy? How have you been able to enact that philosophy when teaching literacy?

What style of teaching do you see yourself using when teaching literacy?

Who and/or what are your primary influences as literacy teachers?

Do you feel prepared to teacher elementary level literacy?

What is your vision of a literacy teacher?

Has this changed overtime?
Appendix B

Framework for facilitating reflective conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literacy Coach’s Moves and Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setting the Stage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking onto the stage: The literacy coach invites the pre-service teacher to share her/his hypothesis and initial thinking about the validity of the hypothesis. This focuses the conversation on literacy teaching and learning and positions the pre-service teacher as thinking agent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displaying the props: The pre-service teacher refers to her/his time-stamped notes calling attention to the moments of the experience that she/he judged to be important. These isolated bits of experiences will be juxtaposed to create dissonance later in the conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying course content: The literacy coach refers to course content, provides examples of course content, and explains how course content is related to the isolated bit of experience the preservice teacher noted as important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opening the Curtain: The Play</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posing a question to create dissonance: The literacy coach poses a question that was carefully crafted while viewing the video in preparation for the reflective conversation. The question is intended to create dissonance and begin the reflective process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively listening: The literacy coach actively listens for words, phrases, or ideas shared by the pre-service teacher in response to the initial question with the intention of using those fragments of language to create juxtapositions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating juxtapositions: The literacy coach puts next to each other (juxtaposes) two or more ideas the pre-service teacher shared and poses additional questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping the aim in view: The literacy coach continues to select thoughts shared by the pre-service teacher that can be used to pursue a particular line of thought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking for clarification: The literacy coach asks the pre-service teacher to make more explicit her/his thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restating preservice teacher thinking: After each new idea is formed through dialectic interaction, the teacher educator restates that idea and presents another question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circling back around: The literacy coach refers to the moment in experience that spawned the creation of the question that ‘opened the curtain’ and asks the pre-service teacher to imaginatively apply the new ideas to that situation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Curtain Closes

**Transitioning into synthesis:** The literacy coach provides a metaphor (the reading of a story and creating a theme) to begin the synthesis process.

**Crafting the ‘warranted assertability’:** The literacy coach and pre-service teacher write together to create the ‘warranted assertability’ about literacy teaching and learning.

**Playing with the ‘warranted assertability’:** The literacy coach poses some prompts for the pre-service teacher to consider as they write a paper about the newly created ‘warranted assertability’.

### The Bow

**Calling attention to the reflection process:** The literacy coach calls attention to the reflection process by asking the pre-service teacher to describe what just happened during the reflective conversation (Gelfuso, 2016, p. 73).
Appendix C

Stimulated recall interview protocol

Explain the purpose of the SR interview: for this interview we are going to use the video-recorded post-conference as a prompt to recall the critical events of that meeting. The objective is for you to verbalize what you were thinking and feeling during those events, as well as what you are thinking and feelings now while watching the post-conference on video.

Prior to watching the video I will ask: “Before watching the video, what do you remember of the given literacy content coaching cycle?”

Once the first question has been addressed and prior to playing the post-conference video, I will prompt: “Now we will relive the content coaching cycle. Please stop the video at critical moments during the post-conference discussion with [name of literacy coach], and describe what you were you thinking and feeling at that moment and what you are thinking and feeling now watching it on video? Also, while watching the video, I may also stop the video to reflect on that moment?

Play video

If, there is no recall initiation at the conclusion of either the utterance of the coach or participant during discussion literacy coaching discussions, I will stop the video and ask the following question: what were you thinking and feeling at this point in the coaching conference? And what are you thinking and feeling now watching this now?
Appendix C (continued)

At the conclusion of the video I will ask: *Were you able to relive what you thought and felt during the pre-conference?* (Adapted from: Geiger, Muir, & Lamb, 2015; Lutovac, Kaasila, & Juuso, 2015; Schepens, Aelterman, & Van Keer, 2007)