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ABSTRACT

High quality teacher preparation is essential for the future of education. Researchers have examined the connection of theory and practice as an imperative to prepare preservice teachers. Methods course instructors and university supervisors are key players in bridge theory and practice, but rarely does the same individual get to be both methods course instructor and university supervisor. While it is important for teacher education programs to consider how to connect theory and practice, it is equally important to understand how to support preservice teachers when the same person acts as methods course instructor and university supervisor. Using self-study, the purpose of this research is to understand how I supported preservice teacher learning by answering the question, “What are my beliefs about how preservice teachers learn?” My sub-questions included (1) what tensions do I experience as I teach coursework and supervise the same group of preservice teachers, (2) how do my beliefs and experienced tensions influence the decisions I make, and (3) how do I support preservice teacher learning in my dual role of classroom management methods instructor and university supervisor.

Data collection included autobiographical accounts, espoused platform, field notes, semi-structured interviews, and reflective journals. I found that I became more aware and meta-cognitive about my practice as a university supervisor and as a methods course instructor. I also found that self-study was a powerful vehicle for supporting my professional learning and development. Additionally, I found how my unique role of being a boundary-spanner enabled me to make valuable connections between the clinical context and my methods course. Finally, I
found I listened to preservice teachers which influenced my instruction so that I could support their learning. My findings have implications for informing my personal growth as a boundary-spanner, other teacher educators, and teacher preparation programs.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Since the rendering of *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), teacher education has been under scrutiny. This report stated teacher education needed to create specific goals and standards for teacher candidates such as improving student achievement, unifying curriculum, raising standards for testing on teachers and teacher candidates, rewarding teachers for performance, and adjusting how teachers are prepared to teach. The adjustments needed in teacher education are added layers of how to prepare teachers beyond the mechanics of teaching to build on teachers’ knowledge development; sources and use of knowledge, beliefs, and attitudes; pedagogical practices; and how people learn to teach over time (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005). Mechanics of teaching have included learning practices, tasks, activities, and traits (Goodlad, 1994).

To support reform, Cochran-Smith and Fries (2005) describe nine areas of focus for studying teacher preparation. Two of the nine are particularly relative to this study: studying teachers’ subject matter preparation, foundations of education for teachers’ learning and knowledge, teachers’ professional practice, and pupils’ learning; and studying methods courses that focus on supporting diverse pupils’ in diverse clinical experiences. Teacher education is an ongoing process for preservice teachers, requiring a foundation of “core ideas and broad understanding of teaching and learning that give them traction on their later development” and the ability to “construct new knowledge and skills in practice” as preservice teachers apply and reflect on their teaching (Bransford, Darling-Hammond, & LePage, 2005, p. 3). Therefore, stakeholders who support preservice teachers, are expected to learn how to best prepare them in
content and clinical experience.

School- and university-based educators are key players in teacher preparation, but their roles must be reconceptualized to actualize educational reform in teacher education (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education [AACTE], 2018).

The roles of teacher educators in both schools and universities must be reconceptualized; school-based educators need to reflect on how to effectively model best teaching practice and engage candidates as coteachers in the classroom, and university-based educators must re-envision course work to integrate candidate learning into school-based teaching experiences (AACTE, 2018, p. 35).

The role of who is supporting preservice teachers in content and clinical experience and how to support preservice teachers in both spaces needs reconceptualization. Future research needs to focus on the ‘how’ to support preservice teachers in content and clinical experience.

Some national associations agree on ways to reform teacher education. These organizations suggest focusing on theory and practice alignment in clinical experiences, school-university partnerships, and school and university-based educator as ways to reform current teacher education (AACTE, 2010; Association of Teacher Educators [ATE] 2000; National Association for Professional Development Schools [NAPDS], 2008; National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education [NCATE], 2010). These organizations call for reexamining how teacher candidates are prepared to teach starting with the coupling of clinical experiences with theory and practice. NCATE (2010) stated, “Creating a system built around programs centered on clinical practice also holds great promise for advancing shared responsibility for teacher preparation, supporting the development of complex teaching skills” (p. ii). The understanding that teacher education needs to prepare teachers for more than the mechanics of
teaching but to shift teacher education to encompass the development of teacher knowledge, pedagogy, beliefs and attitude of teachers and how teachers learn to teach over time is paramount.

Theory and Practice Alignment in Clinical Experiences

The first change in teacher education is to rethink how theory and practice can be linked through clinical experiences. According to NCATE (2010), clinical experiences in teacher education are where “school embedded learning and course work are integrated through a structure designed to help the candidate develop both the knowledge base and skills of professional practice” (p. 9). The notion of linking theory and practice to clinical experiences is not new in teacher education yet a clear vision on how the three should be blended is unclear. Carr and Kemmis (1986) explained, “Practice is particular and urgent; it is what teachers do in meeting the tasks and demands confronting them in their everyday work” while “theory, in sharp contrast, is timeless and universal; it is something produced by researchers through the careful process of enquiry” (p. 2). Practice involves opportunities to enact theoretical concepts. Hammerness, et al. (2005), suggest practice is a way to apply knowledge through learning to understand and enact acquired routines and practices.

The link between theory and practice potentially overlaps in clinical experiences. NCATE (2010) stated that clinical experiences are a core piece of preservice teacher education and that, “content and pedagogy are woven around clinical experiences throughout preparation, in course work, in laboratory-based experiences, and in school-embedded practice.” (p. 5).

Clinical experiences become the context to meld theory and practice. Theory and practice are disjointed when the practical application of theory implemented in clinical experiences is unrealistic. Ünver (2014) suggested the activities designed in method courses should connect
theory and practice. Therefore, it is critical to learn how theory being taught in methods coursework is aligned to teaching practices in clinical experiences. Lacueva (2014) suggested transforming the curriculum from university courses to integrate practice from the schools. The debate about alignment of theory in methods coursework to practice is not about the lack of theoretical content being taught, but that it is unrealistic and impractical for classrooms (Lortie, 1975) and contradicts what preservice teachers observe from classroom teachers (Hawley, 1992).

Preservice teachers are individuals who are enrolled in programs for the initial or advanced preparation of teachers and are distinguished from students in P-12 schools (NCATE, 2010).

Reconceptualizing how theory and practice are organized in clinical experiences is one difference needed in preparing teachers. Waddell and Vartuli (2015) noted the importance of re-examining which course objectives and course components were most critical and would be highly realized in a field-based model. This means that a shift in teacher education around theory and practice embedded in clinical experiences is necessary to redefine how preservice teachers are supported. A way to shift theory and practice to clinical experience is through methods courses. Method courses can be revised and/or developed with a new curriculum to enhance teacher education (Rose, Carter, Brown, & Shunway, 2017). It is the explicit and intentional blending of methods courses to theory and practice that underpin teacher education reform.

**School-University Partnerships**

A second change needed to support the reconceptualizing of teacher education is through school-university partnerships. “A school-university partnership is an arrangement through which the two sets of institutions address selected overlapping self-interests” (Goodlad, 1994, p.114). The intersection of schools and universities creates a logical connection to unite theory and practice but, it is how the two institutions match theory and practice that requires
investigation. The work of the Holmes Group (1986) state that creating partnerships is a way to renew teacher education. To make this change,

Teacher education programs must work in close partnership with school districts to redesign teacher preparation to better serve prospective teachers and the students they teach. Partnerships should include shared decision-making and oversight on candidate selection and completion by school districts and teacher education programs. This will bring accountability closer to the classroom, based largely on evidence of candidates’ effective performance and their impact on student learning. It also will ensure professional accountability, creating a platform to ensure that teachers are able to own, and fully utilize, the knowledge base of most effective practice. In this way, we believe, public and professional accountability for candidate effectiveness can be aligned for the first time. (NCATE, 2010, p. ii)

There is no quick solution to renew teacher education, but long-term educational renewal is generated from the collaborative efforts of colleges and universities joining schools as equitable partners to support the development of preservice teachers (Goodlad, 1994). When universities and schools collaborate, they are better equipped to prepare preservice teachers. “Only when preparation programs become deeply engaged with schools will their clinical preparation become truly robust and will they be able to support the development of candidates’ urgently needed skills and learn what schools really need” (NCATE, 2010, p.3). It is the ebb and flow between both institutions that will create optimal opportunities to reshape theory and practice in clinical experiences.
School- and University-Based Teacher Educators

As schools and universities join efforts, faculty roles need to be reconceptualized (Burns, Jacobs, & Yendol-Hoppey, 2016). One-way teacher education is rethinking faculty roles is through unique, boundary-spanning opportunities. Boundary-spanners are individuals who span between public school systems and universities supporting both entities (Many, Fisher, Ogletree, & Taylor, 2012) and who, “understand the dynamics and culture of both worlds” (Sandholtz & Finan, 1998, p. 24). Boundary-spanners must be skilled and knowledgeable about university coursework as well as PreK-12 classrooms (Burns & Badiali, 2015). Usually university-based teacher educators assume boundary-spanning roles (Martin, Snow, & Torrez, 2011) but recent research on boundary-spanning indicates that both school- and university-based individuals can assume such roles (Burns & Baker, 2016). Boundary-spanners are critical in linking schools and universities (Sandholtz & Finan, 1998).

A boundary-spanner needs to be versed about the responsibilities of both institutions while simultaneously maintaining the needs of the school and university. The boundary-spanner balances teaching of preservice teachers (Bullough, Draper, Erickson, et al., 2004; Burstein, 2008; Christenson, et al., 2008; Ferrara & Gomez, 2014; Fisher & Many, 2014; Myers & Price, 2010), teaching professional development to in-service teachers (Ferrara & Gomez, 2014), building relationships with both partners (Burstein, 2007; Fisher & Many, 2014) and engaging in practices and activities (Bullough, Draper, Erickson, et al., 2004; Christenson, et al., 2008; Walters, 1998) based on the needs of the school and university. Practices and activities consume much of the boundary-spanners work. Examples of practices and activities include supervising preservice teachers through observation and feedback.
Burns and Baker (2016) researched the types of practices and activities boundary-spanners were engaged in and found that their roles were supervisory in nature. Nolan and Hoover (2011) define supervision as “an organizational function concerned with promoting teacher growth, leading to improvement in teaching performance and greater student learning” (p.6). The researchers identified these types of practices and activities boundary-spanners were engaged in as six tasks: Teaching, Collaboration and Community, Individual Support, Equity, Curriculum Development and Support, and Research for Innovation. These six tasks describe the range of practices and activities embedded within boundary-spanner work. The interconnected responsibilities of the boundary-spanner depend on his/her ability to navigate across school and university.

University supervisors are one kind of boundary-spanning role. Nolan and Hoover (2011) define a supervisor as a person who encourages preservice teachers to take risks, experiment, and reflect, and one who “must nurture trust and work collaboratively to promote pre-service teachers’ professional growth; …make summative and perhaps life-altering judgments about the competence of those pre-service teachers” (p. 228). Supervisors are guided by a platform or “a floor of beliefs that provides a framework for practice” that influences how “educators carry on their work, make decisions, and plan instruction” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007, p. 82). Due to the complexity of the work, a supervisor at times will rely on his/her experiences to continue the work. For example, when supervising preservice teachers, boundary-spanners draw upon their practical and theoretical experiences to make informed decisions. This means when a boundary-spanner is in clinical experiences supporting preservice teachers, s/he is in a supervisory role where his/her beliefs surface (whether intended or not) and impact decisions s/he makes for supporting preservice teachers. Jacobs and Casciola (2016) assert supervision begins, “with the
supervisor reflecting on his or her own platform… this lens influences the knowledge and skills supervisors bring to supervision” (p. 225). Because the beliefs of the supervisor and preservice teachers may collide, the supervisor needs to decide how to navigate both beliefs.

When supervising preservice teachers’, boundary-spanners face many challenges. Perhaps of most difficulty are the years of socialization that pre-service teachers’ experience as a PreK-12 in schools. Lortie (1975) stated, “Socialization is a subjective process—it is something that happens to people as they move through a series of structured experiences and internalize the subculture of the group” (p.61). It is these socialized experiences preservice teachers’ draw upon when in the field that may or may not align with what preservice teachers observe or understand in clinical experiences. Boundary-spanners must realize that preservice teachers’ inevitably shape their developing understanding of the complexity of teaching and learning based on years of schooling that influences their view of teaching and their approach to learning (Lortie, 1975; Loughran, 2006; Loughran & Northfield, 1996). This form of socialization into the profession can create tensions between the boundary-spanner’s beliefs and preservice teachers’ beliefs of teaching. When tensions arise, a boundary-spanner needs to be able to make decisions based on the needs, context, and circumstances of the pre-service teachers. Jacobs and Casciola (2016) stated, “Deconstructing one’s identity takes time as supervisors will need to look deeply into their own beliefs and examine any previously held assumptions” (p. 226). The boundary-spanner negotiates his/her beliefs and preservice teachers’ beliefs to create new opportunities for preservice teachers to be socialized during clinical experiences. In this new form of socialization, the preservice teachers can reflect on their experiences as learners and observe teaching with opportunities to discuss questions that arise about teaching with the classroom teacher and boundary-spanner. “This socialization process must be deliberately
planned and conducted if it is to have broad impact in nurturing students and developing in them the expectations and competencies that go with the moral responsibilities of teachers” (Goodlad, 1994, p. 59). The complication of socialized experience in K-12 settings, clinical experiences, and learning about theory and practice influence preservice teachers’ beliefs of teaching.

Understanding the complications preservice teachers’ encounter requires the boundary-spanner to make decisions about how to support preservice teachers while acknowledging how his/her beliefs of teaching also impact decision-making. A boundary-spanner must be able to distinguish between his/her beliefs of teaching and understand the needs of the preservice teachers because students often view the same event in a very different way (Loughran & Northfield, 1996; Van Es & Sherin, 2002) and have no reliable basis for understanding the difficulty of various teaching acts (Lortie, 1975). The variation in views of what boundary-spanners observe in the clinical experiences and what preservice teachers observe is complicated by the connection of theory to practice. When reconceptualizing theory and practice embedded in clinical experiences, a boundary-spanner should consider how s/he are supporting the practical application in clinical experiences. Because the boundary-spanner is positioned between both institutions, s/he is embedded in the understanding of what teaching practices are needed in the field and draws from theory to support the teaching practice. Therefore, boundary-spanners are tasked with identifying aspects of teaching and bringing them to the attention of preservice teachers. Goodwin (1994) theorized the act of bringing attention to aspects of teaching as highlighting. Highlighting points to phenomena significant to a complicated context oriented to professional vision. Professional vision “which consists of socially organized ways of seeing and understanding events that are answerable to the distinctive interests of a particular social group”
(Goodwin, 1994, p. 606). Therefore, boundary-spanners need to consider what s/he is attending to in clinical experience and why s/he decided to focus on that significant phenomena.

**Significance**

Renewing teacher preparation involves aligning theory and practice in clinical experiences, developing school-university partnerships to prepare teachers, and reconceptualizing the role of school- and university-based educators. While these reform ideas are challenging, they are also ripe with opportunity. The first opportunity involves bringing together stakeholders from both institutions as this permits the intersection of multiple beliefs and perspectives. Diversity in perspectives, although challenging, can push both entities to reconsider “old” practices, norms, and structures that will need to be altered to actualize the renewal of teacher education. The second opportunity is the chance for preservice teachers’ socialization as a K-12 learner to be disrupted. Socialization can imprint mixed ideas of teaching for preservice teachers’ often giving them false impressions or a misunderstanding of the realities of teaching. These mixed ideas are connected to preservice teachers’ beliefs and may be difficult for preservice teachers to navigate. Preservice teachers’ need support to assist in unearthing the felt difficulties surrounding teaching. The boundary-spanner’s unique perspective of supporting preservice teachers in clinical experiences and in coursework situates his/her in an optimal space to uncover the complexity of teaching.

Boundary-spanners’ unique perspective can be studied using a variety of methodologies, but the boundary-spanner is uniquely positioned to investigate his/her practices. Through self-study, a boundary-spanner can intimately investigate his/her practice. Self-study research engages researchers in studying their teaching practices to announce personal, professional, and program renewal (Samaras & Freese, 2006). At the forefront of the self-study process is personal
renewal, which allows researchers to study their own practice to arrive at new understandings of
their teaching. To gain a better understanding of their teaching, self-study researchers question
their practice and the “resultant effects on the reframed thinking and transformed practice of our
student teachers” (LaBoskey, 2004, p. 819) to develop new understandings for their practice.

**Purpose**

This self-study examined my beliefs, experienced tensions, and decision-making to support preservice teachers’ learning. My intent was to make my practice more transparent. When focused on my beliefs as a boundary-spanner, I had the opportunity to not only explore how to support preservice teacher learning but learn about myself as a boundary-spanner. Goodlad (1990) suggested that when university faculty teach courses and then follow preservice teachers into schools to supervise them, the impact on preservice teachers’ learning is substantial. I extend Goodlad’s notion that there is substantial learning for the boundary-spanner as well. This self-study investigated what are my beliefs about how preservice teachers learn, my experienced tensions, and my decision-making about how preservice teachers learn. The research questions that guided this study included:

1. What are my beliefs about how preservice teachers learn?
2. What tensions do I experience as I teach coursework and supervise the same group of preservice teachers?
3. How do my beliefs and experienced tensions influence the decisions I make?
4. How do I support preservice teacher learning in my dual role of classroom management methods instructor and university supervisor?
Summary

Teacher preparation has focused on connecting theory and practice, developing partnerships, and reconceptualizing school and university-based educators. This self-study investigated my beliefs of how preservice teachers learn, the tensions I experienced as a boundary-spanner, how my beliefs and experienced tensions influenced the decisions I made, and how I supported preservice teacher learning. In the next chapter, I review what shapes teacher learning in teacher education including theory and practice in clinical experiences, methods courses, socialization, and professional vision; supervision including supervisory roles and the function on supervision itself; and professional development schools including third space and boundary-spanners. I also have included key terms and definitions in Appendix A.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this literature review, I provide an overview of the research related to what shapes teacher learning in teacher education, how supervision supports preservice teacher learning, and the role professional development schools have in working with preservice teachers. In the first section, I address teacher education research by presenting five influential areas important to understanding what shapes teacher learning. In the second section on supervision, I share the differences in the role of the university supervisor and the function of supervision and how the two impact teacher learning. In the final section on professional development schools, I argue for the importance of school-university partnerships in preparing teachers.

Teacher Education: What Shapes Teacher Learning

In the early 1980’s, teacher education became publicly scrutinized. The National Commission on Excellence in Education published an influential report, A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform (1983) that identified five specific areas that teacher education needed to address. Those areas included: (1) creating specific goals and standards for student achievement, (2) unifying curriculum, (3) rising standards for testing on teachers and teacher candidates, (4) rewarding teachers for performance, and (5) adjusting how teachers are prepared to teach. This public critique of teacher education prompted the re-thinking of educational policy.

As changes identified in A Nation at Risk began, new concerns related to teacher education arose. For teacher education, two of those concerns focused on creating sophisticated and
demanding methods coursework and extended time in clinical experiences. To address the concerns, teacher education programs would need to restructure to connect clinical practice and academic content (Ball & Forzani, 2009). However, connecting clinical experiences and academic content is difficult for preservice teachers. They struggle to connect theory and practice in real world contexts (Dennis, Burns, Tricarico, van Ingen, Jacobs, Davis, & Yendol-Hoppey, 2015), they hold beliefs about teaching accrued while being a PreK-12 student (Lortie, 1975), and they have difficulty recognizing teaching practices when observing teachers (Gibson & Ross, 2016). Unfortunately, past foci of teacher education curricula on knowing traits and activities, practices, and key skills of teaching were inadequate (Goodlad, 1994). Reforming teacher education must concentrate on connecting the ‘what’ of teaching to the ‘how’ of teaching.

Theory and Practice in Clinical Experiences

Connecting the ‘what’ and ‘how’ of teaching is referred to as theory and practice, but teacher education has historically been critiqued for separating the two. This perceived disconnect has prompted educational reform efforts to call for a co-mingling of these entities to prepare high quality teachers (Sturmer, Konings & Seidel, 2013). Perhaps the most likely space for theory and practice to co-mingle is in the clinical experience components of the teacher education curriculum. Despite their low status, clinical experiences are critical in quality teacher preparation (Anderson, Rolheiser, & Gordon, 1985; Buck, Morsink, Griffin, Hines, & Lenk, 1992; Hines, 1996; LaMaster, 2001; McDevitt, 1996; McIntyre, 1984; Simpson, 2006; Sindelar, et al., 2010; Zeichner & Conklin, 2008).

acquired in methods classes; on the other, when students had few opportunities to apply their knowledge, field experiences became barriers to their development” (p.14). Preservice teachers need opportunities to wrestle with connecting theory and practice in clinical experiences. The connection between theory and practice should ebb and flow; it should not be separate and fixed (Goodlad, 1994; Loughran, 2006). Creating an organic connection between theory and practice (Dewey, 1938) must include authentic practices of teachers in clinical experiences and methods coursework (Maheady, et al., 2014; Sindelar, et al., 2010).

Researchers are exploring strategies in clinical experiences to align theory and practice. Anderson, Barksdale, and Hite (2005) studied peer observation and coaching in clinical settings with preservice and cooperating teachers that focused on how they “could provide for preservice teachers’ observations that would lead to greater understanding of effective instruction” (Anderson, et al., 2005, p. 98). Preservice teachers were expected to write reflections on their teaching and observations, write lesson outlines of the lessons they taught, identify observer target behavior during the lesson observation, and collect data from the lesson to practice teaching, observing, reflecting, and receiving feedback to improve instruction. The researchers found the use of peer observation and coaching in field experience developed general pedagogical knowledge in preservice teachers when feedback from peers and collaborating teachers was given and observational opportunities were provided for preservice teachers in their field experiences.

In addition to peer coaching, the use of video is another strategy to support preservice teacher learning. In this first study, videoconferencing was used to support preservice teacher learning. Kent and Simpson (2010) examined videoconferencing of cooperating teachers recording their teaching of reading and streaming the video to the university. The university
faculty and cooperating teacher talked about the lesson the preservice teachers would watch. The university faculty designed the reading concepts to be discussed in the reading course around what the preservice teachers would observe in the video. While watching the video, the preservice teachers were noting the reading behaviors discussed in the reading course on a listening/viewing guide. The purpose behind video conferencing was to strengthen the link between theory and practice by interactive experiences focused on purposeful observation and guided reflections.

In a second study on the use of video to support preservice teachers, Santagata, Zannoni, and Stigler (2007) reported the use of videos of teaching with preservice teachers in coursework. The purpose of the video analysis is for preservice teachers to mark and comment on teachers’ actions/decisions, behavior and learning of students, and mathematical content. “Videos of classroom instruction make it possible to connect the knowledge teachers are learning in their preservice teacher education courses to the classroom context in which they will one day apply that knowledge” (Santagata, et al., 2007, p. 125). The use of video provided preservice teachers the opportunity to observe a common set of teaching experiences to create shared language that could then be applied in clinical experiences.

Co-teaching undergraduate courses is a third strategy. Zimmer, McHatton, Driver, Datubo-Brown, and Steffen (2018) explored university faculty co-teaching science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) courses with special education courses to prepare general education preservice teachers to support students with disabilities in their teaching. The preservice teachers were arranged in two groups. The groups had access to clinical experience and the content taught in the courses, but one group had access to the co-teach model with support from STEM instruction coupled with special education instruction. The group of
preservice teachers receiving support from both sets of instructors had a greater understanding of how to support students with disabilities in their teaching.

Reflective journaling is a fourth strategy. Flanagan-Knapp (2012) studied the implementation of reflective journals in coursework to challenge preservice teachers to learn about their beliefs about teaching and how their beliefs transferred into their clinical experiences. The implementation of the reflective journals prompted preservice teachers to think about what they were learning in their coursework and the actual application of their teaching in their clinical experiences.

A final strategy is the use of observation tools. Subban and Round (2015) investigated the use of preservice teachers using a checklist during their clinical experiences to direct their attention on differentiated strategies they observed classroom teachers implementing. The checklist highlighted five themes on differentiation that preservice teachers used as a guide in their clinical experience while observing their classroom teachers during instruction: structure, organization, and development of a lesson; classroom management; differentiated strategies/techniques during teaching; differentiated activities, materials, and teaching aids; and differentiated assessments and applications. The researchers found that the checklist would support preservice teachers to formulate informed decisions on whether authentic differentiation was being used in the classroom, assisted preservice teachers to think about what they observed in clinical experiences, and connected it to what they learned about differentiation from the course.

Assuming preservice teachers will automatically align theory and practice is problematic. Santagata, et al., (2007) stated, “Through field experiences pre-service teachers will meld theory and practice by being exposed to concrete images of the attaching strategies they learn about in
teacher preparation programs based on the assumption that exposure in the field merges theory and practice” (p. 124). It was clear from the research that connecting theory and practice in clinical experiences requires deliberate and intentional thought coupled with support (Anderson, et al., 2005; Flanagan-Knapp, 2012; & Santagata, et al., 2007). Preservice teachers need opportunities to observe teaching and practice instruction (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Brownell, et al., 2005; Maheady, Smith, & Jabot, 2014; Sindelar, Brownell, & Bilingsley, 2010) to produce highly effective teachers (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Darling-Hammond, 2009). Successful alignment of theory and practice is in knowing what current teaching practices preservice teachers observe in the clinical experiences and in linking the methods coursework with clinical experiences.

Methods Courses

It is typical in higher education to consider major content areas (literacy, science, social studies, science, math) in teacher education as methods courses. Although a methods course in classroom management is not considered content specific, it is considered as a course important for maintaining instructional quality (Steffensky, Gold, Holdynski, & Möller, 2014). LePage, et al., (2005) defined classroom management as

…many practices integral to teaching, such as developing relationships; structuring respective classroom communities where students can work productively; organizing productive work around a meaningful curriculum; teaching moral development and citizenship; making decisions about timing and other aspects of instructional planning; successfully motivating children to learn; and encouraging parent involvement (p. 327).

They state classroom management is not simply arranging desks and rewarding and providing consequences for behavior. Instead, classroom management is a skill set involving practices, relationships, structures, and decision-making. The authors stress the relevance of teachers first
understanding their personal ideas of classroom management before transferring their ideas in the classroom. Moreover, teachers need to consider how personal beliefs on classroom management align with their pedagogy because the delivery of instruction can impact how the classroom is managed. When attending classroom management methods courses, preservice teachers are required to negotiate personal beliefs, theory learned in classroom management methods course, observations of classroom management in their clinical experiences, and implementation of classroom management within personal teaching.

In their review of literature on methods courses and clinical experiences, Clift and Brady (2005) found individual methods courses focused on different aspects of content and linkage to clinical experiences varied. Methods course instructors struggled with how preservice teachers’ beliefs of theory and practice influenced their application of content in the clinical experiences. They state, “practice and beliefs are mediated by their prior beliefs and experiences, course work, and current perceptions of curriculum, students, pedagogy, and other factors” (Clift & Brady, 2005, p. 331). Therefore, the strategies to link between theory and practice by methods instructors is combated by preservice teachers’ beliefs.

**Socialization**

Complicating preservice teachers’ alignment to theory and practice are the beliefs they carry with them about teaching, which comes from their socialization into teaching. Socialization is defined as “a subjective process—it is something that happens to people as they move through a series of structured experiences and internalize the subculture of the group” (Lortie, 1975, p. 61). Preservice teachers innately and actively rely on their perception of teaching acquired from their P-12 schooling experiences and they rely on these first when they begin their clinical experiences. When preservice teachers solely rely on their school experiences as indications of
how to teach, these socialized processes can be problematic as preservice teachers may not perceive the intentions of the teacher to teach. Lortie (1975) cautions this notion of socialization by stating those entering teacher education are “Lacking a sense of the problematics and a sure concept of technical performance, they are not likely to make useful linkages between teaching objectives and teacher actions; they will not perceive the teacher as someone making choices among teaching strategies” (p. 63). Preservice teachers’ socialization needs to be considered in teacher education. Grossman (1991) contends socialization alone is not sufficient; preservice teachers need opportunities to learn about teaching.

One way to disrupt socialization is through observation, and specifically observing expert teachers (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1997). Observing others is a typical role for preservice teachers to assume in their clinical experiences (Roberson, Woosley, Seabrooks, & Williams, 2004). Darling-Hammond (2009) stated teachers need time to “practice in practice” with experienced teachers so when they are socialized into the profession, they are observing effective teaching. However, the complex nature of teaching makes observation difficult for novice teachers (Anderson, Barksdale, & Hite, 2005). Preservice teachers’ struggles with observation are influenced by their personal history and beliefs. This intersection of observation and personal history is where the alignment to theory and practice disconnects. Thus, preservice teachers come into the classrooms with their own experiences of teaching and perception of what teaching “looks like” though not necessarily an understanding of the “how” and “what” teachers do (Connelly, Clandinin, & He, 1997).

When preservice teachers attempt to connect what they observe to their personal history, misconceptions of teaching arise, but there are several strategies that can be used to address this issue. One way is to use scaffolds to facilitate the process of observation. Brunvand and Fishman
(2006) used video to scaffold teaching experiences for preservice teachers. They define scaffolds as “the various video-editing effects that help focus attention on predetermined segments of a video” (p. 152). They state, “this is especially important for preservice teachers who have limited teaching experiences to draw from when forming the opinions about instruction” as well as “determining the most effective way to support preservice teachers in the development of their understanding of pedagogy and its application to the classroom” (p. 152). The videos are the pathway to help focus the attention of preservice teachers to specific attributes of teaching.

A second way is through a strategy called focused observation. Yendol-Hoppey and Franco (2014) defined focused observation as, “pedagogy that required (preservice teachers) to systematically and intentionally engage in careful observation of both others and of themselves” (p. 24). With focused observation, preservice teacher lenses are directed to a specific concept therefore lessening the disconnection of theory and practice. However, preservice teachers are not always able to transfer what they observe to theory because they function in the classroom on explicit and isolated knowledge bases (Lachner, et al., 2016). Of most importance is that strategies to foster observation must be systematic and intentional, and they must explicitly connect theory and practice. When preservice teachers are unable to transfer observation to theory, it can create tension. Preservice teachers lack the cognitive skills of teaching (Borko, Livingston, & Shavelson, 1990; Carter, Cushing, Sabers, Stein, & Berliner, 1988; Leinhardt & Greeno, 1986) and when dissonance occurs, preservice teachers struggle with their role in teaching and learning (Wubbels, Brekelmans, & Hoymayers, 1992). The tensions preservice teachers feel are caused by navigating what they learn in their coursework, observing their clinical experiences, and reconciling how they were socialized in schooling.
**Professional Vision**

A goal of observation is to develop preservice teachers’ professional vision, which “consists of socially organized ways of seeing and understanding events that are answerable to the distinctive interests of a particular social group” (Goodwin. 1994, p. 606). Professional vision is developed by identifying teaching moves, and it is a sophisticated practice. Several terms are used to describe this identification of teaching moves. Goodwin (1994) called the act of honing in on a specific aspect of teaching *highlighting* whereas Frederiksen, Sipusic, Sherin, and Wolfe’s (1998) called it *making call-outs*, and Van Es and Sherin’s (2002) referred to it as *noticing*. The commonality among the three terms *highlighting*, *making call outs*, and *noticing* all relate to the ability to identify a particular instance.

One way to support preservice teachers in identifying teaching moves is through a framework developed by Burns and Badiali (2016). They characterized six supervisor pedagogical skills, which are (1) noticing, (2) ignoring, (3) intervening, (4) pointing, (5) unpacking, and (6) processing. The pedagogical skill noticing consists of two identifiers. The first identifier is physical marking. In physical marking, the supervisor notices an incident and records the observation in written form. The second identifier is mental marking. In mental marking, the supervisor notices an incident but does not record the incident with written documentation. The second pedagogical skill is ignoring. In ignoring, the supervisor willingly ignores an incident by not acting on it. The third pedagogical skill is intervening. In intervening, the supervisor acts upon an incident by stepping in and supporting the preservice teacher during instruction or working with students. The fourth pedagogical skill is pointing. In pointing, the supervisor identifies an incident and shares what was noticed with others. The fifth pedagogical skill is unpacking. Like noticing, unpacking has two identifiers. The first identifier is supervisor-
centered. In supervisor-centered, the supervisor decides what incident to discuss with the preservice teacher and elaborates on the meaning of the incident. The second identifier is supervisor-facilitated. In supervisor-facilitated, the supervisor facilitates the discussion around the incident and supports the preservice teachers through questioning to make meaning of the incident. The last pedagogical skill is processing. In processing, the supervisor and preservice teacher discuss the incident and together determine next actions. This framework can assist supervisors’ decision-making in clinical experiences when assisting preservice teachers observing teaching moves.

The professional vision of preservice teachers is vastly different from expert teachers (Gibson & Ross, 2016). This is especially true in complex environments where several interactions are occurring at one time (Sherin & van Es, 2005). Preservice teachers may enact a pattern they have seen in teaching but not understand the theory behind the skill, hindering later teaching enactments and fostering misconceptions. These struggles are opportunities for methods course instructors to discuss the why of teaching in theory and the how of practice. Methods coursework can provide preservice teachers a space to share their teaching practices and discuss what was observed in the clinical experiences. It is within this space of the methods course that instructors can support preservice teachers in identifying what they do notice in the clinical experiences and what that looks like in theory.

Getting preservice teachers to notice what they observe depicts what Jacobs, et al., (2010) state about noticing, “…teachers see classrooms through different lenses depending on their experiences, educational philosophies, cultural backgrounds, and so on and that particular kinds of experiences can scaffold teachers’ abilities to notice in particular ways” (p. 171). When preservice teachers have opportunities to observe expert teachers, they can connect and think
about the practices they observe (Zeichner, 2012). Using the methods courses as a platform for preservice teachers to share what they observe in clinical experiences provides opportunities for methods course instructors to support preservice teachers in connecting theory and practice. Sufficient opportunity to develop and enact teaching with support is critical to preservice teachers’ ability to connect theory and practice.

**Preservice Teacher Development**

The support preservice teachers receive should begin with an understanding of their development. Fuller (1969) addressed this understanding of developmental conceptualization centered in what was referred to as ‘Stages of Concern for Teacher Candidates’. Within these stages, the teacher candidates experience different struggles between the congruence of themselves and teaching. As researchers began to study the stages some discovered the stages were not linear as Fuller (1969) initially presented. Instead, Borich and Tombari (1997) noted that the stages were not exclusive of one another, that the stages might have concerns predominately in one area while exhibiting descriptors from other stages, and that context factors into what stage(s) the teacher candidate experiences.

Moreover, Burn, Hagger, Mutton and Everton (2003), agreed the linear concept of the stages were too simplistic and Tabachnick and Zeichner, (1984), Reeves and Kazelskis, (1985), Hord, Rutherford, Huling, Austin and Hall, (1987) Smith and Sanche, (1993) remarked the student teacher experiences concerns are not sequential, rather, concerns emerge in unordered ways. As the stages continued to be researched and adapted, Swennen, Jorg, and Korthagen (2004) noted that they found that the first year of the teacher candidate experience showed the development of the teacher candidate depended on how engaged they were in classroom activities and teaching practices. Although researchers have varying views on the Stages of Concern for Teacher
Candidates, they concur the stages factor into teacher candidate development. Because of this, considerations for the stages of concern are essential in understanding how to support and meet the developmental needs of preservice teachers.

**Supervision: The Difference between Role and Function**

A way to support preservice teachers’ development is through supervision. The term supervision is widely defined in the field of education and even among prominent scholars. For example, Nolan and Hoover (2011) define supervision as, “an organizational function concerned with promoting teacher growth, leading to improvement in teaching performance and greater student learning” (p.6). While Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002) define supervision as, “to help increase the opportunity and the capacity of schools to contribute more effectively to students’ academic success” (p. 6). Lastly, Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordan (2010) define supervision as, “the function in schools that draws together the discrete elements of instructional effectiveness into whole-school action” (p. 8). These scholars present the differences in definitions, but the lack of a common definition leaves much room for interpretation to individuals who enact supervision.

In schools, supervisors are “principals, department chairs, central office subject-matter specialists, and other formally designated supervisors” while those in informal roles are teachers (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 4). Supervisors observe teachers, provide comments to teachers on practices, help teachers reflect, model lessons, suggest ideas to build up portfolios, analyze student data, and conduct evaluations. In teacher education, supervisors are individuals who support preservice teacher learning in clinical experiences (Burns, Jacobs, & Yendol-Hoppey, 2016). Most supervisors are university-based. These individuals perform tasks such as “collaboration and community; research for innovation; targeted assistance; curriculum
development and support; individual support; equity; and teaching” (Burns & Baker, 2016, p. 37). While these tasks are broad, they provide a frame for supervisors.

In addition to the tasks mentioned above, Nolan and Hoover (2011) suggest supervisors should be able to provide strategies for managing pre-service teachers concerns such as “whether they will be able to keep up with the day-to-day planning and grading, whether their students will like them, and whether they can be successful after their years of study” (p. 218). Additionally, they suggest supporting preservice teachers with gaining command of the content, refining their skills, assisting preservice teachers to attempt to identify concerns in classroom management, and matching instructional strategies and assessments to lesson goals. Lastly, they suggest supporting preservice teachers “to focus on their students and to reflect on ways to improve their teaching behaviors so as to have a positive impact on students’ learning” (p.218). Despite the fact the roles and functions of supervisors and supervision vary, a vast majority of scholars of supervision concur the outcome of supervision is to improve student learning (Burns, Jacobs, & Yendol-Hoppey, 2016; Glickman, et al., 2010; Nolan & Hoover, 2011; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002). If the outcome of supervision is on student learning, then an essential component of supporting preservice teachers in teacher education is through professional development schools.

**Professional Development Schools**

A context for teacher learning is professional development schools, which are school-university partnerships sharing a common vision of “preparing future educators, providing current educators with ongoing professional development, encouraging joint school-university faculty investigation of educational-related issues, and promoting the learning of P-12 students” (NAPDS, 2008). The Executive Council and Board of Directors of the National Association for
Professional Development Schools (NAPDS, 2008) prepared an overview of what it means to be a Professional Development School (PDS). They stated the purpose was to prepare educators, provide educators with ongoing professional development, encourage mutual school-university faculty research, and promote learning of P-12 students. The purpose was to clarify what constitutes a PDS as distinct from other school-university partnerships because there were school-university partnerships that were not PDSs. Therefore, NAPDS (2008) created nine essentials of PDSs to clarify what is and what is not a PDS:

“1) A comprehensive mission that is broader in its outreach and scope than the mission of any partner and that furthers the education profession and its responsibility to advance equity within schools and, by potential extension, the broader community.

2) A school–university culture committed to the preparation of future educators that embraces their active engagement in the school community.

3) Ongoing and reciprocal professional development for all participants guided by need.

4) A shared commitment to innovative and reflective practice by all participants.

5) Engagement in and public sharing of the results of deliberate investigations of practice by respective participants.

6) An articulation agreement developed by the respective participants delineating the roles and responsibilities of all involved.

7) A structure that allows all participants a forum for ongoing governance, reflection, and collaboration.

8) Work by college/university faculty and P–12 faculty in formal roles across institutional settings; and
(9) Dedicated and shared resources and formal rewards and recognition structures” (www.napds.org).

Rutter (2011) chronicles the historical development of Professional Development Schools (PDS) noting influential groups that shaped the development of PDSs: The Ford Foundation’s Academy for Education Development, the Carnegie Task Force, and The Holmes Group. These advocates for teacher education reform played a role in the foundation for PDSs. The idea of a common vision between school-university partnerships suggests PDSs have all the components needed for preparing future educators. One critical component within PDSs is the role of the person who is spanning between both entities.

**Boundary-spanner**

One of the NAPDS Nine Essentials (2008) called for new roles that traverse school and university boundaries. These individuals are referred to by many names. In Burns and Baker’s (2016) study, they found fourteen terms: boundary-spanners (Christenson, et al., 2008; Fisher & Many, 2014; Many, et al., 2012), clinical educators (Christenson, et al., 2008), clinical faculty (Myers & Price, 2010), clinical faculty associates (Bullough, Draper, Erickson, Smith, & Young, 2004; Bullough, Draper, Smith, & Birrell, 2004), hybrid teacher educator (Martin, Snow, & Torres, 2011), liaison (Bullough, Draper, Erickson, et al., 2004; Bullough, Draper, Smith, et al., 2004; Martin, et al., 2011), partnership facilitator (Bullough, Draper, Erickson, et al., 2004; Bullough, Draper, Smith, et al., 2004; Ferrara & Gomez, 2014), professor coordinator (Simmons, Konecki, Crowell, & Gates-Duffield. 1999), professor-in-residence (Burstein, 2007), research liaison, (Neapolitan, 2008), school-based site coordinator (Walters, 1998), university faculty (Myers & Price, 2010), university-based coordinator (Walters, 1998), and university-based liaison (Rodriguez & Breck, 1995).
While boundary-spanning roles are referred to by multiple names, they all may fall under the umbrella of hybrid educators. A hybrid educator is defined as “a university-based educator who works to establish partnerships with P-12 schools that support teacher development.” (Martin, et al., 2011, p. 299). Hybrid educators typically bounce between two entities as they navigate their position, and it is not uncommon for the hybrid educator to be called a boundary-spanner. Sandholtz and Finn (1998) define boundary-spanners as people who “understand the dynamics and culture of both worlds and are vital in linking schools and universities in viable collaboration” (p. 24). A boundary-spanner uses his/her unique role as a place to unite the tensions and successes of school and university to bridge the needs of both entities. The work of boundary-spanners is quite complex because they reside in both the school and university space.

**Third Space**

The idea of creating a third space originated through hybridity theory (Bhabha, 1990). Bhabha (1990) theorized cultural practice, nationalism, and social organization were not fixed spaces dependent upon specific attributes but a way to construct meaning based on experiences. The school and the university are two separate spaces used to support teacher education that have historically been divided. Clinical experiences bring together these spaces to create a third space where schools and universities can collaborate to support preservice teacher learning. Even though a boundary-spanner resides in both spaces, they also reside in a third space where there is potential to connect clinical experiences and undergraduate coursework. When the spaces of clinical experiences and coursework are disjoined, it affects preservice teacher learning. However, when a third space is created to blend clinical experiences with undergraduate coursework, they “can actually work together to generate new knowledge” (Moje, Ciechanowski,
Kramer, Ellis, Carrillo & Collazo, 2004, p. 43). It is within this third space of blending teacher learning that a new context for preservice teacher learning can emerge.

**Summary**

The literature in this section informed my self-study of my beliefs and experienced tensions in supporting preservice teacher learning while being in the dual role of university supervisor and methods course instructor. In this chapter, I shared literature in teacher education on what shapes teacher learning, theory and practice in clinical experiences, methods courses, and socialization. In addition, I explained key literature on professional vision, supervision, professional development schools, boundary-spanners, and third space. While there is extensive literature on different aspects of supporting preservice teacher learning, there is opportunity to understand more deeply how one individual can help preservice teachers navigate the complexity of learning to teach when that person is in the unique situation of being both the university supervisor and the methods course instructor. In the next chapter, I outline the methodology and methods for this self-study that more closely examines the experience of supporting preservice teacher learning.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Clinical experiences provide the ideal opportunities for preservice teacher learning, but preservice teachers struggle to link theory and practice. Supervisors play a critical role in addressing tensions that arise while preservice teachers grapple with linking theory and practice in clinical experiences. If supervisors play a key role in preservice teachers learning, then it is imperative to understand the pedagogical decision-making and the impact those decisions have on preservice teacher learning. It is also important for methods course instructors to explore the content they teach preservice teachers and the rationale behind why they teach the content they do to support preservice teacher learning. To address this issue, I used self-study to investigate my beliefs of how preservice teachers learn, the tensions I experienced as a boundary-spanner, how my beliefs and experienced tensions influenced the decisions I made, and how I supported preservice teacher learning. As a boundary-spanner, my roles and responsibilities span across the local school district and the university. In addition, my role allowed me to teach a classroom management methods course and supervise the same group of undergraduate students in their clinical experience. Therefore, my boundary-spanning role situates an opportunity to begin to understand the dynamics of a role that is typically allocated to two people: A course instructor and university supervisor.

My passion for studying my own beliefs, experienced tensions, and decision-making as a boundary-spanner drove my interest in engaging in a self-study to better understand my own practice. Loughran (2004) defined self-study as a way to examine and learn about practice while
also exploring scholarship in, and through, teaching. Loughran (2007) stated, “An important aspect of self-study that is critical in understanding this methodology is embedded in the desire of teacher educators to better align their teaching intents with their teaching actions” (p. 12). I selected self-study to explore my beliefs about how preservice teachers learn, my experienced tensions, how my beliefs and experienced tensions influence my decisions, and how I supported preservice teachers learning in my dual role of classroom management methods instructor and university supervisor. The research questions for my self-study included:

(1) What are my beliefs about how preservice teachers learn?

(2) What tensions do I experience as I teach coursework and supervise the same group of pre-service teachers?

(3) How do my beliefs and experienced tensions influence the decisions I make?

(4) How do I support preservice teacher learning in my dual role of classroom management methods instructor and university supervisor?

Given the importance of the boundary-spanning role within teacher education, this chapter describes the theoretical and methodological approach I used to investigate these research questions. In the first section, I articulated the link between the theoretical and methodological choices I made as a qualitative researcher that led to selecting self-study as an appropriate methodology. In the second section, I explain the context of the research. Finally, in the third section, I describe the data collection methods, data analysis and efforts I made to provide credibility as well as trustworthiness in the study.

Theoretical Perspective

Qualitative research “involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to the world” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2013, p. 7). Newman, Ridenour, Newman, and DeMarco’s (2003) defined qualitative research as “a research paradigm designed to address questions of meaning,
interpretation, and socially constructed realities” (p. 170). Engaging in qualitative research permits the researcher to interact with their natural setting, to explore their practices, and make their practices visible to the world (Denzin & Lincoln, 2013). It is through qualitative research that researchers investigate their research question while immersed in their context to construct meaning and share their findings with others.

**Constructivism**

This qualitative study aligns with constructivism (Crotty, 1998; Glesne, 2006; Samaras & Freese, 2009). Constructivism is how, “human beings construct their perceptions of the world, that no one perception is ‘right’ or more ‘real’ than another, and that these realities must be seen as whole rather than divided into discrete variables that are analyzed and separated” (Glesne, 2006, p. 7). Denzin and Lincoln (2013) agreed that constructivist theory “assumes a relativist ontology (there are multiple realities), a subjectivist epistemology (the knower and respondent co-create understanding), and a naturalist (in the natural world) set of methodological procedures” (p. 27). There is an “organic connection between education and personal experience” (Dewey, 1938, p. 25) just as there is a natural connection between constructivist theory and self-study. Samaras and Freese (2009) stated, “Self-study is constructivist because it includes elements of on-going inquiry, respects personal experience, and emphasizes the roles of knowledge construction” (p. 10). Through a constructivist frame, I studied my practice to construct meaning and share the reality within my specific context.

Constructivism underpins self-study and serves as a perspective to understand how I supported preservice teachers as a boundary-spanner. By inquiring into how I supported preservice teachers, I uncovered how I constructed meaning and used that learning to improve my work within my specific context. The qualitative process in self-study allowed social
contexts to be “systematically examined as a whole, without breaking them down into isolated, incomplete, and disconnected variables (Hatch, 2002, p. 9). Self-study research allows the researcher to explore and understand his/her reality. It is within the context of studying oneself that “reality is socially constructed, complex, and ever-changing” (Glesne, 2006, p. 6) and what is real becomes relative to the context. Explicitly sharing how my reality constructed my understanding of how I supported preservice teachers in my dual role as a boundary-spanner has implications for my teaching and can inform others’ practice.

**Self-Study Methodology**

One form of qualitative research, consistent with the perspectives of constructivism, is self-study. The term self-study originated in the 1960s in the field of psychology. During this era, the “self” was studied to understand one’s identity and self-image, to study an individual’s learning approach, and study institutional and program evaluations (Samaras & Freese, 2006). Self-study is a form of qualitative research that encompasses the study of personal, professional, and program renewal by drawing on the researcher’s contextual experiences (Samaras & Freese, 2006). Self-study allows the researcher to construct and interpret meaning within the researcher’s context. As a result, self-study supports “the study of teacher education practice in order to understand and improve it” (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p. 7).

Bullough and Pinnegar (2001) highlight four developments of self-study research in education: naturalistic inquiry, reconceptualist movement, involvement of international scholars, and variations of action research. Naturalistic inquiry shifted the nature of research to acknowledge the importance of who the researcher is and what the researcher does in the study. The reconceptualist movement in curriculum studies guided researchers to study themselves as a foundation of a legitimate research practice. The involvement of international scholars in teacher
education research demonstrates the value that teacher educators place on sharing their stories and developing their practice. Additionally, variations of action research allowed the blending of research and practice as well as the roles of researcher and practitioner. In tandem, these four developments created a community of scholars interested in questioning one’s practice and teaching, focusing on the context, exposing the nature of experience, and studying the self.

These developments also attracted a group of international scholars (England, Australia, and Canada) and scholars from the United States (Arizona, Utah and others) who felt disconnected within their universities as they struggled with tenure and promotion (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001). This community of scholars from around the world began recognizing the importance of studying their own practice. The passion to study their living contradictions (Whitehead, 1989) propelled these scholars to pursue self-study as a methodological approach in qualitative research. Increased momentum and interest in self-study led the creation of the Self-Study Special Interest Group (S-STEP) of the American Education Research Association in 1992 (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). Since then S-STEP has grown to include over 200 members.

Self-study researchers are generally teacher educators who share a common vision for broadening their teaching practice. As a teacher educator and much like the initial group of self-study scholars, I identify, reflect upon, and embrace sharing dissonance in my teaching. I often feel tension between my instructional decisions as a methods course instructor and my approach as a university supervisor. Engaging in self-study allowed me to study my current theoretical and supervisory decisions on how I support preservice teachers as a boundary-spanner.

Prominent scholars in self-study research (Berry, 2008; Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009; Russell, 2009; & Samaras & Freese, 2006) reference LaBoskey’s (2004) five characteristics in self-study. LaBoskey, a pivotal scholar in self-study research, created five characteristics to
guide researchers through the self-study process: (1) self-initiated and focused, (2) improvement-aimed, (3) interactive, (4) multiple qualitative methods, and (5) trustworthiness to establish validity (LaBoskey, 2004). Therefore, I used these five characteristics to guide my self-study.

The first characteristic, self-initiated and focused, is defined as “...to better understand and improve our practice, we must incorporate self-analysis and tools of self-transformation” (LaBoskey, 2004, p. 843). I initiated my self-study because I felt a “living contradiction” (Whitehead, 1989) among how I supported preservice teachers as a boundary-spanner. My focus to unearth how I supported preservice teachers as a boundary-spanner stemmed from my background knowledge as a teacher educator.

The second characteristic, improvement-aimed, is defined as studying, “... to improve our practice based upon a careful and thorough understanding of our setting, which in turn results in an enhanced understanding of that practice” (LaBoskey, 2004, p. 845). In self-study research, improvement-aimed means changing the self-study researcher’s beliefs and improving his/her practice. In addition to these personal improvements, improvement-aimed in self-study research can also mean improvements to the beliefs and practices of other teacher educators’ practices and program development within institutions. Making improvements to one’s practice requires ongoing reflection. Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) stated, “Self-study of practice is improvement aimed and through cycles of critical reflection, embodied knowledge becomes intellectually accessible” (p. 99). I engaged in ongoing cycles of reflection by studying how I supported preservice teachers’ learning as a boundary-spanner. My focus to reflect on my practice stemmed from my dual role as a classroom management course instructor and university supervisor.

The third characteristic, interactive, is defined as “gathering multiple perspectives on our professional practice settings helps to challenge our assumptions and biases, reveal our
inconsistencies, expand our potential interpretations, and triangulate our findings” (LaBoskey, 2004, p. 849). Contrary to belief, self-study is not done alone; rather, it is quite interactive as the researcher seeks and collaborates with critical friends to conduct quality self-study research. Bass, Anderson-Patton, and Allender (2002) stated, “Self-study provides a form for practicing a valuable kind of self-monitoring; critical friends with alternative views temper it” (p. 67). The continuous conversations between self-study research and critical friends continuously shape the self-study research, molding it through dialogue of diverse perspectives. Within my self-study, I relied on conversations with critical friends to question, probe, and challenge my thinking. The involvement of critical friends demonstrated the interactive nature of my self-study and allowed for my tacit, personal practical knowledge, and present moment knowledge to be discussed.

The fourth characteristic, multiple methods, is defined as a “mix of mainly qualitative methods (that) can enhance our understanding of our professional practice settings and help us to reframe our thinking and our teaching in appropriate and defensible ways” (LaBoskey, 2004, p. 851). The purpose for selecting multiple methods is for the researcher to broaden his/her understanding of their practices and strengthen the trustworthiness of the study. Berry (2008) suggested selecting data to view practice through multiple perspectives and Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) suggested collecting data as a tool to develop trustworthiness within the findings. For the two reasons mentioned above, I intentionally selected a variety of methods: autobiographical accounts, espoused platform, field notes, semi-structured interviews, and reflective journals. It is through these data collection methods that my tacit, personal practical, and present moment knowledge became transparent.

The fifth and final characteristic, trustworthiness to establish validity, is defined as a way to “formalize our work and make it available to our professional community for deliberation,
further testing, and judgment. Self-study achieves validation through construction, testing, sharing and re-testing of exemplars of teaching practice” (LaBoskey, 2004, p. 860). In self-study research, critical friends and multiple methods are key factors to enhance trustworthiness. I purposefully selected multiple methods (shared above) and two critical friends. “Including one or more critical friends adds considerable strength to self-study, protecting one from some of the personal intensity of self-study while also ensuring that data are interpreted from a range of relevant perspectives and that the interpretations are not self-sealing” (Russell, 2009, p. 76). The deliberate incorporation of critical friends and multiple methods into my self-study enhanced the rigor and strengthened my study, thereby addressing trustworthiness.

The five characteristics created an outline for guiding my research about understanding my beliefs of how preservice teachers learn, the experienced tensions I felt as a boundary-spanner, how my beliefs and experienced tensions influenced the decisions I made, and how I supported preservice teachers learning as a boundary-spanner.

**Concepts of Practice**

In addition to LaBoskey’s five characteristics to guide self-study research, Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) discuss three concepts of practice that influence decisions and actions the researcher makes in self-study research: Tacit knowledge, personal practical knowledge, and the present moment. These concepts of practices are necessary because “to uncover what practitioners know requires careful attention to their thinking and action in an environment and what thought and action reveal about the practitioner’s knowledge of and assumptions about that environment” (p. 26). I defined the concepts of practice and outlined how the practices integrate LaBoskey’s five characteristics to create a conceptual framework for my study.
The first concept of practice is tacit knowledge, which is defined as “… kinds of things revealed not so much in our ability to articulate them as in the action or actions we take” (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p. 17). My tacit knowledge consisted of what I know, which are my personal experiences. Meaning my background knowledge of classroom teaching, my experience as a collaborating teacher, and my experiences as an undergraduate student contributed to my tacit knowledge. Studying what my beliefs are about how preservice teachers learn is how I used the concepts of self-initiated and focused (LaBoskey, 2004). Understanding how my tacit knowledge informed my beliefs, experienced tensions, and decision-making is described in my data analysis and interpretation of data.

The second concept of practice is personal practical knowledge, which is defined as the “knowledge emerges from our narrative history as humans and names the things we have learned that have become intuitive and instinctive” (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p. 21) and that fundamental knowledge which guides teachers’ practice (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988). This knowledge consists of personal experiences, family history, interactions with others, and professional encounters and development. Because of the nature of personal practice knowledge, it was possible to unintentionally overlook aspects of my beliefs. To ensure this does not occur, interactions with critical friends were situated throughout the self-study. LaBoskey (2004) stated a third characteristic of self-study is interactive. The involvement of critical friends demonstrated the interactive nature and rationale of my self-study behind my personal practical knowledge. In addition to interactions with critical friends, analyzing my autobiographical accounts, espoused platforms, field notes, and reflection journals were critical components to informing how to support pre-service teachers. Through analysis and reflection, I uncovered how my personal practical knowledge influenced my beliefs and experienced tensions as a boundary-spanner.
The third concept of practice is present moment knowledge, which is defined as “we take all that we know from our past to confront what is happening now and then take action” (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p. 24) and “we bring a past experience forward and reconsider it in this moment, we may reinterpret, relive, and retell, coming to new understandings that have the power to both reinterpret the past and propel us forward into the future” (Stern, 2004, p. 23). My tacit and personal practical knowledge impact my present moment actions as a boundary-spanner. When in similar current situations, I retrieved knowledge from past experiences and made present moment decisions. If the past decisions were successful, I used a similar action based upon the situation and if the decision was not successful, I reflected and selected another avenue to support pre-service teachers. Obtaining new knowledge is an essential component in reinterpreting past decisions and actions to move forward. Present moment knowledge is continually evolving based on previous experiences coupled with new knowledge to enhance understanding of one’s actions. In Figure 1, the concepts of practices are shown connected to LaBoskey’s (2004) self-study characteristics.
Figure 1. LaBoskey’s characteristics

Connecting the five characteristics of self-study to how the three concepts of practice was critical to understanding my beliefs of how preservice teachers learn and how my beliefs and experienced tensions influenced my decisions as a boundary-spanner. When supporting preservice teachers in clinical experiences and coursework, my tacit and personal practical knowledge guided my decisions. The dialogue I engaged in with critical friends allowed me to challenge my thinking, unearth my tensions, and wrestle with my decisions to adapt my instructional and supervisory approaches.

When investigating self-study, the focus is on the self and how the researcher’s experiences are reflected in the practice to reframe beliefs and/or decisions. According to Feldman (2009), “self-study research is usually done by teacher educators who have as their aim the improvement of their practice and the production of new knowledge about teaching and the relationship between teaching and learning” (p. 36). Self-study, unlike teacher research and action research, exposes “the self” to grow personally and professionally by opening the research
to critique to engage in conversation and build understanding (Samaras & Freese, 2009). LaBoskey (2004) agreed an important characteristic of self-study is improvement-aimed. In self-study research, improvement-aimed means changing the self-study researcher’s beliefs and improving his/her practice. In addition to these personal improvements, improvement-aimed in self-study research can also mean improvements to the beliefs and practices of other teacher educators’ practices and program development within institutions. Making improvements requires ongoing reflection. Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) stated, “Self-study of practice is improvement aimed and through cycles of critical reflection, embodied knowledge becomes intellectually accessible” (p. 99). Within my self-study, I engaged in ongoing cycles of reflection to improve my teaching practices associated with my boundary-spanning role in the integrated instructional space of being both classroom management methods course instructor and university supervisor.

**Context**

This self-study was conducted in a unique, clinically based educator preparation program called the Preparing Teachers Residency (pseudonym) in a college of education at a research university in the southeastern United States. The research-extensive university is in an urban setting and serves over 40,000 students, 2,000 of those attend the College of Education. The largest program in the College of Education is the Elementary Education Program, which prepares over 300 teachers each year. The Elementary Education Program is a nationally recognized program for its commitment to clinically rich educator preparation and robust school-university partnerships. There are two pathways to undergraduate certification in elementary education at this research university and Preparing Teachers Residency (PTR) is one of them.

There are four partnering elementary schools in the PTR. All four were specifically selected by the local school district in collaboration with the university and are located within a
ten-mile radius from the university. The size of the four schools range from approximately 550 students to 900 students. All four elementary schools are Title 1 schools (schools with 75% or higher of the student population receive free and reduced lunch), three of the four are Renaissance (95% or higher on free or reduced lunch), and all four are Extended Reading Time (ERT) schools (30 minutes of added reading time to the school day). Resources are specifically allocated to this program to prepare preservice teachers. PTR has many resources to support residents. There are university faculty members (instructors, graduate assistants, professors, and/or boundary-spanners) who support residents in their clinical experiences as well as teach their undergraduate courses. On-going and deliberate collaboration between the local school district and university are maintained to monitor the needs of all stakeholders within the program.

**Teacher Education Curriculum: The Clinical Experience**

In PTR, undergraduates, called “residents” earn their state teaching licensure through a clinically intensive two-year residency experience. There are twelve residents in the program. They range in age from 18-36 years old. The residents are housed in one of four urban elementary schools within a school district that is the 8th largest in the nation with a total of 145 elementary schools. Three of the elementary schools contain Pre-K-5th grade students and one contain Pre-K-8th grade students with a wide variety of ethnicity (Caucasian, African American, Asian, Hispanic, Haitian, Indian, Pacific Islander, and Arabic).

Residents are required to apply to the PTR by writing an essay, providing letters of recommendations, conducting a specified amount of observation hours, and holding a specific GPA. A review committee consisting of the directors of the program and university faculty review all applications and determine acceptance.
Residents are contracted just like teachers from 7:30am-3:30pm Monday through Friday throughout their two-year residency. During these hours, residents are either in clinical experiences or in coursework. Residents spend a considerable amount of time, almost 2000 hours upon graduation, in clinical experiences. In their junior year of the PTR, the clinical experience is between 20-25 hours a week throughout the fall and spring semesters. They attend one of the four partnering elementary schools in the junior year fall semester and then change elementary schools and grade levels in the spring semester. In their senior year, they average 28-32 hours a week in their clinical experiences. They attend a third partnership school and change grade levels but stay in that placement their entire senior year. See Table one for examples of three residents’ placements over a two-year period in their clinical experiences in the PTR program.

Table 1

Example of School Placements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
<th>School C</th>
<th>School D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student A</td>
<td>Fall Junior Year</td>
<td>Spring Junior Year</td>
<td>Fall &amp; Spring Senior Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st grade</td>
<td>5th grade</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student B</td>
<td>Fall &amp; Spring Senior Year</td>
<td>Spring Junior Year</td>
<td>Fall Junior Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>2nd grade</td>
<td>4th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student C</td>
<td>Fall &amp; Spring Senior Year</td>
<td>Fall Junior Year</td>
<td>Spring Junior Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st grade</td>
<td>4th grade</td>
<td>3rd grade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over the course of two years the residents in the PTR program are immersed in clinical experiences applying what they are learning in their coursework.

**Classroom Management**

The undergraduate courses are taught at the university or on site at one of the partnering elementary schools. In the fall semester, the residents’ course load included classroom management, clinical experience seminar, two literacy courses, an educational psychology course, and a student of second language (ESOL) course. The classroom management methods course is taught on site at one of the four partnering elementary schools during the fall semester of the residents’ first year. The three main objectives in the course are:

- Compare alternative strategies of classroom management and strategies for acceptable management of student behavior in a diverse elementary classroom, including the interaction with ESOL students and students with academic and/or behavioral disabilities
- Development professional teaching behaviors, select appropriate teaching strategies, including ESOL modifications, and questioning techniques, depending on the content to be covered for diverse characteristics of the learners
- Demonstrate the ability to work in collegial relationships with peers in preparation for professional committee involvement, collaborative learning, and teaching. The readings in the course inform residents of philosophies of management, influences of teacher theory, influences of student behaviors, and strategies for preventing and intervening student behaviors.

The residents engage in discourse with peers, course instructors, collaborating teachers, and supervisors about the readings before applying the theories, influences, and strategies in clinical experiences. The resources and materials are specifically adapted to support residents in
meeting the objectives for the course. For example, the text *Principles of Classroom Management* (Levin & Nolan, 2014) described theories of teacher influences that align with the second objective about developing professional teacher behaviors. After application, residents grapple with the practical and theoretical aspects of experiencing theory and practice back in the classroom management methods course. The residents have abundant opportunities to explore theory and practice and practice and theory connections within the PTR program due to the expansive time in clinical experiences.

The self-study was conducted when I taught the classroom management methods course and supervised the same preservice teachers in the clinical experiences. Prior to this self-study, I taught the classroom management methods course three times in the PTR. As the classroom management methods instructor, I collaborated bi-weekly and/or monthly with a team of course instructors who taught the classroom management course to other cohorts at the same university. The meetings supported the instructors with resources, discussions, and practical ideas for linking theory and practice.

**Clinical Experience Seminar**

The residents’ one-hour seminar course is taught every semester at one of the partnership schools and is connected to the residents’ clinical experiences. As the residents’ progress from semester to semester, so do their roles and responsibilities in their clinical experiences. Based on the objectives listed below, the residents move from development to enactment, extension to application, and demonstration to involvement. The objectives in the classroom management course are:

- Develop and enhance ability to use an inquiry stance to observe individual children, groups of children, classroom learning environments and instruction
• Extend their pedagogical content knowledge to become a professional educator
• Demonstrate the dispositions necessary to become a professional educator including professional responsibility, ethics, and integrity in multiple professional learning communities and environments.

The twelve residents attended the same classroom management methods course and clinical experience seminar course. I supervised all twelve in the clinical experiences seminar course and taught the same twelve in the classroom management methods course. Prior to this self-study, I taught the clinical experience seminar course five times in the PTR. However, two of the five times were as a support to planning the course and co-teaching some of the classes. As the clinical experience seminar instructor, I collaborated daily/weekly with the other instructor. The discussions supported the needs of the preservice teachers from their clinical experience by applying strategies, obtaining resources, engaging discussions, and practical ideas for linking theory and practice.

**Supervision**

In the PTR program, I supported residents in their clinical experiences on average 1-2 times a week for the length of the semester. My support included a plethora of tasks such as encouraging residents to become involved in the K-5 classroom (demonstrating how to work with students), organizing scheduled and unscheduled observations (provide feedback and discuss lessons to co-teaching and modeling), coaching (instructional decisions and practices), mentoring (from how to have difficult conversations with other educators to preparing for job interviews), lesson planning (aligning standards, providing feedback, gathering materials, etc.), and linking theory and practice in clinical experiences.
Evaluation

The residents in the PTR program had access to all evaluation documents and those documents are shared and reviewed with them; here are no surprise evaluations. All forms of evaluation require input from the resident, boundary-spanner, and collaborating teacher. The form that is used throughout the residents’ two years in the program is a summative teaching evaluation form. The summative teaching evaluation form has four sections providing statements around highly effective teaching practices. The residents’ focus on specific sections based on the coursework for that semester. The form has a Likert scale and areas to include evidence and statements surrounding the residents’ growth and areas of improvement. In the first fall semester, the focus was capturing the residents’ progress for the following spring semester based on the second and fourth sections of the form. In the spring semester, the residents shared their goals with the next collaborating teacher and worked towards progressing to section one while still expanding on sections two and four in which they excelled. The rationale for dividing the evaluation forms into specific sections for each semester correlates to how the residents are introduced to the subsequent courses throughout every semester. See Table 2 for how the evaluation form was used in the PTR program with a resident who would enter the program starting in the fall of their junior year.
Table 2

Evaluation by Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Summative teaching Evaluation form</th>
<th>Completed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Sections 2 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Resident, Boundary-spanner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborating teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Sections 1, 2, &amp; 4</td>
<td>Resident, Boundary-spanner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborating teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>All 4 Sections</td>
<td>Resident, Boundary-spanner,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborating teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>All 4 Sections</td>
<td>Resident, Boundary-spanner,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborating teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Self-Study Participant**

In this self-study, I am the researcher and the participant. In self-study, the primary participant is the self, and for this reason, it is commonly accepted, if not required, to provide extensive detail about one’s self (Berry, 2008). To define the self, I detailed accounts of my historical, personal, and professional selves. The ‘historical self’ section described how I came to be at this place and time as a boundary-spanner. The ‘personal self’ section described how past experiences related to current experiences. The ‘professional self’ section described how historical and personal experiences interacted with our professional experiences. These detailed accounts can be found in Appendix B. The in-depth account of ‘self’ is necessary to establish why I selected self-study and my theoretical and conceptual frameworks. The elaboration on ‘self’ also addressed the concepts of practice which aligned with how I supported preservice teachers as a boundary-spanner.
Data Collection Methods

As previously mentioned, data collection in self-study includes a variety of sources (Berry, 2008). The purpose for selecting multiple data collection methods is for the researcher to broaden his/her scope of understanding about his/her practices and to attest to the need of evidence to strengthen the trustworthiness of the study. LaBoskey (2004) noted collecting multiple methods as a fourth characteristic of self-study. She stated multiple methods “provide us with opportunities to gain different and more comprehensive perspectives on the educational processes under investigation” (p. 859). Berry (2008) suggested selecting data to view practice through multiple perspectives, and Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) suggested collecting data as a tool to develop trustworthiness within the findings. For the reasons mentioned above, I intentionally selected a variety of methods: autobiographical accounts, espoused platform, field notes, semi-structured interviews, and reflective journals (see Table 3).

Table 3

Timeline and Explanation of Data Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autobiographical Accounts</td>
<td>Written statements about my autobiographical accounts of my historical, personal, and, professional self</td>
<td>Recorded in a word document describing my lived experiences in detail to establish my initial espoused platform</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Prior to preparing for course and clinical experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espoused platform</td>
<td>Written statements of my beliefs, tensions, and decision-making as a course instructor and supervisor</td>
<td>Prior to course preparation and clinical experience claim my beliefs, tensions, and decision-making, revisit mid-term,</td>
<td>August, October, &amp; December</td>
<td>Once prior to course preparation and field, mid-term semester, &amp; conclusion of semester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Recorded in a word document with date, label of critical friend A or B, questions asked by critical friends in addition to questions provided, notes from discussion and reflection</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured Interviews</td>
<td>“Semi-structured Interviews” Discussions based on Critical Incidents provided to Critical Friends prior to meetings</td>
<td>August, September, October, November, &amp; December</td>
<td>Weekly or bi-weekly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Journals</td>
<td>Written accounts of my beliefs, tensions, and decision making as a course instructor and university supervisor</td>
<td>August, September, October, &amp; November</td>
<td>Daily/weekly throughout semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes</td>
<td>Handwritten accounts of my beliefs, tensions, and decision-making while in clinical experience</td>
<td>September, October, &amp; November</td>
<td>Daily/weekly based on interactions in clinical experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Autobiographical accounts**

Autobiographical accounts are “personal journaling that situate you, the researcher, within the research process” (Glesne, 2006, p. 60). They are important because they provide the researcher an opportunity to think about actions, emotions, interactions, and questions that are part of the researcher’s story and how the story interweaves within the research. Berry (2008) stated, “Pedagogical actions are often grounded in autobiographical experiences of learning, hence bringing these experiences to the surface can be an important step in coming to understand
one’s actions as a teacher/educator” (p. 22). I started my data collection with autobiographical accounts of my historical self, my personal self, and professional self.

**Espoused Platform**

An espoused platform is “a set of values and convictions about the fundamental purposes of education and how those purposes should be translated into the teaching and learning process” (Nolan & Hoover, 2011, p. 24). Espoused platforms are important because they allow the researcher to examine and make explicit their beliefs, assumptions, and expectations of teaching and learning. Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002) stated “when one’s espoused theory matches one’s theory in use, they are considered congruent” (p.231). It is through examining one’s espoused platform that researchers identify congruence. I established my initial espoused platform in August, revisited my espoused platform in October, and again at the end of a 15-week semester in December (see Appendices C-E).

**Reflective Journals**

Reflective journals are “a place where researchers can openly reflect on what is happening during the research experience and how they feel about it” (Hatch, 2002, p.88). They are important because they structure a space for researchers to reflect on their experiences over time. The reflective journal establishes raw data for the researchers to expose their thoughts, emotions, and experiences that can be used to inform their actions. “Journal writing is commonly used in educational settings to assist the development of reflection…Journal retrospection can be short and/or long term, looking back on immediate experience and/or total experience” (Berry, 2008, p.24). The table below displays the number of pages and entries for both reflective journals (see Table 4).
**Table 4**

**Reflective Journal Pages and Entries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflective Journal</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th># of Entries</th>
<th># of pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management Methods Course</td>
<td>Aug.-Nov.</td>
<td>Reflections 15</td>
<td>60 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rationales 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor Meeting 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Supervisor</td>
<td>Sept.-Nov.</td>
<td>Weeks</td>
<td>45 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sept. 3rd - 20th</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sept. 23rd - Oct. 12th</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct. 22nd – Nov. 23rd</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I used two reflective journals during my 5-month self-study. I initiated my first reflective journal in August during my planning stages for the classroom management methods course (see Appendix F). I used the reflective journal to record my decisions, explain my rationale for my decisions, and grapple with tensions I experienced about my beliefs, experienced tensions, and decision-making for planning and teaching the course. I used the software program Dragon Naturally Speaking to record my thoughts in the reflective journal weekly. The reflective journal was created in a word document. Knowing the reflective journal entries were a robust data source, I created a monthly calendar for organizational purposes (see Appendix G). The calendar marked when I needed to plan for the course and track my thinking, reflect on the course after implementing the lesson, read reflective entries and highlight critical incidents and question my decisions, meet with my critical friend to discuss the course over time, listen to the recorded session from my discussion with my critical friend and identify key ideas, and then use the key ideas to create analytic memo. The reflective journal also contained entries of classroom
management methods course instructors’ meetings which were held monthly. Each entry in the reflective journal had the date and a specific heading in bold that noted the type of entry.

My second reflective journal was used for reflecting on my field notes I took while in the clinical experience. When I was in the clinical experience, I jotted handwritten accounts of my interactions (see Appendix H). I used the reflective journal to record my decisions, explain my rationale for my decisions, and grapple with tensions I experienced about my beliefs, experienced tensions, and decision-making when supervising in the clinical experience (see Appendix I). I used the software program Dragon Naturally Speaking to record my thoughts in the reflective journal daily/weekly. The reflective journal was created in a separate word document from the reflective journal used for the classroom management methods course. I added reminders to the monthly calendar to organize when I needed to explain my field notes from the clinical experience, reflect on the interactions I had in the clinical experience, read reflective entries and highlight critical incidents and question my decisions, meet with my critical friend to discuss the clinical experience over time, listen to the recorded session from my discussion with my critical friend and identify key ideas, and then use the key ideas to create analytic memos. The reflective journal was created in a word document. Each entry in the reflective journal had the date and a specific heading in bold that noted the type of entry.

**Field Notes**

Field notes are “…products of active processes of interpretation and sense-making that frame or structure not only what is written but how it is written” (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995, p. 9). They are important because researchers can record descriptive written accounts to grasp and interpret an in-depth experience through personal observations. The descriptive accounts allow the researchers to recollect their experiences as time passes.
Handwritten field notes were recorded daily/weekly as interactions occurred between preservice teachers, collaborating teachers, and I while in the clinical experience. I used a legal sized notepad to write the date, name of preservice teacher, and brief note to capture the interaction. The handwritten notes were used to recount the interaction from the clinical experience in detail into the reflective journal.

**Semi-structured Interviews**

Semi-structured interviews are when “Interviewers prepare a list of questions, but these can be asked in a flexible order and with a wording that is contextually appropriate” (Gibson & Brown, 2009, pp. 86-87).” They are important because they outline the conversation but allow the interviewer to ask clarifying and /or probing questions to delve deeper into the interviewee thinking. Gibson and Brown (2009) state, “Interviewers are also free to probe the research participants for more information on particular points, to explore the topics more discursively than in structured approaches, and even to explore topics that may emerge that were not included in the interview schedule” (p. 88).

I conducted semi-structured interviews with two critical friends bi-weekly/monthly starting in August and continuing until December. The semi-structured interviews occurred with one critical friend at a time in a mutually agreed upon location in a confidential space. The difference for interview questions was to focus on the relationship between my research questions and to account for trustworthiness. I believed that these questions would allow for follow up questions from my critical friends as well as my critical friends’ ability to adjust the questions based on my responses. The next three sets of semi-structured interview questions that followed were constructed from critical incidents analyzed from my reflective journals. The last meeting with critical friends, I selected the initial set of semi-structured interview questions to
allow for reflection of the entire semester. The reflection and discussion informed my last espoused platform (see Appendix J). The data collection was intentionally selected to increase trustworthiness within the study. See Table 5 for a detailed account of the number of face-to-face meetings, ranges of discussions, and average discussion lengths.

**Table 5**

**Critical friends’ meetings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Friend</th>
<th># of Meetings All Face-to-face</th>
<th>Range of discussions</th>
<th>Average Discussion length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A               | Meeting 1: 53 min. 04 sec.  
Meeting 2: 41 min. 24 sec.  
Meeting 3: 34 min. 49 sec.  
Meeting 4: 31 min. 01 sec.  
Meeting 5: 34 min. 53 sec. | 31 min. 01 sec. - 53 min. 04 sec. | 39 minutes 11 seconds |
| B               | Meeting 1: 55 min. 11 sec.  
Meeting 2: 43 min. 35 sec.  
Meeting 3: 47 min. 52 sec.  
Meeting 4: 50 min. 21 sec.  
Meeting 5: 41 min. 43 sec. | 41 min. 43 sec. - 55 min. 11 sec. | 47 minutes 48 seconds |

**Data Analysis**

For data analysis, I coupled Braun and Clarke’s (2006) phases of thematic analysis with Saldaña’s (2013) qualitative approach to data analysis because it provided me with multiple opportunities to analyze my data sets through a series of phases using an inductive approach. An inductive approach is defined as “researchers working back and forth between the themes and the database until they establish a comprehensive set of themes (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p. 43). I selected an inductive approach because the process allowed me to work through the data and not
limit the number of possible themes. Using this process assured me the greatest opportunity to analyze the data sets by searching and researching the data until no new themes emerged.

There are similarities between Saldaña’s (2013) and Braun and Clarke’s (2006) approaches to qualitative data analysis.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saldaña (2013)</th>
<th>Initial Coding</th>
<th>Axial Coding</th>
<th>Structural Coding</th>
<th>Identifying Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Braun &amp; Clarke (2006)</td>
<td>• Phase 1: Familiarizing self with data</td>
<td>• Phase 3: Searching for Themes</td>
<td>• Phase 5: Defining and naming themes</td>
<td>• Phase 6: Producing a report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Phase 2: Generating Initial Codes</td>
<td>• Phase 4: Reviewing Themes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2. Thematic Analysis and Process of Analysis**

Thematic analysis is defined as “a method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 79) by organizing and categorizing the data sets. Thematic analysis aligns with Saldaña’s (2013) data analysis approach as thematic analysis “examines the ways in which events, realities, meanings, experiences and so on are the effects of a range of discourses operating within society” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 81). In Braun and Clarke’s (2006) approach, thematic analysis occurs through six phases: (1) Familiarizing yourself with your data; (2) Generating initial codes; (3) Searching for themes; (4) Reviewing themes; (5) Defining and naming themes; and (6) Producing the report (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In Saldaña’s approach, he identifies several types of qualitative coding schemes that can be used. For the purposes of this study, I used initial coding, axial coding, and structural
coding. He defines initial coding which “is intended as a starting point to provide the researcher with analytic leads for further exploration” (p. 101). He defines axial coding which “describes a category’s properties and dimensions and explores how the categories and subcategories relate to each other” (p. 209). He defines structural coding which “applies a content-based or conceptual phrase representing a topic of inquiry to a segment of data to both code and categorize the data corpus” (p. 83). In Saldaña’s approach, the analysis process is iterative where the researcher engaged in rounds of coding. Then the researcher uses those codes to generate categories and themes, which Saldaña refers to as thematic analysis. Saldaña defines categories which “are variable qualities that display the range or distribution within similarly coded data” (p. 52) and theme which “is an outcome of coding, categorization, or analytic reflection, not something that is, in itself, coded (p. 14). Figure 2 shows how I used Saldaña’s (2013) approach to coding and thematic analysis with Braun and Clarke’s (2006) phases of thematic analysis, and I next describe my data analysis through these six phases.

**Phase 1: Familiarizing Self with Data**

Braun and Clarke’s (2006) first phase in thematic analysis is to familiarize oneself to the data which requires the researcher to read and reread the data and jot down ideas. They suggested not skipping this phase as it is important to be familiar with the entire data set. They recommend starting coding ideas from the data set. Therefore, for Phase 1, I familiarized myself with the d autobiographical accounts, espoused platforms, reflective journals, field notes, and semi-structured interviews data sets. As I read, I jotted notes.

**Phase 2: Generating Initial Codes**

Braun and Clarke’s (2006) second phase of thematic analysis is to create initial codes in a systematic way across all data sets. The first two phases of thematic analysis are embedded in
Saldaña’s (2013) process of analysis in initial coding. Initial coding began the process of openly viewing data to initiate codes (Saldaña, 2013). I began with my autobiographical accounts by identifying “critical incidents” (Berry, 2008; Freese, 2008). As I read, I jotted down critical incidents, which are defined as “key events in the individual’s life, and around which pivotal decisions revolve” (Measor, 1985, p. 63). I used this first set of critical incidents to generate my first espoused platform and to select questions for my first meeting with critical friends as well as a process for continued interviews with critical friends.

My semi-structured interviews were another data set that I also coded for critical incidents. Uncovering critical incidents allowed me to pinpoint moments of my beliefs, experienced tensions, and decision-making (see table 6).

Table 6

Critical Incidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1 Analysis: Critical Incidents</th>
<th>Reflective Journal</th>
<th>Months</th>
<th># of Critical Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management Methods Course</td>
<td>Aug. 21st, Sept. 11th, Sept. 18th, Oct. 2nd, Oct. 22nd, Nov. 13th</td>
<td>17, 15, 20, Total: 52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Supervisor</td>
<td>Sept. 4th, 20th, Sept. 24th, Oct. 12th, Oct. 22nd, Nov. 28th</td>
<td>12, 10, 12, Total: 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After each interview, I wrote a reflection, and I coded those reflections as well. Then I examined the codes and wrote analytic memos (see Appendices K & L), which “reveals the
researcher’s thinking process about the codes and categories developed thus far” (p. 216). I also used the reflections to identify talking points for my discussions with my critical friends.

During this phase, I also drew upon these critical incidents to identify questions my critical friends could ask me in an Espoused Platform Conference (Nolan & Hoover, 2011). I selected six of the ten questions from Nolan and Hoover’s (2011) Conducting an Espoused Platform Conference to discuss with my critical friends. I decided on six of the ten questions to discuss with critical friend A and five of ten questions to discuss with critical friend B because the selected questions were mostly aligned with my role as a boundary-spanner. The questions were shared with both critical friends prior to our meetings (see Appendix M). For example, one of the discussion questions was “Why should the students learn the content that you teach? How does that content relate to the world outside the classroom?” This question was selected because it attested to how my beliefs and experienced tensions influenced the decisions I made as classroom management methods course instructor and university supervisor.

My reflective journals for the classroom management and clinical experience were ongoing data sets. Reflective journals were a space for me to confront my beliefs and think deeply about my decision-making. Hatch (2002) suggested reflective journals “provide a place where researchers can openly reflect on what is happening during the research experience and how they feel about it” (p. 88). These data sets were robust because they were analyzed through each phase of analysis. I read through the reflective journals a second time. During initial coding of the classroom management reflective journal, I marked words and/or phrases with a yellow highlighter to describe the entries. The words and/or phrases became my codes. I wrote my thoughts on a sticky note to track my thinking. Knowing the sticky notes could fall off the reflective journal, I created a labeling system to assist me in tracking the codes and supporting
evidence (see Figure 3). The labeling system consisted of numbering the sticky notes and sticking them next to the highlighted segments. I wrote the same number from the sticky note near each highlighted segment in the reflective journal. I also wrote on each sticky note the initials CM for classroom management.

Figure 3. Initial Coding: Classroom Management Reflective Journal

After I marked words and/or phrases with a yellow highlighter and wrote the word/phrase that became my code, I removed the 172 documented codes that were on the sticky notes. I read and reflected on each code. I placed the first code on the table. Then, as I read each code, I decided if the code had a commonality with the previous code. If the code had a commonality, I added it under the code currently placed on the table. If there was not a commonality, I placed the code on a new section of the table. I continued this system until all 172 codes were in columns on the table (see Figure 4).
Figure 4. Initial Coding: Categories from Codes in Classroom Management Reflective Journal

The codes in each column were reread. An overarching idea was used to capture the codes and created a category. Depending on the number of codes within each category, some categories needed subcategories. The subcategories were created when multiple codes within the category were evident. Out of the 172 codes created from the sticky notes, 12 categories and 36 subcategories were compiled (see Appendix N). The categories and subcategories were used to initiate axial coding in phase 3 of analysis. I followed the same process for University Supervisor Reflective Journal Field Notes. There were 152 documented codes written on sticky notes which created 13 categories and 19 subcategories (see Appendix O). Phases One and Two of data analysis occurred through the data collection process during the semester in which I was acting in the dual role of classroom management methods course instructor and university supervisor. As I collected and generated more data, I repeated the processes of familiarizing myself with the data, initially coding the data, and generating categories.
Phase 3: Searching for Themes

Braun and Clarke’s (2006) third phase of thematic analysis is to search for themes. To search for themes, I reviewed the list of codes, categories, and subcategories generated from Phase Two and generated new codes across the analyzed data. Saldaña (2013) refers to this process as axial coding, which he defines as extending the initial coding process by using the codes, categories, and subcategories from the initial codes and reviewing those to potentially create new codes. During this phase, I used the classroom management methods course reflective journal a second time. I read through each entry and highlighted in blue phrases describing my beliefs, decisions and/or tensions I made as a course instructor. The phrases became my codes. I wrote my thoughts on a sticky note to track my thinking and placed it in the reflective journal next to the code. I used the same labeling system from Phase Two initial coding.

After reading, highlighting, and tracking my thoughts on the classroom management reflection journal, I typed up the categories and subcategories generated from Phase Two initial coding and printed them out. Once printed, I cut them out and placed them on a table. I removed the green sticky notes from the classroom management reflection journal. I read each sticky note and decided if it fell under a previously identified category and/or subcategory. If the code fell under a pre-identified category and/or subcategory, I placed the green sticky note on the table under the pre-identified category and/or subcategory (see Figure 5).
If the code did not align with any of the pre-identified categories and/or subcategories, I created a new category and/or subcategory to use in the next phase. I repeated this same process on my University Supervisor Reflective Journal Field Notes.

**Phase 4: Reviewing Themes**

Braun and Clarke’s (2006) fourth phase in thematic analysis is a mapping process. This mapping process is a way to holistically conceptualize patterns and relationships in the data. I used the mapping process as part of Saldaña’s (2013) process of axial coding. I expanded Phase Three of searching for themes to Phase Four reviewing themes. For the sticky notes from Phase three that did not fit into the categories and/or subcategories I created a new category and/or subcategory. This flexibility allowed me to conceptualize patterns and relationships among the data (see Appendix P & Q).
Phase 5: Defining and Naming Themes

In Braun and Clarke’s (2006) fifth phase in thematic analysis includes defining and naming themes. This process is aligned with what Saldaña, (2013) refers to as structural coding. Structural coding applies an already identified conceptual phrase to a data set. I decided to include the structural coding in phase five as an analytic frame for helping me to connect my previous codes to my beliefs and decision-making. I used the Supervisor Pedagogical Skills Framework (Burns & Badiali, 2016) for the University Supervisor Reflective Journal Field Notes. This framework identified, defined, and described pedagogical skills and subcomponents of university supervisors. In keeping consistency, I created a pedagogical skills framework for methods course instructors. I based the creation on Burns and Badiali (2016) framework. I used the same pedagogical skill identifier but created my own definitions and subcomponents (see Appendix R). The definitions were created based on analysis phases two-four.

The first data set I analyzed was my reflective journal entries from the classroom management methods course. Using the reflective journal word document, I read through each entry and highlighted in green any section describing a pedagogical skill. After I highlighted the section in green, I used the ‘new comment’ feature and typed the pedagogical skill associated with the highlighted section (see Figure 6).
After reading, highlighting, and tracking my thoughts for the classroom management reflection journal, I created a new word document. The word document was constructed of each of the pedagogical skills and subcomponents definitions and under each pedagogical skill and subcomponent definition was a five-column table. The first column housed the code from the reflective journal. The other four columns were one of the subcomponents. A letter ‘X’ was placed in the subcomponent(s) that explained the rationale of that specific entry from the reflective journal (see Appendix S). There were 141 codes identified in this round of analysis. During analysis, I used the original six pedagogical skills and four components. However, three other pedagogical skills emerged and were added. So, the 141 codes merged into nine pedagogical skills and four subcomponents.

I followed the same process for university supervisor reflective journal field notes. There were 47 codes identified in this round of analysis. During the analysis, I used all six pedagogical skills and subcomponents. I also added a new pedagogical skill with four subcomponents (see Appendix T).
Then, I analyzed the pedagogical skills through a supervisor and course instructor lens. I started with the classroom management methods course reflective journals. I created a frequency chart to uncover the depth in which I utilized the different pedagogical skills when planning and implementing the course (see Table 7).

**Table 7**

**Frequency Table of Pedagogical Skills: Classroom Management Reflective Journal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noticing</th>
<th>Beliefs</th>
<th>Support PSTs</th>
<th>Course Content</th>
<th>Clinical Experience Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ignoring</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervening</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpacking</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grappling</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and a frequency chart of the pedagogical skills uncovered when in the clinical experience (see Table 8).
**Phase 6: Producing the Report.** Braun and Clarke’s (2006) final phase in thematic analysis selects vivid examples that support the themes and relates the analysis back to the research question and literature by producing a scholarly report of the analysis. The final process of analysis in Saldaña’s (2013) approach is identifying themes. The phases of analyzing data sets provided a comprehensive analysis which were supported by evidence. As a final level of analysis, I identified themes that represented the comprehensive analysis of initial, axial, and structural coding. The process of reviewing the themes across the comprehensive analysis allowed me to reflect on my research questions and literature. During this final phase of analysis, I printed out all four research questions (see Figure 7).
Next, I printed out the analysis from phases three and four from both reflective journals. I cut the evidence apart and placed them on the table under the corresponding research question (see Figure 8).
After the process was completed, I eliminated any evidence that was insufficient. An insufficient evidence meant there was not enough to support a theme. I then used phase five to determine my overall themes. This comprehensive analysis created eight themes across four research questions.

**Trustworthiness**

In my self-study, I am the researcher who is researching myself. Therefore, others could question the validity of my claims and the rigor of my research without inclusion of critical friend interactions. I reported personal and professional claims recognizing self-study may leave me vulnerable. In self-study, validity could be questioned if false claims were made in the analysis. Therefore, it is imperative to make explicit how and why I stated the claims I made within the study. To attend to the validity of my study I needed to ensure trustworthiness. The results stemmed from the “interpretation and meaning-making rather than explanation” (Craig, 2009, p. 22) to increase the validity of the study. Trustworthiness is essential in self-study research, and it is used to establish validity. Trustworthiness “formalizes our work and makes it available to our professional community for deliberation, further testing, and judgment” (LaBoskey, 2004, p. 860). In self-study research, critical friends and multiple data collection methods are key factors to enhance trustworthiness. To establish trustworthiness, I purposefully selected multiple data collection methods and two critical friends. “Including one or more critical friends adds considerable strength to self-study, protecting one from some of the personal intensity of self-study while also ensuring that data are interpreted from a range of relevant perspectives and that the interpretations are not self-sealing” (Russell, 2009, p. 76). I identified two critical friends who extended my thinking and added trustworthiness to my sense-making. Paugh and Robinson (2009) stated, “Teacher educators who engage in participatory self-study
naturally include methods that depend on collaborative communities of practice” (p. 93). My critical friends were structures embedded within my study to assist in creating awareness of the moral and ethical commitment I have as a researcher to report my findings in such a manner that the validity of my study increases. Critical Friend A is a doctoral candidate at the same university I attend. She was familiar with teaching the classroom management methods course as she had previously taught the course for three semesters. Critical Friend B was a boundary-spanner in the same teacher education program supervising the same preservice teachers in their clinical experiences. We interacted daily and/or weekly with preservice teachers in their clinical experiences. My critical friends and I participated in collegial conversations and they challenged my thinking through questioning and discourse. The deliberate incorporation of critical friends and multiple data collection methods into my self-study enhanced its rigor and strength of the study thereby attending to and, thereby, its trustworthiness.

In addition to multiple data collection methods and the use of critical friends, self-study researchers must make clear their data analysis and use extensive evidence to support their claims to establish trustworthiness. Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) claim, “…what makes a researcher trustworthy turns toward the authority of experience and evidence represented in the analytic and interpretive process…they must be able to see the ways in which the researcher moves from data analysis to data interpretation and back again and make the link between that collection-analysis-interpretive process” (p. 156). Therefore, I described my decision-making through my data collection and analysis processes.

As part of self-study, the researcher opens their practice to critical review. Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) stated, “As researchers/teacher educators/practitioners, the knowledge from our studies needed to have enough trustworthiness to guide us in our own practice and be useful to
others who wanted to understand or improve their practice” (p. 49). I used multiple sources of data collection and multiple rounds of analysis during and after my self-study along with two critical friends to engage in collegial conversations and questioning through discourse to attend to trustworthiness within my self-study.

Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to provide a rationale for my selected methodology of self-study. In this chapter, I outlined the various data collection methods, and I chronicled, in great detail, my data analysis methods. I also demonstrated how my choices in data collection and analysis were aligned with self-study methodology. I also illustrated the trustworthiness of my study by explaining my use of multiple data collection methods, critical friends, and extensive description in my analysis and interpretation. In the next chapter, I describe the findings of my self-study.
CHAPTER FOUR
FINDINGS

The purpose of this self-study was to examine the complexity of being a boundary-spanner in the dual role of a university supervisor and classroom management methods course instructor for a semester in a clinically intensive undergraduate teacher certification program. The study aimed to improve my current and future practice as a university supervisor and course instructor by examining my beliefs, unpacking my tensions and decision-making, and exploring how I supported preservice teachers. Before I engaged in this research, I was mindful of how I could support preservice teachers in my boundary-spanning role, but I would often experience tensions and question my decisions. To study my practice, I used a conceptual framework I created based on LaBoskey’s (2004) five characteristics of self-study research and Pinnegar and Hamilton’s (2009) concepts of practice to explore my beliefs, tensions, and decision-making in greater depth. The findings are organized by four research questions, I identify eight themes which I listed here as an overview.

For the first research question, What are my beliefs about how preservice teachers learn? I found I believe preservice teachers learn by (1) coupling four specific signature pedagogies: Shared Conversations. Data Collection of Observations, Focused Observation, and In-the-Moment Coaching, (2) having time and space in class to grapple with course content, their experiences, and their beliefs, and (3) needing to know that the concepts taught in the course are practical and should be applied in the clinical experience.
For the second research questions, *What tensions do I experience as I teach coursework and supervise the same group of preservice teachers?*, I found: (1) I experienced tensions when wanting preservice teachers to construct their learning, because I struggled to enact that belief in my teaching practice, and (2) I experienced tensions on what feedback to provide when preservice and collaborating teachers’ beliefs misaligned with my beliefs on preservice teacher preparedness.

For the third research question, *How do my beliefs and experienced tensions influence the decisions I make?*, I found my beliefs and experienced tensions arose during planning which influenced (1) how I planned course content based on my beliefs of the content, observations from the clinical experience, and preservice teacher need and (2) how I addressed preservice teachers’ readiness and developmental need through course and clinical experience connections.

For the fourth research question, *How do I support preservice teacher learning in my dual role of classroom management methods instructor and university supervisor?*, I found I processed what I observed in the clinical context and what I knew about course content before determining what technique to use to support the preservice teacher.

For the remainder of the chapter, I elaborate on the themes for each research question, and I provide evidence from my espoused platforms, reflective journals, and conversations with critical friends to support the themes.

**Research Question #1:**

*What are my beliefs about how preservice teachers learn?*

To address this research question, I explored my beliefs on how preservice teachers learn. I had always felt I had strong beliefs on how preservice teachers learn based on my experiences as a methods course instructor, university supervisor, doctoral student, and a previous
collaborating teacher, but I never formally articulated them. Prior to exploring my beliefs, I
started by sharing my thoughts by writing espoused platforms, which are an educator’s view on
factors that impact students such as education and curriculum, expectations for students as a
class and individually, and pedagogy (Nolan and Hoover, 2011). By formally articulating my
beliefs, I was able to thoroughly analyze them to understand more about my perceptions of
preservice teachers learning. I found three themes regarding my beliefs about preservice teacher
learning: they learn by supervisors: (1) coupling four specific signature pedagogies: Shared
Conversations, Data Collection of Observations, Focused Observation, and In-the-Moment
Coaching, and by course instructors (2) giving them time and space in class to grapple with
course content, their experiences, and their beliefs, and (3) designing course instruction to
demonstrate teaching practices that mirror authentic K-5 classroom experiences through course
content.

**Theme 1.1: I believe preservice teachers learn by supervisors’ coupling four specific
signature pedagogies: Shared Conversations, Data Collection of Observations, Focused
Observation, and In-the-Moment Coaching.**

Signature pedagogies are a way of teaching that prepares candidates for a particular
profession (Shulman, 2005). When I examined my beliefs, I identified four signature pedagogies
about how preservice teachers learn: Shared Conversations, Data Collection of Observations,
Focused Observation, and In-the-Moment Coaching. I define the four signature pedagogies as
follows: Shared Conversations are dialogue between preservice teachers and their supervisor
regarding a specific lesson. Data Collection of Observations are written accounts of teaching by
the preservice teacher and/or collaborating teacher taken during a lesson. Focused Observations
are observing the preservice teacher and/or collaborating teacher teaching with awareness of a
targeted focus of instructional practice to examine. In-the-Moment Coaching is demonstrating a teaching behavior during teaching and/or describing teaching behaviors while teaching.

Although, I have identified these four signature pedagogies individually, I believe they are not isolated. Supervisors intertwine them depending on the preservice teachers’ needs. In this first example, I believed the preservice teacher would learn if I used the signature pedagogies of Data Collection of Observation and Shared Conversations, “I needed her to take notes and I would take notes and afterwards, we could discuss” (Reflective Journal Field Notes, October 2018, line 915). This is an excerpt from my Reflective Journal Field Notes around our shared conversation.

She stated that she liked how the CT used the strategy of looking at things through an eagle eye, she noticed that the CT did different tasks depending on the student, and she noticed the CT asked questions. I told her that I had similar observations and a few additional ones. I suggested that she identify a strategy like the CT did based on the strategy card at the guided reading table, I suggested that she identify each page of the book what she wants the student to do on that page: for example, identify the letter; sound out the letter; say the word; do the motion, and one thing she didn’t mention was how the CT was redirecting students (October 2018, lines 919-926).

I believe these two signature pedagogies provided an opportunity for the preservice teacher to gather data on the teaching behaviors her CT used during the group which informed her of steps to take when preparing to instruct this group of Kindergarten students. Then by having a Shared Conversation, she shared the data she collected and explained how she interrupted what teaching behaviors occurred in the group. Based on her sharing her thoughts, I was able to refer to the data I collected and share a specific example from the observation. The two signature pedagogies I
selected, Data Collection of Observation and Shared Conversations, provided an opportunity for the preservice teacher to learn potential teaching behaviors to implement in a small group.

Another example of intertwining different signature pedagogy to support student learning occurred in this next example where I used the signature pedagogies of Shared Conversations, Data Collection of Observations, and Focused Observations to support preservice teacher learning. As part of the Shared Conversation, “I asked her if there was something specific she would like me to gather data on and she mentioned that earlier in the week she and her CT realized she was calling on kids quickly after she posed the question” (Reflective Journal Field Notes, October 2018, lines 608-610). During her observation, the preservice teacher requested, I collected data on wait time and on what second grade students she called on during the lesson. “I told her that I would collect data on her wait time which meant how much time went by from the time she posed the question to students and are calling on a student to answer the question… and that she was also wondering about what students she was calling on (Reflective Journal Field Notes, October 2018, lines 610-612 & 614).

The preservice teacher was struggling with wait time and on which second grade students she called. She enlisted my support to observe her and gather data so she could gain a better understanding of how she implemented wait time in her teaching. Since this was a Focused Observation with Data Collection, I believed a Shared Conversation afterwards was needed because the conversation allowed me to understand how the preservice teacher perceived the data I collected. I believed implementing three of the four signature pedagogies created a space for the preservice teacher to learn how to implement wait time in her teaching.
A third example of intertwining pedagogies occurred when I used my knowledge of the preservice teacher’s exposure to math concepts and my supervisor relationship to combine the signature pedagogies of, In-the-Moment Coaching and Focused Observation.

I observed for a few minutes and then walked over and got a whiteboard and marker so that I could model for the preservice teacher how to support the students in determining the equation. I drew a line and then a + and then another line and = and another line. I asked the students to place the numbers from the word problem in the appropriate part of the equation and right away the preservice teacher realized she was asking them to add when she needed them to subtract. I told her it was okay this gives the students a chance to really try to understand what the word problem is asking them to do. I began placing the numbers in the equation based on what the students were asking, and the students quickly began to realize that the numbers were not in the correct place (Reflective Journal Field Notes, October 2018, lines 1028-1037).

During this focused observation, the preservice teacher was teaching a small math group. As I observed, I realized she was using the incorrect computation. I decided at that moment, I could not let the preservice teacher continue instruction using an incorrect method. My decision to use In-the-Moment Coaching is what I believed generated an opportunity for the preservice teacher to learn. I provided the preservice teacher a way to develop her understanding of how to model for her second grade students a strategy to use to solve the problem and at the same time the preservice teacher who was unsure of why the second grade students were not understanding the equation was shown how to teach the second grade students.

A final example of intertwining signature pedagogies to support preservice teacher learning included coupling In-the-Moment Coaching and Focused Observation. However, in this
Focused Observation, the preservice teacher and I observed the CT teach a small group of Kindergarten students. The preservice teacher approached me and commented that she struggled with the small group she led. The preservice teacher wondered if she could observe the CT teaching the small group so she would have a better idea of what to do when she taught. I suggested I could coach her through what her CT was doing with the small group while we observed the group together. I used In-the-Moment Coaching to explain to the preservice teacher, “One key decision the CT was making was the redirection to students and the group…the CT would verbally and visually restate to the student what they should be doing and then she would hold them accountable to those requests” (Reflective Journal Field Notes, October 2018, lines 676-677 & 669-671). I also used In-the-Moment coaching when I explained, “to the preservice teacher that the CT made an instructional decision that the task initially assigned was too difficult and therefore in that moment needed to readjust the task. The CT was able to readjust the task because she was familiar with whatever concepts aligned with the task, she was asking them to do” (Reflective Journal Field Notes, October 2018, lines 684-687).

The preservice teacher openly talked about not knowing how to adjust her teaching to support her Kindergartener’s learning. The small group of students were the same group the preservice teacher teaches when she’s in the clinical experience. Through the Focused Observation and In-the-Moment Coaching, we observed, and I pointed to teaching behaviors the CT used while teaching the small group. I believed that using the signature pedagogies In the Moment Coaching and Focused Observation presented an opportunity for the preservice teacher to observe how to lead her small group.

My beliefs influenced the signature pedagogies I selected because of my personal experiences as an educator. When I was teaching, I learned by having conversations with other
educators, focusing observations on specific teaching practices, collecting data during observations, and receiving coaching while teaching. I believe my personal experiences influenced my beliefs about how preservice teachers learn. Intertwining signature pedagogies can be an effective strategy for supporting preservice teacher learning. I believe preservice teachers learn when I vary the signature pedagogies I use when supervising.

**Theme 1.2: I believe preservice teachers learn by having time and space in class to grapple with course content, their experiences, and their beliefs.**

I believe preservice teachers learn when they have time to grapple with their beliefs and experienced tensions. In one of my espoused platforms, I wrote, “I believe this is an opportunity to support them during this time of dissonance. I believe dissonance is another way to learn” (Espoused platform, October 2018, lines 49-50). I believe as preservice teachers understand course content when they wrestle with their learning and beliefs.

To illustrate, in this first instance, preservice teachers shared comments about the readings. As they talked, I jotted down two of the preservice teachers thinking on teaching. I pointed out their statements were the beginnings of them exploring their beliefs.

The first note was that one of the preservice teachers started to form her beliefs, which were that she doesn’t like when teachers sit at their desk while students are working to catch up on busywork or paperwork, and the other one stated that she has realized the importance of oral and written directions. I pointed both of those things out and explained that they were starting to generate beliefs as it connected to what we were learning in the course (Reflective Journal Classroom Management Methods Course, September 2018, lines 685-690).

I wanted to keep the momentum of preservice teachers grappling with their beliefs, so I decided to do a simulation task in next week’s course. The simulation task was designed to surface
preservice teachers’ beliefs about K-5 students’ academic, behavioral, and emotional needs when arranging the physical environment of an elementary classroom.

There were students whose bias was revealed and at first, they apologized for it however the discussion led to us all having bias. Let’s recognize it and then grow ourselves as educators. Other conversations around the simulation included although at first they may not want a specific type of student in their classroom for whatever reason when it was time to give away students from their hypothetical class they stated that they found it difficult because all students need the opportunity to be taught. So, although they were struggling with some of their bias, they were also struggling with how to support students in the classrooms (Reflective Journal Classroom Management Methods Course, September 2018, lines 961-967)

The simulation task the preservice teachers were engaged in created cognitive dissonance because they were thinking more deeply about what they believed. I decided to extend the conversation, “We ended the topic by sitting on the carpet as a group and discussing challenges that they thought about when creating their arrangement. Some were based on behavior, academic ability, English and non-English speakers” (Reflective Journal Classroom Management Methods Course, September 2018, lines 1059-1061). I believe this task prompted discussions that might not have occurred otherwise. Therefore, I wanted to dedicate class time to foster the learning environment around productive discussions and allow preservice teachers time to grapple with their beliefs and experienced tensions. Through this dedicated time, I believe preservice teachers learn about their beliefs.

In addition to the whole group discussion, I also used small group discussion to allow preservice teachers time to grapple with their beliefs and experienced tensions. I placed
preservice teachers in small groups to write a script on how to line K-5 students up to go to lunch. I explained that they would need to think about their individual clinical context and what they learned in the course about the learning environment to write the script.

   The discussion the preservice teachers had in their individual groups prior to enacting the script provided an opportunity for them to think about what they’re observing in their clinical experience and how we can tie it back to the content in the course (Reflective Journal Classroom Management Methods Course, October 2018, lines 1273-1276).

The purpose of the small group task of writing a script on how to line K-5 students up to go to lunch was to have preservice teachers articulate their beliefs of lining students up. This routine of lining students up for lunch required preservice teachers to reflect on their beliefs about such routines consider, what they have observed in the clinical experience, and connect those beliefs and experiences to what they have read in course readings about the learning environments. By creating time and space during methods courses for the preservice teachers to grapple with their beliefs about the learning environment, I was able to support preservice teacher learning.

   In addition to facilitating conversations, I also supported preservice teachers in grappling with their beliefs and experienced tensions through independent tasks. Classroom management tasks are extensive, so I designed a graphic organizer to provide clarity for the preservice teachers. The preservice teachers wrote about their beliefs as they related to the course concepts.

   I want to give preservice teachers an opportunity to think through all I’ve written on the board in a way that makes the most sense to them. I will have construction paper and markers if they want to draw a graphic organizer, they create a graphic organizer in word, or create something in PowerPoint. Then as we continue to talk about the theorists, authority bases, and theories of teacher influences they can add to the organizer
I believe for preservice teachers to make sense of their beliefs and uncover possible reasons for their tensions I needed to embed independent tasks within my lessons to provide them time to grapple. The graphic organizer served as a mechanism for preservice teachers to explore their beliefs and experienced tensions. In fact, two preservice teachers came to me because they were having some tension with a few K-5 students in their small groups.

During the field experience, I observed and discussed with the two preservice teachers that they have an opportunity to think about which theorist they connect to and decide how they would implement expectations and their small groups. The K-5 students in both groups are very active and need redirection. As I know redirection is a cue that can be used to manage student behavior, I decided this would be an opportunity for the preservice teachers to focus on an authentic teacher behavior that is directly connected to content in the course. This will also provide the preservice teacher with an opportunity to enact their belief.

The graphic organizer task sparked the two preservice teachers to think about what they were learning in class. As we dug deeper into the course content, preservice teachers started making connections to specific K-5 students in their clinical experience. Then they experienced tensions about what they learned and how they would enact what they learned in the small group. I believe the graphic organizer prompted preservice teachers to think about what they were learning in the course and how it translated to the clinical experience.
Theme 1.3: I believe preservice teachers need to know that the concepts taught in the course are practical and should be applied in the clinical experience.

I believe preservice teachers need to know that the concepts taught in the course are practical and should be applied in the clinical experience. I enact this belief by modeling classroom management for preservice teachers as part of their experiences in my classroom management methods course. I began by modeling the use of manipulatives and distributing papers. These two examples are categorized within the course as learning materials. According to Clayton, Forton, and Lord (2001) learning materials support student learning. The first learning material I modeled was the use of manipulatives. I used Play-Doh as the manipulative. I brought into class several individual containers of Play-doh. The Play-doh was stored in a bin on a side table in the class to represent how manipulatives would be housed in an elementary classroom. I shared the preservice teachers were K-5 students, and that I was the classroom teacher, “We talked about using Play-Doh as an instructional strategy and the types of procedures you would need if you are using Play-Doh with K-5 students” (Reflective Journal Classroom Management Methods Course, September 2018, lines 1070-1071). I believe by using class time to model course concepts, having the preservice teacher discuss the course content, and shifting the thinking of the preservice teachers to discuss how they would explain using a manipulative in the K-5 classroom was a way for preservice teachers to learn.

In this second example, I modeled ways to distribute paper to K-5 students. I followed a similar process of using a manipulative but shared different options for distributing paper. I stored the paper in a specific area of the room, the preservice teachers were assuming the role of the K-5 student, and I was the classroom teacher.
I walked around and handed them all sheets of paper restating what they should be doing on a sheet of paper. I then turned it into what would this look like in a K-5 setting. And shared some different possibilities. For example, I could’ve passed the papers to each student in the circle and once they got the sheet of paper they then went back to their seats and started working. Another example would be I asked the student to pass out the sheet of paper while I was giving directions while the rest of the students were in the circle. I know we talked about this as procedures in a classroom and why procedures will be important in the clinical experience. This again relates to content will be talking about within the course (Reflective Journal Classroom Management Methods Course, August 2018, lines 165-173).

Again, I believe by using preservice teachers experience in my course instruction to model course concepts was a way for preservice teachers to learn. The preservice teachers thought about the ways to distribute paper while I demonstrated different options. They were given the opportunity to connect the class experience of distributing papers to the observation of distributing papers in the clinical experience. I believe structuring class in this manner helped preservice teachers learn.

In these next two examples, I use the course concepts of getting to know students and behavior management systems in my course instruction. When I taught the course content, getting to know students, I used a student survey the preservice teachers used in their clinical experience. I first gave the survey to the preservice teachers and asked them to complete the survey as my undergraduate students. I wanted the preservice teachers to complete the survey, as it was a way for me to learn about them as my students. I then used the survey in class to demonstrate how the survey could be used in K-5 classrooms.
I then shared the student survey from last week. The section on what they like to do on the weekends. We discussed how this could be written on a chart and displayed in the classroom to allow K-5 students opportunities to talk with one another about what they learned and have in common with their other classmates. I then shared about all the sports that were indicated from the student survey last week and mentioned how that could be incorporated into instruction as well as classroom library (Reflective Journal Classroom Management Methods Course, October 2018, lines 1858-1863).

By allowing preservice teachers to complete the survey as students, I learned about my preservice teachers and I provided time for them to think like a K-5 student. This demonstration prompted discussion about how to use the information gathered from the survey into the K-5 classroom as well as what should be on the survey. I designed course instruction on the concept of getting to know students so preservice teachers could have the experience of what it was like to take the survey and use that experience to discuss how the survey could be used in a K-5 classroom. I believe by using preservice teachers experiences in my course instruction to model course concepts they learn.

In this last course concept example, I modeled in class a behavior management system preservice teacher had experienced. During class, the preservice teachers were in collaborative groups working on a task as if they were K-5 students. As they worked on the task, I circulated and enacted the behavior management system as if I were an elementary teacher. After the collaborative task was complete, we met back together with the whole group and began discussing the implications of the behavior management system.

I selected one name from each group. I began to have a conversation about, How do you remember if you give a reminder? Is a reminder the same as a warning? Do you add
checks to the person’s name and/or remove checks from the person’s name? These are all decisions that would have to be made to implement the system. I then moved on to table points and there was one table that did lose points for using technology the way it shouldn’t be used. We discussed the potential for that to happen in a real K-5 classroom as the other students in the group may start to complain or yell at the other student for losing a table point. (Reflective Journal Classroom Management Methods Course, November 2018, lines 2153-2160).

By demonstrating the behavior management system in class, I invited conversation about this specific approach to classroom management, the decisions teachers need to enact this approach, and potential issues that may arise when using such a system. I believe the demonstration of the behavior management system took what preservice teachers read about in the course and observed in the clinical experience to allow them to learn about behavior management systems.

I believe preservice teachers need to know that the concepts taught in the course are practical and should be applied in the clinical experience. The course content is not separate from what they observe and implement in the clinical experience but an extension of one another.

When I design methods for course instruction, I model course concepts found in K-5 classrooms because that is how I believe preservice teachers learn.

**Research Question #2:**

What tensions do I experience as I teach coursework and supervise the same group of preservice teachers?

In the next two themes, I addressed what tensions I experienced as I taught coursework and supervised the same group of preservice teachers. The tensions I experienced as a course instructor and supervisor were different. When I taught coursework, I believed preservice
teachers should construct their learning, but I found myself dominating instruction time. And, when I supervised, my experienced tension stemmed from what feedback to provide preservice and collaborating teachers’ beliefs misaligned with my beliefs on preservice teacher preparedness.

**Theme 2.1: I experienced tensions when wanting preservice teachers to construct their learning, but I struggled to enact that belief in my teaching practice**

As a course instructor, I wanted preservice teachers to construct their learning. I believed that because I taught the same group of preservice teachers in their methods course and clinical experience that I knew what they needed to learn. These decisions were based on several factors. I brought my tacit knowledge of teaching elementary students, my personal practice knowledge of teaching the course for several semesters, and present moment knowledge of their clinical context. These factors contributed to the tensions I experienced as I taught coursework and supervised the same group of preservice teachers, which were unearthed from conversations with Critical Friend B, my espoused platforms, and my reflective journal about my classroom management methods course.

To illustrate, I asked Critical Friend B, “How do I use the content of the course to support preservice teachers when my beliefs don’t align? (August 2018, line 177). The first experienced tension surfaced when I started planning for the course at the beginning of the semester. Relying on the tacit, personal, and present moment knowledge, I planned accordingly. However, I discovered I ignored certain coursework and selected coursework that aligned with my beliefs.

I personally connected to the texts. I believe in the effectiveness of the theories and content. I was able to implement those as a classroom teacher, so I know that they are important to teach. However, I struggle even within those two texts as to what I should
cover in the course. An example- the authority bases. I struggle with trying to get preservice teachers to understand that you do need more than one (Critical Friend B, August 2018, lines 37-40 & 46-47).

I experienced tension in selecting content from the text to the context of the preservice teachers because I found my selections were based on my beliefs. When I planned coursework, I realized I impose my beliefs about teaching onto preservice teachers. Although this imposition is not necessarily a negative technique, it does not align with my belief about the need for preservice teachers to construct their learning, so I began to plan differently. As I planned for each week, I thought about the coursework and how to prepare it for preservice teachers. I wondered how long I should dedicate to a topic. This question was mentioned in a conversation with Critical Friend B, “How long on a topic? Why am I spending this much time on a topic? (December 2018, line 403).

When I planned, I kept in mind that I wanted preservice teachers to construct their learning. However, when it came time to discuss behavior management systems my first instinct was to share behavior management systems, I thought preservice teachers should learn. I stopped myself and began discussions with preservice teachers to inquire into what questions they had about behaviors management systems. In this first instance, the preservice teachers and I discussed one of the behavior management systems acquired from the clinical context. They asked me to lead the implementation of the rules laid out in the behavior management system. I struggled with this as a request because I didn’t believe in the behavior management system. So, this experienced tension arose because I wanted preservice teachers to construct their learning, they were asking to learn about this specific behavior management system and I didn’t want to teach it, but I decided to honor the request anyway.
The class chose to have me enforce the rules as last time when it was left up to them
didn’t follow the rules. This is difficult for me to enact since I did not agree with the
management system and/or rules, consequences and or rewards. (Reflective Journal

Although the enactment of the behavior management system evoked an experienced tension, I
felt it was important for the preservice teachers to observe the behavior management system and
construct their own learning. At that moment in the course, I planned for preservice teachers to
familiarize themselves with the behavior management system and connect it to course content.

In another instance, preservice teachers requested that we talk about parent-teacher
conferences, which is a key concept in the classroom management course and it is something
they experience in their clinical experiences, “As the preservice teachers were learning about the
parent-teacher conference they began to ask questions (Reflective Journal Classroom
Management Methods Course, October 2018, lines 1368-1369). At first the discussion related to
the course text, however before too long the conversation shifted.

The preservice teacher asked me a question about the personal experiences I had of
parent-teacher conferences and before I knew it, I was dominating the conversation. This
bothered me because I really wanted the preservice teachers to own the conversation and
allow me to just facilitate. The main reason I want to bring in the field and course
connection is, so preservice teachers can begin to internalize their beliefs and
understanding of the content (Reflective Journal Classroom Management Methods
Course, October 2018, lines 1369-1373).

This request surfaced an experienced tension as I realized I dominated the conversation. I wanted
the conversation to focus on what preservice teachers needed to learn about parent-teacher
conferences. Instead it became about me sharing stories. Again, I am not dismissing the benefit of preservice teachers learning from my personal experiences, but I did not afford them the opportunity to construct their learning around parent-teacher conferences. Instead, I dominated the conversation and lost the connection to course content. I noted, when it comes to connecting course content “It is important that I find a balance between listening and interjecting and not focus on the points I want to make but to listen to see if they make the points and I just restate” (Reflective Journal Classroom Management Methods Course, November 2018, lines 1982-1984). I worked on finding this balance throughout the semester. I wanted to step back and give preservice teachers a chance to explore the content and clinical context connected to their teaching to construct their learning. I reflected,

So, although they were struggling with some of their bias, they were also struggling with how to support students in the classrooms. There were even a few comments about how they had a better understanding of how and why their CTs have the arrangements in their classrooms that they now have because of this simulation. I will continue to have discussions throughout the semester about the lesson today. I held back on interjecting some of my personal thoughts because I wanted the preservice teachers to have time to process (Reflective Journal Classroom Management Methods Course, September 2018, lines 966-971).

I believe it is important for methods course instructors to acknowledge their experienced tensions and examine how they might impact preservice teachers’ construction of learning. In my Espoused Platform in December, I reflected upon my experienced tension.

Instructors need to be willing to adjust or remove course content to meet this need. I have learned adjusting or removing content creates tensions as a methods course instructor.
The tension stems from deciding on what content to adjust or remove. My personal experiences as a classroom teacher and several semesters of teaching the course are the factors that create the most tension. To negotiate these two factors, I base my decision on preservice teachers’ clinical context. I believe instructors need to be willing to negotiate these factors to support preservice teacher learning. Instructors also need to consider how to condense content to create opportunities to delve deeper into course concepts (lines 130-137).

After reflecting on my tension of not imposing my beliefs of teaching onto preservice teachers, I concluded I needed a balance of integrating course content, clinical experience, preservice teacher need, and my personal experiences. In fact, considering these factors are opportunities for my growth as a course instructor and preservice teachers’ growth on teaching beliefs.

**Theme 2.2: I experienced tensions on what feedback to provide when preservice and collaborating teachers’ beliefs misaligned with my beliefs on preservice teacher preparedness.**

As a supervisor, I decided on what feedback I provided to preservice teachers. The feedback was based on my beliefs of teaching elementary students, supervising for several years, and observing in the clinical context. This tension was unearthed from conversations with Critical Friend A, my espoused platform, and evidenced from my reflective journal field notes.

The conversations I had with Critical Friend A prompted my thinking about feedback “I do need to be sure I give preservice teachers feedback not always positive. It’s not like everything is fantastic, but I try to find a balance between positive and things they need to improve on” (September 2018, lines 148-150). As I thought about the balance of providing preservice teachers feedback on successes and areas of growth in their teaching a tension
emerged. This experienced tension revolved around the differing beliefs systems among the preservice teacher, collaborating teacher, and me when determining preservice teachers’ feedback on teaching preparedness. I defined teaching preparedness as: support provided to preservice teachers to prepare them in being ready for the teaching profession

To illustrate, I share about how an experienced tension arose when I observed a preservice teacher engaging K-5 students with a text that was above their independent reading level. The preservice teacher’s belief was the text was appropriate for the group of K-5 students. However, my belief was the text was not appropriate because the K-5 students needed continued support from the preservice teacher while reading.

I did feel a tension with the book selection of a DRA 18 because the two students would not be able to read and comprehend the text on their own. However, the text wasn’t so far off that it created huge frustration with the students. The preservice teacher also had a misconception that the level was fine for the two students as she commented they did well with the reading (Reflective Journal Field Notes, October 2018, lines 850-854).

Before I decided on feedback, I talked with the preservice teacher about the text selection. She informed me the collaborating teacher allowed her freedom in the text selection based on several options of leveled texts.

The preservice teacher then went on to tell me that this book was a level 10 and was way too easy so she asked the CT what other options were for books the CT told her to either pull from the 12 stack or the 18 stacks. She pulled from the 18 stacks because she figured the 12 would be too easy since it was close to 10 (Reflective Journal Field Notes, October 2018, lines 808-812).
In this moment, the preservice and collaborating teacher’s beliefs differed from my beliefs. I believed the preservice teacher should have received specific guidance in the text selection with a rationale of why the text was selected to be prepared to teach K-5 students. This difference in guidance from the collaborating teacher complicated the feedback I provided because she allowed the preservice teacher to select in my opinion an inappropriate text. I wanted the preservice teacher to know the text needed to match K-5 comprehension. I moved beyond the tension and reflected on what feedback to provide to the preservice teacher to not under-mine the collaborating teacher’s decision but also to ensure she improved her teaching behavior of selecting appropriate texts for K-5 students prior to the next lesson.

In another example, the preservice teacher and collaborating teacher’s belief system differed from mine in how to prepare the preservice teacher to teach a small guided reading group,

The preservice teacher and I were able to talk outside about the groups that she was pulling during guided reading time. She explained that the CT gave her a resource and told her she could select any passages from that source to use with your students (Reflective Journal Field Notes, October 2018, lines 1083-1085).

As I engaged in the conversation with the preservice teacher, I felt tension, which I reflected upon in my journal, “The decisions did not align with my beliefs as the preservice teacher seems to be making decisions unfounded in data but based on what she thinks” (Reflective Journal Field Notes, October 2018, lines 1092-1094). I was conflicted as the preservice teacher was not prepared to teach the lesson and was left to determine what K-5 students need without knowing the K-5 students. I reflected in my journal,
My decisions did create some tensions as I feel as though the preservice teacher is getting a false sense of security with her guided groups as far as what she is asking them to do and their output (Reflective Journal Field Notes, October 2018, lines 1096-1098). I felt the preservice teacher believed selecting any of the passages supported K-5 students’ needs. This selection process is not how I believe preservice teachers should be prepared to teach K-5 students. The collaborating teacher needed to select the text and explain the rationale for the passage to address the K-5 student’s needs.

Like the previous example, the collaborating teacher allowed the preservice teacher to determine what passage to use with K-5 students. However, I believed the collaborating teacher needed to discuss the passages and the skills used within the passages with the preservice teacher prior to the preservice teacher passage selection. I believed the preservice teacher needed to inquire about what skills were connected to each passage before selecting a passage. When I needed to provide feedback, I decided, “Until I’m able to observe the group in progress, I decided to just allow the preservice teacher to share” (Reflective Journal Field Notes, October 2018, lines 1098-1099). I felt I needed more information to make an informed decision, so I decided to observe the guided group prior to providing feedback.

In this third example, in a different preservice teacher’s clinical experience, a similar situation with the preservice and collaborating teacher’s beliefs systems differing from mine occurred around text selection and skills within the text for K-5 students.

She then shared with me some trade books and student work from two students she works with one-on-one. I asked her where the books came from as far as why these books were chosen to work with the students. She commented it was the books her CT gave her because they are on the students’ level. I then asked what skills she was working on and
she pulled out a pre-scripted sheet on skills that could be used along with the books

(Reflective Journal Field Notes, October 2019, lines 751-756).

The preservice teacher used a book and a skill unrelated to K-5 students’ needs. The preservice teacher assumed that the book and skill were a fit for the K-5 students. However, the skill did not meet the K-5 students' needs. Although I recognized the mismatch the preservice teacher had difficulty realizing the importance of the teaching behavior- aligning the book and skill, to K-5 students' needs. Therefore, our beliefs differed on the teaching behavior on how text selection and skills within the text are aligned. I noted in my journal,

The tension about the books and skills the preservice teacher is using with the two students was difficult for me to not state how the books and skills that were selected are more random and isolated as opposed to purposeful and building on the skills the students need (Reflective Journal Field Notes, October 2019, lines 761-763).

Again, I believe the preservice and collaborating teacher’s belief of how to plan and prepare for preservice teachers to work with K-5 students differed from my belief and created conflict for me on how to give feedback to not minimize the preservice and collaborating teacher’s teaching preparation.

As a university supervisor, I felt tension around differing belief systems among the preservice teacher, collaborating teacher, and myself when determining feedback to preservice teachers. After reflecting on how I provided feedback, “I reminded myself about how preservice teachers learn and combined that with understanding their beliefs about teaching, and the clinical context; I made more informed decisions that lessened my tensions” (Espoused Platform 3, December 2018, lines 155-157). I concluded my experienced tensions were reminders that differing beliefs may cause disruption in the feedback I wanted to provide but are ultimately
potential opportunities for my professional growth as I seek new ways to prepare preservice teachers.

**Research Question #3:**

**How do my beliefs and experienced tensions influence the decisions I make?**

In these next two themes, I address how my beliefs and experienced tensions influence the decisions I made. My beliefs and experienced tensions influenced the decisions I made in my dual role as a boundary-spanner, differently. As a classroom management course instructor, my beliefs of the course content influenced the content I selected which created tensions and influenced the decisions I made when I planned. As a university supervisor, my beliefs and experienced tensions influenced how I addressed preservice teacher readiness and developmental needs.

**Theme 3.1: My beliefs of the course content influenced the content I selected which created tensions and influenced the decisions I made when I planned.**

I found at the beginning of the semester all my planning decisions were based on what content I believed preservice teachers should be taught. To this point, I provided rationales in my discussions with critical friends on my decision-making during planning. In a discussion with Critical Friend B on my thoughts about my decision-making, I responded

I believe in the rationale behind theory to support practice and practice to support theory. I want preservice teachers to have a foundation to understand their beliefs and stop judgments and misconceptions preservice teachers have as they enter the field. In the course, we read content, use a protocol to understand the language, role play-act them out. If preservice teachers took this stance what would they be doing as the teacher and what the students think of the teacher in this stance. Do I use the content to determine
similarities and differences so they can choose this stance? So, what am I dedicating my time to in the course? It’s a struggle. (August 2018, lines 152-159).

I realized planning for the course was critical in attempting to provide preservice teachers with the course content I felt they needed to learn. I purposefully planned from week to week to adhere to this belief. When I observed or heard topics arise in the course and/or clinical experience, I wanted to address them. Then during a conversation with Critical Friend B, I commented,

I think when I select readings some of it has come from the judgments and misconceptions the preservice teachers have when they first enter the field. They say things like that teachers’ really mean, that she’s restricted, the teachers allow students to walk all over her, I would never let that happen. I can connect those phrases that there actually using to the content of the course you. And say that you may not agree with that but here is research and here’s theory that supports this as a strategy (August 2018, lines 69-74).

I noted in this conversation that I decided on course readings to bridge experiences with course content. I firmly believed the readings I chose during planning supported preservice teachers in grasping the course content and how it applied to clinical experiences and therefore, influenced the course content I selected.

From chapter 8 pages 204 to 211 on interventions for common behavior problems the purpose is to increase student self-control and decrease disruptions to the teaching and learning environment. I want to be sure preservice teachers understand that they need to look at their own teaching behaviors and how that could influence student behavior as well as the section is focused on common day-to-day behaviors which is different from
students who have chronic behaviors or highly disruptive behaviors. The overarching question which is essentially an essential question will be: what do teachers need to know and learn about students to understand why they misbehave? This will be the focus as we read through the proactive and remedial skills and fill out the graphic organizer. I believe preservice teachers need to learn how the content was discussed in the course all connected as opposed to separate readings that are talked about on one day and never tie together (Reflective Journal Classroom Management Methods Course, November 2018, lines 1938-1947).

I found throughout my planning my beliefs informed my instructional decision-making. I then determined if the decision I made about course content was pertinent to preservice teachers. I used my beliefs and decision-making to conclude curricular alignment.

A major part of the classroom management course is comparing and contrasting different management systems. In this next example, I decided to use a management system a preservice teacher observed and implemented in the clinical experience. I selected this management system because preservice teachers had numerous questions about the system. The decision to use this system in the course influenced my decision as to what course content I selected for the class.

Before we begin discussing chapter 2, I will share the management system which came from one of the teacher’s classrooms that one of our preservice teachers are in. This theory will be based on Alberts as we work cooperatively to construct the rules, expectations, rewards, and consequences. The first stage is ready to grow, raise the roots, sprouting growth, stem-tastic choices, perfect pedal, blooming behavior, way to grow, you got… Flower power, and flower (Reflective Journal Classroom Management Methods Course, October 2018, lines 1811-1815).
I decided on this chapter and behavior management system as it connected a topic in the course content with one of the preservice teacher’s clinical experiences. I believed incorporating a system a current collaborating teacher used demonstrated to preservice teachers how what they learned in the course translated to the clinical experience. The decision to use the management system from one of the classrooms and connect it to course content raised a tension as the management system did not align with my beliefs.

As the semester continued, I discovered my planning still focused first on my beliefs. Chapter 2 pages 25 to 31 and pages 34 to 38 which specifically focus on the nature of discipline problems. I specifically chose these sections in the chapter to read because they carry specific rationales of the nature of discipline problems. Although the other pages in the chapter are important, I believe preservice teachers need a way to start identifying behaviors they see in their clinical experience and potential reasons for why those behaviors occur. These chapters I believe will support them in making the connection. I do believe that I will need to use questioning and reflection time to allow them to really think about the students and their clinical experience and how these pages can help them understand why they are seeing some of the behaviors in the field that they see (Reflective Journal Classroom Management Methods Course, October 2018, lines 1610-1619).

Although the planning decisions I made aligned with my beliefs, there were incidents when the content and/or clinical experiences did not align with my beliefs. When this misalignment occurred, I experienced tensions in my planning.

The rest of the chapter explains how you’d actually set it up in your classroom and although this is important the reality is some field experience teachers that the students
are placed with will not have morning meeting in their classroom, some will, some have modified it, some will have pieces of it throughout the day and so I will share with them that they will then use this section at the beginning of their senior year fall semester where they have more opportunity to establish during preplanning how morning meeting will fit into the schedule and at that point they can read the remaining section. There’s also opportunity through other content in this course to talk about how to set rules, norms, manage the classroom, and manage student behavior during morning meetings (Reflective Journal Classroom Management Methods Course, August 2018, lines 91-99).

The tension happened when preservice teachers expressed to me that they had not observed this system in their clinical experience. To deal with that tension, I decided to share with preservice teachers how to adapt the system. When planning afterwards, I considered what teaching behaviors preservice teachers may or may not experience in the clinical experience. This consideration led me to intentionally plan tasks within the course to align with course content.

During the whole group discussion, I shared one example and allowed the preservice teacher to explore the conversation. At this point, I explained that they would stay in their groups and begin discussion on the three theories of teacher influence that they could then add to their graphic organizer. I allow them to stay in their groups to discuss the three theories of teacher influences because these are not as complex as the theorists and authority bases, so I felt as though that the discussion would not need as much reflection. I did not collect the graphic organizers because I did not want the preservice teachers thinking there was a right or wrong way to align the concepts we were talking about. My purpose was to really get them thinking holistically about how the authority bases, theorists, and theories of teacher influence are all interchangeable based on the K5
I felt it was essential that the preservice teachers had time to unpack the content through discussion, add the content to the graphic organizer, and align the content to make personal connections to K-5 students from their clinical experience. In this task, the preservice teachers were reflecting on their beliefs and clinical experience.

As noted in this theme, my beliefs of the course content influenced the content I selected which created tensions and influenced the decisions I made when I planned. I learned the importance of using my beliefs as a stepping-stone into how I plan for course content. I also learned that relying solely on one’s beliefs has the potential to overlook relevant course content and welcoming experienced tensions has the potential to think differently about course content while leading to decision-making that may otherwise have been missed.

**Theme 3.2: My beliefs and experienced tensions influenced how I addressed preservice teachers’ readiness and developmental need through course and clinical experience connections.**

I had an opportunity to create powerful learning environments for my preservice teachers to connect course content and clinical experiences because I taught and supervised the same students. This opportunity to create powerful learning environments was deeply rooted in my experiences as an undergraduate student and it was an impetus for my practice as a teacher educator to support preservice teacher learning. I noted in one of my autobiographical accounts my personal experience as an undergrad, I wrote,

As I started my undergraduate education at a major southern university, my desire to teach remained but I struggled because my coursework and internships were not heavily
linked. I learned content and theory through scenarios, readings, lectures, and case studies. There was no communication between the university and the elementary school where I conducted my internships. In fact, I was only assigned a university supervisor during my final internship (August 2018, lines 29-33).

Since I was left to decipher course content while in clinical experience as an undergraduate, I struggled. Thus, I wanted to ensure that my preservice teachers had a different experience in their teacher preparation program. As a boundary-spanner, this desire was finally a reality. I often wonder if my undergraduate experience was based on my readiness and developmental needs and how I would have connected those experiences to course content and in my clinical experience.

Even though I wanted to address preservice teachers’ readiness and developmental needs, I was unsure of how I was accomplishing that goal. As the semester moved forward, the preservice teachers gained understanding of course content and had more teaching opportunities in the clinical experience. The preservice teachers began articulating wonderings they had around experiences in the field as well as in the course content. When preservice teachers began asking about theory and clinical experience connections my lens as a boundary-spanner widened. I reflected on how I could support preservice teacher learning in a new way. I explored how I adjusted my support to meet the readiness and developmental needs of preservice teachers. In this example, the preservice teacher initiated the theory and practice connection.

Then she asked me a question about transitions. Specifically, as it pertained to the transition observation tool for the classroom management methods course. She was unsure of what the transition looks like or what it was. So, I gave her some examples of how the teacher transitions from content to content meaning that she verbally tell students
what they need to do such as okay now get out your math books, using the board and writing directions like if you are in group 1 go to the carpet group two go to the side table. Also, it could be transitions from the carpet in the classroom back to student desks. As well as lining up and transitioning to specials, assembly, lunch. I asked her to remind me to explain this in class on Tuesday in case there were others that had misconceptions or questions about what transitions are or could be considered a transition (Reflective Journal Field Notes, September 2018, lines 299-309).

The preservice teacher tried to apply the course concept of transitions to what transitions would look like in the clinical experience. In this case, the preservice teacher identified her need and was ready to connect theory and practice. I supported her by providing different times and examples relevant to her clinical experience of when transitioning K-5 students could take place.

As the readiness of the preservice teachers emerged, I adapted my support. In this next example, the preservice teacher enacted course content by leading a lesson in her clinical experience.

She began to explain how she led part of the morning meeting this morning and used one of the activities from the classroom management methods course that we use during the greeting. I asked her what the experience was like and she replied that right away she knew she needed to explain in more detail to the students about what she wanted them to do. I asked her what she meant, and she said that once she started tossing the ball all the students were yelling out at one time to be next. So I asked her what she thought she could do the next time she did a greeting and she said that she would be more clear and I supported that by saying even if she needed to write it on a sheet of paper so that she had it to refer to if one of the students didn’t follow the direction she gave. I told her that like
in the classroom management course we talk about procedures and how procedures if not set in place properly can impede instruction. She commented that she learned firsthand how that could happen. She then commented that she would probably use the rules that the CT already had in place and remind them of that the next time she did the morning meeting. She then went on to say that she uses an attention getter and was surprised that the students responded so quickly to her. I asked her which attention getter she used she told me she replied class, class, class and the students replied yes, yes, yes because that’s what her CT uses. (Reflective Journal Field Notes, September 2018, lines 238-255).

The preservice teacher articulated what course content she applied in her lesson. Because she articulated the course content to me, I realized I didn’t need to connect the course content to her clinical experience for her. She was ready to make connections to theory and practice on her own. Instead I realized she was developmentally ready to extend her learning, so I elicited her thinking on how she used her knowledge in the lesson.

As I worked with preservice teachers, I reminded myself to address their individual readiness and developmental needs. In this next entry, the preservice teacher was conflicted about a course concept and how it applied to the clinical experience.

She continued to say that she’s noticed that the rules are the same in the classroom as they are in the media center and that she has not identified any of the other areas within the school where the rules are posted yet. She said that she found it interesting as talking with other preservice teachers from different schools they are finding differences. I told her if she had any questions about the routines to please be sure to let me know that we will be talking about them in class and connecting them to content so that she will be able
to start to identify her beliefs on managing classrooms (Reflective Journal Field Notes, September 2018, lines 89-92; 95-97).

After this interaction, I realized the preservice teacher had identified a course concept—which is rules. She struggled with understanding how this concept that’s prevalent in every clinical experience varied across schools. The struggle the preservice teacher shared demonstrated her readiness to delve deeper into the course concept, rules. To address this preservice teachers wondering about rules, I planned to devote time during the next classroom management course to allow her to share what she learned about rules in her clinical experience. I addressed her need in this way because I felt she had not developed enough knowledge on rules and sharing in class opens further discussion on rules.

As I began addressing preservice teachers’ readiness and developmental needs, I realized the varying levels of how preservice teachers conceptualize course content and enact the content in the clinical experience. In this next example, the preservice teacher approached me about a struggle she was having with a K-5 student’s behavior.

We discussed how this connects to the management course in getting to know your students and what motivates them. This could be a way to motivate the second-grade student by working out something that connects with his older brother. In addition, we talked about how to motivate the student to answer questions during class time. He currently gets really frustrated and does not participate because he is unsure of the answers. I suggested one way to motivate him which again what we are talking about in the course is to share a specific question with him prior to instruction to set him up for success. The preservice teacher commented that this would probably help because he doesn’t feel as though he belongs in the class. Which brings up another point of sense of
belonging that we have talked about in the management course as well (Reflective Journal Field Notes, October 2018, 1208-1217).

The preservice teacher recognized a behavioral need in a K-5 student and sought advice as to how to assist the K-5 student in the clinical experience. As the preservice teacher described the K-5 student’s behavioral concern, I realized she had developed an understanding of the course concepts on addressing student’s behaviors. I felt I should address the course and clinical experience connection by providing suggestions to use with the K-5 student based on course theory and her clinical context.

Additionally, in this last example, I recognized readiness and developmental needs are not always about delivering content in the clinical experience. For instance, the preservice teacher was ready to support a K-5 student in the clinical experience but was unsure of how to guide the student emotionally.

The preservice teacher began to explain how she felt bad for one of the students because she only earned a 6% on the test. She was wondering how and what type of conversation she should have with the student. Because I do not know the history of the K-5 student, I recommended she go back into the course text where we talked about motivation and reread the section on self-esteem (Reflective Journal Field Notes, November 2018, 1535-1539).

The preservice teacher was concerned about one of her K-5 students but was unsure how to go about addressing the concern. She demonstrated a readiness of recognizing a concern in the clinical experience. I saw this opportunity to address course and clinical experience connections to support her learning by referring her to the course content and gaining deeper knowledge on how to support K-5 student emotional state.
When preservice teachers approached me with a struggle, wondering, or concern, I realized I had a chance to support their learning based on their needs. This realization led to a shift in how I supported preservice teachers learning. I adjusted my support based on preservice teacher readiness and developmental needs. Addressing preservice teachers’ readiness and developmental needs led me to rethink how I could continue to support preservice teachers.

**Research question #4:**

How do I support preservice teachers learning in my dual role of classroom management course instructor and university supervisor?

In this last theme, I discovered how I supported preservice teacher learning in my dual role of classroom management methods instructor and university supervisor. When in the clinical context, I needed to explore how I supported preservice teachers. I recognized I supported preservice teachers in the clinical context by using specific techniques.

**Theme 4.1: I processed what I observed in the clinical context and what I knew about course content before determining what technique to use to support the preservice teacher**

The techniques I used in the clinical experience to support preservice teacher learning are: (1) clarifying, (2) observing, (3) listening, and/or (4) inquiring. By taking some time to process what was occurring in the classroom, I was able to determine what techniques I needed to use to support preservice teachers. For instance, “The student had their back to me, but I was facing the preservice teacher. I took a few minutes to observe the interaction between the preservice teacher and student and realized that the preservice teacher was assessing the student on positional words” (Reflective Journal Field Notes, September 2018, lines 50-52). Through observation, I noticed the preservice teacher assessing the K-5 student. Therefore, I decided to not approach the preservice teacher and the K-5 student so as to not impede K-5 learning. I have
learned when I enter a K-5 classroom, I should scan the clinical context and take note of what is occurring prior to implementing any techniques. When I allowed myself this process, I thought as a boundary-spanner. As a boundary-spanner, I wanted to think about the course content and the clinical experience before determining how to support the learning of the preservice teacher while not impeding K-5 student instruction. This scanning process also allowed time for me to consider whether I needed to use another technique (clarifying, listening, and/or inquiring).

Moreover, this scanning process afforded me time to internalize what I observed in the K-5 setting. In this example, the preservice teacher was working with a small math group of students. I was aware the preservice teacher had not had her math methods course, so I listened to learn what math concepts she was working on with the group.

The preservice teacher was working with a group of three students on math. They were using manipulatives to construct polygons. The preservice teacher had pictures of the polygons the K-5 student was to create and had snap line segments to create the shapes. As I listened to the preservice teacher, I realized she did not have the math language to support her explanation to the K-5 student on what they should be attempting to produce. The math language I talked with her about was vertices, line segment, rectangle, triangle, square, hexagon, and rhombus. Then I shared with her a way to collect data on the students within her group to determine the number of sides and vertices of the individual shapes (Reflective Journal Field Notes, November 2018, lines 1360-1368).

Because I did not always know what the preservice teacher would be engaged in when I entered the clinical context, I learned to scan the learning environment first. This made me aware of how and when to support preservice teacher learning. Before any action, I inquired,
I asked her if she talked to the CT about how she selected the specific activities and she said that she just knew it was based on the assessment the CT gave. I told her that this is what we call differentiation. Where we’re using student assessment whether it’s formal or informal to make decisions on what the K-5 student needs (Reflective Journal Field Notes, September 2018, lines 219-223).

In this interaction with the preservice teacher, we had a quick exchange which allowed me to decide how to support her learning. Once aware of the preservice teacher’s role, I decided to name and define a teaching behavior. At this point the preservice teacher had not been in her instructional planning course and hadn’t learned the terms but since she was observing the authentic behavior, I named and defined it.

As the semester moved forward, my involvement in the clinical context increased to two-three times a week. Through this increase, I became more aware of the preservice teacher’s clinical context, and therefore, my involvement of support increased.

Before taking my notebook out to begin taking notes, I listened to the preservice teacher and the K-5 students to gain an understanding of what the focus of the lesson was. The K-5 students were supposed to determine if the shapes were two-dimensional or three-dimensional. The preservice teacher did have three-dimensional manipulatives but did not have two-dimensional manipulatives. I took an index card from my bag and drew two-dimensional shapes on individual cards and handed them to the preservice teacher. This allowed the preservice teacher to continue her instruction without interruption and the K-5 students were beginning to understand the differences (Reflective Journal Field Notes, November 2018, lines 1403-1410).
As I was observing and listening to the conversation between the preservice teacher and K-5 students, I decided to actively participate in the lesson by supporting the preservice teacher’s instructional delivery. I made this decision because I had established myself with the clinical context and the preservice teacher was also more comfortable with me adjusting to how I supported her learning.

My involvement continued to evolve as the preservice teacher, and I observed a collaborating teacher teach a guided reading group. We each collected our own data and discussed afterwards what we collected.

After the lesson was over I allowed the preservice teacher to start first with her observations and she stated that she liked how the CT used the strategy of looking at things through an eagle I, she noticed that the CT did different tasks depending on the student, and she noticed the CT asked questions. I told her that I had similar observations and a few additional ones. I suggested that she identify a strategy like the CT did based on the strategy card at the guided reading table, I suggested that she identify each page of the book what she wants the student to do on that page: for example, identify the letter; sound out the letter; say the word; do the motion, and one thing she didn’t mention was how the CT was redirecting students. We talked about how this would connect back to the theorists in the classroom did she want to create the norms, have students create the norms, collaboratively create the norms of the group and then how would she or would she correct students if they did not follow the norms (Reflective Journal Field Notes, October 2018, lines 918-929).

This observation provided me insight into the preservice teacher’s thinking about what she observed her collaborating teacher teach and her understanding of what she observed. Once I had
inquired into her thinking, I decided to clarify the reading strategies and redirecting technique the collaborating teacher used and connect those strategies back to course content.

There are times, I entered the clinical context and the preservice teacher was wrapping up an interaction with a K-5 student. When this occurred, I inquired about the K-5 interaction.

At that point I sat down, asked the preservice teacher what she was doing, and she explained she was giving an assessment. I asked her what she thought she could learn about the student from this assessment. She said to determine what the students knew about each word. At that point I addressed how she should use the words that were written on the assessment and her explanation of what the words meant to keep the language consistent between what she was asking the student to do and describing the words. (Reflective Journal Field Notes, September 2018, lines 60-65).

During the conversation, I gathered enough information to decide how to support the preservice teacher. I inquired, listened, and clarified to support her learning.

However, there were times when I was in the clinical experience, I was unsure initially of how to support preservice teachers. During those times I observed longer before deciding on if I listened, clarified, or inquired about what I observed in order to know how to support the preservice teacher.

I then observed and listened to what the preservice teacher was working on with the four students. I noticed she was reading out of a resource book that was scripted. The K-5 students were writing on whiteboards what the preservice teacher was saying to them. I continued to listen and observe (Reflective Journal Field Notes, October 2018, lines 1231-1234).
During this observation, the preservice teacher was teaching from a script. The script was given to her a few minutes before she was asked to teach the concept. The preservice teacher was familiar with the text the script was in because she used the text in one of her courses. There were many teaching behaviors I wanted to address but was hesitant because the preservice teacher did not have time to prepare for this lesson. Therefore, I continued to listen and observe longer than I typically would when supporting a preservice teacher.

There are other times, I hesitated to give support even though I had asked for clarification or inquired into their thinking because I didn’t have a clear idea of what the preservice teacher was doing. I didn’t want to provide support that wouldn’t lend to preservice teacher learning.

The preservice teacher and I began to discuss the contents they were working on in group. She explained that they’re working on comprehending the word problems prior to solving them. She commented that she is using visuals to try to help them understand the word problems. Because I didn’t see a lot of the group, I didn’t know what visuals she was referring to and she had written them on the whiteboard, so they were no longer there. So instead of questioning further I told her I would come in again to observe her on the visuals, so I could get a better understanding on how to support her (Reflective Journal Field Notes, October 2018, lines 993-999).

I realized I needed different techniques to support preservice teacher learning. When I asked preservice teachers for clarification, listened, observed, and/or inquired into their context, I made an informed decision of how to support preservice teacher learning.

Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to report my findings, which revealed the beliefs, tensions, and decision-making I had as a boundary-spanner. I discovered that I used these
practices when studying my beliefs: coupling four specific signature pedagogies, having time to grapple with course content, experiences, and beliefs, and knowing course concepts are practical to apply in the clinical experience. I found my beliefs have influential impacts on my decisions and actions which led me to examine my experienced tensions. I found my beliefs created tensions within my actions. When these experienced tensions arose, I acknowledged them by listening to preservice teacher requests, adjusting my practice, and applying what I knew about the preservice teacher and their clinical context to inform my decisions. I then explored how my experienced tensions and beliefs influenced the decisions I made. I found I factored into my decisions what I knew about my beliefs of course content, the clinical context, and the readiness and developmental needs of the preservice teacher and adjusted my practice. Finally, I engaged in four techniques to provide targeted support to preservice teachers. In the next chapter, I discuss and imply what the findings of this self-study might mean for my future practice and other boundary-spanners and teacher educators. I also identify future research that is needed.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION AND INPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

In this self-study, I examined my role as a methods course instructor and university supervisor. I hoped to explore and improve my practice as a boundary-spanner while studying my beliefs about how preservice teachers learn, tensions I experienced, decisions I made, and how I supported preservice teacher learning. The research questions that guided my study included: (1) What are my beliefs about how preservice teachers learn? (2) What tensions do I experience as I teach coursework and supervise the same group of preservice teachers? (3) How do my beliefs and experienced tensions influence the decisions I make? and (4) How do I support preservice teachers in my dual role of classroom management course instructor and university supervisor? I uncovered while studying my beliefs on preservice teachers’ learning that beliefs have an influential impact on the decisions and actions I made as a boundary-spanner. Throughout the process of studying my beliefs, I unearthed my experienced tensions which forced me to rethink my decisions and actions. My knowledge of teaching preservice teachers in methods courses and through supervision surfaced as I wrestled with my decision-making and implementation of my practices as a methods course instructor and supervisor.

In this chapter, I address how self-study influenced my practice. Specifically, I describe how engaging in self-study made me more aware and meta-cognitive about my practice as a supervisor and as a methods course instructor. I also discuss how engaging in self-study was a powerful vehicle for supporting my professional learning and development. After that, I share how my unique dual role of being a boundary-spanner enabled me to make valuable connections.
between the clinical context and my methods course. Finally, I share how listening to preservice teachers influenced how my instruction so that I could support their learning. I conclude this chapter with implications and limitations of my study. I stress the importance of studying one’s beliefs and the importance of professional learning and faculty development. Additionally, I state how teacher preparation programs should consider boundary-spanning roles as a priority to meet preservice teachers’ needs through understanding the clinical context, creating authentic experiences, and bridging theory and practice connections. Lastly, I share how the dual role of university supervisor and methods course instructor influences the third space. Then, I discuss concluding thoughts for my practice as a boundary-spanner as well as for teacher educators, and future research in the area of teacher educator preparation programs and ongoing learning. Finally, I share limitations of my study.

**Discussion**

The foundation of my self-study is built upon my willingness to be transparent about my beliefs. Throughout my educational career, I thought my beliefs about how preservice teachers learn were evident in my practice. However, it wasn’t until I studied my beliefs, that I could truly articulate them and determine how I implemented them in my practice. Aquirree and Speer (2000) suggest beliefs are usually connected to how teachers think about teaching and learning. Based on this suggestion, I relied on my teaching and learning experiences to form my beliefs. I found this suggestion to be true as I combed through my concepts of practice (e.g. tacit, personal practice, and present moment knowledge) and began to unearth my beliefs. The process of combing through my concepts of practice added a level of trustworthiness to my self-study by making my beliefs transparent to others as well as myself by processing my beliefs and experienced tensions (Berry, 2008; Craig, 2009; & Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). The unveiling
of my concepts of practice aligned with LaBoskey’s (2004) first characteristic of self-study: self-initiated and focused to gain a better understanding and improve practice by engaging in self-analysis and transformation. I continue my discussion with my concepts of practice woven into how I improve my awareness and metacognitive practice, support my professional learning and development, and connect methods coursework with clinical practices through listening to preservice teachers.

**Improving My Awareness and Metacognition about Practice**

Engaging in self-study made me more aware of my beliefs and their influence on my practice. Self-study made me more metacognitive about practice as a teacher educator. Through self-initiation and focus, I became aware of my beliefs and experienced tensions, which influenced my decisions and actions. I realized I made decisions and enacted those decisions because of my beliefs. LaBoskey (2004) emphasized the improvement-aimed characteristic of self-study to specifically address my decisions and actions. I addressed improving my practice by engaging in weekly reflection as a methods course instructor and university supervisor. During my reflection, I started with drawing upon my concepts of practice. I used my tacit knowledge of my years as a classroom teacher, my personal practical knowledge of my doctoral studies and research, and my present moment knowledge of years of experience as a boundary-spanner, and I learned about my beliefs. Evans (2013) suggested “a belief is a proposition of content accepted as true by the individual holding it” (p. 897). Left unstudied, Evans (2013) suggestion of accepting one’s beliefs as true can limit decisions and actions. Subsequently, Bautista, Schussler, and Rybczynski (2014) state, “instructors beliefs’ about teaching and learning can have a large impact on their teaching practices” (p. 52) and “teachers’ beliefs greatly influence instructors’ teaching methods,” (Wang, 2019, p.14) while “those who supervise clinical experiences can
make a number of important contributions to preservice teacher education” (Levine, 2011 p. 930). I learned throughout this self-study to focus on my beliefs as a methods course instructor and university supervisor to discover how they might impact my teaching practices prior to making instructional decisions. DeGraff, Schmidt, and Waddell (2015) argued “that teacher education should place more emphasis on key teaching practices.” Consequently, they found “little consensus exists about which teaching practices to emphasize and how to engage preservice teachers in learning those practices” (p. 367). Therefore, I needed to continue studying my teaching practices as a methods course instructor and university supervisor.

I determined I needed to note my beliefs first and then decide on my actions. Uncovering my belief created a tension and left me vulnerable as I decided on my next action. However, the tension created an opportunity to explore the tension further. My tension stemmed from a misalignment of my beliefs and how I supported preservice teachers in the methods course and clinical experience around teaching practices. When I made these changes, I felt it was important to be strategic in selecting teaching practices that were supported within the course content and clinical experience. Thompson and Emmer (2019) agreed, “creating enactment context that closely mirrors authentic classroom settings” are important for preservice teachers (p. 314). This meant I needed to consider what I knew about the preservice teachers’ clinical context to support course concepts. I reminded myself to stay aware of my beliefs when making my instructional decisions. The teaching practices I selected represented the needs of the preservice teacher, even if their needs were counter to my beliefs.

I discovered my beliefs as university supervisor and methods course instructor to ensure I met the readiness and developmental needs of preservice teachers. This connection is supported in Chen, et al. (2017) work when they stated how essential it is to identify gaps between what
preservice teachers learn in coursework and what they experience in clinical experience. I believe in order to identify the gaps in coursework and clinical experience, teacher educator’s first need to identify their beliefs of how preservice teachers learn. DeGraff et al. (2015) believed there should be a balance between theory and practice when developing preservice teachers’ professional knowledge. When exploring beliefs, I believe it is important to consider beliefs from the lens of a methods course instructor and university supervisor even if the discovery leads to tension. Part of studying one’s self means showing vulnerability (Berry, 2008 & Galman, 2009). When one examines their beliefs through self-study the opportunity of improving one’s practice or at least improved insight into one’s practices can occur (Berry, 2008). I believe it is important for teacher educators to consider studying their beliefs to meet the readiness and developmental needs of preservice teachers. Since the literature states that beliefs influence practice, I was able to have more awareness about how my beliefs were influencing my instructional decisions instead of blindly acting because I intentionally made my tacit beliefs transparent. Engaging in self-study enabled me to be more aware and metacognitive about my instructional decision-making to support preservice teacher learning. It meant that I could make more informed decisions about preservice teacher readiness to support their learning.

**Supporting My Professional Learning and Development.**

Engaging in self-study is a powerful vehicle for supporting my own professional learning and development. As a classroom teacher, I engaged in professional inservice workshops and collaborative and self-studies to inform my classroom practice. As a doctoral student and candidate, I engaged in professional learning communities, supervisor professional learning, collaborative research and self-study to inform by practice as a methods course instructor and university supervisor. A common practice in my professional learning and development centered
in self-study to inform my practice. My motivation to self-initiate is embedded in my practice, yet I believe I have more to learn. To my point of self-initiation, not all teacher educators share my stance on self-study to engage in professional learning and development. Therefore, when teacher educators are not engaged in self-study they need to engage in some type of professional learning and development because there is an expectation that as a supervisor and/or methods course instructor one has acquired the skills and disposition needed to support preservice teacher learning. Studies show there are ways in which supervisors and methods course instructors are prepared to support preservice teacher readiness and developmental need although there tends to be a level of focus on development for preservice teacher preparation with their development. For instance, Gravett and Ramsaroop (2015) studied how training schools (or practice schools) are used with their stakeholders to develop their learning while professional development schools (NAPDS, 2008) are a staple in demonstrating how professional development is a priority for all stakeholders. Professional Development Schools place an emphasis on professional learning. Burns and Badiali’s (2019) work shared that “powerful and transformative professional learning can occur through hybrid roles in PDSs” (p.16). The types of professional learning and faculty development vary based on the institution.

As a methods course instructor, I initially relied on my concepts of practice to develop my course: my tacit knowledge of my undergraduate experiences, my personal practical knowledge of classroom teaching, and my present moment knowledge of course content. However, the self-study is how I improved my practice through faculty development. According to Adams (2009) promoting self-awareness through inquiry-based faculty development is used to improve university teaching. I engaged in collaborative inquiry while in my boundary-spanning role at my institution. The inquiry informed my practice as a methods course instruction;
however, the focus was more on assignments and course content selection rather than changing my instructional decisions for supporting preservice teachers. The inquiry with my university colleagues lacked the focus on my instructional decisions as a course instructor. Brendel and Cornett-Murtada (2019) suggested faculty development on team-based seminars focused on bringing mindfulness practices to their teaching to promote self-awareness is beneficial. I found bringing mindfulness into my practice through self-study brought self-awareness to my practice and benefited my instructional decisions.

Course instructors could engage in self-study to enhance faculty development. Without self-study, I would be left to discern how to improve my teaching even with faculty development. For instance, Cavanna, Drake, and Pak (2017) recommended, “methods instructors move teacher candidates from more distal examples of practice, with more scaffolds, to more proximal examples of practice, dropping the scaffolds as they progress” (p. 811). This recommendation leaves potential missed opportunities if the course instructors do not consider how they need to adjust their practice to support preservice teacher learning. I learned from my faculty development that universal recommendations like Carvanna, et al. (2017) targeted only the surface of meeting the needs of preservice teacher learning. I recognized substantial change in my practice when I studied my instructional decisions as a methods course instructor. Wood and Turner (2016) suggested, “the methods class is primarily about preservice teachers learning, what preservice teachers learn and how they learn are necessarily limited by the context of the methods course” (p. 43). I believe that when universal faculty development is delivered the context of the individual methods courses is lost. Engaging in self-study is how I focused on the context to create a broader understanding of the preservice teachers. As I learned about my practice, I had similar accounts to Jao (2017) as she recalled, “As the course instructor, further
introspection into my own teaching practices is necessary to ensure that I am adequately supporting preservice teachers’ learning” (p. 908). Thus, engaging in self-study was a powerful professional learning experience for me to assist me with supporting preservice teacher readiness and development.

Professional learning for supervisors also varies from institution to institution. According to Boyan (1974), supervisors are trained by university faculty to understand activities such as observing, analyzing, prescribing, counseling, acknowledging their judgments, and identifying behaviors. However, without studying one’s beliefs around these activities, tensions arise, and frustration occurs. I believe it is not only about the professional learning but the professional learning around beliefs needs to come first. Unlike Keiser, Kincard, and Servais (2011) they built upon Boyan (1974) activities and recommend training supervisors of expectations, observation tools, addressing problems and using technology. Again, the activities lead supervisors to a path of experienced tensions as they have not studied their beliefs.

However, Macfadyen, et al., (2019) advocated for an online and group approach for supervision development which promoted supervisors to collaborate. Richards and Fletcher (2019) also promoted self-study of teacher education to enhance professional learning. I agree self-study promotes professional learning. Especially since Levine (2011) suggested supervisors often rely “on their own memories of being supervised when they were a teacher candidate” as well as “relevant experience teaching students” (p. 931) when supervising teacher candidates. I found this to be true for me which is why I studied how I supported preservice teachers.

In my self-study, I discovered that I intertwined four signature pedagogies to support preservice teacher learning. I acquired these pedagogies through my tacit knowledge of previously enacting the pedagogies while I supervised, my personal practical knowledge of
hosting preservice teachers as a collaborating teacher and my present moment knowledge as a university supervisor and doctoral student. Throughout the exploration of my beliefs, I began to experience tensions. Levine (2011) stipulated that typically, core practices of teaching and supervision are handled alone but, I acknowledged and examined these tensions. I acknowledged my beliefs were disrupting my practice as a boundary-spanner and recalled a phase from Kuriloff, Jordan, Sutherland, and Ponnock (2019) work. They noted preservice teachers should, “experience coherence and integration between their coursework and fieldwork” (p. 55). I hold this as truth for my own practice as I should experience coherence and integration between my beliefs and actions. Wood and Turner (2015) referred to this as “the powerful intersection of the unique assets of methods and the field” (p. 29). After initially relying on my concepts of practice, I shifted my thinking around preservice teacher context. As a result, I began reframing my practice. Murray and Male (2005) refer to this as the substantial self. They asserted that “this reframing occurs in part because the socialization process is not passive but active, with each educator creating and recreating their personal and communal understandings of their roles as teachers of teachers” (p. 135). The self-study generated a sense of newness in my professional learning and faculty development. Moving forward, I plan to continue to engage in self-study to support my own professional learning in order to promote preservice teacher learning in the clinical context and in methods courses.

**Connecting Methods Coursework with Clinical Experiences**

Throughout my self-study, I realized that my boundary-spanning role uniquely positioned me to make powerful connections between methods course content and the preservice teacher’s clinical experiences. Teacher educators can have a pivotal role in preparing preservice teachers. A university supervisor and methods course instructor are just two teacher educators whose roles
are intended to prepare preservice teachers. As a boundary-spanner, my intent was to always make informed decisions on how to prepare preservice teachers in both spaces to the best of my ability while acknowledging and exploring my experienced tensions. It was not until I studied my practice that I realized my experienced tensions. Without proper consider for how my experienced tensions impacted how I supervised and taught preservice teachers the repercussions could be a prescription for missed opportunities.

As a boundary-spanner, regardless of the space I happen to be in with preservice teachers, I learned to ask myself ‘how can I use what I know about the clinical context and coursework to support their learning’. In this boundary-spanning role, I sometimes think like a university supervisor first and then a methods course instructor or vice versa which is why I think this dual role (although usually thought of as separate) needs to be studied.

Meuwissen (2005) suggested,

Thus it is important that teacher educators seek to illuminate the connections between purpose and practice and push their students to conceptualize curriculum development and instruction as a process of acting on broader educational aims in the context of their preservice courses” (p. 254).

As a result, I began to intentionally seek out course content observed in the clinical context. I found when I brought these concepts into the course preservice teachers began requesting examples of course content displayed in the clinical context. I used my tacit knowledge of working with the same group of preservice teachers as their supervisor and methods course instructor, my personal practical knowledge of the clinical context, and my present moment knowledge of the needs of the preservice teachers.
I felt as a boundary-spanner that teaches and supervises the same group of preservice teachers, I was in a unique position to support them. When I was in the clinical context, I used the techniques to gather additional information and think about what I know in relation to coursework to make a holistic decision on how to support the preservice teacher. Wood and Turner (2015) contended, “…that these different perspectives are essential for preservice teachers who need the practical skills of the field, as well as the structures and frameworks of methods” (p. 29). When I considered the clinical and course contexts, I learned to allow what I knew about both spaces to support preservice teachers.

**Listening to Preservice Teachers.**

As preservice teachers began making requests about course content, I began reflecting on how I addressed their readiness and developmental need. During the course, preservice teachers requested that I address questions they had about the clinical experience. I used their requests to launch course concepts. Levine (2011) pointed out, “to nurture learning and to elevate teaching competency in the field” (p. 940). Through my experiences, it occurred to me that I did not always have to be the one to decide their readiness and developmental need. Instead, I decided to listen to preservice teachers to assist me in forming my decisions. Course instructors use student voice to shape research and inform findings (Harkness, D’Ambrosio & Morrone, 2007). I agree that a student voice is needed to shape research and inform practices but this occurred after the fact. For instance, Johnston (2001) used written reflections, Moody and Moyer (1999) collected surveys, autobiographies, and interviews, and Ebert (1995) choose journal reflections. I choose to not wait until my research concludes but to listen to preservice teachers during instruction and use what I learned from listening to make informed instructional decisions and adjust my practice.
Addressing preservice teachers’ readiness and developmental needs prompted me to reflect on the decisions I made and how my beliefs and experience tensions influenced those decisions. I started by listening to what preservice teachers were discussing and wrestling with from within the course. There was a shift in my thinking as the course became less about how I thought I should support their learning and turned it into addressing what they needed. I realized that as I shifted the course to listen to preservice teachers’ needs, they began connecting the course content and clinical experiences. The preservice teachers’ request prompted me to consider what I observed in their clinical context that I could use in class. I felt this was important as traditionally there is a loose connection between teacher preparation and clinical experience (Chen, Daniels, & Ochanji, 2017; Gardiner & Lorch, 2015), and I wanted to strengthen those connections.

**Implications**

An essential part of self-study is improving one’s practice. Levine (2011) shared the nature and meaning of practices are conveyed and altered by people who use the practice. In this section, I detail the implications of my study as to how it will influence my future practice, how it could influence the future practice of other teacher educators, teacher preparation programs, and teacher educators in dual roles.

**Influencing My Future Practice**

According to Borg (2001) and Gabillon (2012), there have been several studies finding relationships between teaching beliefs and practices in teaching in which Tzanni (2018) adds, “the majority of those studies have shown a clear influence of teaching beliefs on practices” (p. 151). Considering the influence teaching beliefs can have on practice, studying one’s beliefs seems imperative. One’s beliefs are formed through general life experiences (Murray & Male,
In the self-study I conducted, my beliefs were shared in how I believed preservice teachers learn, how my beliefs and experienced tensions influenced the decisions I made which led to tensions I experienced in my practice. Because I began with a focus on my beliefs, I was able to delve deeper into my practice.

As we know from research, one way to support preservice teachers learning is through theory and practice. I believe a shift in the focus of theory and practice is needed. This shift is key. Meuwissen (2005) stated, “We teacher educators need to address disconnections between the methods course and life in the classroom” (p. 257) and one way to address these disconnections is for university supervisors and methods course instructors to begin understanding if the theory they are teaching and practicing is based on their beliefs of what preservice teachers need to learn or based on what preservice teachers truly need. Through this self-study I learned I needed to reflect on my practice to ensure the decisions I made and actions I implemented meet the readiness and developmental needs of the preservice teachers. I will continue to listen to students in order to address their readiness and meet their developmental needs.

**Influencing Teacher Educators’ Practice**

Although the intention of self-study is to improve one’s practice (Berry, 2008), other teacher educators can use what I learned from my practice to inform their practice. First and foremost, teacher educators need to examine their beliefs and make them transparent in order to promote preservice teacher learning. Unfortunately, prior experiences and tacit beliefs currently dominate teacher educators’ instructional decision-making. For example, Valencia et al., (2009) “even when supervisors possess knowledge of coursework, they tend to support their decisions and recommendations with prior teacher experiences, even if their prior experiences and
feedback conflict with course expectations (p. 318). The implications for ignoring preservice teachers needs because personal beliefs of teaching and practice contributes to the disconnection of theory and practice. Thus, teacher educators can learn from my experiences and explore their own beliefs in order to support their preservice teachers.

Second, teacher educators should listen to preservice teachers in order to support their learning. For example, Valencia et al., (2009) found that few supervisors inquired into preservice teachers’ concerns over the disconnect between their methods coursework and what they were seeing in their clinical experience. They referred to this as “opportunities to learn were missed and minimized” (p. 318).

Although literature cited so far has referenced university supervisors, it is reasonable to make similar comparisons to methods course instructors as they too have opportunities to connect theory and practice to support preservice teacher learning. Methods course instructors should also critically examine their beliefs and improve their practice, especially since few courses stressed explicit integration of theory and practice (Tulley, 2013). Korthagen (2011) stated, “the theory-practice divide has to do with the learning process within teacher education itself” (p. 33). Connecting theory and practice cannot be the sole responsibility of the university supervisor; methods course instructors need to do so as well in order to foster preservice teacher learning. Some examples can include embedded class activities to highlight specific teaching practices (Jao, 2017), guided opportunities for observation and rehearsal (Thompson and Emmer, 2019) and re-immersing themselves in K-12 classrooms (Myers, Sanders, Ikpeze, Yoder, Scales, Tracy, Smetana, & Grisham, 2019). In addition, methods course instructors can remove “artificial distinctions” that inhibit connecting theory and practice. Bahr, Monroe, and Eggett (2013) argued, “that removing artificial distinctions between acquiring and applying knowledge
enables prospective teachers to connect coursework and practice” (p. 274). If teacher education solely relies on the idea of connecting theory and practice without authentic and purposeful teaching, then the attempt to connect theory and practice remains divided.

The significance of theory and practice connections in teacher preparation are not being disputed, the connectivity of the two are at the forefront of discussion. Given the significance of theory and practice on teacher education programs, “It behooves us to ask how teacher educators can help students see the practicum and methods course experiences-and eventually preservice education and their work as teachers-as complementary rather than contradictory” (Meuwissen, 2005 p. 254). Theory and practice should be complementary rather than contradictory.

**Influencing Teacher Preparation Programs**

In addition to influencing my own practice and other teacher educators’ practice, my self-study also has implications for teacher preparation programs. While teacher preparation programs are designed to prepare teachers, teacher education programs also need to be concerned with those individuals who are working with and preparing preservice teachers. Since self-study can be an important vehicle for teacher educators’ learning, teacher education programs should be structured in such a way that they encourage teacher educators to engage in self-study. As noted earlier in this chapter, professional learning is an area that varies from institution to institution, especially for educators leaving the K-12 classroom. For example, “Full time K-12 teachers who adopt non-tenure-line roles may experience their transition into work in higher education as stressful…characterized by high levels of uncertainty and anxiety” (Levine, 2011, p. 931). Teachers struggle when they become teacher educators because they must, “…adapt their pedagogical skills and knowledge to a very different setting” (Murray & Male, 2005, p. 129). Since their knowledge base “is often tacit rather than explicit, and is inevitably permeated
by that practice and by individual ways of understanding the processes of teaching and learning.” (p. 126), engaging in self-study can make their tacit knowledge transparent and it can support novice teacher educators with the transition to becoming a teacher educator.

Another way teacher education programs can support teacher educators is through school-university partnerships. According to Aydin et al., (2018), “university–school partnerships have the potential to offer considerable resources to expand professional development options for teacher educators” (p. 151). The collaborative nature of school-university partnerships creates mutually beneficial relationships for the teacher educator and preservice teacher. Mutually beneficial relationships create spaces for teacher educators to cultivate learning through different perspectives. Burns and Badiali (2019) added that this is, “an additional benefit to PDSs as spaces not only for preparing teacher candidates but also for cultivating teacher professional learning and developing teacher leadership” (p. 18). Teacher preparation programs can consider seeking school-university partnerships to enhance professional learning.

Influencing the Dual Role in a Third Space

When preparing for a dual role as a university supervisor and methods course instructor, teacher educators need to first think about the two spaces collectively based on his/her beliefs of how preservice teachers learn in those spaces. Janzen and Peterson (2020) stated, “Binary thinking, which has beleaguered teacher education, is found in dichotomies such as: theory-practice” and suggest “either/or thinking and are rejected in third space, where instead both/also thinking is valued” (p. 56). Then teacher educators need to think about how he/she can envision those roles as a new space by collectively blending those spaces into a third space. Goodlad (1994) called this third space the center of pedagogy. In the center of pedagogy teacher educators
have the space to wrestle with teacher preparation. In fact, Jónsdóttir (2015) suggested third space “…involves the integration of what are often seen as competing discourses in new ways” (p. 186). It’s important to think of these dual roles to truly learn about his/her beliefs as they impact decision-making within the third space. Flessner (2014) suggested, “Rather than envisioning a third space as the end in itself, I propose that reflective third spaces are simply the means that lead to an end that is purposeful change in the first and second spaces” (p. 233). It is within this third space that teacher educators have the ability to link theory and practice in a new way. Hoffman, et al. (2018) called this a way to “…generate new knowledge and identity” (p. 59). Within the third space, teacher educators have the opportunity to generate new knowledge and identify but realize this new knowledge and identity in the third space can create unexpected experiences. Chan (2019) concurred third spaces, “…can create unpredictable and complex experiences for individuals who reside in them” (p. 3). Therefore, Ikpeze et al. (2012) added, “Third space does not always exist in harmony but could be a site of struggle and tension” (p. 277). These unpredictable, complex experiences and spaces of struggle and tension can become opportunities to reframe how teacher educator’s support preservice teacher learning.

One consideration for reframing how teacher educator’s support preservice teacher learning is associated with linking theory and practice. As a person in this dual role, teacher educators need to factor into his/her practice how to link theory and practice in your third space. Flessner (2014) stated, “The lens of third space theory is one way to engage teacher educators in reflective practice to re-imagine the ways in which courses are structured, pedagogies are employed, and actions are taken to address the gap” (p. 232). A teacher educator assuming a dual role has the opportunity to reflect and re-imagine how to link theory and practice in an effort to tease out the complexities of teaching. Wang et al. (2010) stated, “The complexity of teaching
practice has been both the target and the source of two major streams of educational inquiry—the theory driven and the practice driven” (p. 3). This complexity of teaching embedded in linking theory and practice is only complicated by the teacher educator’s belief of theory and practice. These beliefs are foundationally situated in how he/she was socialized into teaching.

In assuming a dual role, teacher educator’s need to consider how the preservice teachers they are supporting were socialized into teaching. The socialization process for preservice teachers set predetermined notions of what teaching should look like in the K5 classroom. In fact, Isbell (2008) stated, “They enter college with strong preconceived notions about how and what to teach” (p. 164). Therefore, it is essential to uncover the images preservice teachers have around teaching to assist in understanding how to support preservice teacher learning.

In connection to socialization it is important to know the development stage of the preservice teacher. The insight to knowing preservice teacher development can assist in how to address preservice teacher need as they learn theory and gain experience in the clinical context. Tochtermann, Cooner, and Lehmann (2005) noted that preservice teachers stages were “…not bound by time intervals; it was based on experience and the degree to which the participants developed insight into their practice” (p. 88). When the socialization and developmental need are considered in the dual role of the teacher educator the frustrations lessen for all stakeholders as decisions on how to support preservice teacher learning are better informed.

Another way to become better informed around how to support preservice teacher learning is immersing his/her self in the clinical context. Learning about the clinical context adds an additional layer to decision-making when thinking about connecting theory and practice as well as preservice teacher socialization and stages of concern. A teacher educator in this dual role is situated in a unique position to gather and use these insights in supporting preservice
teacher learning. Typically, “Teacher education programs structurally divide coursework from practical experiences because different bodies oversee each component. Faculty guide coursework whereas retired teachers, graduate students, or others who have limited roles for limited periods of time guide practical experiences” (Hoffman, et al. 2018, p. 59). Factoring in how to reimagine theory and practice, the use of knowledge gained about the preservice teachers socialized process, the insight into preservice teachers’ developmental stages, and the immersion in the clinical context are how the third space generates new knowledge and identity which can be applied to support preservice teacher learning.

The process of supporting preservice teachers learning is not easy. Like teaching, living in a third space is complex and messy. Ikpeze, et al. (2012) stated, “The notion of third space as a contested space is important because bringing together divergent ideas and perspectives may lead to tension and resistance” (p. 277). When resistance and tensions surface it is important to rely on professional learning and faculty development. It is important for a teacher educator in the dual role of a university supervisor and methods course instructor living in a third space to continue professional learning and faculty development to grow professionally. Köpsén and Nyström (2015) had this remark about professional learning, “…uncertainty exists at a time when knowledge and methods are undergoing constant development” (p. 30). When thinking about faculty development, Bonds and Blevins (2019) reported, “Providing faculty who are in the midst of organizational change the opportunity to interact with and learn from other faculty engaged in the same predicament around change can be beneficial” (p. 231). Professional learning and faculty development are key elements of addressing the complexity and messiness of third space.
I question the term boundary-spanner as it insinuates there are defined lines between theory-practice. I argue as a boundary-spanner that the perceived boundaries of the clinical context and methods course should be eliminated to create a third space. I suggest the term, a hybrid educator. I view a hybrid educator as a person who uses their knowledge of previously identified individual spaces to help them construct new knowledge and identity within a new space. Clark, et al., (2005) defined a hybrid educator “as a person (or position) with certain responsibilities and we are, at the same time, speaking of hybrid behaviors which are boundary spanning behaviors” (p. 4). I believe the hybrid educator pulls from previous understanding to take action on their informed decisions to support preservice teacher learning in this new third space. Bhabha’s (1994) hybridity theory suggested this is where one relies on several perspectives to make meaning of the world. The third space is where the hybrid educator does not separate the spaces but pulls from their learning of theory and practice, their development of supervision and methods instruction, and beliefs of teaching to learn about preservice teachers socialization, developmental stages, understanding of theory and practice, and clinical context to support preservice teacher learning by creating action in the third space.

The Need for Future Research

Future research is needed in teacher educator preparation and ongoing learning. My self-study was an example of one individual examining my beliefs, experiencing tensions, and decision-making, but more research with other teacher educators who serve in the dual capacity of methods course instructor and supervisor is needed. In addition, research should examine more deeply the connection between beliefs and preservice teacher learning with school-based educators. Finally, future research is also needed to study questions like “How school-university partnerships support school-based educators transitioning into boundary-spanning roles?”
From this self-study, I also generated additional self-study questions to explore beginning with “How do my beliefs of supporting preservice teacher learning contribute to my professional identity as a methods course instructor and university supervisor?” From there, I can consider, “What professional learning and faculty development do I engage in to enhance my practice as a teacher educator?” and “How do I transfer my professional learning and faculty development in my teaching practices to support preservice teacher learning?

Limitations

The limitations of this study originated with myself as the subject of the data collection and analysis as there was potential bias in my study (Feldman, 2009). Knowing self-study could generate bias, I embedded multiple data collection methods and rounds of analysis. In addition, self-study methodology suggests the use of critical friends to address potential bias (Bass et al., 2002; Berry, 2008). Thus, I used critical friends to challenge my thinking throughout the data collection and analysis process to address potential bias. An additional limitation to my study was that I solely focused on my beliefs. I used my beliefs as a stepping-stone into how I believed preservice teachers learn. I contemplated studying my attitude or self-efficacy towards preservice teacher learning but decided to focus on beliefs before addressing any other facet of my professional identity. According to Vidović and Domović (2019) professional identity influences how one perceives themselves. I feel that I needed to first study my beliefs as they would influence my professional identity. I attempted to be vulnerable and trustworthy in my opening up about my beliefs to strengthen my findings. I accept my findings may not be generalizable (Samaras & Freese, 2009) as they are specific to my classroom management methods course and my clinical context. A final limitation to my study was that I sought to only discover how I supported preservice teacher learning and not if preservice teachers learned. Researchers have

**In Summary**

Preparing high quality teachers is essential for the future of education. Thus, it is important to consider how course instructors and university supervisors are preparing preservice teachers. As seen in this self-study, I explored my beliefs, experienced tensions, and decision-making to better support my preservice teachers to make connections between their methods course and their clinical experiences. Through the collection of autobiographical accounts, espoused platform, field notes, semi-structured interviews, and reflective journals and multiple rounds of data analysis, I found that I improved my awareness and metacognition about my practice, I supported my professional learning and development, I connected methods coursework with clinical experiences and I listened to preservice teachers.
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APPENDIX A:
DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

Clinical Experience. “a school or other authentic educational setting that works in partnership with an educator preparation program to provide clinical practice for teacher candidates” (AACTE, 2018, p.11).

Theory. “Theory, in sharp contrast, is timeless and universal; it is something produced by researchers through the careful process of enquiry” (Carr& Kemmis, 1986, p. 2).

Practice. “Practice is a way to apply knowledge through learning to understand and enact acquired routines and practices” (Hammerness, et al., 2005).

Preservice Teacher. Individuals enrolled in programs for the initial or advanced preparation of teachers and are distinguished from students in P–12 schools (NCATE, 2010).

Methods Course. “Instructors work simultaneously with prospective teachers on beliefs, teaching practices, and creation of identities- their students’ and their own” (Clift & Brady, 2005, p. 325).

Socialization. A subjective process created through one’s experiences that ultimately results in the internalization of a group’s subculture (Lortie, 1975).

Supervision. “an organizational function concerned with promoting teacher growth, leading to improvement in teaching performance and greater student learning” (Nolan & Hoover, 2011, p.6).
Supervisor. An individual in a role who is charged with enacting the function of pre-service teacher supervision by encouraging risk-taking, experimentation, reflection, and the functions of pre-service evaluation by making determinations about pre-service teacher performance and competency (Nolan & Hoover, 2011).

Professional Vision. “Consists of socially organized ways of seeing and understanding events that are answerable to the distinctive interests of a particular social group” (Goodwin, 1994, p. 606).

Boundary-spanner. A boundary-spanner is an individual who spans between public school systems and universities supporting both entities (Many, Fisher, Ogletree, & Taylor, 2012) and who, “understand the dynamics and culture of both worlds and are vital in linking schools and universities in viable collaboration” (Sandholtz & Finan, 1998, p.24).

School-University Partnerships. Mutually beneficial partnerships for all stakeholder partners who share a vision on renewing and developing reflective practice centered on teacher preparation while improving successful outcomes for PK-12 students (AACTE, 2018).

Professional Development Schools. A comprehensive mission between school and university-based stakeholders dedicated to teacher preparation, engaged in professional development for all stakeholders, committed to innovation and reflection on practice, shared work of practice with those in and out of their PDS, developed roles and responsibilities, and dedicated resources. (NAPDS, 2008).

Third Space. A space where new meaning is constructed based on experiences derived from two other individual spaces (Moje, Ciechanowski, Kramer, Ellis, Carillo, & Collazo, 2004).

Self-Study. The study of teacher education practice by teacher educators in order to understand and improve it (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009).
**Critical Friend.** “A trusted person who asks provocative questions, provides data to be examined through another lens, and offers a critique of a person’s work as a friend” (Samaras, 2011, p. 75).
APPENDIX B:

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL ACCOUNTS

**Historical Self.** I grew up in a small rural town in the northeast United States where to this day generations of my family still live. The small rural town where I attended elementary school was predominantly white (498 out of 500 students). The administrators and teachers of the school were peers of my parents. I attended the same schools as all my family before me. Parents were involved not only at the school but with supporting all students in the community.

As a child, I had extreme anxiety. My teachers encouraged, supported, and devoted extra time to assist me throughout the day. As I aged, the anxiety did not subside, but I learned techniques to alleviate some of the symptoms. Some of the techniques to manage my anxiety were recommended by my elementary teachers. It was through these experiences I knew I wanted to be a teacher. I wanted to be the one who encouraged, inspired, and supported students just as many teachers did for me.

At the end of my sophomore year of high school I moved to the south. It was then that a whole new world of schooling entered my life as I now found myself the minority. Other than my own experiences of going to school in a rural area, I had no exposure to suburban or urban settings. I was under the impression the only difference in the types of schools were their locations.

As I started my undergraduate education at a major southern university, my desire to teach remained but I struggled because my coursework and internships were not heavily linked. I
learned content and theory through scenarios, readings, lectures, and case studies. There was no communication between the university and the elementary school where I conducted my internships. In fact, I was only assigned a university supervisor during my final internship. My internships encompassed three separate clinical experiences over the course of five semesters. My first and third semester were strictly coursework and the second and fourth semester had coursework and a clinical component. My fifth semester had an internship only. All three internships were in different elementary schools within different areas of the same district.

Although the elementary schools were across the district in rural and suburban areas, I did not have any experience in Title 1 (schools receiving 75% free or reduced lunch) or urban schools. The placements were random and based on the availability of cooperating teachers.

My first clinical experience was one day a week in a rural elementary school. On the first day of my experience, I handed the cooperating teacher with a checklist from the university that were suggested responsibilities for me to pursue while in my clinical experience. The checklist was optional and required no documentation of completion. During this time, I observed the teacher teach, conducted mainly organizational and managerial tasks for the teacher, and had very little interaction with students during instructional time. At the time, I had no idea how oblivious I was to the complexity of teaching.

My level-two clinical experience was in a suburban school setting. Students were bused in from other areas of the district to this specific school (this was a concept I had never heard of before). During this experience, I continued organizational and managerial tasks but also began working with students’ one-on-one and in small groups. However, I did not plan for any of the instruction with small group or one-on-one teaching, I used the plans and resources prepared and provided by my cooperating teacher. The verbal feedback I received from my cooperating
teacher stemmed from my small group. The feedback was connected to materials and resources and not pedagogy or content knowledge.

My last clinical experience was considered my final internship. During this experience, I taught all content all day long for the whole semester. The cooperating teacher was pulled from the classroom to help with administrative duties, as she was interested in obtaining her master’s degree in Educational Leadership. I quickly became uncertain of my instructional decisions. I followed the teacher’s edition page by page. There was no guidance from my cooperating teacher or supervisor while in the clinical experience.

My university supervisor observed me twice in my final semester, once in the middle and then at the end. When he arrived in the classroom he sat in the back, took out his evaluation form, rated my teaching, and then left. A time was scheduled to meet in his office on campus where he would provide me with formal written and oral feedback on his observation. I remember being eager to meet him. The first words out of his mouth related to his recommendation that I select another profession. He felt I would make a terrible teacher. He told me my rating on the evaluation form (nothing positive). I sat quietly and listened, signed the evaluation form, and asked him if he was still coming in to complete the last observation. He said he would because he had to. I left his office, shut the door, and burst into tears. I could not believe that one observation and one person could crush my dreams of teaching. I was devastated. It was at that moment that I decided that not only did I still want to be a teacher but eventually a university supervisor.

Unlike the support of my teachers in grade school that launched my desire to teach, the rough and unsupportive experience with my university supervisor launched my desire to
supervise and to supervise differently. I wanted my students’ clinical experiences to be rich in learning where theory and practice and practice and theory occurred regularly.

**Personal Self.** My first three years of teaching experience were in a Title 1 urban school. The school was comprised of 98% of the students receiving free and reduced lunch. Most students walked home, a small percentage were picked up in cars, and there were no buses. The students attending the school faced life experiences I never encountered as a child. Some students stated they slept under their beds at night for fear of stray bullets, some were being raised by extended family because parents were incarcerated, many had older siblings in gangs, and most had nothing to eat once they arrived home so attending school provided two meals for them. They were not always focused on learning as stresses from home lingered with them all school day.

I began to understand that teaching was more than teaching content. At the time, I thought I was supporting the students in my classroom. I would talk with other members on my team and even my administrators who would all tell me to provide my students with structure, discipline, and consistency and by establishing an environment of learning I would provide my students with emotional and academic support. The way I was raised, my school experiences, and my beliefs of teaching were creating huge tensions in my reality. I made the decision to transfer schools, and it was one of the hardest decisions I made as an educator. I felt as though I had not given all I could to the students at this school. With a heavy heart, I transferred from an urban Title 1 school to a rural Title 1 school within the same district.

It was during this transition; I learned the variance in Title 1 schools. The rural school I was now teaching in had 77% of students on free and reduced lunch. One similarity in the urban and rural schools was many of the students only had food when they came to school. The
differences in this Title 1 School related to the population of students. Many students were from migrant families, so they moved during fall and spring seasons to provide continued income. As I learned about my students’ lives outside of school, I once again realized my life experiences were unlike those of my students. This self-reflection helped me learn to navigate the complex nature of teaching. I adapted my practice and modified my classroom environment. This process of reflecting and adapting my classroom has never ended. In fact, it propelled my curiosity of teaching to earn my master’s degree.

I spoke to my principal at the time about continuing my education by earning a master’s degree. She mentored me and expanded my teaching beyond the classroom and into leadership roles. With her support, she guided and challenged my thinking as an educator. Through added leadership roles my confidence as an educational leader grew. Just as learning the different perspectives of my students in the classroom, I was privileged to see different sides of education beyond the classroom.

It was during my last semester of my master’s degree that the professor from my research course altered my thinking again as an educator. The professor introduced me to inquiry- a way to reflect and adapt my practice in a systemic and intentional way. The professor mentored me through inquiry and offered opportunities for me to co-teach the process with her for several semesters. It was during this time of working with this professor that I learned a whole new side of education; Higher Ed. Learning with and from a highly regarded expert in the field was not an opportunity I could have foreseen. The professor expanded my thinking and disrupted my philosophy of teaching.

I took inquiry back into my elementary classroom and began another new educational journey. The first time I inquired into my teaching I was the only educator at my school involved
in inquiry. I relied heavily on my professor for guidance and support. The following year my 4th grade team joined me on my inquiry journey. This time through the inquiry process my team looked to me for guidance. My professor’s faith and guidance gave me strength and added confidence. It was during this time that the professor I was learning with shared with me a new position in the district. The position was a boundary-spanner role referred to as a Partnership Resource Teacher (PRT).

**Professional Self.** Entering this role as a PRT after two decades of elementary teaching led me to know the complexities of teaching others to teach. What I did not know was how complex and intricate of a process it would be to learn to teach teaching. The *how and why* of teaching was a new lens for me as a teacher educator. I drew on my personal experiences as a classroom teacher to support pre-service teachers in clinical experiences.

As I entered my second year as a PRT, I was more confident in how to support pre-service teachers in the clinical experiences. My confidence created a space for me to step back and observe how pre-service teachers were engaged in their clinical experiences. I realized they exhibited similar behaviors to what I did during my first two internships. How could this be? The pre-service teachers in this program have a collaborating teaching in the clinical experiences with them the whole time and on certain days a supervisor, course instructor, and/or graduate student with them and they are engaging in similar behaviors as in my clinical experiences. It was at this moment that I realized the next phase of my educational career was related to the interconnectedness of theory and practice and practice and theory in authentic clinically rich settings.

**Professional Experience as Doctoral Student.** I knew doctoral studies were in my future if I wanted to teach teachers. What I did not know was how much my teaching, beliefs,
and confidence as a teacher would be altered. I began questioning who I was as an educator. There were spaces throughout my coursework where I paused to inquire into my beliefs. I would gain confidence, feel solid about my beliefs, and then be challenged through a professor, colleague, or reading that led me to reflect on my practice. It seemed as I progressed through one semester, the next semester raised more questions about my teaching, beliefs, and confidence as an educator. It was this back and forth dissonance that piqued my desire to inquire into my practice further. I embedded theory, strategies, and frameworks from my coursework to my practice as a PRT.

As I moved further into my coursework additional responsibilities crept into my world. I began submitting proposals to different organizations, presenting at conferences, engaging in research, reviewing for journals, leading professional developments (college and school-based), attending and presenting on committees, and submitting publications to national journals. The added responsibilities meshed with my coursework and my work as a PRT.
APPENDIX C:

ESPOUSED PLATFORM 1 AUGUST 18, 2018

I decided to enter the teaching profession for two major reasons. The first being the support of my elementary teachers and the second because of my university undergraduate supervisor. As a child I dealt with anxiety and my elementary teachers supported and coached me through my anxious moments by giving me strategies to help alleviate my anxiousness. The experience from my elementary years instilled in me the importance of knowing students beyond academics and supporting them through barriers they may encounter in their lives. I believe educators have opportunities to support and coach students as ways to encourage them to be their most successful selves. My second reason for entering the teaching profession stemmed from my experience with my university undergraduate supervisor. My supervisor was not interested in my input as a future educator. The decisions about my teaching rested with his thoughts and I had no input. I believe that supervisors should not just advise but listen as well. I believe teaching is more than academics. Teaching is learning about the needs of my students and balancing the content with practical experiences within the context of my students. I believe supervision is more than providing strategies, coaching, and mentoring but intentionally listening to students to ensure their educational journey is not derailed by my bias.

I believe in alignment between content in coursework and field experience. I believe the content from coursework should be based on text selection, research, personal experience and the students’ field experience context should guide those decisions. I believe students gain understanding of content and clinical experience through intentional coaching, modeling, dissonance, and practice. As a course instructor I need to be aware of my personal experiences of teaching as it relates to the content I include in my coursework and as a supervisor I need to be aware of the beliefs I hold of the importance of supervision to be sure they support the needs of my students.

As an educator, I believe students need ownership of their learning to ensure growth. I believe my goal as an educator is to provide content and context in a manner that encourages students to explore and learn through failure and success. I understand my life experiences impact the decisions I make as a course instructor and supervisor. I believe I need to show my students transparency in my decisions and share my expectations of them as future educators.
APPENDIX D:

ESPOSED PLATFORM 2  OCTOBER 21, 2018

As a university supervisor and methods course instructor, I believe PSTs learn in a variety of ways. They learn through reading, observing, interacting, questioning, reflecting, and enacting to identify a few. Regardless of the way they learn, PSTs need support to assist them in understanding why and what they are learning. I believe it is important for PSTs to first identify and express their belief of teaching to build a foundation for what they will learn in their coursework and clinical experience. As they read, observe, interact, question, reflect, and enact what they are learning they will experience various emotions. One of those emotions will be tension. Tension occurs when beliefs do not align. When this happens, PSTs will begin making judgments and build misconceptions about teaching because they will base this feeling on their beliefs but then also struggle with new beliefs from clinical experience and coursework. I believe this is an opportunity to support them during this time of dissonance. I believe dissonance is another way to learn.

For me to support PSTs in ways that they need, I believe I should identify my beliefs on how PSTs learn. I should ask myself questions about how I should support PSTs in the clinical experience and examine why I believe PSTs need the support I am providing. I should be aware of my beliefs as I work with PSTs to be sure my bias is not filtering the decisions I make when supporting PSTs learning. When I am in the clinical experience, I need to be sure I am not making assumptions about what PSTs know and don’t know about teaching. Therefore, I need to be more transparent in the strategy, model, or naming of teaching behaviors I engage in with PSTs. To continue PSTs support, I need to follow up with my interactions, discussions, and topics from previous encounters. I need to inquire into their thinking and work with the CT to continue the support. Although, I am continuing to understand how PSTs learn, I need to consider how I am best meeting the needs of how PSTs learn.

When selecting content and tasks for PSTs to engage in during the classroom management methods course, I should ask myself why I am teaching the content in the methods courses I provide to PSTs and examine if what I am teaching aligns with the PSTs context. I believe theory and practice is a way PSTs learn. Because of this belief it is important for me to engage in ongoing reflection that includes identifying what expectations I have for myself and PSTs. One way I should apply my expectations is through my lesson planning. My lesson planning should not only state the expectations I have for PSTs learning, but explain how to enact them as well as identify how I should adjust the course to meet the needs of my PSTs. A way to adjust the course is through developmental appropriateness. I believe I need to ask myself if PSTs are ready to connect theory and practice based on coursework and course discussion and observations from the clinical experience. I believe I need to incorporate authentic clinical experiences into the course and allow PSTs to lead in the learning as connections from theory and practice arise in the clinical experience. I believe I should be explicit in my decision making and be transparent with those decisions with PSTs.
APPENDIX E:

ESPOUSED PLATFORM 3 DECEMBER 19, 2018

As a boundary-spanner, teaching an undergraduate methods course and supervising the same pre-service teachers in their clinical experience, I am afforded a different perspective on how pre-service teachers learn. I believe in syncing course content to pre-service teachers’ clinical experience. The time I spend in clinical experiences with pre-service teachers showcases concepts to concentrate on in the methods course. I identify behaviors in the clinical experience and attach the behaviors to concepts in the course. When I incorporate authentic experiences stemmed from pre-service teachers’ specific clinical experience to course content, pre-service teachers begin to connect the experience to their understanding of teaching. In addition, pre-service teachers begin to discuss concepts from the course they have enacted or observed from their clinical experience. The idea of creating course content derived from authentic clinical experience attests to the importance of pre-service teachers connecting theory and practice. I believe it is important for pre-service to learn how theory and practice are connected. When pre-service teachers connect theory and practice, they begin to expand on their learning of teaching. They begin to understand the how and why of teaching. I believe it is important for pre-service teachers to relate learning of teaching to content and then enact what they have learned. Therefore, pre-service teachers not only learn through reading theory and making connections to practice, but I believe pre-service teachers learn by enacting theory in authentic clinical experiences.

I believe the content taught in undergraduate methods courses should be relevant to pre-service teachers’ clinical context. Theory and practice are important in pre-service teacher learning. Instructors need to consider how the content in the course blends with the pre-service teacher clinical experience context. Instructors need to be willing to adjust or remove course content to meet this need. I have learned adjusting or removing content creates tensions as a methods course instructor. The tension stems from deciding on what content to adjust or remove. My personal experiences as a classroom teacher and several semesters of teaching the course are the factors that create the most tension. To negotiate these two factors, I base my decision on pre-service teachers’ clinical context. I believe instructors need to be willing to negotiate these factors to support pre-service teacher learning. Instructors also need to consider how to condense content to create opportunities to delve deeper into course concepts. When pre-service teachers grapple with content, they can begin to inquire about it. This inquiry can lead to deeper course conversations around the concept and what the concept would look like in the clinical experience. I believe pre-service teachers learn through dialogue of course concepts that also link to their authentic clinical experience.

Clinical experience is a pathway for pre-service teachers to observe and enact teaching. When pre-service teachers are in the clinical experience to observe and enact teaching university supervisors need to tailor their support to meet pre-service teachers learning. I have learned tailoring my supervisory approach to align with the support of the pre-service teachers needs.
lessens frustration for the pre-service teacher but may heighten tension as a university supervisor. My tensions emerged when my supervisory approach did not align with how the pre-service teacher needed support during the clinical experience or what I thought the pre-service teacher needed. To assist in resolving these tensions, I relied on differentiating my supervisory approaches to align with the pre-service teachers learning style and my knowledge of the clinical context. I believe it is important to learn about pre-service teachers as learners, their beliefs of teaching, and their clinical context. Knowing how the pre-service teachers learn and their beliefs of teaching provided pertinent information on how I should adjust my supervisory approach. When I assumed pre-service teachers knew what I expected my frustration grew and the pre-service teachers’ growth stagnated. When I reminded myself of how pre-service teachers learn and combined that with understanding their beliefs of teaching, and the clinical context, I made more informed decisions that lessened my tensions. University supervisors should tailor their supervisory approach when supporting pre-service teachers in their clinical experience. I believe university supervisors need to consider how pre-service teachers learn, what are pre-service teachers’ beliefs of teaching, and understand the clinical context in which pre-service teachers are conducting their clinical experiences.

As a boundary-spanner, personal experiences factor into the decisions I make as a methods course instructor and university supervisor. I believe boundary-spanners need to explore and define their personal experiences about supervising pre-service teachers and teaching undergraduate methods courses. Boundary-spanners need to question the decisions they are making when working with pre-service teachers in their clinical experience and methods courses to investigate if the content they are teaching and how they are supervising are relevant to the needs of pre-service teachers. A boundary-spanner's personal experiences will impact the decisions they make for course content and supervisory approaches, but decisions should not be made solely on personal experiences. Boundary-spanners unwilling to explore their beliefs on the methods course content they teach and the supervisory approaches they use may not support the needs of pre-service teachers. When boundary-spanners base the decisions they make on personal experiences pre-service teachers may be unable to connect the experience to their clinical context. Boundary-spanners should connect personal experiences that provide opportunities for pre-service teachers to learn and experience their understanding of teaching. I believe boundary-spanners need to consider how their personal experiences of methods, course content and supervisory approaches influence how they teach course content and what supervisory approaches they use when working with pre-service teachers.

When boundary-spanners explore personal experiences, they will generate beliefs on the types of content that should be taught in methods courses and what supervisory approaches they should use when working with pre-service teachers. Boundary-spanners will face tensions when beliefs are not aligned with the content, clinical experience, and beliefs of pre-service teachers. When faced with tensions a boundary-spanner needs to question why it is a tension. Is it because of a personal experience? Is it a conflict from within the course content? Is it a concern from the clinical experience? Is it unaligned with pre-service teachers’ beliefs? I believe the decisions boundary-spanners make about how pre-service teachers learn should be explored and adjusted based on pre-service teachers learning.

I believe boundary-spanners need to explore their personal experiences and consider how the experiences have influenced their beliefs of teaching. I believe boundary-spanners need to investigate how their beliefs factor into the decisions they make as a university supervisor and methods course instructor. I believe boundary-spanners need to be willing to adjust course
content and their supervisory approaches based on pre-service teacher needs. I believe boundary-spanners need to uncover the learning styles of the pre-service teachers they work with to support them in course content and clinical experience. I believe boundary-spanners need to use authentic clinical experiences in their methods courses to assist preservice teachers in making practice and theory connections. I believe boundary-spanners need to align course content from the methods courses to the clinical experience to generate authentic clinical experiences. I believe boundary-spanners have a different perspective of how preservice teachers learn and should explore how the perspective supports pre-service teacher learning.
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REFLECTIVE JOURNAL CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT METHODS COURSE

Aug. 20 Rationale for lesson planning for class on 21st

From 7:30-9:00 we will work on community building activities as demonstrated through the morning meeting. I will share the book with them letting them know what they needed for the next course meeting. Out of the Kriete & Davis text on page 11 I will share the purpose of morning meeting and explained that not only does research support the practical applications of utilizing morning meeting in the clinical experience, but I can share my personal experiences as an elementary classroom teacher as well as my experiences with preservice teachers learning and implementing morning meeting and their clinical experiences. I will then model the four components of the morning meeting greeting, sharing, group activity, morning message. For my greeting we will throw a phone puck where the person will say their name and throw the puck to someone that person will then say good morning to the person that threw it and introduce themselves. They will then throw the puck as we go all the way through the circle. We will then discuss how directions will be given if this was in a K5 setting and what the teacher’s responsibility would be for modeling and communicating expectations. We then start the sharing component which students will write on a sheet of paper that they crumble up and throw in the middle so that it stays anonymous. Then it takes a minute to explain how this allows the teacher to learn a little about the students in the class as well as for the students in the class to develop an understanding that they may have similarities and differences together with students in the class. The next section is the activity section where students will have an opportunity to draw their representation of the teacher and then share outs. And the last section of morning meeting is news and goods which is also considered a morning message where I will have written on the board the following message; good morning future educators I look forward to learning with you over the course of the semester as well as in your clinical experience over the next two years. Signed Wendy.

From 9 o’clock to 10 o’clock start the course information starting with the course overview of the three assignments, the point values for the three assignments and how the three assignments are broken down. Then get into the explanation of assignment one and get into the explanation of assignment two explaining the differences between the five tasks in assignment one and the five tasks for assignment two. Students will sign up for morning meetings from the weekly schedule provided. Then assign reading out of the Kriete and Davis text. Overview and chapter 1: Specifically, 12-22: so, I picked pages 12 to 22 because it gives descriptions and purpose and rationale for using morning meetings in the classroom. The rest of the chapter explains how you’d actually set it up in your classroom and although this is important the reality is some field experience teachers that the students are placed with will not have morning meeting in their classroom, some well, some have modified it, some will have pieces of it throughout the day and so I will share with them that they will then use this section at the beginning of their senior year fall semester where they have more opportunity to establish during preplanning how morning meeting will fit into the schedule and at that point they can read the remaining section.
There’s also opportunity through other content in this course to talk about how to set rules, norms, manage the classroom, and manage student behavior during morning meetings. There is a fine-tuning section that I will reference as students may have questions regarding the implementation of the morning meeting. Chapter 1 is the greeting section, so they will be reading pages 51 to 63. The rest of the section gives very specific examples of different types of gratings which they’ll be over to skim through and use when it is their turn to implement the morning meeting, so they will be reading a section just not as in-depth as the beginning of the chapter. There is also a fine-tuning section that I’m not going to require for reading but I will let students know that if they’re running into concerns with the greeting to look there is a resource first to help them clarify the question they may have.
**APPENDIX G:**

**EXAMPLE: MONTHLY DATA COLLECTION CALENDAR**

September 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Created lesson plan and recorded decisions in reflective journal</td>
<td>Taught course and reflected on lesson in reflective journal; Met CFA for supervisor approach</td>
<td>Listened to recording and took notes, recorded field notes</td>
<td>created field notes; Listened to recording and took notes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Continue Revising Chapter 3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Continue Revising Chapter 3; Began Analytic Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Met with CF B to discuss CI; recorded session; recorded field notes</td>
<td>Recorded field notes; Recorded to recording CF B and took notes</td>
<td>Recorded field notes; Analysis Stage 1: Critical incidents field notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Continue Revising Chapter 3; Began Analytic Memo</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Created lesson plan and recorded decisions in reflective journal</td>
<td>Taught course and reflected on lesson in reflective journal</td>
<td>recorded session; recorded field notes</td>
<td>Recorded field notes</td>
<td>Recorded field notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Continue Revising Chapter 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Met CF A to discuss CI; recorded session; Taught course and</td>
<td>Listened to recording CF A and took notes</td>
<td>Recorded field notes; Worked on Analytic memos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructors meeting in EDU 407 1-3 Recorded notes in reflective journal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis field notes</td>
<td>Reflected in journal</td>
<td>Recorded field notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Continue revising Chapter 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CLINICAL EXPERIENCE FIELD NOTES

10-11-18 Present teacher 4 math group
1-10 10 frame
She created
9, 9 looks like a

Adjust instruction based on last
class

Created name cards 15L class
Based on our conversation

10-11-18 Present teacher observing guided group 1A

Materials ready

Required students not following names
Student finished - asked to stay seated
Try again

Remind students of expectations - I will help you
Supporting students when expectations - I will help you

Mix up name puzzle - what letter is...

Remind students of names
Recognize a sound - sound - matrix
Showed eagle
Letter a in the book
Feel letter a in book

What picture is on the front cover?
What sound does it make?
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REFLECTIVE JOURNAL FROM CLINICAL EXPERIENCE

Week 10/1-10/5

Interaction: Who was part of interaction? 10/3

What decision did I make and why? Once I had received her schedule, I knew she was reading aloud at a specific day and time. I went to the classroom on that day and time to observe her reading aloud to students. The K5 students were coming back from special so the resident and I were able to talk in the hallway prior to entering the classroom. I asked her if there was something specific, she would like me to gather data on and she mentioned that earlier in the week she and her CT realized she was calling on kids quickly after she posed the question. I told her that I would collect data on her wait time which meant how much time went by from the time she posed the question to students and are calling on a student to answer the question. She said she thought that would be helpful and that she was also wondering what student she was calling on. We walked into the classroom she began reading aloud and I began timing the second in between her questioning and calling on students as well as noting the name of the student she called on. The lesson itself was about five minutes and there were a total of four questions she asked. Her time was either 2 to 3 seconds of waiting before calling on a student. She did not call on the same student twice and she had a balance between boy and girl students. Afterward she and I were able to talk, and our conversation centered around the data I collected. She was surprised that she was calling on students so quickly but happy she had a balance between calling on different students and them being boys and girls. I explained to her the importance of wait time meaning it allows children to think of a response to the question posed and allows the teacher time to think about how to respond to students’ replies as well as the opportunity to rethink the question if students are not responding. I explained that we will talk about wait time in the learning environment course that I teach. And that chapter will go into more detail about wait time. I shared an experience of my beginning years of teaching where I had a similar experience with wait time. I began to carry a squish ball in my pocket and would squeeze it and count two of these five prior to calling on a student. I suggested she identify a way that would work best for her to calculate the wait time and then talk to her CT about the optimal weight time for the students in the classroom.

How did the decision align/not with my beliefs? This decision aligned with my beliefs because I was able to collect data on her observation with a focused target in mind, have a collaborative conversation about the data, provide suggestions for moving forward, and allow the resident time to reflect and think about next steps.
APPENDIX J:

CRITICAL FRIEND A: FINAL INTERVIEW FOR ESPOUSED PLATFORM

CF A asked: Think back and share some of the most important reasons why you enter the teaching profession. Have your feelings changed in any way? Explain. Entered several reasons 1-elementary student anxiety issues and my teachers supporting and understanding yet challenged me to tackle areas that I was uncomfortable in. I was thankful for that. University supervisor was very critical not understanding so my feelings are still the same as why I wanted to go into teaching. After this semester the PSTs I work with I do want to push them to be out of their comfort zone, but I don’t want them to be complacent and utilize us. I do get frustrated with PSTs who do not take advantage of the opportunities. I don’t want it to become additional tension- how should and how far should I stretch a resident. Support and push them in the right direction. What is the balance? To become a potential educator.

CF A asked: Why should students learn the content that you teach? How does the content relate to the world outside the classroom? Content to PST clinical experience as well as my personal experience. Professionalism piece beyond pedagogy and content knowledge, attendance, punctual, teamwork, communication, dependability, K5 students holistically. I struggle with what is realistic for me to expect PST to understand within this semester. Professionalism comes from how they were raised. Try to conform to the expectations of a classroom teacher- PSTs need to learn the other aspects of teaching-beyond the content and pedagogy also the added layer what it means to be a professional moving from scholastic world into a professional word. Merit and grades and acknowledgement and practical world pedagogy and content and your disposition with parents, colleagues, K5 students. Beyond the content-use content, my personal experience and the clinical experience, different administrators. expose PSTs to more than a content holistic view of the teaching profession. CF asked: Connects to the real world because of the professional piece. Yes, I have tensions between content and the professional side of teaching.

CF A asked: How do you handle the constant tension between covering the content and exploring topics in-depth to promote deeper understanding? At times I want to take all my experience into a semester. How do I weed through the content to make decisions for me? The biggest piece is move away from my personal experience and move towards in your context clinical experience you live this right now no other background in your own classroom? Tensions for me are I have those experiences and how to balance my personal experiences between content and clinical experience. How can it be connected to the course? PSTs want to know how I would handle it. I don’t want it to be the only piece. K5 students are all different. Behavior could be the same but the K5 student is different and how PSTs interact with K5 students may not work. Cautious for my advice and relate to text, make a more informed decision based on text, relationship with K5 student, interactions with K5 student.
APPENDIX K:

SAMPLE OF ANALYTIC MEMOS OF FIELD NOTES

Summary: I’ve had three weeks of data from the field experience to discuss with Critical Friend A. These discussions were based on critical incidents from the first three weeks of September.

Data source: (From Tuesday Sept. 25th Wendy & Critical Friend A on critical incidents based on Sept. 4-20 Field experiences)

1. Through this discussion with critical friend A, I’ve discovered I am making assumptions about:
   a) What preservice teachers know in their enactment in the field?
   b) Knowledge of what is happening in the field
   c) Being able to make connections from clinical experience to coursework

Emerging ideas: I need to remind myself what decisions I am making when I enter the classroom and within those decisions could I be making assumptions if so what assumptions.

1. I make assumptions in the field of what preservice teachers are able to enact, understand, and connect.
   a. These assumptions influence my decisions for planning and enacting the content from the course.
      i. “Resident was looking for routines in the classroom- I realized I assumed that routines are self-explanatory- How often do I make assumptions? I assume the CT does more with residents than I know- How can we lessen the amount of assumptions you make in the field- I need to ask more questions of CT, resident, and self about what is happening in the classroom instead of me just making a decision. Be more aware that I need to inquire more about what is in the classroom. Even follow up with the decision I make. I will probably make a sticky note to carry with me to ask more questions when in the classroom. Until I can get into the habit of inquiring. Ironic because I know inservice and preservice do not notice the same thing and yet I am making assumptions.” (Critical friend a, 2018, p. 6 para. 6)
      ii. “I should have inquired more about what direction the CT gave the resident prior to the resident giving the assessment. For example, if the resident observes the CT administering the assessment, that the CT and resident have a conversation about the assessment, the CT watches the resident administer the assessment. Because I didn’t ask those questions, I assumed to not go into depth with the resident on an explanation. I assumed that because the resident didn’t have the coursework on would be
Summary: So far for the fall semester I have taught four classroom management methods classes and the residents have been in their field experiences for two weeks. I have met with Critical Friend B twice. First to discuss my espoused platform as a course instructor and then once to discuss critical incidents from my reflective journal. I am starting analytic memos during phase 1 of my data analysis to uncover written accounts of emerging ideas that serve as another form of analysis embedded throughout the analysis process by identifying patterns and relationships. This process begins the foundation for my analytic memos on classroom management.

Data source: (From Wednesday, Sept. 12th Wendy & Critical Friend B on critical incidents originated from classroom management methods course reflective journal for the weeks of Aug. 21-Sept 11.)

1. At this point I have determined through my discussion of critical incidents on coursework from August -September with Critical Friend B that I need to clarify for myself:
   a) What expectations I have for preservice teachers in the classroom management methods course
   b) What expectations I have for myself as the course instructor
   c) My lesson planning needs to be more explicit and focused based on the expectations I have for preservice teachers and myself.

Emerging Ideas:

1. I need to define what my expectations are for PSTs learning.
   a. In order for me to plan the course and enact the content in the course I need clear expectations for what I want PSTs to learn and what the expectations look like for PSTs.
      i. These are noted in the critical friend B notes from August to September 11 for course reflection based on critical incidents 1-17. “I need to take some time to reflect and think about my expectations for this immediate course

2. I need to define what expectations I have for myself as the course instructor.
   b. I need to think about what PSTs should know about the content in the course and why they need to know it.
      i. Expectations for myself as the course instructor.” (critical friend b, 2018, p. 7 para. 2)
      ii. “What are my expectations for a classroom management course instructor? What expectations for my residents?” (critical friend b, 2018, p. 7 para. 3).
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ESPOUSED PLATFORM CONFERENCE QUESTIONS

Critical Friend A:

Think back and share some of the most important reasons why you enter the teaching profession. Have your feelings changed in any way? Explain.

Why should students learn the content that you teach? How does the content relate to the world outside the classroom?

How do you handle the constant tension between covering the content and exploring topics in-depth to promote deeper understanding?

What indicators tell you that you have taught a successful lesson? How do you know when your students have learned what you hoped to convey?

If I were a new student moving into your classroom what would you say if I asked, “What would you expect from me?”

What questions do you have about your instructional practices?

Critical Friend B:

Why should students learn the content that you teach? And how does the content relate to the world outside the classroom?

How do you handle the constant tension between covering the content and exploring topics in-depth to promote deeper understanding?

What indicators tell you that you have taught a successful lesson and how do you know when your students have learned what you hoped to convey?

What questions do you have about your instructional practices?

What questions do you have about your students learning?
APPENDIX N:
INITIAL CODING CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT REFLECTIVE JOURNAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: Ways for PSTs and course instructors to connect course content and clinical experience</th>
<th># of Codes</th>
<th># of Subcategories: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open discussion</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open the discussions of preservice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed opportunity throughout semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership of content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice teachers’ ownership of content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice teacher makes field and course connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice teachers to recognize thoughts and connect to content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect to content to lessen judgments of preservice teachers from field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice teachers to connect theory and practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice teacher connection to field and course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice teachers can connect to content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course content to clinical experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine if the course connection to field is internalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpret content to clinical experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect and understand content connected to field experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on self when preservice teachers present in course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support residents in making connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enactment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice teachers to experience developing behavior system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice teachers to enact belief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to link theory and practice in authentic clinical experience but not necessarily enact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to link theory and practice in authentic clinical experience with enactment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a way for preservice teachers to enact course and field knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connected to theory, content, observed in the clinical experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing in clinical experience in connecting to course content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice teachers identifying teacher’s behavior based on observation and course content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix O:

### INITIAL CODING OF REFLECTIVE JOURNAL CLINICAL EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th># of Codes</th>
<th># of Subcategories:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting the needs of PSTs in clinical experience</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning the PST needs in the clinical experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiring into the PST learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support PST based on their interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSTs grappling with their beliefs of teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST need practice of concepts to inform their beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST beliefs impact their actions of theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggles with logistics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to not inquire as CT was there walking in hallway and short of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time constraints should have followed up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed opportunity to talk about K5 data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling observations time with PST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensions and struggles I feel as Supervisor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback to PST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggle with giving preservice teachers too much feedback and suggestions at one time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension on how much info to give preservice teachers on a topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple topics to mention deciding on appropriate time struggle based on if resident is ready</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension not enough data to share how to make instructional decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much debrief at once for PST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need follow up when I feel tensions to avoid misconceptions of PST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My beliefs and PST and/or CT not aligned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension of not being able to align decisions with PST actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension of what materials used by CT for PST with K5 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT instructional decisions creating tension as PST doesn’t know how to adapt to K5 need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held back on comments how PST was working with K5 student since CT driven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension of building misconceptions of CTs are not explaining their thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of PSTs in the clinical experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation of what PST should be able to produce in field when working with PST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX P:

**AXIAL CODING CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT REFLECTIVE JOURNAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorizes from Round 1:</th>
<th>Subcategories from Round 1: and codes from Round 2</th>
<th>New Codes generated from Round two Axial Coding</th>
<th>New Subcategory generated from Round two Axial Coding</th>
<th>New Category generated from Round two Axial Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ways for PSTs and course instructors to connect course content and clinical experience | **Open discussion**  
Believe questioning and reflection time to support PST connection to content and clinical experience  
I need to support residents in making connections during course discussions  
**Ownership of content**  
Reflection, observation, own beliefs, and content one-way PST learn  
**Feedback**  
I shared what the task could look like in the clinical experience  
Adjustments made to receive feedback from PST on course  
Believe PST share thinking based on others feedback  
**Support**  
Believe my responsibility to support course and | None | **Transfer of course content to clinical experience**  
Believe activities in course way to value/build relationships with PSTs and PSTS value/build relationships with K5 students  
Intentional in selecting content to support learning in field  
Transfer class activity to clinical experience  
Transfer class activity to clinical experience | None |
### APPENDIX Q:
#### AXIAL CODING CLINICAL EXPERIENCE REFLECTIVE JOURNAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories from Round 1:</th>
<th>Subcategories from Round 1: and codes from Round 2</th>
<th>New Codes generated from Round two: Axial Coding</th>
<th>New Subcategory generated from Round two Axial Coding</th>
<th>New category generated from Round two Axial Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting the needs of PSTs in clinical experience</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSTs grappling with their beliefs of teaching</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggles with logistics</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>PST question on clinical experience times Logistics of scheduling Logistics on course assignments</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensions and struggles I feel as Supervisor</td>
<td>Feedback to PST Tension between building relationships with preservice teacher and not giving feedback Assumed preservice teacher would pick up on my modeling I’m observing CT coach preservice</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX R:
COURSE INSTRUCTOR PEDAGOGICAL SKILLS FRAMEWORK ADAPTED FROM
BURNS & BADIALI SUPERVISOR PEDAGOGICAL SKILLS (2016) AND BAKER
(2020, DISSERTATION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogical Skill:</th>
<th>Noticing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Skill Definition:</td>
<td>Noticing occurs during the planning stages of the course and implementation of the course content. The course instructor should be attuned to what key concepts they notice as important to embed within the course and enact during instructional time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcomponents:</td>
<td>Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcomponent Definition:</td>
<td>More than likely course instructors are making decisions when planning based on what they are noticing as it relates to their beliefs, how to support preservice teachers, connections to course content, what they know about the clinical experience context, a combination of the subcomponents, or all of the subcomponents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerations:</td>
<td>To identify what subcomponent(s) they identified when planning to make informed decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogical Skill:</th>
<th>Ignoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Skill Definition:</td>
<td>Ignoring occurs during the planning stages of the course. When the course instructor decides to not include key concepts in the course, they have ignored content. The course instructor should have a clear rationale as to why key concepts would not be embedded within the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcomponents:</td>
<td>Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcomponent Definition:</td>
<td>More than likely course instructors do not think about why they ignore certain course content, however, it usually relates to their beliefs, how they want to support preservice teachers, how they can make connections to the course content, what they know about the clinical experience context, a combination of the subcomponents, or all of the subcomponents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerations:</td>
<td>To identify why they have ignored certain subcomponent(s) when planning to make informed decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Skill:</td>
<td>Intervening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogical Skill Definition:</strong></td>
<td>Intervening occurs during course instructional time. The course instructor intervenes when misconceptions are made, when a lack of understanding occurs around course content, when they want to share a personal experience, and when they want to add more information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcomponents:</strong></td>
<td>Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcomponent Definition:</strong></td>
<td>More than likely course instructors do not articulate why they intervene during course instructional time, however, it usually relates to their beliefs, how they want to support preservice teachers, how they can make connections to the course content, what they know about the clinical experience context, a combination of the subcomponents, or all of the subcomponents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Considerations:</strong></td>
<td>To identify why they have intervened and how it is related to certain subcomponent(s) to make informed decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogical Skill:</th>
<th>Pointing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogical Skill Definition:</strong></td>
<td>Pointing occurs during course instructional time. The course instructor has opportunity throughout the course in assignments, discussions, etc. to bring to the students’ attention specific content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcomponents:</strong></td>
<td>Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcomponent Definition:</strong></td>
<td>More than likely course instructors do not identify what they point to during course instructional time, however, it usually relates to their beliefs, how they want to support preservice teachers, how they can make connections to the course content, what they know about the clinical experience context, a combination of the subcomponents, or all of the subcomponents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Considerations:</strong></td>
<td>To identify why they have pointed to course content and how it is related to certain subcomponent(s) to make informed decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogical Skill:</th>
<th>Unpacking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogical Skill Definition:</strong></td>
<td>Unpacking occurs during course instructional time. The course instructor has an opportunity to delve deeper into key concepts or provide time for students to delve deeper into key concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcomponents:</strong></td>
<td>Beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcomponent Definition:</strong></td>
<td>More than likely course instructors do not attend to what they unpack or their students unpack during course instructional time, however, it usually relates to their beliefs, how they want to support preservice teachers, how they can make connections to the course content, what they know about the clinical experience context, a combination of the subcomponents, or all of the subcomponents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Considerations:
To identify why they have unpacked course content, or their students have unpacked course content and how it is related to certain subcomponent(s) to make informed decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogical Skill:</th>
<th>Processing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogical Skill Definition:</strong></td>
<td>Processing occurs during course instructional time. The course instructor decides how the content should be processed (assignments, discussion, collaboration, etc.) and has a rationale for why the content is processed in that specific way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcomponents:</th>
<th>Beliefs</th>
<th>Support PSTs</th>
<th>Course Content</th>
<th>Clinical Experience Context</th>
<th>Combination</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcomponent Definition:</strong></td>
<td>More than likely course instructors do not indicate how they decided to have students process content during course instructional time, however, it usually relates to their beliefs, how they want to support preservice teachers, how they can make connections to the course content, what they know about the clinical experience context, a combination of the subcomponents, or all of the subcomponents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Considerations: | To identify why they have students process course content in a specific way and how it is related to certain subcomponent(s) to make informed decisions. |
APPENDIX S:

STRUCTURAL CODING

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT METHODS COURSE

Pedagogical Skill Noticing: Noticing occurs during the planning stages of the course and implementation of the course content. The course instructor should be attuned to what key concepts they notice as important to embed within the course and enact during instructional time. **Subcomponents Definition:** Considerations for course instructors to identify why they have selected the course content and why they have chosen to enact the content during instructional time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Beliefs</th>
<th>Support PSTs</th>
<th>Course Content</th>
<th>Clinical Experience Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are not in the clinical experiences as many hours, so I will be adjusting the enacting classroom learning environment routines in the field from assignment one. The expectation based on assignment one is to have five routines utilized in the field and I will require 10 routines to be implemented within the field (1).</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I picked pages 12 to 22 because it gives descriptions and purpose and rationale for using morning meetings in the classroom (6).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1 is the greeting section, so they will be reading pages 51 to 63 (8).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removed “Areas identified as strengths” and “Areas identified as improvements/Steps I will take to make improvements”. I adjusted this section because I felt like the feedback and strengths and weaknesses sections were disjointed from what I really wanted to know about the class. I wanted to know if they were able to make connections from the course and the clinical experiences. Was I supporting them in making the connections to clinical experience and coursework with the content and examples I was sharing from experiences and observations to materials I was selecting for the course?</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX T:

STRUCTURAL CODING CLINICAL EXPERIENCE

UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR PEDAGOGICAL SKILLS (BURNS & BADIALI, 2016)

Pedagogical Skill Noticing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Mental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student had their back to me, but I was facing the resident. I took a few minutes to observe the interaction between the resident and student and realized that the resident was assessing students on positional words (3).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I then commented that this would be an example of a lesson that you could use to teach positional words. She commented like what we were talking about yesterday (8).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I asked her if she talked to the CT about how she selected the specific activities and she said that she just knew it was based on the assessment the CT gave. I told her that this is what we call differentiation. Where we’re using student assessment whether it’s formal or informal to make decisions on what the K5 student means (13).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I decided to write out specifically to aspects of the lesson which were the objective and how did she know if the students met the objective and left those with her along with the data I had collected. I did not stay and talk with her because after this group finished, she was moving on to the next group. I decided on these two aspects of the lesson because even if she is not creating the objectives on her own she should still be aware that she needs to have a specific focus when working with the groups and therefore needs to be sure she specifically asks her CT what the focus should be. Because she has not had instructional planning, yet I would not expect her to create the objective especially if the CT is just asking her to work with this group. However, she still needs to be aware of what the objective should be. The second aspects would be to begin to understand how she would collect that data even if it would be starting with one student and not all four like the data I collected. She needs to understand the surface level that you need to have an objective and you need to know whether your students have met that objective. Know what that looks like can be different depending on the students in the lesson but that will, over time with experience and coursework (34).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>