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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine how seven undergraduate foreign language (FL) preservice teachers’ (PSTs) motives, use and appropriation of tools, and teacher identity develop within two learning-to-teach FL contexts: the FL Education program and student teaching (ST). A sociocultural theoretical lens incorporating activity theory (AT) (Engeström, 1999) was used to frame this study. A key issue in examining PSTs’ formal experiences learning to teach FLs was how such experiences influenced their ideas about best FL practices, their teacher identity developments, and commitments to FL teaching.

Data were collected using language biographies, demographic questionnaires, self-reported confidence measure, stimulated recalls, interviews, blogs, and classroom observations. Triangulation and inductive data analysis led to revealed patterns in the PSTs’ FL learning histories, motives, use of tools, and beliefs about FL teaching over time and within learning-to-teach FLs contexts such as, the use of a particular approach to FL teaching, for example.

Findings indicate that often the overriding motives that shape action within the FL Education program and the ST practicum are misaligned to one another. This is partly because the university and cooperating schools have been constructed through their own historical and culturally grounded actions and social participation (Houston, 2008).
PSTs’ participation in each context mediated their ways of thinking, learning, and acting like FL teachers leading to tensions among differing motives, approaches to teaching FLs, and teaching tools utilized for FL instruction. As a result, opportunities existed for PSTs to problem-solve, to critically reflect upon their teaching and teaching situations, and to (re)create and work toward developing identities as different types of FL teachers. Findings also suggest that most PSTs in this study positioned themselves and (re)constructed their teacher identities during ST in relation to how they felt they were received by their students and cooperating teachers (CTs). In turn, such ways of becoming FL teachers shaped PSTs’ emerging teacher identities. The specific ways in which these PSTs learned to teach FLs, appropriated various tools, and began envisioning themselves as becoming certain kinds of FL teachers further had bearing on their commitments to the field. Implications for these findings suggest ways of narrowing the gap between what PSTs learn and experience in teacher education as compared to what they learn and experience during ST.

Suggestions for further research include more examination into what the field (e.g., foreign and second language educators and researchers) conceptualizes as best FL teaching practices, longitudinal studies exploring PST pedagogical and identity development throughout preservice education and teacher induction, exploration of the ways in which PSTs’ reasons for entry into the field have bearing on their commitment to teaching over time, and finally, the impact of professional organizations’ (i.e., National
Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education, American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages) expectations and standards on FL PSTs’ practices, conceptualizations of FL teaching, and identity development.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

“From the beginning of, but also during, their careers, teachers are engaged in creating themselves as teachers” (Coldron & Smith, 1999, p. 712). Coldron and Smith contend that part of the experience of teaching is recurrently constructing and reconstructing a sustainable identity as a teacher (1999). Coldron and Smith also suggest that a teacher’s identity is simultaneously determined by his or her own individual choices that affirm affiliations and make distinctions in the professional field and concurrently are partially socially determined or “given” (1999, p. 715). These authors propose that teachers regularly make moral judgments and decisions about how they choose to act and teach with regard to or in light of the school’s practices or climate. At times school cultures or climates may not mesh with those of the teacher, thus leaving the teacher to choose how they wish to establish and present themselves professionally. They argue that it is within the process of making moral judgments that teachers locate themselves in relation to other possible choices or positions that they could have taken, thus forming and informing their professional identities. The current study reported here takes up many of the same issues, especially preservice foreign language (FL) teacher identity construction as they move from the setting of the university course work to teaching FLs in a range of school contexts. As will become evident, teacher identities develop when they confront some of the difficult decisions of how to teach, what to teach, and what to teach when in institutional settings are not fully in alignment with one
another. Such decisions and how they are made are at the heart of what it means to become a teacher.

The Challenge of Learning to Teach Foreign Languages

It has been argued that in order to achieve the communicative goals implemented in the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* (ACTFL, 2006) (hereafter referred to as ‘the national FL standards’) that preservice teachers (PST) must learn to use a communicative approach to FL teaching (Savignon, 2001; Burke, 2006). Although the field of FL teaching argues that communicative approaches to FL teaching are those that are designed to develop student learners’ communicative skills (Burke, 2006), this study provides deeper understanding into how preservice teachers (PSTs) learn and conceptualize communicative FL teaching, and likewise, how such understanding has bearing on their identity construction and practice during student teaching (ST). Burke (2006) suggests that PSTs often learn about using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and communicative approaches in FL Education programs, but that they often fail to implement such instruction when teaching during field placements. Burke’s intention was to examine the influence of FL Methods courses on PSTs’ classroom instruction during field experiences. It is my intent to consider the teaching and learning during FL education and ST, as well as to explore why PSTs believe, behave, and practice the way they do.

The FL Education program in this study espouses a communicative approach grounded in constructivist principles for teaching and learning FLs. A main component of the teaching that is presented during the FL methods courses consists of implementing
the national FL standards as a means to promote CLT. The national FL standards consider performance-based, proficiency-based, and communicative-based FL instruction to be embedded within the overarching category of “standards-based instruction”. While grammar-based and other traditional FL methods are also strands or components important to well-balanced, comprehensive FL instruction, these methods are less important to what shapes FL instruction in the 21st century (ACTFL, 2006). Most PSTs in this study reported learning their FLs from a predominantly grammar-based approach; this sets up the possibility that when learning to teach FLs these PSTs may have rejected certain identities in line with the conceptual home of their university program. The ways in which FL teacher candidates are taught to teach FLs during teacher preparation not only have the potential to present them with new and perhaps different ways of teaching FLs, but also to new ways of envisioning themselves as prospective FL teachers. However, as previous studies have documented (Burke, 2006; Watzke, 2007) these new visions often clash with school-based approaches to FL teaching and learning.

The Problem of Teacher Identity

It is the intent of this study to explore how and why PSTs sort out, resist, and take up various teacher identities as they are learning to teach FLs. Often during teacher education, the diverse learning contexts promote conflicting practices and ideologies that often provide a sense of tension to the PSTs. This tension is experienced, in part, because PSTs are often (un)supported by their mentors within each context or their mentors disagreed about the kind of teacher identity development the PSTs might develop. While such positioning may cause confusion for PSTs, it is this tension that PSTs must
negotiate in order to learn how to teach FLs. Understanding how and why PSTs develop their practices, use of tools, and teacher identities during FL teacher education may provide insight and intervention into teacher education programs as a means to facilitate PSTs’ transition into teacher induction and potentially reduce teacher attrition rates.

The Problem of “Field Experience”

One aspect of teacher education that is often perceived and experienced disconnect as a cause between theories of the practice is the nature of the field experiences (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985; Hammerness, Darling-Hammond, Grossman, Rust, & Shulman, 2005; Rosaen & Florio-Ruane, 2008). While this problem exists in general teacher education, it is perhaps even more problematic in FL teacher education due to the additional complexities of learning FLs and learning to teach them. FL educators, linguists, researchers, and learners often have differing views of best FL learning and teaching practices. What adds to the complexity is that in addition to what students learn during FL instruction (i.e., content) and how students learn FLs (i.e., content through differing approaches to FL instruction) shapes their perceptions about how to eventually teach FLs. “The FL teacher must continue to learn about teaching as the beginning experience is investigated and a context for pedagogy developed. This learning process can include myriad emotions, frustrations, and deterrents” (Watzke, 2007, p. 74).

Rosaen and Florio-Ruane (2008) find the metaphorical term “field experience” problematic. They posit that field experiences often invoke an expectation among PSTs that teaching in school settings is a separate or isolated learning experience from teacher
education courses. Despite being practical events that inform PSTs’ teaching practices, it appears that often the nature of field experiences continues to perpetuate the dissonance between praxis and theory. Part of the problem, as they see it, is that education faculty and PSTs “divide their professional education into two unrelated parts as they are expected effectively to change discourses and cross culturally determined borders in order to learn” (p. 712).

Others argue that the transition from undergraduate education courses to ST is often considered a critical point in an individual’s preparation for teaching (Lederman, Gess-Newsome, & Latz, 1994; Hammerness et al., 2005). Franzak (2002) similarly acknowledges that “[T]he practicum experience is often stressful for preservice teachers because they encounter dissonance between their preconceived views of teacher and what they observe in the field” (p. 260). While attempting to balance these multiple influences, PSTs begin to construct an explicit view of himself or herself as teacher (2002). Given this perceived dissonance as ‘reality shock’ by preservice and novice teachers (Franzak, 2002), the argument has been made (Zeichner & Conklin, 2008; Danielwicz, 2001; Grossman, 1990) for more practical, meaningful, and coherent experiences provided to PSTs during teacher preparation.

The Problem of the Apprenticeship of Observation

In order to be more supportive of beginning teacher development, researchers have explored the interrelationship among personal ideas, experiences, and beliefs PSTs bring with them into teacher education to better understand how teacher candidates conceptualize learning and learning to teach (Grossman, 1990; Feiman-Nemser, 2001;
Feiman-Nemser (2001) suggests the beliefs and knowledge that teachers bring with them to their teacher education program, field experiences, and into first teaching experiences, serve as the filters for making sense of what they learn and encounter during this process of professional development. Understanding teacher candidates’ personal FL learning trajectories, their ways of knowing, and how they conceptualize teaching FLs may better inform FL teacher education programs and curriculum. Understanding how PSTs conceptualize their FL learning and teaching experiences may consequently shed light on how instruction to teach FLs influences FL PSTs’ emerging teacher identities.

While there continues to be debate about the impact of education courses on PSTs’ instructional practices in the classroom (Velez-Rendón, 2002; Zeichner & Conklin, 2008; Johnson, 1994; Watzke, 2007), scholars have agreed that teachers’ previous learning experiences are “as important as education programs in shaping teachers’ ways of knowing” (Velez-Rendón, 2002, p. 459; Feiman-Nemser, 2001). PSTs’ beliefs are important not only because of the intimate connection with identity, but also because of the nature of the beliefs that PSTs bring with them into teacher education, as long-time experienced observers of teachers and teaching (Lortie, 1975). The interplay among prior beliefs, current beliefs, and emerging beliefs as a result of learning to teach FLs in two different contexts with differing motives may contribute to PSTs’ teacher identity development. The ways in which a teacher candidate has learned a FL contributes, in part, to how he initially conceptualizes teaching a FL. Given that one’s previous, as well as current ways of learning, knowing, and behaving as a FL learner and as a FL teacher
candidate contribute to one’s emerging teaching identity, each setting or context of learning to teach must be closely examined.

The Problem of the Two-Worlds Pitfall

Research and practice in teacher education suggest that teacher education programs ought to provide teacher candidates with the means to analyze personal beliefs and reflect, develop subject matter knowledge, develop understandings of learners and theories of learning, develop tools for studying teaching, and connect theory with their field or practical teaching experiences, among others (Zeichner & Conklin, 2008; Darling-Hammond, 2008; Feiman-Nemser, 2001). Recent efforts have been made in the field to reconceptualize teacher education (Rosaen & Florio-Ruane, 2008); some teacher education programs have undergone reform through adopting state and national standards (Godwin & Oyler, 2008; Wilson & Tamir, 2008; Feiman-Nemser, 2001), and FL teaching standards have been implemented (National Standards In Foreign Language Education Project, 1996, NCATE, http://www.ncate.org/documents/ProgramStandards/actfl2002.pdf). However, despite program reforms and the influx of new standards the elusive problem of how to best prepare teacher candidates for today’s FL classrooms remains. Perhaps if field experiences reinforce the philosophies of the FL Education program, and PSTs are supported by experienced FL educators who implement similar best FL teaching practices, and FL PSTs are positioned by both the FL program and their CTs as competent communicative FL teachers, then the issue of ‘wash-out’ might be less concerning. Could Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann’s notion of the two-worlds pitfall
experienced by many PSTs be vigilantly reduced towards a more unified pedagogical trajectory? The findings gleaned from the present study aim to rejoin some of these questions.

The Concept of Identity

In exploring teacher identity development among PSTs, one must not only consider how PSTs are taught to teach FLs in the FL Education program and how they personally have learned FLs, but also how they are taught to teach FLs during ST, and consequently, how the three learning contexts may (mis)align. Additionally, how the PSTs are supported as FL teachers within these contexts is important to how and why PSTs form or reject certain positions and identities for themselves in the FL classroom. Lave and Wenger posit that “[L]earning thus implies becoming a different person with respect to the possibilities enabled by these systems of relations. To ignore this aspect of learning is to overlook the fact that learning involves the construction of identities” (1991, p. 53). Others advocate that “[D]eveloping an identity as a teacher is an important part of securing teachers’ commitment to their work and adherence to professional norms of practice” (Hammerness, Darling-Hammond, Bransford, Berliner, Cochran-Smith, McDonald & Zeichner, 2005, p. 383). Yet, Bransford, Hammond, and LePage point out that questions still remain surrounding the professional commitments teachers need in order to help their students succeed while also developing their own pedagogical knowledge and skills (2005, p. 3). Therefore, this study focuses on how PSTs are positioned and supported in their learning to teach FLs in two learning-to-teach contexts, and simultaneously, how they perceive their roles and responsibilities in the FL
classroom. Positioning by others (i.e., cooperating teachers [CTs], university supervisors, etc.) during ST is examined to explore and describe how it may inform or shape PSTs’ learning and teacher identity formation. Further, how PSTs choose to work towards (re)constructing, developing, and maintaining teacher identities and commitments to FL teaching is examined in chapters 4 and 5.

**Activity Theory and Teacher Learning**

This study aims to contribute to the field of FL education by considering a familiar context (FL teacher preparation), with a focused aim (explore PSTs’ beliefs about FL teaching and processes of teacher identity formation), as understood through PSTs’ perspectives and experiences within two activity systems: Teacher education and ST. In order to carry out such investigation activity theory (AT) frames this study. AT theorizes that within mediated sociocultural contexts, a person’s basis for thinking and behaving is developed through (problem-solving) action and tools (Engeström, 1999; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Tools are materials or concepts that have been modified by humans as a means of facilitating or regulating their interactions with others and within various settings. A reciprocal relationship exists between the activity and the tool (Cole, 1999). “Activity presupposes a corresponding motive, which coincides with an object of activity; actions are aimed at concrete goals; and operations are connected to certain tasks” (Lektorsky, 2009, p. 77).

Multiple and competing motives often coexist within a context or activity setting. The overriding motive for an activity setting provides channels that encourage and discourage particular ways of thinking, acting and teaching. Activity theory is useful for
illuminating how, why and when teachers choose pedagogical tools to inform and conduct their teaching (Grossman, Smagorinsky, & Valencia, 1999). During teacher education, PSTs’ ways of thinking and knowing are developed and informed through experiences with problem solving in specific contexts such as university classrooms and FL classrooms (Grossman, Valencia, Evans, Thompson, Martin, & Place, 2000, p. 633). These contexts have been constructed through historical and culturally grounded actions and social participation, and therefore, such contexts mediate PSTs’ ways of thinking, learning, and knowing; essentially, identities as FL teachers are formed, created, and understood through social interactions.

Britzman (2000) notes that little agreement exists in the field of teacher education “nor understanding regarding how those trying to teach actually learn from their practices, their students, or their incidental anxieties made from acquiring experience” (p. 200). Sumara and Luce-Kapler (1996) suggest that a beginning teacher must negotiate at least three types of teaching identities: those that they bring with them into teacher education, those that they develop during their teacher preparation courses, and those that they develop during their student teaching experience (p. 65). This study examines the beliefs and identities PSTs have formed from being lifelong student observers and from their participation in FL teacher education along with the experiences PSTs have during ST that give shape to their emerging teacher identities and commitments toward FL teaching. This study considers how the positioning of PSTs by those affiliated with the university (during FL education) and CTs during ST may have bearing on PSTs’ beliefs about FL teaching, teaching practices, and on their commitments to FL teaching.
Sumara and Luce-Kapler (1996) have observed that for many education students “becoming a teacher” often means excluding or discarding various previous identities and experiences that do not necessarily conform to the often restricting practices that dominate in teacher education. They further argue that teacher candidates need to learn to disengage from the identities that they bring with them to teaching (1996). Patterns gleaned in PSTs’ changing beliefs about FL teaching, emerging identity formations, and their commitments to sustaining those identities within the contexts examined in this study may provide discernment into issues surrounding (FL) teacher preparation and teacher induction in general.

For purposes of this study, having, using, and maintaining a teacher identity includes: the specific ways through which teachers professionally relate to other individuals (students, parents, administrators, etc.), the associated responsibilities, attitudes, and behaviors teachers adopt as well as the knowledge and skills manifested in their classrooms; and lastly, having socially legitimized teacher status or qualification that is used as a tool for the individual (and others) to perceive him or herself as a teacher. This identity is dynamic and constantly being modified (Coldron & Smith, 1999; Beijaard, Meijer, & Verloop, 2004).

Furthermore, this study considers teacher identity formation as the taking of a position or the creating of one’s self as a certain type of FL teacher. An identity is taken up or chosen within a range of possible identities and must be socially legitimated. It is understood that an individual has to negotiate his or her teacher identities within the context of a community and its boundaries and customs. As for the location of an individual within the professional array of possibilities—his or her present location
should be considered with regard to the ideal location to which the person wishes to achieve (Coldron & Smith, 1999). Finally, beliefs are constructs that name, define, and describe the structure and content of mental states that are believed to drive a person’s actions. With regard to teacher beliefs, they can be “represented as a set of conceptual representations which store general knowledge of objects, people and events, and their characteristic relationships” (Zheng, 2009, p. 74). Using AT to shed light on various sociocultural elements and contexts of learning-to-teach FLs has the potential to provide clearer insight into the complexities of PSTs’ teaching and pedagogical development over time. This study investigates the contexts in which and through which PSTs form their beliefs, (re)construct their teacher identities and in turn, realize their commitments to FL teaching over time. It is within the context of ST that I aim to explore such development. Guiding questions of this investigation include:

- What are the principal contexts in which FL PSTs learned to teach FLs? What overriding or dominant motives shape action within these contexts?
  - What tools, concepts, and beliefs of FL teaching do PSTs develop during FL teacher education and during ST in order to take action toward the goals of the various contexts?
  - How do the ways in which PSTs learn to teach FLs within various formal contexts (i.e., FL teacher education and ST) shape teacher identity development? How do PSTs’ beliefs, teaching tools, and commitment to FL teaching shape their identity development and vice versa?
Motivation for and Significance of the Study

The motivations for this study are rooted in both personal and professional experiences. As a beginning FL teacher, I personally struggled with creating and maintaining an identity as a FL teacher. Being a first-year Spanish teacher with no formal education background proved to be challenging. Although I survived the first year of teaching Spanish at a private high school (HS), the experience raised serious doubts in my mind about whether I wanted to pursue a career in the field of FL education. I felt out of place in the classroom and certainly did not create professional identities that were sustainable or admirable during my first two years of teaching. Even after completing a formal teacher education program and state certification requirements a few years later, I still felt uneasy in the classroom. While I found that I fared better and enjoyed more the experience of teaching at the middle school level, it took some time before I felt that I was becoming the FL teacher that I had wanted to become. Each year I continued to strive for crafting more engaging lessons and fostering meaningful FL communication and cultural awareness among my students. I began to consider my student learners as recipients of my teaching rather than simply consider my own instruction. I gradually found ways to promote cultural understanding and appreciation in my classes. I eventually discovered ways to engage students in their study of Spanish. I learned how to be an advocate of FLs and help my students find meaning and utility in their study of Spanish. Several more years of teaching left me feeling that I had finally understood how to provide students with more relevant, meaningful, and exciting experiences—unlike my own memories as a FL learner.
While I did not have fond memories of FL teachers in HS, I did have one inspiring FL teacher in college. I was fortunate to have cultivated a friendship with my former German professor that lasted beyond my years at the university. The fond memories of his engaging German classes and recollections of how, over the course of two years, he had managed to create a community of student learners who shared in each other’s German learning stuck out in my mind when I prepared for my own classes. I kept in touch with Herr Dodge and often solicited his pedagogical advice about fostering a sense of community, engagement, and responsibility in the FL classroom.

Since then, I have gone on to teach Spanish and FL Education courses at the college level. I often use my stories as a means to help prospective teachers learn from my experiences and to help broaden their ideas, ground their expectations, and encourage them to consider who and what kinds of FL teachers they want to become. For many years, I pondered what kept me teaching when I did not always feel comfortable with what kind of FL teacher I was becoming. During my years of teaching in K-12 schools, I did not have mentor teachers to help support and encourage me, nor to guide me as a competent FL teacher in the classroom. I now can look back and say that it was a combination of experiences, intrinsic motivation, a mentor colleague (several years later) and even the experiences of motherhood, that have helped me to become the FL teacher I am today.

Over the years I have witnessed FL Education students complete teacher education programs only to leave the field either before or just after completing student-teaching (ST). I have often wondered what the underlying reasons are that account for some individual’s motivations for beginning a FL Education program and their
motivations for leaving FL education. Why have some FL teacher candidates gone through the program, only to stop short of completing ST and essentially graduating from the university with a degree in education, but not licensed to teach? I have asked such students what has turned them away from FL teaching after such an investment and I have not received what I think has been a complete answer. Perhaps it is too difficult to verbalize, perhaps they did not want to share a disappointing outcome, or perhaps they themselves did not know. This quest for knowledge indirectly has led me to conduct this research study in attempts to find out how preservice teachers (PST) construct teacher identities as they vacillate between university coursework and field experiences. As well as among a range of identities they imagine as possible for them. Understanding what contributes to PSTs’ experiences of learning to teach FLs and problem-solve as they find themselves within differing contexts may shed light on the significant numbers of new teachers leaving the profession after a short time in the field; despite the efforts of university teacher education and mentor programs (Almarza, 1996; Ben-Peretz, 2001; Ingersoll, 2001; Bullough, Jr. & Draper, 2004; Hiebert, Morris, Berk & Jansen, 2007).

In search for such answers, I have explored the research and have found some possible reasons for why this dilemma may be. In turning to the research, Demerath (2006) suggests that individuals are motivated to affirm their understandings of identities when something has occurred that challenges or puts those identities in jeopardy. She further suggests that individuals “are most likely to work to maintain those identities” to which they are most committed (p. 497). In the field of teacher education, Beeth and Adadan (2006) point out that “preservice teachers are usually unaware of many of the situational problems that can arise in the classroom, although they expect their
preparation to have addressed these problems before they are encountered in the field” (p. 104). Many of the problems that lie within the perceived and experienced dissonance PSTs often experience are results of a multitude of factors: inability to connect theory to praxis (Sumara & Luce-Kapler, 1996), misunderstandings about reflective teaching (Bartlett, 1990), experiencing of the two-worlds pitfall trying to mesh education coursework into the realities of teaching in classrooms (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985), complicated university and cooperating school mentor relationships (Bullough, Jr. & Draper, 2004), or classroom management fears and problems (Maynard & Fuller, 1995; Veenman, 1984; Watzke, 2007), among others. PSTs facing such situational problems in university coursework and FL classrooms may provide opportunities for their developing teacher identities to be affirmed, challenged, or put in jeopardy. I suggest that in addition to these potential factors contributing to PSTs feeling unprepared for the realities of teaching in today’s FL classrooms, such feelings may also result from not understanding who they are becoming as FL teachers.

The process of learning to become a teacher and gradually developing teacher identities are complex issues that have been studied throughout the last several decades (Coldron & Smith, 1999; Beijaard et al., 2004). Although various studies of teacher identity formation and development have been conducted, researchers define teacher identity differently, hindering the conceptual clarity of these concepts (Coldron & Smith, 1999; Gee, 2000; Jackson, 2001; White & Moss, 2003; Beijaard et al., 2004). Being a teacher is a matter of being viewed as a teacher by oneself and by others, and of constructing and redefining an identity that is socially legitimized (Coldron & Smith, 1999, p. 712). Cooper and Olson (1996) propose that “teacher identity is continually
being informed, formed, and reformed as individuals develop over time and through interaction with others” (as cited in Franzak, p. 259). Given that taking on a professional identity needs to be socially legitimized or recognized, it is important to consider the growth and maturation processes of individuals and their developing identities towards becoming teachers as they progress through teacher education preparation prior to formally being socially recognized as educators. At what point in time does one start defining him or herself as a teacher? How and when does teacher identity develop? Does teacher identity development have bearing on PSTs’ decisions to stay in FL education?

An obvious place to start when considering teacher identity development is the area of teacher preparation. Discussion abounds about how and what teacher candidates need to learn in undergraduate teacher education programs. Darling-Hammond (2008) argues that in addition to pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1987) and subject matter content, teacher candidates must also learn how students learn and process information individually, how they may benefit from working collaboratively, and how to structure tasks that elicit student comprehension and motivation. She argues that it is perhaps “the most important role of universities in the preparation of teachers” to provide teacher candidates with opportunities to envision and comprehend meaningful learning experiences for student learners (2008, p. 343). Providing teacher candidates with adequate pedagogical content knowledge, subject matter content, emic perspectives of student learners’ experiences, and an informed awareness of themselves as the teachers they are becoming is a complex task.
Recent efforts have been made in some teacher education programs to help teacher candidates become more aware of their emerging teacher identities through attempts at conducting action research and reflectivity. In doing so, teacher candidates may become more cognizant of their personal beliefs, perceptions, visions, and reasons for their practices within the classroom (Danielwicz, 2001; Britzman, 1991; Sumara & Luce-Kapler, 1996; Antonek, McCormick & Donato, 1997; Rosaen & Florio-Ruane, 2008; Rodgers & Scott, 2008). Beijaard, Verloop, and Vermunt (2000) state that “[T]eachers’ perceptions of their own professional identity affect their efficacy and professional development as well as their ability and willingness to cope with educational change and to implement innovations in their own teaching practice” (p. 750). These authors further argue that it is important to conduct such research on how teachers perceive themselves and their professional identities because these perceptions “strongly influence their judgments and behaviour [sic]” (2000, p. 762), and perhaps have bearing on their commitments to teaching and to the profession over time.

**Organization of the Dissertation**

Chapter 1 includes an introduction to the study’s focus, objectives, basic assumptions, and research questions. Personal and professional motivating factors driving this research study have also been offered.

Chapter 2 reviews the literature pertinent to this study. These areas are positioned in relation to theories stemming from research of sociocultural views of identity, teacher preparation, teacher identity, and current instructional approaches in FL education. Finally, an overview of the main theoretical framework for this study, activity theory
(AT) (Engeström, 1987), and recent studies in the field of education that have used AT have been reviewed. It is not the intent of this paper to critique methodological approaches to FL teaching, but rather to explain the premises behind CLT and national FL standards as they were promoted during the PSTs study in the FL Education program.

Chapter 3 describes why a qualitative research paradigm is best suited for an investigation like this one. A description of the research methods and coding is provided for data collection and analysis. In addition, a description of each context examined in this study has been provided.

Chapter 4 presents a cross-case analysis of findings from the seven PSTs in the study. The PSTs’ motives, use of tools, problem spaces, teacher identity development, and commitments varied during ST. Findings show that these PSTs tended to gravitate towards the teacher identities that they were guided towards in both learning-to-teach contexts. PSTs left the FL methods course intending to develop into communicative FL teachers, as they had been encouraged to do by me, the FL methods instructor. PSTs initially talked of teaching communicatively in the target language (TL) and of establishing the FL classroom as a mock target culture community, for example. With that said, it must be mentioned that the national FL standards are visionary goals that aim to transform the FL teaching profession into meeting the global and linguistic needs of student learners in the 21st century. Such transformation of instructional approaches takes time, collaborative efforts, and many layers of national, state, and local support. Many of the programs in which these PSTs student-taught have not yet made such transitions, and thus, often create divergences with the FL Education program. In most cases, PSTs were placed in FL classrooms under the supervision of CTs who did not
utilize communicative or proficiency-based approaches. Most PSTs gradually began taking on the identities of grammar-based or hybrid FL teachers after working with CTs who encouraged them to take up such pedagogical practices.

Chapter 5 presents a synthesis of the research findings, contradictions identified in this study, a discussion of pedagogical and FL Education implications, avenues for future research, limitations of the study, and a final summary.
Chapter 2: Review of Related Research

Overview

This chapter reviews the research and theories related to teacher identity development, teacher learning and formative experiences during teacher preparation that give shape to preservice foreign language (FL) teachers’ ways of doing, knowing, and being. As this study of FL teacher preparation includes not only case study teachers but also a range of social contexts including professional educators who have differing motives for teacher education, in this review I weave together several theoretical frames that I hinted at in chapter 1. These frames include sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978) with particular emphasis on activity theory (Cole, 1996; Leont'ev, 1981; Tulviste, 1991; Wertsch, 1981), identity theory (Moje & Luke, 2009; Penuel & Wertsch, 1995), and theories of language teaching and learning including standards-based instruction and communicative language teaching (CLT) (Canale & Swain, 1980; Leaver & Shechtman, 2002), and second language acquisition (Krashen, 1989; Savignon, 1991; Swain, 2000). Each of these frames plays a role in understanding preservice FL teachers’ (PSTs) learning and teacher identity development.

These theories of teacher learning and language teaching provide three key elements to this study. First they contribute analytic lenses for studying PSTs’ beliefs, perspectives, and practices. Features of teacher learning that are important during FL
teacher preparation also interacts with PSTs’ backgrounds prior to teacher education. PSTs’ language learning experiences and memories of schooling (Lortie, 1975) become significant as they practice, learn, and explore what it means to become FL teachers.

Second the theoretical frames assume that rather than focusing on the development as an individual or psychological phenomenon that teacher learning occurs within the sociocultural context of teacher preparation. Activity theory (AT) highlights the importance of context in learning to teach. Just as research on teaching has begun to focus on context (McLaughlin & Talbert, 1993), research on teacher education needs to take up the analytic challenge of portraying the features of settings that matter most in learning to teach (Grossman, Smagorinsky, & Valencia, 1999). However, focusing solely on the setting overlooks the ways in which it is constructed by each teacher within it, making discrepant cases difficult to explain because they defy the motive of the setting. The question of individual history and identity within settings, then, becomes part of the consideration of their dynamic and evolving nature. Accordingly, a third key theoretical lens for this study is the use of case study methods (Merriam, 1998) to capture PSTs’ learning within contexts to attain in-depth understanding of the sometimes overlapping and conflicting motives within a particular FL Education program.

This investigation into PSTs’ beliefs about FL teaching practices they learn and transfer from university course work to student-teaching (ST), and their explorations of who they are becoming as FL teachers during ST draws upon specific research of teacher knowledge and beliefs, teacher preparation, and teacher identity development. Put another way, the features of teacher learning investigated in this study encompass how
and to what extent FL PSTs’ experiences with learning FLs combine with what and how they learn to teach FLs within FL teacher preparation to further give shape to the teacher identities they construct as FL teachers.

An Activity Theory Framework for Studying Teacher Learning and Development

Activity Theory was developed in early twentieth century by those associated with the cultural-historical school of Russian psychology, including Vygotsky, Leont’ev and Luria (Engeström, 1999). The impact and uses of activity-theoretical approaches over the past two decades can be seen in areas, such as organization studies (Blackler, 2009), digital technology (Rückriem, 2009), and education (Grossman et al., 1999; Jonassen, 2000; Newell, Gingrich & Johnson, 2001; Johnson, Thompson, Smagorinsky & Fry, 2003) among others. AT begins with the assumption that conscious learning and activity are both interdependent and interactive (Jonassen, 2000). As such, one’s knowledge of a domain cannot be separated from one’s interactions within that domain. Moreover, knowledge that is integrated with the activity cannot be considered outside of the context in which it was constructed. Learning, then, is considered a process of making meaning, which originates from interactions with other individuals, tools and artifacts. Often such learning is derived from situations of confusion, curiosity, or conflict (Engeström, 1999, 2000; Jonassen, 2000).

Multiple and competing motives often coexist within a context or an activity setting, though typically some predominate. For example, while a FL Education program might espouse standards-based instruction or proficiency-based instruction as its
overriding motive; the schools in which PSTs learn to teach FLs may regard explicit grammar learning, translation, and memorization as best practices for teaching FLs. The overriding motive for a context provides channels that encourage and discourage particular ways of thinking, acting and teaching. AT is useful for illuminating how, why and when teachers choose pedagogical tools to inform and conduct their teaching.

In the context of teacher education PSTs’ ways of thinking and knowing are developed and informed through experiences with problem-solving in specific contexts, such as, university classrooms and cooperating school classrooms (Grossman, Valencia, Evans, Thompson, Martin, & Place, 2000). These contexts have been constructed through historically and culturally grounded actions and social participation, and therefore, such contexts mediate a PST’s ways of thinking, learning, and knowing; essentially, an identity as a teacher is formed, (re)created, and understood through social interactions within the context of various activity. In the next section I review some of the empirical work inspired by AT.

Foreign Language Education Research and Activity-Theoretical Studies of English Language Arts Teacher Education

Several important studies incorporating learning to teach, teacher development, and teacher identity development have been conducted using an activity theoretical framework during the past few decades. While these studies have been significant in forming and informing the framework for this study, my search yielded no empirical
studies using AT to understand how PSTs learn to teach FLs. As such, several studies in English Language Arts and FL education inform the empirical base of this study.

Grossman, Smagorinsky, and Valencia (1999) provide the most comprehensive use of AT to frame ways of studying teacher learning and development. They present their framework using the tenets of AT and the tentative result of a longitudinal study of twenty-one novice English education teachers during their first years of teaching. Specifically, Grossman et al. (1999) take the reader through an explanation of how to employ AT using results of their study. In so doing, these authors identify five degrees of appropriation observed in the practices of the PSTs in their longitudinal study. They defined the levels of appropriation as lack of appropriation, appropriating a label, appropriating surface features, appropriating conceptual underpinnings, and finally, achieving mastery (p.16-18). These authors suggest that appropriation may occur at various stages across varying levels. They also caution that the lack of appropriation does not necessarily imply a lack of understanding, but rather may suggest a rejection of that particular tool or an environment, which may not be conducive to the implementation of such tool. In the current study, I examine and consider the appropriation and use of a communicative approach (conceptual tool) and other tools associated with teaching FLs by the FL PSTs as a key component to their teacher identity formations.

Grossman, Smagorinsky, and Valencia (1999) argue that AT provides a heuristic for understanding how novice teachers understand and conceptualize their practice over time. AT considers the progression of a developing teacher through series of contexts, which may mediate teachers’ learning, beliefs, and practices in the classroom.
authors further suggest that an approach grounded in AT may help account for changes in individual teacher’s thinking and practice, even when it may vary from case to case, by simultaneously attending to individuals and the settings in which they learn.

Furthermore, Grossman et al. (1999) suggest that the overarching motive of an activity setting encourages and discourages particular ways of thinking and doing. This is embedded through its resources for learning, structural features and procedures, and sets of relationships. Teacher education becomes complicated when various and multiple contexts are involved; sometimes they overlap, align, or misalign. Often problems encountered while learning to teach during various settings (i.e., pertaining to subject content or classroom management, etc.) contribute to a teacher’s identity development (Britzman, 1991). As Grossman et al. (1999) point out, learning to teach in different contexts, driven by different motives and tools, may lead to confusion and may complicate potential teacher identity development. Therefore, understanding PSTs’ beliefs about FL teaching, how they perceive themselves as FL teachers, their use of tools which have been appropriated from FL education and ST contexts, and ultimately, how the learning-to-teach contexts support teacher identity development among PSTs are key concerns of this study.

Grossman, Valencia, Evans, Thompson, Martin, and Place (2000) conducted a longitudinal study of ten novice English teachers during their final year of teacher preparation through their first three years of teaching. Data collected included multiple interviews, classroom observations, and documents from prior coursework and from the school settings where the participants were teaching at the time of the study. The authors
developed a coding scheme which focused on the teaching of writing to analyze the gathered data. While they present mainly three teachers’ cases, they present a cross-case analysis of the ten participants’ experiences. As other research has suggested (Grossman et al., 1999; Newell et al., 2001), findings indicate that the ST practicum can be a powerful setting which influences the ways in which PSTs appropriate knowledge of teaching tools. This suggests the possibility that ST placements may not necessarily have to be consistent with teacher preparation coursework in order to be valuable; something I also found among several PSTs in this study. They posit that contexts (encompassed by specific individuals, tools, relations, motives, etc.) may support or thwart continued learning and greater appropriation of tools. Grossman et al. (2000) suggest that, over time, pedagogical tools learned during teacher preparation can provide a framework for individual’s views of teaching and images of sound instruction. Their study cautions of making preempted claims about what PSTs (in general) learn and take away from teacher education.

In another study of English teacher education, Newell, Gingrich, and Johnson (2001) posit that AT provides insight into novice teacher learning and development that occurs within various mediated settings or contexts. Newell et al. used AT as a framework for investigating the contexts in which nine undergraduate and graduate PSTs appropriated tools for teaching English in middle and secondary schools. One of the main concerns of the study was to explore why and how student teachers’ thinking and practices were influenced differently by the diverse activity settings provided by their cooperating schools and teachers during student teaching. Newell et al. (2001) set out to
examine the activity settings which shaped student teachers’ efforts to learn the social
customs and practices of their particular cooperating school climates. They also intended
to better understand which modes of participation (i.e., reflective practice, procedural
display, and routinization) occurred during the student teachers’ appropriations of
pedagogical tools during ST. Understanding these modes of participation, they argued,
would provide some understanding of the participants applied the pedagogical tools in

These nine PSTs were observed in the classroom and interviewed multiple times
over the course of 10 weeks. The participants were also expected to keep journals,
provide unit and lesson plans, and participate in student debriefings throughout the course
of the study in efforts to triangulate the data gathered from concurrent observations and
interviews. The authors used this descriptive data to capture details about how the
participants’ academic background and preparation, personal purposes and perceptions of
teaching, and to explore the decisions and experiences that the participants in the
classrooms made during this time.

These authors conclude that field experiences (i.e., activity settings in teacher
education programs) are significant because of the impact they have on the actions,
beliefs, and intentions of the student teachers. Newell et al. (2001) explain that what best
accounts for the variance in student teachers’ appropriation or internalization of
pedagogical tools and practices was the extent to which the participants developed a
thorough understanding of instructional scaffolding within specific contexts. These
authors considered student teachers’ academic trajectories and the university coursework,
including field experiences, to see how they may have shaped the participants’ efforts to principally employ and modify pedagogical tools in context. Their findings suggested that when activity settings from the university teacher education program were closely aligned with the activity settings provided by the cooperating school, the participants were more likely to appropriate the university-provided tools. When the contexts did not align or conform, it posed additional challenges for the student teachers to appropriate these same tools. A key finding that seems to run counter to AT was that despite the shaping influences of social contexts, the study of activity settings does not offer a uniform explanation for student teacher development across the board. While two teachers, for example, may work at the same arena (e.g., school), they may have different understandings of the school setting based on their own goals, histories, and activities within the school arena (Lave, 1988; Grossman et al., 2000).

Newell et al. (2001) suggest that as student teachers negotiate themselves and their actions in activity settings provided by teacher education programs, researchers can observe how their beliefs and practices develop. While the authors admit that AT does not provide explanation for all activities, actions, and operations that occur in teaching because of its situated nature in specific and unique moments and contexts, it does however, provide a lens to view how social settings become negotiated and how personal identities are constructed.

Exploring the personal backgrounds of PSTs provides insight into the ways in which they construct and perceive their surroundings and settings. How individual life trajectories, personal language-learning histories, agency, and behaviors of PSTs have the
potential to shape their conceptual development, practice, and future commitment to the profession must be given fair consideration when examining contexts for learning to teach FLs. Newell *et al.* (2001) also noted similar components as essential when using activity theory to study situated contexts of learning among secondary English teachers. To account for such information, I explored the personal FL learning histories and general life trajectories of each PST prior to their participation in ST.

Moreover, within an activity theoretical framework the collective activity system is driven by a collaborative motive (Jonassen, 2000). As referenced earlier by Grossman *et al.* (1999) the ultimate goal of teacher preparation and raison d’être for NCATE is to prepare PSTs “to assume the professional responsibilities of a teacher and to teach competently” (p. 5). In this study the motive is embedded within and perpetuated by the FL teacher education’s goal-oriented object of preparing competent FL PSTs to teach FLs communicatively and through the use of the national FL standards. Contradictions and disturbances observed in activity systems often indicate potential opportunities for change, growth, and reflection for the institutions and participants involved. In this study, the learning of PSTs to teach FLs using CLT and the national FL standards during FL education, coupled with their learning to teach FLs during ST often under the supervision of CTs who espouse more traditional, grammar-based instruction lends itself to possible tension. This tension, I argue, has the potential to shape teacher identity development and perhaps a PST’s future commitment to FL teaching.

Conflicts and inconsistencies across and within activity systems and learning contexts have the potential to provide PSTs with personal and professional growth
opportunities (Engeström, 1999; Engeström, 2000; Jonassen, 2000). How PSTs receive and reject some opportunities for growth and change vary. Such opportunities for dealing with conflict and tension in this study can be seen in the many observed interactions that provide opportunities for the PSTs to problem-solve, make meaning, resolve confrontation, and critically reflect through their use of conceptual and practical tools gained in FL teacher preparation and ST. In addition to encountered variation in the methodological approaches and instructional practices between two learning-to-teach FLs contexts, how the PSTs’ pedagogical learning and practices of FL teaching were supported within those contexts furthermore influenced their identity formations. These are taken up further in chapter 5.

An important goal of this study then is to explore how (and to the extent possible why) the PSTs accommodate or reject certain positions the university and cooperating schools expect of them during ST. When PSTs enter into the ST practicum university-oriented in their thinking, they run the risk of encountering tension between the two contexts. For some PSTs, such tension can be productive as they sort out which identities they want to construct for themselves. Prior studies have observed that some PSTs tend to align themselves with the cooperating schools rather than university settings (Grossman et al., 1999; Newell et al., 2001) and begin to recognize themselves as less university-oriented in their thinking and more in line with FL teachers who implement more traditional teaching approaches. Some PSTs are able to reject being positioned as grammar-based teachers and hold onto their former visions of becoming communicative FL teachers.
This study explores these occasions of growth, transitions, tensions, and identity development and negotiation that occur during FL PSTs’ ST practicum. Is it plausible for teacher preparation to change the long-held notion of the two-worlds pitfall (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985) into a more uniformed global path towards teacher development and teacher identity development? This study aims to illustrate how learning to teach FLs communicatively and then becoming communicative FL teachers is plausible if PSTs are properly supported, encouraged, and provided rich and meaningful experiences upon which to base their practices and identities during preservice education.

The Identity Work of Preservice Teachers

Within a sociocultural perspective identity formation includes both sociocultural processes and individual functioning as dynamic, interacting moments in human action, rather than as static processes existing in isolation (Penuel & Wertsch, 1995, p. 84). In other words, human action provides the unit of analysis for considering how individual intentions are realized by cultural artifacts and tools used to carry out actions and activities. Penuel and Wertsch (1995) suggest that by considering the unit of analysis as human action, a more coherent understanding of a dynamic identity that may vary from activity to activity—depending on the purpose, form, tools and ways the contexts are configured—can be gained.

In coming to understand a mediated-approach to identity several considerations must be made. Identities must be examined in settings where “forming identities are at stake in the course of the activity” (Penuel & Wertsch, 1995, p. 90). By considering the
contexts in which identities are sometimes contested or confronted, the individual is forced to co-construct or renegotiate a different way of acting and defining himself or herself. In contexts where identities are being constructed, contested, or are shifting, positioning plays an important role. Moje & Luke (2009) suggest in their review of literature on literacy and identity that identities “are produced in and across spaces but also in the ways people are cast in or called to particular positions in interaction, time, and spaces and how they take up or resist those positions” (p. 430). These authors argue that viewing identity through the metaphor of position situates the constructed-self and its identities in relation to others.

This view of identity, then, assumes several factors are at play, that is, that an identity is socially situated, mediated by tools, contexts, and interaction with others, and is dynamic and shifting (Moje & Luke, 2009). Lewis, Enciso, and Moje (2007) play out identity even further—considering identity to also be comprised of the many different positions in which individuals enact, perform, or resist in various contexts within specific sets of social, economic, and historical relations (p. 4). They argue that learning has “the potential to make and remake selves, identities, and relationships” (Moje & Lewis 2007, p. 18). Given that learning has the potential to shape and reshape identities, how PSTs learn to teach also has potential to shape their developing teacher identities—or the identities they are cultivating while learning to teach FLs.

The practices, approaches to FL teaching, and tools used to teach PSTs how to teach FLs often vary across two crucial learning contexts; the FL methods courses and ST. This study considers how PSTs are positioned and how their learning of teaching
FLs is (un)supported by their university professors and supervisors and their cooperating teachers within both activity settings. Taking the stance of identity-as-position (Moje & Luke, 2009) assumes that the PSTs’ teacher identities are constructed not solely in the context of the teacher preparation program, but also within the context of their student teaching placements as they learn different approaches to teaching FLs promoted by their CTs. How such contexts and approaches to teaching and learning (mis)align have important implications for how some PSTs may develop their teacher identities.

How and why PSTs take up or resist certain positions that the university or the cooperating schools expect of them is important to how their teacher identities form. For example, Eva, a PST in this study, initially expressed in an interview (8/20/07) wanting to turn her classroom during ST into a mock French community—“as if the students were walking off a plane in France and were completely immersed in the language and culture.” This idea falls in line with utilizing a communicative approach to foster TL learning and cultural appreciation. During ST Eva’s ideas became more centered on her CTs’ pedagogical beliefs, and consequently, Eva no longer envisions successful implementation of communicative approaches in typical U.S. FL classrooms. Likewise, PSTs’ evolving beliefs about themselves as FL teachers may have bearing on their future commitments to teaching FLs. As tension comes about during teacher preparation PSTs are often forced to sort out which identities they want to construct for themselves. How the PSTs in this study sort out and construct certain identities as types of FL teachers is discussed in chapters 4 and 5.
Gee (2000) adds that “[W]hen any human being acts and interacts in a given contexts, others recognize that person as acting and interacting as a certain ‘kind of person’ or even as several different ‘kinds’ at once” (p. 99). He argues that individuals have and maintain multiple identities that are connected to their performances and behavior in society. With that said, Gee (2000) suggests that humans possess a ‘core identity’ which manifests itself in ways through which individuals participate and are involved in various Discourses. Such Discourses are historical, social, and cultural in nature, and therefore, people’s multiple, varied, and timely experiences within such Discourses shape one’s multifaceted identity. Gee suggests that the visual fluidity of an identity, ostensibly having multiple dimensions, is actually situation-specific aspects of the “core identity”. In chapter 5 I return to Gee’s notion of “core identity” and argue for the possibility of constructing a core teacher identity.

Identities are complex and complicated. Sociocultural theory suggests that identities are constructed and negotiated through a myriad of meaningful experiences across time and space, social interactions, participations in Discourses, from recognition by others, through gaining an individual sense of similarity and difference, through processes and experiences of learning, among others. These myriad experiences lead one to form beliefs about such things. Beliefs, therefore, also contribute, define, and refine an identity. Beliefs are a subset of a group of constructs that names, defines, and describes the content of mental states that drive a person’s actions (Zheng, 2009, p. 74). Beliefs are “often defined as psychologically held understandings, premises, or propositions felt to
be true” (p. 74) and therefore, often act as filters for making meaning of new knowledge or experiences.

An individual’s beliefs enable a person to understand one’s self and his surroundings, and to therefore, define or identify himself to others. Consequently, one’s beliefs about himself, his profession, and his surroundings (including other individuals and tools) give way to shaping one’s identity development. Exploring personal beliefs is important in distinguishing between what is known and what is believed. In the context of this study PSTs’ beliefs are important not only because of the intimate connection with identity, but also because of the nature of the beliefs that PSTs bring with them into teacher education, as long-time experienced observers of teachers (Lortie, 1975). The interplay among prior beliefs, current beliefs, and emerging beliefs as a result of experiencing learning to teach FLs in two different contexts may have bearings on PST teacher identity development. This study fleshes out this notion.

**Related Studies of Teacher Identity**

“Teacher identity” and teacher’s “professional identity” have been used as synonymous terms in the literature; however, it has been noted that mutually exclusive definitions of these constructs do not yet exist (Beijaard, Meijer, & Verloop, 2004). Therefore, the definition of teacher identity used in this study is taken from Lasky’s (2005) work focusing on teacher agency. For purposes of this research “teacher identity” is comprised of “how teachers define themselves to themselves and to others” (Lasky, 2005, p. 901). Lasky (2005) posits that such an identity is gradually formed and shaped
over the course of stages during one’s career. Such understanding of teacher identity, then, assumes that various social and individual aspects contribute to the building, having, and sustaining of teacher identity. Teacher identity evolves through interactions and relationships with others in the field, as well as with students, parents, administrators, etc. Taking on a teacher identity implies that multiple associated responsibilities, attitudes, knowledge, practices, and behaviors that teachers gradually adopt emerge over time through participation in the various contexts in which they place themselves (Coldron & Smith, 1999). Lastly, ways of defining one’s self as teacher presumes that one has socially legitimized teacher status or qualification, thus facilitating and socially validating others’ perceptions of him or herself as an educator. This identity is dynamic, recursive, and constantly being made or modified.

In spite of its significance to teacher learning, teacher identity development remains a vague and complicated area of interest in current educational research (Beijaard et al., 2004; Coldron & Smith, 1999; White & Moss, 2003; Franzak, 2002; Rodgers & Scott, 2008). The ways in which individuals—and more specifically, teachers—construct or negotiate their identities have been debated for many decades. Coldron and Smith (1999) suggest that a teacher identity is partly given and partly achieved. They argue that a variety of possible relations exist between an individual and others. Some of these relations are determined and shaped by inherited social structures and some are chosen or created by the individual. They believe that the development of a teacher’s identity is in many ways dependent upon the quality and availability of these possible relations. Understanding—or attempts made toward understanding—the
acquisition process of an individual’s identity as a teacher is an important factor in preparing for one’s future professional development (Freeman, 1991).

Coldron and Smith (1999) posit that being a teacher is a matter of establishing and then redefining an identity that is socially legitimized. “This process begins with the conferring of qualified status on teachers and it continues in the ways colleagues, children and parents respond to them” (p. 712). These authors further explain that people understand who they are by knowing their appropriate relation to others (1999). Franzak (2002) concurs with Coldron and Smith by stating: “Those of us who create ‘teacher’ as part of our identity must negotiate the particular implications of our professional identity in relation to students, peers, the general public, our intimates, and ourselves” (p. 258). These authors agree that by choosing some and rejecting other possibilities, a teacher is essentially affirming affiliations and making distinctions that constitute an important part of his or her professional identity (Coldron & Smith, 1999, p. 713). While these authors suggest that teacher identity formation begins, in part, due to the status bestowed upon them or “the conferring of qualified status on teachers” (p. 712) in combination with the status achieved and attained individually, others, such as Sumara and Luce-Kapler argue that teacher identity development begins long before teachers are actually socially legitimized as qualified teachers; for many it begins often before teacher preparation (Sumara & Luce-Kapler, 1996).

There is consensus that identity is partially formed and shaped, and in essence, dependent upon the contexts in which we place ourselves (Gee, 2000; Britzman, 2003; Beijaard et al., 2000; Coldron & Smith 1999). Within each context implicit and explicit
rules, expectations, and sets of norms exist and are upheld. Although such constraints can limit a PST’s agency or power and create a sort of negotiated or comprised identity (Rodgers & Scott, 2008), it is also possible that the resulting tension may lead to a satisfying sense of identity (Smagorinsky, Cook, Moore, Jackson, & Fry, 2004). Hence, an individual has to negotiate identities within a community bound by its own customs and traditions (Coldron & Smith, 1999). The possibilities for identity construction are available partly because of the pedagogical traditions that teachers embody, the practices of the academic communities to which a teacher belongs, and the various external practices brought into critical relation to teaching (1999). In the current study, PSTs negotiate their teacher identities in relation to the motives and beliefs of others (i.e., university supervisors, CTs, etc.) involved in the institutional contexts for learning to teach FLs, leading to the possible development of distinctive teacher identities.

A case study conducted by Antonek, McCormick, and Donato (1997) of eight post-baccalaureate FL teachers explored the use of portfolios to document teacher identity growth and development during their ten-week ST practicum. These authors chose to present two participants’ portfolios which they deemed provided evidence and documentation of teacher growth and evolving identities during the ST practicum. The process of creating a working portfolio, they argue, is social in nature because it represents teacher candidates’ experiences during ST interacting with other individuals (i.e., students, advisors, etc.). The portfolios consisted of items, such as, lesson plans, reflections on teaching experiences, feedback from university supervisors (and personal rationales for those selections) among other materials that were specifically chosen by the
teacher candidates. The participants were instructed to collage such examples to
demonstrate their teaching effectiveness during ST and were ultimately successful in
their quest for FL licensure in the state in which they studied. What the authors claim the
portfolios highlighted were their unique routes and encompassing beliefs, perspectives,
and emerging teacher identities that developed over the 10-week period of study. The
portfolios were analyzed by looking for meaningful and emergent themes in the data
collected from the teacher candidates with regard to their selected choices of materials.

Findings from Antonek et al. show that the two participants perceived their
experiences quite differently (1997). One participant in the study indicated that teacher-
student relationships and interactions were important in his professional development;
more so than the CT. He viewed external forces (i.e., students and their reactions) and
his personal experiences in the FL classroom as measures of his teaching success. The
other PST’s FL teaching portfolio illustrated that the CT and internal factors (i.e., internal
beliefs and motivation) played more vital roles in the teacher candidate’s conception of
herself as an effectual teacher. She defined herself more by what she felt and thought
while being in the FL classroom, as opposed to the other teacher candidate who defined
himself more by what he did or practiced in the FL classroom. These authors argue that
“working portfolios are mediational tools that facilitate reflection on actions and beliefs
and the construction of a new professional identity within the context of a student
teacher’s personal and social history” (1997, p. 2).

While this study provides a rationale for using portfolios as one way to examine
teacher identity growth during ST, it focuses only on teacher candidates’ individual
choices of selected works, performances, and reflections. Teacher identity is comprised of how one identifies him or herself as a teacher to others, but it also encompasses the views and social recognition of others. Having the teacher candidates choose their own selected works and provide narrative regarding both the works and their individual experience in the classroom, in a sense, provides a one-sided view of the context of teaching. This study focused on the use of portfolios to actively reflect upon PSTs’ practice as a means to better inform their pedagogical beliefs and FL practices.

Portfolios may empower PSTs to regulate their professional development, and indeed, a teacher identity is partially comprised of how individuals define themselves. With that said, this study failed to demonstrate examination of the various settings within which these PSTs were involved. While the study did consider the FL Education program from which they graduated, it did not consider the FL classrooms where these PSTs participated during ST. Further examination of the ST contexts, the interactions that took place, how these teacher candidates were positioned and (un)supported by others, and how such factors may have influenced their selected choices of works and narrated experiences in the classrooms must also be considered. In-depth investigation into what and why PSTs feel during teacher preparation, along with when and why such feelings emerge, is important when examining teacher identity development within various learning to teach contexts.

On a similar quest to explore teacher identity development among beginning teachers, Olsen (2008) conducted a study with six novice English teachers. He considered their reasons for entry into the field and how such reasons for entry continue
to motivate and influence their development as novice teachers. Olsen argues that teacher development is cyclical rather than linear and is a compilation of one’s past, present, and future goals, motivations, and beliefs as an emerging teacher. Using a sociocultural model of identity to explore teacher identity development among novice teachers, Olsen (2008) sees teachers’ professional identities as the possible constraints and opportunities which stem from their personal social histories and the agency that they may possess within their teaching contexts. Teacher identity development, then, is considered both a process and a product.

Olsen conducted several interviews with his novice teachers while also collecting teaching artifacts, information on the teacher preparation program, and published reports about the schools where the participants were teaching at the time of the study. He analyzed the data to create identity profiles of the participants and then compared the profiles against analytic categories included in his model of teacher identity: reasons for entry, teacher education experience, current teaching context, prior professional experience, prior personal experience, and future career plans or retention (2008).

One of the emergent findings from Olsen’s study is the prevalence of teachers’ references to their reasons for entry into the profession through personal biographies and narratives. Using discourse analysis and a life stories approach, Olsen considered how teachers’ reasons for entry illuminated interactions among their personal and professional pasts and their current teaching contexts to contribute to their teacher identity development. Reasons for entry among the majority of participants in Olsen’s study were relatively strong in nature and provided insight into who the teachers in his study were
becoming. For example, one teacher’s reason for entry was particularly connected with issues of social justice. Although this teacher struggled during her first year of teaching, it was mainly due to differences between the school’s philosophy and political stances on social justice issues and her own. The experience left her feeling uncertain about how long she would teach at such school. The case in point is that this teacher did not acquiesce to the school culture, and consequently, her experience in such a school climate seemed to instill in her a stronger desire to promote social justice. This first year English teacher was able to sustain that aspect of her emerging teacher identity because it was deeply ensconced within her beliefs and being as a person and teacher.

While Olsen’s study makes a compelling case for the interconnectedness of personal and professional past histories, reasons for entry, teacher education experiences, and current teaching contexts along with future career plans; one must consider to what extent potential connections exist among preservice and novice teachers with relatively weaker reasons for entry into the profession. Keeping reasons for entry into the profession in mind, the current study of FL PSTs’ experiences learning to teach FLs and their teacher identity development during teacher preparation provides additional insight into how reasons for entry into the field may have bearing on other components in Olsen’s model of teacher identity. Does having lifelong vocations or goals of becoming teachers begin gradually shaping a teacher identity prior to entry into teacher education? Do weaker reasons for entry into the profession (i.e., mid-life conversion) have bearing on teacher identity development? Does it have bearing on one’s commitment to teaching?
For those of us who decide to take on the role of educators, a dynamic shaping and reshaping of who we are as teachers is a constant, on-going process (Olsen, 2008). For preservice and novice teachers who entertain weaker reasons for entering into the field of education, having less time and experience developing their teacher identity may potentially inhibit their confidence and perceptions of themselves as effective teachers. How newcomers and novices to education perceive themselves as being able to bear out any conflicts, tensions, or mediate any dissonance in personal beliefs and school culture that may exist is important to their teacher identity development. This researcher concurs with Olsen (2008) in that teachers’ reasons for entry into the profession can illuminate teacher identity development. In addition to reasons for entry giving way to teacher identity development, this researcher argues that how PSTs are supported and positioned within their teaching contexts also may illuminate teacher identity development.

The notion of time clearly has implications for nearly all human development, growth, and maturity. A sense of time and experience is also important to learning, gaining confidence, and shaping a teacher identity. When considered within the context of teacher preparation I propose that time (i.e., maturity, growth, experience, etc.) plays a key role in teacher identity development. Borrowing from Wenger (1988), “[W]e are always simultaneously dealing with specific situations, participating in the histories of certain practices, and involved in becoming certain persons” (p. 155). With that said, the amount of time a teacher candidate has spent thinking about teaching, envisioning himself teaching, and working towards becoming a teacher contributes to how he may perceive himself as a prospective teacher. This begs the question: When does one begin
constructing teacher identity? Due to the intangible nature of the construct of teacher identity, it has been argued and debated when such development begins.

Sumara and Luce-Kapler (1996) suggest that “[B]ecoming a teacher involves more than transposing teaching skills onto an already-established personal identity: it means including the identity ‘teacher’ in one’s life” (p. 65). Unlike Coldron and Smith (1999), who suggest that, forming a teacher identity “begins with the conferring of qualified status on teachers”, Sumara and Luce-Kapler posit that teacher identity formation begins prior to being socially recognized or having “qualified status” as teachers (p. 719). They suggest that at least three teaching identities exist among beginning teachers. Teacher candidates need to negotiate these teaching identities or “images” because of the dissonance that often exists among them. Sumara and Luce-Kapler posit that such teacher identities include: those they carry with them into teacher education or the ‘pre-teaching’ image; those they develop during teacher preparation or the ‘fictive’ image; and thirdly, those they develop during ST or the ‘lived’ image (1996, p. 67). These authors argue that due to the often-disconnected experiences teacher candidates encounter during teacher preparation and ST, the teacher identities they form often remain misunderstood. They argue that many PSTs have to discard various identities and experiences, rather than simply foster greater pedagogical practices, in order to become teachers. They argue that simply using the term ‘becoming a teacher’ is problematic in that it suggests that teaching skills be imposed upon the individual as he or she is when entering into teacher education. Seen this way, the goal of teacher education becomes transpositioning rather than transforming teacher candidates.
Sumara and Luce-Kapler (1996) used exposure to texts in their study as a way to help PSTs (un)become teachers; in essence, to renegotiate or discard their preconceived images and identities as teachers. They attempted to provide the students with an exposure to texts that provided lived experiences in education, and in turn, encouraged spontaneous discussion as a means to help teacher candidates make a stronger connection between theory and practice. They integrated into the teacher preparation curriculum texts that they thought would generate critical discussions about issues of teaching and learning to teach. Sumara and Luce-Kapler anticipated that as a result of such critical dialogue, teacher candidates would better understand the complex identity negotiations involved in such activities and experiences. Although the authors realized after the study that they had chosen the wrong kind of text that would encourage teacher candidates to integrate their own experiences with their interpretations of the text. The authors attributed the failure of the teacher candidates to identify with the text as a result of their individual experiences not creating a location for critical enquiry into their experiences of identity transformation while they had learned to teach (p. 72-73).

The ‘three identity’ formulation (Sumara & Luce-Kapler, 1996) was used as a heuristic in the current study as a means to better understand the process of constructing and negotiating developing teacher identities. Exploring whether the FL PSTs passed through clearly defined categories or stages of teacher identity development within the contexts of this study or whether they seemed to construct, negotiate, and sustain one evolving ‘core’ teacher identity is a key interest of the researcher. This notion of multiple or core teacher identities is discussed further in chapter 5.
Current Foreign Language Pedagogy and Research: Communicative Language Teaching

as the Dominant Motive

Language teaching in the United States is based on the idea that the goal of language acquisition is communicative competence: the ability to use the language correctly and appropriately to accomplish communication goals. The desired outcome of the language learning process is the ability to communicate competently, not the ability to use the language exactly as a native speaker does. (http://www.nclrc.org/essentials/goalsmethods/goal.htm)

Communicative approaches to FL teaching, which emerged in the 1960s, emphasize the learner’s ability to communicate in the target language (TL) using socially appropriate gestures, expressions, and cues. The aim of using such approaches is to promote authentic language use where learners are engaged in meaningful, real communication in the TL (Galloway, 1993). Such approaches to FL teaching came about in response to the general dissatisfaction in the field, at that time, with audiolingual and grammar-translation approaches to teaching. Communicative approaches that were popular during the 1960s and 1970s included the following: Community Language Learning, Total Physical Response, and Suggestopedia, among others. The 1980s saw a collective blending of communicative approaches which became known as Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). CLT grew out of the idea of communicative competence, initially coined by Hymes in 1970, which is the linguistic knowledge an individual needs in order to communicate effectively. Canale and Swain (1980) identified three components of communicative competence: grammatical, sociolinguistic,
and strategic competence. Later discourse competence was added as an important aspect contributing to communicative competence (Leaver & Shecktman, 2002).

CLT is based upon several broad premises that are the main goals of classroom activities: learners learn through using the language to communicate; learning is a process of creative construction and involves trial and error; fluency is a key component of communication; communication involves the use and integration of language skills; learners are best served by authentic and meaningful communication (Canale & Swain, 1980; Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Communicative approaches to FL teaching have played and continue to play important roles in FL education and in FL classrooms and such approaches are encouraged and incorporated into the national FL standards (ACTFL, 1999; Urzúa 1999; Burke, 2006). The national FL standards document serves as a means to unify FL education as a profession and has proclaimed a more cohesive vision and direction for the future. The overarching goals set up by the profession for the areas of Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities clearly place emphasis on lifelong-learning of language and culture alongside communication. Additionally the national FL standards promote a more holistic perception of the language learner, in and out of the FL classroom. Rather than considering each linguistic skill (reading, writing, listening and speaking) separately, the national FL standards define three modes of communication: interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational (ACTFL, 2006).

This change from viewing language as isolated skills and components (aligned with more traditional grammar instructional approaches) to overarching modes of real-
world communication is evident in FL research, classroom practices, and foreign and second language teacher education (Savignon, 2001; Velez-Rendón, 2002; Watzke, 2007). The rise of CLT and proficiency-based approaches to FL teaching, along with the indoctrination of the national FL standards are not without their critics in the field.

According to Savignon (1991) some language teachers agree with the general ideas surrounding the negotiation of meaning and communicative competence in foreign and second language learning, others see problems surrounding such approaches. For example, some teachers believe that CLT promotes language use that lacks accuracy or precision among its learners. Others have argued that it leaves FL teachers facing the problem of how to assess FL production. Widdowson (1998) argues that the slogan “focus on meaning rather than form” (p. 705, original italics) which has been often associated with CLT, is misleading in several ways. He argues that prior methods to FL teaching, particularly those promoted by structuralists, also focused on meaning, but it was on semantic meaning as opposed to pragmatic meaning. Widdowson (1998) posits that people use communication to engage in social action and that the pragmatic meaning that is achieved or understood from discourse is context dependent. He further argues that when people speak, they often use language in ways that make an appropriate connection with their shared perceptions and knowledge. Such contexts are constructed through shared local knowledge of discourses and communities to which they belong. It is this contextually bounded use of communication and sense of shared knowledge that leads Widdowson to suggest that often semantic meaning can not be inferred from pragmatic use because a large extent of what people say does not lie in the language but
rather in the context. Finally, he argues that the reality of language is local and is pragmatically realized in relation to the contexts of particular communities, and therefore argues against the practicality of using authentic language use in the FL or second language classroom. Language that is authentic for native speakers “cannot possibly be authentic for learners” (p. 711). Widdowson (1998) suggests that one way in which classroom learners may be able to attain the semantic meaning as well as pragmatic meaning is through presenting language that activates a context in the learners’ mind and provides a fictional reality that sets up contextual and linguistic expectations in which students can engage. Widdowson must consider that when learning FLs, particularly those whose dominant cultural backgrounds and target cultural backgrounds are dissimilar, FL learners’ cultural schemata must be explored and guided because knowledge gained through fictional contexts has the potential to hinder FL and cultural learning as well as expand it (Droop & Verhoeven, 1998; Dunsmore, 2002).

Bax (2003) blames the methodology of CLT for the neglect of contextuality that exists in the approach. He argues that CLT is problematic because it focuses first on methodological pedagogy towards teaching FLs rather than focusing upon the contexts in which and for which language learners are learning the languages. Bax (2003) argues that CLT has not had consistent worldwide success as an approach and method to FL teaching because the context for learning “is a crucial determiner of the success or failure of learners” (p. 281). While he admits that those who espouse CLT methodology often recognize that the context for learning is important, it is only secondary to the methodology itself. His main point is that CLT’s main focus surrounds methodology.
rather than the context in which the language is being learned. While Bax (2003) argues that methodology and communication can and should play important roles in FL teaching, they should be secondary and complementary to assess contextual factors in particular classrooms, with particular students, within particular countries, languages, and cultures.

Since one of the main goals of CLT and proficiency-based instruction is to foster TL communication among learners, the role of the teacher in such environment becomes that of facilitator or task designer, while the students become negotiators of meaningful communication (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). In order for the FL teacher to take on such an active role in promoting in meaningful communication, the teacher must have a high level of communicative competence in the TL. This approach to FL teaching emphasizes the communication of meaning through interaction rather than through practice and manipulation of decontextualized grammatical forms (Lightbown & Spada, 2006).

Canale and Swain (1980) noted that teacher training is a crucial component to carrying out successful communicative approaches to teaching FLs; how to effectively teach FL teacher candidates to teach FLs communicatively is still being explored today.

A recent study by Wilbur (2007) examined the methodological training of undergraduate FL PSTs during FL education in an attempt to explore the pedagogical development of future secondary FL teachers. She found extensive differences among the various FL programs examined in her study in terms of how instructors connected theory to practice, how they implemented standards-based instruction and assessment, and in their teaching backgrounds. With regard to the students enrolled in these
programs, she found that many teacher candidates lacked proficient TL skills. Wilbur (2007) identified three potential reasons for this: the instructional means through which these FL learners were taught during high school and college, tertiary FL education being predominantly literature-based beyond the introductory and intermediate courses, and candidates’ unrealistic perceptions of their overall linguistic skills and the means and beliefs about how to improve their proficiency. Wilbur (2007) concludes that the FL language education profession as a whole must begin to demystify FL teaching practices and establish a more systematic and comprehensive means of teaching future FL teacher candidates.

Similarly, Bateman (2008) conducted a case study of FL PSTs in an attempt to explore their attitudes towards TL instruction and their practices of using FLs while teaching. This study suggests that PSTs’ use of the FL waned in the classroom and their attitudes towards using the FL progressively became less enthusiastic during ST due to a variety of reasons. Reasons included the following: PSTs’ linguistic limitations, classroom management skills, lack of time, teacher fatigue, time spent building rapport with students, PSTs avoiding unfamiliar vocabulary, and because of the complexities of the FL. How PSTs perceive themselves and their abilities during ST is important to their identity formations and commitments as prospective FL teachers.

Given Bateman’s (2008) purported concerns from the PSTs’ perspectives (i.e., their own language proficiencies and comfort in using the FL while teaching), and Wilbur’s concern that the FL education profession in general lacks consensus about how and what to teach in undergraduate FL methods classes, may lead one to wonder how
these concerns influence PSTs’ emerging identities. Smith (2006) contends that the extent to which prospective teachers are able to cross boundaries and connect the various perspectives they have been exposed to during teacher education impacts their identities as future FL teachers.

Burke (2006) gleaned similar findings from her study investigating the effects of FL methods courses on PSTs’ pedagogical instruction and practices during field experiences. Because Burke was also the instructor of the FL methods courses from which she obtained her participants for the study, she had an intimate knowledge of the participants’ understanding and exposure to CLT. Burke provided the PSTs with modeled communicative FL lessons and then gave the PSTs opportunities to individually create and deliver communicative lessons in the FL. After the PSTs completed the 10-week methods course, they then spent five weeks in secondary FL classrooms where they observed teaching and learning FLs. They were required to implement several of their own FL lessons and in doing so, were encouraged by the researcher and instructor (one in the same) to implement CLT. The CTs in the FL classrooms were not necessarily supportive of CLT; they may have used and preferred other approaches to FL teaching. Throughout the study Burke collected PSTs’ lesson plans, self-critiques of lessons, updated philosophies of education, and a survey regarding their field experiences.

Burke used analytic induction to analyze the written documents and create three teacher profiles: the CLT teacher, the grammar-translation teacher, and a hybrid of the two. Burke’s data analysis of the FL PSTs’ in her study showed that largest number of PSTs fell under the category of hybrid teacher. Her findings showed that despite all PSTs
learning to use CLT during the FL methods courses, only some promoted CLT in their field experiences. Burke speculates the mixed outcomes of her PSTs’ successes in implementing a CLT approach in their cooperating FL classrooms as being in part due to several factors: a condensed ten-week methods course, lack of PSTs’ ability to implement student-centered communicative activities, lack of confidence in teaching and FL abilities, personal preferences for teaching the FL, or possibly due to a different approach used by their CTs. Burke (2006) argues that “[I]f the preservice teachers preferred to be seen as authoritarian in the classroom, they would have found it difficult to act as facilitators and allow students to take more responsibility” (p. 161). Burke concludes that the findings of her study reiterate the assertion that “training in university methods courses and participation in field experiences is not enough to convince new teachers to use CLT” (p. 162, original italics). While her research is a start in the right direction and provides evidence of novice FL teachers being taught how to implement CLT in FL classrooms, it does not consider the setting or contexts of the PSTs’ experiences. Her study identified PSTs becoming certain types of FL teachers and utilizing various forms of FL instruction during field experiences; however, less emphasis was placed on exploring PSTs’ reasons for believing, implementing, and practicing such instruction. In what types of FL classrooms were these PSTs placed? How the PSTs were positioned by their CTs and the researcher of the study, and did such positioning have bearing on their identities as particular types of FL teachers?

Using Burke’s (2006) implication that current FL teacher preparation and participation in field experiences “is not enough” (p. 162) to promote CLT teachers,
Watzke (2007) gives FL educators and researchers hope for the implementation of such communicative approaches to FL teaching among novice teachers. In a longitudinal study of nine participants enrolled in a two year field-based graduate education program, Watzke investigated how their FL pedagogical content knowledge changes over time. His data collection methods included journals, interviews, and classroom observations during participants first two years of teaching. Despite other research suggesting that novice teachers’ concerns develop in a pattern (Conway & Clark, 2003), Watzke believes teachers’ concerns for student learning and personal well-being are central concerns regardless of how long teachers have been practicing (p. 66). Watzke’s goal was to use the gathered data to construct a theoretical framework marking FL teacher development.

Watzke (2007) observed four general categories of how pedagogical content knowledge is used and changes over time by novice FL teachers: prior knowledge used to frame instructional practices, attitudes toward teacher control and classroom management, instructional goals for lessons, and finally, contemplations for responding to student affect in the classroom. Watzke surmises that initially novice teachers draw on their knowledge of curriculum and instruction to manage their classrooms. He similarly observed that the participants gradually viewed FL learning through the lens of communication and task performance, and that instructional practices and assessments became more student-centered over time. Watzke’s findings suggests that contemporary approaches to FL teaching often develop as pedagogical content knowledge through the process and experience of teaching, through problem-solving, and through the act of self-reflection. He concludes that “[T]he process by which FL teachers implement
instructional practices as they transition into teaching careers remains elusive” and merits further investigation (p. 75). Watzke suggests that:

Accomplishments during the preservice years, such as crafted unit plans and successful field experiences, should not be considered proxies for the success of teacher education graduates once they are in the field. The true test comes when these teachers transition into the full-time classroom, away from sheltered and structured courses and field experiences, and translate their pedagogical content knowledge to their classroom context. (p. 74)

While Watzke’s findings (2007) contribute to the understanding that beginning FL teachers may over time implement the instructional practices they learned during FL teacher preparation, his examination of the participants’ learning-to-teach FLs contexts was limited. He cautions that beginning FL teachers must continue to learn about FL teaching through professional development and effective mentorship in order to more fully develop a context for FL pedagogy.

Summary

This chapter presented an overview of AT and its role in current teacher education research. This chapter brought together research from relevant studies in the fields of identity work, FL and English Teacher Education to illustrate how AT has been used recently to investigate (FL) teaching, learning, and teacher identity development.

It is clear from the combined research examined above that learning in formal social contexts (i.e., university courses and ST) may support, overlap, or challenge the learning and experiences that take place within other contexts. According to Wenger’s (1998) theory of social learning, learning is comprised of several components; meaning,
practice, community, and identity. He suggests that learning transforms who individuals are and what they can do. Therefore, learning is an experience of identity; a process of becoming. Focusing on the interplay between learning and identity is useful in providing a means for understanding PSTs’ learning and teacher identity development. In the current study, PSTs began to envision and take on certain identities as prospective FL teachers utilizing CLT and the national FL standards during FL education—a context where they were supported by a social network (i.e., professors, advisors, peers, etc.). Likewise, when some cooperating school contexts provided environments that promoted learning to teach FLs from predominantly grammar-based approaches, PSTs’ teacher identity was simultaneously shaped by those involved in such interactions (i.e., CTs, administrators, etc.). If PSTs make meaning out of their practices and interactions within their surrounding networks or communities, and such meaning gives shape to teacher identity development, then how does such conflict and tension between the learning-to-teach contexts impact PSTs’ teacher identity development, especially when FL approaches to teaching misalign? The current study aims to provide such understanding.
Chapter 3: Methods

**Contexts of the Study and Research Sites**

Due to the breadth and depth of PSTs’ active participation in two different learning-to-teach contexts during this study, it is imperative to clarify and give a description of those contexts. AT suggests that a “context” is comprised of the activity itself (Nardi, 1996), rather than a conceptualization of the term as being a tangible place with physical boundaries. In other words, what takes place within an activity system is composed of the object, actions, and operations, along with the mediating tools and individuals involved. According to Nardi (1996), “[C]ontext is both internal to people—involving specific objects and goals—and, at the same time, external to people, involving artifacts, other people, specific settings” (p. 76). Therefore, within this study, the terms “context” and “activity setting” are used to describe the comprehensive area (inclusive of the implicit and explicit elements of an activity system) where learning to teach FLs took place in this study: the FL Education program and the ST practicum. The following contexts examined in this study are presented below: FL Education program at Calico University, contexts of the cooperating FL classrooms, the role of supervision during ST, Project KLM, and the role of professional accrediting organizations. All names reported in this study are pseudonyms.
FL Education Program at Calico University

Represented in Figure 3.1 below as activity system 1, Calico University is located in Midwestern United States and is a public university serving more than fifteen thousand students. The university’s mission statement suggests that it is committed to students’ success, fosters student loyalty, and empowers its students “to become engaged citizens who use their knowledge and skills with integrity and compassion to improve the future of our global society” (Calico Mission Statement, 2008). The university’s focus is on the teaching of undergraduate students in an effort to help them become well-rounded individuals who are committed to life-long learning. The university boasts of having a long tradition of combining academic programs with personal attention from faculty as a means to help create a smaller school feel than its enrollment figure suggests. The school aims to provide a quality comprehensive liberal education to all students (2008).
The FL Education department consists of two FL faculty members and is housed within the university’s education department within the School of Education. While each year the total number of graduates from the teacher education department is moderate (i.e., 451 graduates were recommended for state licensure in 2006), the average number of FL Education graduates is small by comparison. During the previous year, 14 FL PSTs were recommended for state licensure (state education website). A recent change in leadership in the School of Education has led to a refocus on international and global studies, specifically a push to increase enrollment in FL classrooms and offer more world
languages. The new Dean aims to increase enrollment in FL courses and to strengthen the study of FLs and FL education through providing more study-abroad opportunities.

For a clearer understanding of the guiding philosophies directing the FL Education department two formal interviews were conducted with key informants: the Dean and one of the FL methods instructors. When asked about what constitutes excellent FL teaching, the Dean commented:

I really do believe in the 5 C’s, the national standards and really that involvement of the community level, you know, with the local business and you know all of that and really bring…tying those together with the schools and making… bring languages to life…I mean there is no excuse anymore for us not to bring in the outside world into the classroom so that students would leave not only knowing how to communicate in the language and… what is the socially appropriate communication and culturally appropriate and understand something about the whole host culture and the level of understanding and empathy that goes beyond the benefits of knowing another language for an economic edge… and then being able to really implement and connect that with the local community. I think that that is just very powerful… (4/14/08)

The Dean’s in-depth knowledge of FL teaching and learning and beliefs in the value of broadening students’ horizons helps guide the FL Education department towards developing FL educators and leaders in “tomorrow’s classrooms” (interview, 4/14/08). The Dean’s vision of excellence in FL teaching was echoed by the current FL methods instructor. Their visions of excellent FL teaching can be glimpsed from the following response:

Excellent FL teaching entails a convergence of several factors…the teacher seamlessly integrates the standards of FL goals as well as the state standards into planning and instruction. The teacher must have a proficiency level that may provide the students with a learning environment that follows the standards. Excellent language teaching integrates culture into the curriculum and provides students with opportunities to investigate products, practices and perspectives of the target culture. Students engage in content-based learning and the use of
authentic texts in the target language. The teacher collaborates with colleagues in the school to enhance content-based learning in the language classroom… (5/18/08)

These two responses from key faculty members at Calico University demonstrate their beliefs and adherence to national FL standards they deem necessary for effective FL teaching and learning. The appropriation of such clear visions of FL teaching by PSTs is one of the aims of the program; however this study seeks to understand the extent to which the learning-to-teach FLs activity settings reflect such goals.

Another goal of the FL Education program is to provide various tools for teacher candidates that will mediate their learning to teach FLs. Grossman, McDonald, Hammerness, and Ronfeldt (2008) suggest that “[T]o teach effectively, teachers must develop both conceptual and practical tools” (p. 245). Conceptual tools are the frameworks or guiding principles upon which teachers base their decisions about teaching and learning (Grossman et al., 1999). For example, students in the FL Education program are introduced to sociocultural theories of teaching and learning and issues of second language acquisition, such as sequential stages of second language development in student learners, the importance of providing “comprehensible input” and opportunities for “comprehensible output” to foster FL learning, as well as Krashen’s Affective Filter Hypothesis (1982).

In line with the teacher education department’s constructivist philosophy of learning, the FL methods courses and instructors promote a communicative approach to
FL teaching and the implementation of the national FL standards. This approach espouses such principles as learners learn FLs through the FLs, learning as a process of creative construction that involves trial and error, fluency rather than accuracy as a key component of communication, and meaningful communication as the main goal of student-centered classroom activities. In line with the university’s adherence to National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards, as a former instructor, I made consistent reference to and modeling of the national FL standards proposed by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL, 2006) and state benchmarks to guide PSTs’ development of effective and engaging communicative FL lessons. Given the environment in which these PSTs studied, participated, and learned in the FL methods courses, they were encouraged to take up a communicative or proficiency-based approach to teaching and were positioned as such types of FL teachers during their preservice education.

In addition to conceptual tools such as constructivist theories of language learning, teacher candidates are taught about the importance of theory in the FL classroom. Practical tools refer to the practices and techniques teachers enact in the classroom that underlie or help carry out their teaching and instruction (Grossman et al., 1999). In the FL methods courses teacher candidates are taught how to implement the national FL and state standards into cohesive communicative lesson plans, as well as how to connect FL learning to other disciplines in the curriculum. Teacher candidates are taught the importance of contextualizing FL learning and the integral role of cultures in FL teaching. Students learn about and are asked to craft and deliver four FL lessons,
through such projects called “clinical”. Clinicals are set up as mock FL lessons, directed
to an audience of new FL learners, with the purpose of demonstrating teacher candidates’
understanding and utilization of various pedagogical tools. Such tools and practices
include implementing communicative activities that incorporate the national FL
standards, expansion activities, transition activities, student-centered activities, formal
and informal assessments, and peer collaboration, among others. Finally, teacher
candidates are taught about issues of classroom management, student learning and
assessment, and ways of implementing technology in FL classrooms.

Program Benchmarks to Ensure Quality. While the above description provides a
synthesis of the contexts of the FL teacher preparation at Calico University, below is a
general description of the required teacher preparation process in order to proceed to the
ST practicum. Within AT and sociocultural perspective, rules, policies, and conventions
govern human social behavior (Lantolf, 2000; Donato, 2000; Jonassen, 2000). An
understanding of how social behavior is governed in certain settings is linked to the
learning and identity formations that take place among individuals participating in those
contexts. Rules, implicit and explicit, guide the activities and actions of the teacher
education program, while the tools and symbols used by and within this program mediate
the teacher candidates’ learning processes. To ensure the quality of its teacher candidates
the program uses layers of checks and balances (internal and external) or sets of rules by
which the teacher candidates must abide. Specifically, the university has established four
benchmarks that sequentially take place between the time at which a student is accepted
into the program and the time at which the student is recommended to the state for licensure. Within these benchmarks are seven key assessments used to report performance-based assessments to NCATE.

The first benchmark is implemented using both traditional measures and performance-based measures and it occurs at admission into the FL Education cohort. Requirements for admission are that teacher candidates maintain a Grade Point Average (GPA) of 2.5 or higher, pass Praxis I examination, and compose an acceptable disposition in the form of an essay. A disposition is defined as “the values, commitments, and professional ethics that influence behaviors toward students, families, colleagues, and communities and affect student learning, motivation, and development as well as the educator’s own professional growth (NCATE, 2002)” (Licensure Handbook, 2007, p. 8).

Once admitted into the FL Education program, candidates must meet the indicators for the second benchmark by completing early field experiences, successfully passing specific FL content courses, and finishing general course requirements while maintaining a minimum 2.5 GPA. If candidates do not successfully meet the indicators for this benchmark, they cannot proceed to the FL methods courses. Intervention procedures such as the retaking of failed classes and study skills review are required.

The third benchmark occurs during the time in which the FL methods courses take place. Candidates meet this benchmark by successfully completing clinicals and content course requirements, maintaining a minimum 2.5 GPA, and successfully completing two field placements in K-12 schools. Candidates are required to pass the Praxis II Content examination before ST. Students from the FL cohort who do not
successfully meet these indicators cannot proceed to ST. Additionally, FL teacher candidates are required by the state and NCATE to complete an oral proficiency interview (OPI) in the target language (TL) and achieve a passing score before they may proceed to ST. Possible intervention procedures include retaking the Praxis II Content examination or OPI (Licensure Handbook, 2007).

Finally, the fourth benchmark typically occurs during the FL cohort members’ final year of study, during which time candidates must successfully complete ST. Specifically, they must meet performance-based indicators (i.e., Project KLM) for this benchmark. Candidates who do not meet this benchmark are able to graduate but would not be recommended for state licensure. Intervention procedures include additional ST placements or redoing Project KLM if need be.

Additional expectations of teacher candidates exist during ST. The teacher education program expects PSTs to become a part of the educational team in the cooperating school and is expected to operate within the policies, rules, and regulations of the cooperating school while working cooperatively with the CT and other personnel (Licensure Handbook, 2007). It is in within such expectations of PSTs participation in collaborative learning and social interactions during ST that tensions many begin to develop. The PSTs in this study met all university requirements in order to student teach including 21 hours of general education coursework. An additional 15 hours consisting of three FL methods and two general education courses about assessment and classroom management were also required.
In addition to the above mentioned requirements, each participant had to meet FL requirements. FL coursework consisted of 34 semester credit hours beyond intermediate level courses. FL coursework encompassed an array of topics including: linguistics, literature, composition, conversation, and culture. All participants (except Paco because of his native-speaker status) were required to participate in one study-abroad experience prior to ST. These programs ranged from six weeks to one year abroad and several PSTs opted to participate in more than one study-abroad experience.

In addition, the FL Education program has put forth several procedures that encourage the use of additional artifacts by the teacher candidates. Teacher candidates produce various artifacts, such as assignments (i.e., thematic unit plans, personal reflections, etc.) used in the FL methods courses which they may ideally utilize during ST. These artifacts are created by the teacher candidates, and although these may become a sort of experiential knowledge, they are also tools that some PSTs may use to mediate their learning during ST. The extent that the PSTs use these artifacts varies as does the monitoring of PSTs’ usage of tools by university supervisors. For example, some PSTs used these evaluated assignments to inform their own practices and lessons during ST or to reflect on and analyze their instructional decisions; however, others simply viewed them as means of assessment for the methods class.

According to a FL faculty member, one of the goals of the FL Education program is that teacher candidates become “reflective teachers” (interview, 5/12/08), but the extent to which they demonstrate reflection is only formally assessed in Project KLM. One reason for possible variation in reflectivity among PSTs during ST is due to the fact
that many of the practical tools utilized and produced during the FL methods courses are not specifically shared with the university supervisors. Likewise, tools and artifacts crafted or utilized by the PSTs during ST are not shared with the FL methods instructors. These features of the program caused some degree of misalignment of tools and motives, and essentially teacher identity development, as the PSTs moved between activity settings.

Because all human activity is considered to be object-oriented, the transformation of the object into the outcome denotes the purpose of the activity (Jonassen, 2000). Achieving object-oriented goals of the FL Education program is important to the teacher candidates’ overall success during each phase of their study at Calico University. These benchmarks are interconnected, typically achieved in a sequential order, and are built upon the achievements of previous efforts and produced objects. The program’s goals for ST are that PSTs be able to measure and self-monitor their effectiveness in the classroom; provide evidence for the use of a variety of assessment techniques and instructional strategies with student learners; and measure initial student learners’ understanding, acquired knowledge during the lesson, and their measurable gains at the end. These objects are assessed and measured through an assignment labeled Project KLM (pseudonym) which is further described below in the section entitled Project KLM.

An additional formal component called the “Oral Proficiency Interview” (OPI) was added to the FL Education degree requirements at Calico University during the academic school year of 2007-2008. The OPI is a required performance-based assessment of teacher candidates’ FL proficiency as established by ACTFL and endorsed
by NCATE. Despite the new requirement, no PSTs in this study were required by the FL Education department to participate in such interview due to the fact that all PSTs were juniors or seniors at the time. In addition to participating in an OPI, achieving a score of ‘Advanced-mid’ or better is required in order for teacher candidates to proceed to ST. For several PSTs in this study, thinking about passing the OPI in their FL was a source of concern and tension because they were uncertain of their FL proficiency. The OPI is taken up in chapters 4 and 5 since it was a source of tension for some PSTs.

The role of supervision during ST. The FL Education program envisions ST as a means to provide a “supervised learning experience in a real school setting in which the student teacher practices the application of professional knowledge and skills, develops a personal style of teaching, and demonstrates teaching ability under direct supervision by school and university personnel” (Licensure Handbook, 2007, p. 1). While ST is seen as “an indispensable part of the total teacher education program,” through an AT perspective the practicum is seen as one activity setting within the teacher education activity system. The ST practicum is guided by individual goals and motivations, provides and affords opportunities to PSTs to utilize specific tools, and encompasses a particular community that works towards a collective object. The ST practicum is a context to inform PSTs’ learning to teach FLs, while the cooperating teacher (CT) is an agent who, ideally, mentors and guides PSTs’ learning, utilization of tools, and development. It is the intent of the university for CTs to serve as model teachers for PSTs and this professional relationship is important to the overall success of the teacher
education program and the PSTs. The Teacher Education program maintains that CTs are “the professionals” with whom PSTs are most closely associated during ST, and therefore the PST-CT relationship is critically important to the overall success of ST. If professional relationships among the CTs, PSTs, and university supervisors are not cultivated and sustained, the potential exists for restricted individual learning and development and of failed outcomes. Because all human activity is considered to be object-oriented (Leontiev, 1978; Engeström, 1999; Jonassen, 2000), CTs also maintain their own motives, which can (mis)align with those of the university.

The CT’s role is to provide guidance and support and assess the PST’s performance during ST. The FL Education department expects CTs to work closely with the PSTs to provide and share guided practical experience and knowledge and it is also hoped that CTs will reinforce the methods, techniques, and practices discussed in the FL Education department. All CTs involved with this study, with the exception of one, agreed to be interviewed and share their guiding philosophies of FL teaching and also their goals for their PSTs during ST.

University supervisors, who oversee the PSTs during ST, are technically members of the faculty at Calico University, though they do not teach on campus. These supervisors are former K-12 teachers responsible for representing the university and its goals through observing and evaluating the performances of PSTs during ST. University supervisors do not work with the FL Education faculty, but rather with certain faculty in teacher education, namely the FL education student advisor (who does not teach but rather advises students on needed coursework and benchmark criteria), the university-
appointed NCATE Coordinator, and those responsible for the coordination of student teaching placements. The university supervisors work closely with the university-appointed NCATE coordinator for understanding the motives and goals of the FL Education program. The supervisor’s role is mainly to advise and confer with PSTs, to participate in assessing PSTs, and to serve as a liaison between the university and cooperating school. PSTs are expected to make their lesson plans available to the supervisors and participate in conferences with them after each classroom observation. University supervisors are responsible for hosting four general seminars during ST. These seminars are intended to provide opportunities for all PSTs to discuss areas of pedagogical concern with other PSTs. Finally, supervisors are to make eight classroom observations to discuss individual PST progress and any concerns on behalf of the CT or PST (Licensure Handbook, 2007).

The three university supervisors involved with this study responded to a questionnaire regarding their roles, responsibilities, and relationships with PSTs. It should be noted that these university supervisors did not necessarily speak the FLs of the PSTs being supervised, nor did they conduct eight observations of each PST. These issues resurface in chapter 5 as they were sources of contention for some PSTs.

**Project KLM.** Project KLM is a requirement of the FL Education department that obligates all teacher candidates to demonstrate and document their abilities to measure their pedagogical effectiveness in the classroom. This project is set up by the university as a means to satisfy NCATE requirements through the use of performance-based teacher
candidate assessments. According to the university (Licensure Handbook, 2007), the focus of Project KLM is “to collect data on the impact” of teacher candidate’s teaching on the students in their ST classrooms. PSTs are asked to complete Project KLM through the following steps:

- Select a topic that will fit into the current curriculum and plan a unit of study that will span several days or weeks.
- Choose two assessment techniques that will fit appropriately with the subject/lesson to be taught and plan a method for administering these techniques and for recording data.
- Administer pre-assessments, teach the prepared lesson or unit (length of time determined by nature of lesson/unit), and administer post-assessments at the appropriate time.
- Before, during, and after the lesson, use information from the assessments to record students’ responses and insights into the lesson.
- Reflect on teaching and comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson.
- Write a report that outlines what procedures and findings.

PSTs turn in their completed projects to their university supervisors for a final evaluation which are rated ‘pass’ or ‘fail’. Projects are not reviewed or seen by methods instructors. If projects are found to be unsatisfactory a conference is set up with the candidate and a follow-up project is completed until mastery is reached.

Professional accreditating organizations. National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) serves as “the profession’s mechanism to help establish high quality teacher preparation” (http://www.ncate.org/public/aboutNCATE.asp. para. 2). NCATE aims to improve the quality of teaching and teacher preparation through an in-depth process of professional accreditation of schools and departments of education. Goals for FL teacher candidates based on the collaborative efforts of NCATE and ACTFL include demonstrating performance-based abilities in six areas:
- language proficiency
- cultural understandings of the connections among the perspectives of target cultures and their practices and products
- understanding language acquisition and developing instructional practices that promote language outcomes and learner diversity
- integrating standards in planning and instruction with state standards
- knowing and using assessment models appropriately, reflecting and analyzing assessments and adjusting instruction accordingly
- engaging in professional development opportunities and becoming advocates to promote the field.


FL Education programs may implement the above-mentioned standards into their curriculum in various ways; with the exception of demonstrating FL proficiency. This assessment must be done through the ACTFL OPI.

The preparation of FL teachers at Calico University is the joint responsibilities of the faculty in FL departments and the FL Education department. In order for FL teacher candidates to attain the knowledge, skills, and dispositions described in the national FL standards (ACTFL, 1999), programs of FL Education preparation must demonstrate that they include and account for the components described above. Such performance procedures aim to account for FL PSTs’ competencies in many conceptual and practical tools. Performance-based evidence is required to demonstrate that FL teacher candidates have a coherent and in-depth understanding of the FL and culture(s), FL proficiency, and understanding of pedagogy. An understanding of second language acquisition principles and sociocultural theories in teaching and learning must be demonstrated, and finally teacher candidates must show interest in growing professionally in the field and of becoming reflective practitioners.
Given that Calico University is a NCATE-accredited school of education; the FL Education program must adhere to the NCATE/ACTFL standards in terms of its performance-based assessments and regulations. PSTs have to successfully meet these standards before being recommended to the state for licensure. The state department of education, using NCATE and ACTFL Teacher Education Program Standards, sets benchmarks for teachers to use as a means to effectively educate student FL learners. Teachers and teacher candidates in this state should, ideally, know and implement the national FL and state standards. It should also be noted that the only formal measure of PSTs’ FL knowledge in this study comes from their Praxis Content examination scores, and hence, is discussed in chapter 5; as it posed a contradiction within the study. When the institutional accrediting organizations and Calico University operate in sync, a firm set of ‘checks and balances’ are put in place. However, some of these goals for novice FL teachers seem to be ones that teachers learn and experience over time. These goals are further addressed in chapter 5 as implications of this study.

**Contexts of the Cooperating Classrooms**

Represented in Figure 3.1 (above) as activity system 2, the research sites for the present study were located at seven public schools in Midwestern United States. The schools-- five high schools (HS), one middle school, and one elementary school—were located in predominantly urban settings. The locations of the schools varied across a geographical span of approximately sixty miles and were diverse in terms of their student
body populations and ethnicities. Table 3.1 below indicates a range in the districts’ socioeconomic statuses, population sizes, and in their state ratings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperating schools</th>
<th>Student teachers</th>
<th>School rating by state</th>
<th>Student population at building</th>
<th>Economically disadvantaged students</th>
<th>Ethnic population make-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funnelton High</td>
<td>Heidi Sara</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2500+</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>White 75% Black 12% Multi 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funnelton Middle</td>
<td>Kate (Spanish)</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>1600+</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>White 75% Black 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hisp. 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopewell High</td>
<td>Eva, Paco</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>1700+</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>White 76% Black 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hisp. 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norris High</td>
<td>Mora</td>
<td>Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>1900+</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>White 69% Black 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multi 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calico High</td>
<td>Chela</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>950+</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>White 92% Multi 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison High</td>
<td>Kate (French)</td>
<td>Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>1170+</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>White 70% Black 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hisp. 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Elem.</td>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>750+</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>Black 69% White 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multi 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Demographics of cooperating schools

Public schools located within the state are given a yearly rating that is indicative of the state’s determination of individual school’s overall effectiveness. These ratings are used to demonstrate schools’ effectiveness through the use of multiple measures (i.e.,
State Indicators, Performance Indices, Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), and Value-Added data) which assess the performances of schools and school districts within the state in regards to student achievement and progress. Schools (and districts) receive a categorical designation status based on the state’s findings. Classifications include the following: Excellent with Distinction, Excellent, Effective, Continuous Improvement, Academic Watch, and Academic Emergency. School ratings are published yearly in local newspapers as State and local report cards (state department of education website).

Student Populations in Target Classrooms

Although the student learners were not the focus of this study, they were integral to the PSTs’ learning to teach and to the social dynamic of each classroom. Across these classrooms, students varied a great deal. Their ages ranged mostly from 12 to 18 years of age, however kindergartners (ages five and six) were also included because of an unexpected change in ST placement for Heidi. Some student learners were beginning their study of FLs, while others had already completed several years of FL study. For ESL students in these classrooms, their study of FL was actually their third or fourth language, unlike the majority of students for whom the study of a FL was their second.

While I observed some eager and intrinsically motivated students in the PSTs’ classrooms, there were also students who seemed disinterested in learning FLs. The FL classes being taught by PSTs in this study predominantly ranged from the first year to the third year of high school language study, suggesting that most student learners’ FL Proficiency was that of a novice or novice-mid based on ACTFL OPI ratings. The one
exception was Heidi, who, as a change in original ST plans, spent time teaching in FLES program. Heidi was placed into a kindergarten (K) German classroom where students had just begun learning their formal study of the German language. German was taught daily for approximately 27 minutes a day. Based on my classroom observations, it was quite obvious that in some cases FL learning was taking place and a cultural awareness was being fostered. In these more successful classrooms, the PSTs often implemented engaging and meaningful lessons, showed their enthusiasm for FL teaching, and maintained consistent classroom management procedures to ensure an environment conducive to FL learning. In other cases, however, it appeared that less FL teaching and learning were taking place in less favorable conditions such as, lack of classroom control, inconsistent classroom management strategies, and lack of engaging lessons or FL proficiency, among other things.

Through formal interviews conducted with cooperating school administrators, I was able to glean common themes regarding their personal visions for their schools. Such visions included the following: high expectations for students and student learning, effective leadership, effective teaching, the sense of fostering a safe and supportive learning environment, and the need for parental and community involvement.

**Selection of Participants**

I gained access to seven PSTs as an instructor at Calico University during 2006-2007. The participants were students in three of my FL methods classes. All students in this FL cohort were invited to participate in this study. A letter of student recruitment
was sent to the 19 PSTs who had completed the FL methods courses in 2006-2007. Though participation in this study was voluntary, incentives for the participants were offered. Each participant learned how to create a professional teacher portfolio, had dinners during group interviews, and received 50 dollars at the initial interview.

Seven FL PSTs were involved with this study: Heidi, Kate, Paco, Chela, Mora, Sara, and Eva. Table 3.2 (below) describes PSTs’ backgrounds and previous FL learning and teaching experiences. Not all PSTs had completed their FL requirements at the onset of this study, and hence, four PSTs taught in the fall of 2007, and three in the spring of 2008. Although this sample is one of convenience, the seven PSTs in this study are representative (in demographic characteristics) of the FL Education department at Calico University. The breakdown of the FL education cohort at the time of this study was: 100% Caucasian, 94 % female, 73 % Spanish Education majors, 22% percent French Education majors, and 5 % German Education majors.

Other key participants included nine CTs, eight administrators, two faculty members from the FL Education department, and three university supervisors. All participants interviewed one time with the exception of two administrators and Heidi’s second CT. The PSTs in this study, with the exception of Paco, were traditional undergraduate students between the ages of 21 and 22. Paco was 33 years old and married with one child at the time of this study. The other six female participants were from the Midwest; while Paco was from Basque Country, an autonomous region in northern Spain. Paco’s first language was Basque language, while his second language was Spanish. The seven PSTs who made up this study group were: white, from
predominantly middle-class backgrounds, had completed the specific FL Education program requirements and were about to embark upon ST. Table 3.2 below presents background information for each PST.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Languages taught during ST</th>
<th>Years of FL study</th>
<th>study abroad</th>
<th>Praxis Content Score in %</th>
<th>Praxis PLT Score</th>
<th>Reported previous teaching experience</th>
<th>reported previous FL teaching experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paco</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>subbing</td>
<td>subbing, field experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mora</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>daycare provider</td>
<td>after-school program, field experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>√√</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>two field experiences</td>
<td>two field experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>ice skating, daycare</td>
<td>after-school program, field experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>daycare</td>
<td>field experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Spanish, French</td>
<td>11.5, 7.5</td>
<td>√√</td>
<td>93, 92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>swim instructor</td>
<td>after-school program, field experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chela</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>tutoring</td>
<td>field experiences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 PSTs’ backgrounds and FL learning and teaching experiences prior to ST

Information provided in Table 3.2 (above) also references the PSTs’ number of study-abroad experiences, prior teaching experiences, as well as their scores on Praxis examinations (Content and Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT)). The Praxis II (PLT 7-12) examination measures the general pedagogical knowledge of test takers.
regarding student learners in grades 7-12. Specific content knowledge tested includes: instruction and assessment, teacher professionalism, and communication techniques. This test uses a case study approach and features constructed-response and multiple-choice items (http://www.ets.org/Media/Tests/PRAXIS/taag/0524/glance.htm). The Praxis Content examinations of FLs assess areas in the FL including: interpretive listening, structure and grammar of the FL, interpretive reading, and cultural perspectives. The lowest qualifying score on French and Spanish examinations is 80%, while German requires 82% (http://www.ets.org/Media/Tests/PRAXIS/pdf/0181.pdf).

During first interviews several PSTs engaged in discussions about their previous FL classes and FL teachers. Many still carried with them memories of former FL teachers from their experiences as student learners. While the impact of the ‘apprenticeship of observation’ (Lortie, 1975) on teacher candidates has been documented in the literature (Grossman, 1990; Lampert, 2000; Borg, 2004; Watzke, 2007), it was also observed in this study. These sometimes inflated or exaggerated recollections are still prevalent in many of the participants’ memories prior to and during ST. Little formal exploration of these PSTs’ preconceived ideas of FL teaching occurred as part of teacher preparation prior to ST. Throughout ST, as referenced in interviews, many PSTs were still reflecting on their memories of specific FL teachers and classes.

Data Collection

Data collection occurred during the 2007-2008 academic year. This provided the opportunity to study the PSTs’ development over time and to obtain an increased number
of participants. Figure 3.2 (below) displays the qualitative methods I employed to allow for more comprehensive description and exploration of the processes in which these PSTs learned to teach FLs as they began taking on the roles of classroom teachers during ST.

Being positioned as certain types of FL teachers was the beginning of an iterative process of self-realization, evolving identity formations, and personal and professional changes. These emotional and developmental processes varied among PSTs; they were reached at different times, to varying extents, and in unparallel sequences.
Figure 3.2 Data collection methods and analysis flowchart
For this investigative exploration (Stebbins, 2001) I employed a case study approach (Yin, 2003) to explore and describe the activity systems that (in)form FL PSTs’ beliefs, utilization of tools, learning, emerging teacher identities, and finally, their commitments to FL teaching. Activity Theory (AT) (Leontiev, 1978; Engeström, 1999) was used as the theoretical lens to conceptualize and gain understanding of the seven undergraduate FL PSTs’ experiences, learning, and teacher identity development during teacher education.

My primary role as the researcher in this study was that of observer; however, due to the nature of my guided interactions and close supervision of the PSTs during ST, I was inevitably involved in the process of co-constructing knowledge with them. Throughout the study, I made every effort to focus on what the PSTs were experiencing and learning rather than on an evaluation of my own teaching or on the quality of the FL Education program. I encouraged the PSTs to be self-reflective and to provide retrospective and introspective responses about their experiences in learning to teach FLs.

I worked to ensure the trustworthiness, accuracy and transferability of this study and its subsequent findings. The trustworthiness of this research is demonstrated through the research methods and strategies used consistently throughout this study as well as through my role in the FL Education department at Calico University prior to this study. As a former FL methods instructor, I had the opportunity to cultivate professional relationships with each PST, as well as gain understanding of their content and pedagogical knowledge. At the same time I attempted to gain deeper insight into the rules, tools, community, and objects of the FL Education program. The accuracy,
authenticity, and credibility of this study and its findings have been established through techniques including: triangulation of data, peer debriefing, and member checking.

The purpose of triangulation is to ensure that data and the methods used to collect and analyze data are done so from multiple perspectives and sources (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 2002). These techniques were employed to triangulate the data in various ways; (1) language biographies, (2) demographic questionnaire, (3) document collection, (4) focus group interviews, card-sort, stimulated recall, (5) group blog communiqués, (6) multiple classroom observations, (7) interviews, (8) field notes, conceptual memos, (9) self-reported measures, (10) member-checking, and (11) peer debriefing. For example, information gathered from language biographies regarding their personal language learning histories was corroborated by information they provided in the demographic questionnaires and the focus group interviews, which lead to fuller descriptions of PSTs as FL learners. Similarly, information gathered from the focus group interviews, stimulated recall procedures and self-reported measures collectively provided avenues for gaining description of PSTs’ teacher identities at the beginning of the study. Finally, information regarding PSTs’ motives, use of tools, perceived problem spaces, and emerging teacher identities gathered during the focus group interview was compared with practices utilized in the classroom during classroom observations as well as with information elicited from the PSTs in follow-up interviews. Similarly, information provided by both the PSTs and CTS during interviews regarding the nature of the CTs’ FL teaching practices was compared for consistency. In some cases I was able to observe
the CTs teaching, which further verified PSTs’ and CTs’ accounts of utilizing particular FL practices or instructional approaches.

The purpose of member checks and peer debriefing was to ensure that the researcher’s analyzed interpretive data have been accurately interpreted. I attempted to withhold my opinions and biases from the data analysis during this study to carefully portray a more accurate image of the social settings, PSTs’ beliefs, and the activities being examined (McKay, 2002). All PSTs were asked to review their personal profiles for accuracy and affirmation of content.

In an effort to help maintain the credibility of this study, two peer reviewers each read through various samples of both interview and classroom observation transcriptions to ensure reliability of the coding. Each rater was asked to code two interview transcripts, one set of 15 blog responses, and one classroom observation transcript according to the coding descriptors I provided. Raters were coding references to or instances of PSTs’ motives, use of (and attribution of) tools, encountered (or perceived) problem ‘spaces’, and emerging teacher identities. A problem ‘space’ was explained as any area or realm of teaching the PSTs encountered that posed a problem. For example, Chela had difficulty building relationships with many of her students, so in her case one of the problem ‘spaces’ was student relationships. All coding was entered and stored in MAXQDA software. The coding among the three raters was similar on average 87% of the time. Most instances of disagreement occurred with coding for the category ‘emerging teacher identities’. When all three raters were not in agreement, it was often the case that one of the three had coded differently. After talking to the rater of the
discrepant codes, on occasion the rater changed the coding to be in agreement with the other two coders. If the discrepant coder did not change the original coding, I left the coding as the two coders had agreed, but such instances are not reflected in the average agreement of 87%. For example, each rater’s codes (from the combined four transcripts) were categorized and counted in MAXQDA. One rater had 98 codes on the combined four transcripts, while the other had 101 codes. I coded these same transcripts with 103 codes. Using 98 as the minimum number of codes all three raters coded, I then checked for the similarities in coding among the three raters. Of the total 98 codes, 84 codes were originally similar in the ratings of all three raters. Of the remaining 15 discrepant codes among the three raters, on eight occasions one rater had coded differently. After talking with the discrepant rater, on two occasions the coding was changed; thus changing the total similar codes from 84 to 86. Additionally, one of the changed codes was actually an additional code by the rater in order to be in agreement with the two other raters—the rater felt that he had overlooked this aspect of the data. This additional code then increased the total number of codes to 99. The number of similar codes (86) was then divided by the total number of codes (99) for a percentage of 87.

Language Biographies

Prior to ST PSTs wrote personal FL biographies, that is, a written, personal narrative summary of their own FL learning experiences. In this study it served as a means of reference when triangulating the data in that it provided rich description of the participants’ FL experiences which led them to choose FL education as a career and
towards the ST experience. Information gleaned from narratives provides insight into some of the underlying issues important in this study: self-confidence, subject and pedagogical content knowledge, impact of previous teachers, vision and beliefs about FL teaching, and visions of themselves as prospective FL teachers. The Language Biography prompt can be found in Appendix A (page 228).

**Demographic Questionnaires**

A questionnaire which elicited specific information regarding PSTs’ backgrounds, learning FL experiences and trajectories, previous teaching experiences, as well as information relevant to their academic performance during teacher education (i.e., G.P.A., Praxis scores, etc.) was gathered. This data was collected to provide a more comprehensive picture of the nature of PSTs’ involvement in the teaching and learning of FLs. The Demographic Questionnaire can be found in Appendix B (page 230).

**Document Collection**

Document collection was conducted to obtain background information relating to the activity systems, such as the FL education program, explored in this study. I collected general information about the FL Education program, the PSTs’ cooperating school environments, and accrediting organizations charged with evaluating the quality and integrity of FL Education preparation (i.e., ACTFL, NCATE, etc.). Data gathered from these organizations’ websites provided a description of the nature of these contexts and their roles and involvement in preparing the PSTs in this study. Informal reading and
note-taking of these documents was done to seek consistency and coherence among the procedures, regulations, and experiences of the PSTs. This comparative analysis showed inconsistencies among the PSTs’ experiences during ST, professional institutional procedures overlooked by the FL Education department, discrepancies in requirements of the university supervisors, accompanied with disregard among some CTs for the professional institutional organizational standards that, in theory, guide their instruction. These assertions are discussed in greater detail in chapters 4 and 5.

**Focus Group Interviews, Card-sort task, and Stimulated Recall**

Focus group interviews are defined as a research technique that collects data through group interaction and communication about a specific topic. The purpose of the focus group interviews used in the present study was to obtain the following information: personal and general background information from the PSTs about their perceptions of FL teaching, and PSTs’ visions of the impact of ST on their pedagogical practices as well as on their emerging teacher identities. I used this information to generate tentative hypotheses about PSTs’ processes of teacher identity formation. Focus group interview questions can be found in Appendix C (page 232).

Additionally, a card-sort task, similar in format to the one used by Grossman (1990) was conducted during this stage which asked the participants to rank completed teacher education coursework. The purpose of this task was to provide me with an awareness of PSTs’ learning during teacher preparation and their perceptions of the coursework they found pertinent to their sense of teacher preparedness. In Grossman’s
study, she used the card-sort task as a means to indicate how the university coursework had influenced participants’ knowledge and conceptions of teaching English (1990, p. 153). This research tool is an elicitation and clarification tool designed to help students articulate their knowledge and beliefs (Meis Friedrichsen & Dana, 2003) as well as rank relevant preparatory coursework. This activity served as an impetus for eliciting PSTs’ perceptions of completed coursework and for a discussion of their perceived feasibility of incorporating the national FL standards (ACTFL, 2006) into their forthcoming practicum. This elicited information was used to triangulate other collected data, affirming a particular set of beliefs about FL teaching and type(s) of FL teacher identities PSTs held prior to ST. A copy of the card-sort tasks can be found in Appendix D (page 234).

Finally, previous works were later used for a stimulated recall revealing general descriptions of the PSTs’ perceptions of previous teacher preparation experiences and their perceived levels of self-confidence prior to ST. This information exemplified the personal FL learning endeavors and educational experiences, as well as experiences and undertakings in the lives and learning which guided these PSTs towards FL education. This procedure can be found in Appendix E (page 236).

**Weekly Group Blog**

Bartlett (1990) suggests that in order to do critical reflective teaching one must move away from the simple questions inquiring about pedagogical techniques, to more value laden questions that help to provide answers about what and why “things” occur in the classroom or in one’s teaching. Bartlett posits that through serious reflection, the
possibility of transforming actions in the classroom as well as personal beliefs and ideas about teaching have the potential to take place. Loughran (2002) further suggests that if PSTs are asked to develop assertions about their teaching practices as a result of sharing their experiences with other PSTs, then personal learning outcomes may be more profound than those of simply sharing experiences for peer support. The ability to recognize and articulate knowledge about teaching practice gives real purpose for and value in reflective practice (2002, p. 38).

For the purpose of PSTs conducting (and sharing) personal reflections during ST I created and maintained two separate blogs forums. The blog forum was a means for the PSTs to communicate about their experiences, learning, and changing beliefs about FL teaching over the course of ST. Due to the nature of the blog format, I posed questions weekly and the PSTs were able to read other responses and make comments on them before or after adding their own. The weekly blog discussions were used as a means to foster a sense of an intimate discourse community. These questions were crafted to elicit information regarding PSTs’ emerging beliefs and identities as well as to encourage them to think profoundly and reflect upon their personal and professional roles as teacher in the FL classroom. A big impression was that participants may have been more candid in their writings than they may have been in the focus group interviews. For weekly blog questions, see Appendix F (page 238).

A teacher’s belief system is based on their perspectives, attitudes, and understanding of teaching and how he or she perceives his or her role within the system (Richards, 1996). Richards contends with Johnson (1992) and further suggests that
adding a teacher’s belief system and an objective view of that system can be seen as reliable sources of reference for many teachers. Aspects that contribute to and inform a FL teacher’s belief system include the teachers’ theory of language-learning, the nature of language teaching, the role of the teacher, effective teaching practices, and teacher-student relations (1996). Providing guiding questions which promote critical reflection of student teachers’ personal beliefs and experiences in the FL classroom in attempts to better understand the essence of the teacher they are becoming is perhaps a result of this study.

Classroom Observations

Three classroom observations were conducted for each of the six PSTs in this study; while Kate was observed four times due to the nature of her split ST practicum. The first observations occurred within the first three weeks of teaching; the second observation took place after eight weeks of teaching, and the last observation took place during the last two weeks of the practicum. The purposes of conducting classroom observations were to understand the cooperating school setting where each PST was placed; to observe how the PSTs performed, learned, and developed within these contexts and to consider the extent to which they employed a range of conceptual and practical teaching tools, including NCATE Standards. As a researcher, I used a classroom observation protocol to maintain the focus and consistency of the research during classroom observations. The protocol is procedural-oriented in nature so as to focus attention on the methods, delivery, coherence, and objectives of the lessons. It accounted
for pedagogical practices and teaching tools such as the implementation of CLT and of the national FL standards. The completed protocols were later compared with the PSTs’ initial beliefs about FL teaching and with the CT’s personal views of FL teaching. This was done in order to explore and observe patterns (e.g. utilization of CLT, teaching tools, etc.) in the composition of the lessons crafted and delivered by the PSTs. Classroom observations were conducted at a date and time agreed upon by both the PSTs and CTs. All classroom observations were audio-taped and later transcribed so that I could repeatedly attend and return to specific PST’s practices or discourse, if need be. The FL classroom observation protocol is provided in Appendix G (page 241).

Interviews

Follow-up interviews. Follow-up interviews were conducted with PSTs after each classroom observation. Interviews were informal and lasted between 18 and 55 minutes. All interviews were audio-taped and later transcribed. Typically, the process of the interviews began with me asking specific questions about the particular lesson that I had just observed and then moved to general questions about how the PSTs were managing and accepting various responsibilities during ST. I approached these interviews with concern for both privacy and candor so that the participants felt reasonably comfortable talking about emerging issues, their feelings, and their experiences during ST. Because I also observed classroom practices over time, I was able to talk with the PSTs’ about their emerging beliefs about FL teaching. A total of 22
classroom observations and 20 follow-up interviews were conducted at the cooperating schools.

Formal interviews. Formal and more structured interviews took place with the CTs, school administrators, FL Education faculty members, and the three university supervisors peripherally or directly involved in the ST placements. These interviews were structured to elicit information about the nature of (FL) teaching at the schools, the particular routines and procedures of the classrooms, as well as the CTs’, principals’, FL Education faculty’s, and university supervisors’ beliefs about FL teaching. This descriptive information gleaned from participants at various institutional levels provided a more comprehensive look into how such contexts may influence PSTs’ learning, beliefs about FL teaching, their teacher identity formations, and their commitments to FL teaching. Interviews varied in length from approximately 17 to 38 minutes. All interviews conducted for this study, with the exception of three, were recorded and transcribed. Unrecorded interviews were paraphrased while notes were later transcribed and analyzed. A total of eight CT interviews and six interviews with school administrators took place during this study. Interview questions for CTs can be found in Appendix H (page 244). School administrator interview questions can be found in Appendix I (page 246). Questions utilized during FL Education faculty members’ interviews as well as the questionnaire for university supervisors can be found in Appendix J (page 248).
Field Notes, Conceptual Memos

After compiling and reading the transcripts of each classroom observation, as well as comparing them with the results of the interview coding, I identified patterns in the data and wrote conceptual memos. Hatch (2002) suggests that creating such memos from reiterations of reading the data as a whole helps the researcher to “structure” one’s thinking in ways that make sense and can be easily communicated to others (p. 183). I did this for each individual PST. The memo was a compilation of hand-written memos made during the cyclical iterations of comparative analyses which was later inserted into and stored in MaxQDA 2007 qualitative software. The conceptual memo contained themes relevant to PSTs’ experiences in the activity systems, which were then explored in greater detail and compared to see if and how those experiences influenced their emerging teacher identities, learning and beliefs about FL teaching, and their commitment as future FL teachers. These analyses were then compared across PSTs’ pedagogical procedures to look for consistency among their stated academic, personal, and pedagogical goals, their use of tools, and the CT’s FL teaching beliefs and practices.

Self-reported Measures

Self efficacy is the confidence (or judgment of confidence) that individuals have in their abilities to carry out various activities (Bandura, 1986; Pajares, 2000). Sander and Sanders (2003) argue that “[E]xperience tells us that confidence differs between people in the same situation and that people have differing levels of confidence in different situations” (p. 3); suggesting a reciprocal relationship between an individual and
his or her environment implying successful experiences resulting in higher level of self-efficacy. Pajares (2002) suggests that self-efficacy influences choices individuals make in specific situations as well as their persistence to carry out and complete various challenging tasks.

In this study PSTs were asked to rate their confidence (on a level from one to ten, ten being highest) in FL teaching both before and after ST. Additionally PSTs were also asked to rate their perceptions of their abilities to effectively teach FLs before and after ST. These self-reported measures were used simply as a means to gauge if their ST experiences may have had some bearing on the PSTs’ perceptions of their learning to teach FLs and teacher identity development. These can be found in Appendix K (page 252).

Data Analysis Procedures

Multiple sources of data were compiled to provide an understanding of the influences of such systems on PSTs’ beliefs about FL teaching, learning to teach FLs, utilization of tools, teacher identity formations, and commitments to FL teaching. The nature of using a case study methodology with seven PSTs lends itself to the incorporation of massive amounts of data. Due to the quantity of data that needed to be analyzed for this study, I used a qualitative textual analysis software program called MaxQDA 2007. Though I completed most analyses, the software facilitated the coding and organization of the data and was predominantly utilized while compiling examples for the cross-case analysis. The following research questions guided me in this study:
R1a What are the principal contexts in which PSTs learned to teach FLs?

R1b What overriding or dominant motives shape action within these contexts?

R2 What tools, concepts, and beliefs of FL teaching do PSTs develop during FL teacher education and during ST in order to take action toward the goals of the various contexts?

R3a How do the ways in which PSTs learn to teach FLs within formal contexts (i.e., FL education and ST) shape teacher identity development?

R3b How do PSTs’ beliefs, teaching tools, and commitment to FL teaching shape their identity development and vice versa?

Table 3.3 (below) displays the gathered data as it corresponded to the research questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>R1a</th>
<th>R1b</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>R3a</th>
<th>R3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language biographies</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic questionnaires</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document collection/Informal institutional organization background information</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group interview, Card-sort task, Stimulated recall</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Blog responses</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observations</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST interviews (follow-up)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal (CT, administrator) interviews</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes and Conceptual Memos</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reported measures (pre &amp; post)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3 Data collected pertaining to research questions
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Inductive data analysis took place on many levels throughout this study. Combinations of analytic procedures (single-case and cross-case analyses) were used to analyze data gathered from the PSTs’ experiences within the activity systems explored in this study. The unit of analysis for this study is irreducible tension between the agent (PST) and the tools available for use within the object-oriented, artifact-mediated collective activity system (Wertsch, 1985). Therefore, ensuing analyses will be reported with this unit as the implied boundary unless noted otherwise. Put another way, the focus of my analysis was the mediated action of the PSTs as they made instructional decisions and learned to teach FLs as they did so. This means that rather than focusing only on individual PSTs or his or her teaching, my analysis of PSTs’ learning and development was always made by considering what tools they were using to carry out actions within specific contexts. Inductive analysis was conducted on most data gathered including: language biographies, participant interviews, blog responses, card-sort task, and classroom observations. Data gathered from the demographic questionnaires and the self-reported confidence measures was simply used as background information of each PST. Results from these instruments provided a comprehensive picture of PSTs’ past FL learning experiences as well as a glimpse of their confidence at the time of this study. In addition, informal reading and note-taking of documents provided general background information regarding university, state, and accreditation procedures, regulations, and assessments of PSTs seeking licensure.

For interview data collected in this study, participant comments were thematically analyzed into four broad categories: (1) motives; (2) use of tools; (3) problem ‘spaces’ (4)
emerging teacher identities (see Table 3.4 below). While these organizing categories helped frame the analysis, I was cognizant that it is possible that the data would reveal the need for additional categories, or even the nullification of some (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996; Hatch, 2002). During the various steps of inductive analysis, I reread the data, refined the broad categories, breaking them down into smaller categories as the data lent itself to more detailed categorizations. For example, while I used PSTs’ motives as a focus of the analysis, upon closer readings of the interviews and classroom transcriptions it became clearer that I needed to distinguish between the types of motives the PSTs talked about. Therefore, motive was further defined into four more categories: academic, personal, pedagogical, and CT’s motives. I then reread the data and considered patterns and similarities within domains, and a second time across domains. This was done to see if connections exist between and among domains, thus allowing for more detailed, rich representations of the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PST’s motives for teaching</th>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Problem spaces</th>
<th>Emerging Teacher Identities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- academic</td>
<td>- conceptual</td>
<td>- perceived</td>
<td>- grammar-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- personal</td>
<td>- practical</td>
<td>- encountered</td>
<td>- communicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- pedagogical</td>
<td>- attribution</td>
<td></td>
<td>- hybrid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4 Coding for interviews, classroom observations, blogs, and language biographies
Motives for teaching. It became apparent during reiterative cycles of immersing myself in the data that the four broad categories previously mentioned were simply too general and needed to be refined. In the first category, motives, it became clear in PSTs’ interviews that they had multiple motives before and during ST. While not all PSTs expressed having all three types of motives identified in this analysis, many of them did, thus making it apparent for the need of adding three subcategories: academic, personal, and pedagogical. In the context of this study, PSTs’ academic goals or motives refer to their ideas regarding the benchmarks set up during teacher education experiences. For example, all PSTs wanted to attain passing scores on the Praxis examinations and OPI interviews. All PSTs aimed to do well on the high-stakes assignment Project KLM.

Personal goals are those referenced by PSTs which refer to achieving individual growth and success during ST. For example, often PSTs referred to improving their confidence in teaching or affirming FL education as their career choice. Finally, pedagogical goals refer to outcomes the PSTs wanted student learners to achieve during ST, as well as their individual aims for becoming certain types (i.e., communicative) of FL teachers.

Teaching tools and appropriation. It was expected that certain teaching tools would be utilized by the PSTs during ST. Given that all PSTs participated in the same FL cohort and attended the same courses during FL teacher education, I anticipated that most PSTs would take up the conceptual tools that had been promoted, discussed, and modeled at the university. Because theories are the foundations for the use of conceptual tools, I expected that PSTs would utilize theories of constructivism, and more...
specifically, communicative language teaching (CLT). That is, PSTs would maintain a conceptualization of the student learners as active participants in the process of FL learning (and meaning-making) rather than simply as recipients of knowledge or language. Keeping in mind that most PSTs reported learning their FLs from predominantly grammar-based approaches, I recognized that the possibility existed for some PSTs to take up such approach (or a blending) during ST, and that doing so may result in conflict in motives across two contexts.

Practical tools were coded as such based on PSTs’ references to tools or actual tool utilization that I observed during classroom observations. Having taught the FL methods courses I had understanding of the pedagogical tools the PSTs had learned during university coursework and therefore anticipated observing such tools during ST. For example, practical tools in the context of this study included the use of the national FL standards during planning and instruction, top-down processing, authentic texts, realia, and information-gap activities, among others. After rereading the data other practical tools that were more grounded in transmission notions of learning or grammar-based approach to FL teaching were added in order to capture the full range of tools from all contexts—not just the FL Education program. Some of the practical tools included the utilization of grammar review worksheets, mechanical and translation drills, and explicit focus on form activities, etc. During follow-up interviews with PSTs and formal interviews with CTs, I inquired about the learning of and use of practical tools to consider the attribution or sources of these tools. Such categories included: previous personal learning or “apprenticeship of observation” (Lortie, 1975), FL instructor or methods
courses, university supervisor, CTs, state or school mandates, passion for FLs, and FL conferences or professional development opportunities. After iterative cycles of reading the data other attribution categories emerged; FL cohort or peers and intrinsic motivation or personal reward.

A key concern in AT has to do with the appropriation of tools (Leont’ev, 1981; Wertsch, 1991). Appropriation refers to the taking up or adopting of (in this case) pedagogical tools available for use in learning to teach FL contexts. Through such developmental processes individuals internalize particular ways of thinking that are specific to various cultural practices. Researchers suggest that the extent of appropriation depends on the congruence of the learner’s beliefs, past experiences, and goals and motives and his or her active role in these processes (Grossman et al., 1999). Appropriation, then, provides learners with ways to reconstruct and transform the knowledge they internalize. Utilizing Grossman et al.’s (1999) ‘five degrees of appropriation’, (lack of appropriation, appropriating a label, appropriating surface features, appropriating conceptual underpinnings, and achieving mastery, as referenced in chapter 2), I attempt to better understand the appropriation that was taking place among the PSTs during this study and discuss it further in chapters 4 and 5.

Problem ‘Spaces’.

Learning to teach can be problematic for some teacher candidates and novice teachers. Problems ranging from developing subject matter content knowledge (Shulman, 1987; Grossman, 1990) to developing and maintaining professional identities as teachers (Beijaard, Meijer, & Verloop, 2004; Olsen, 2008).
Understanding how the PSTs made sense of their teaching situations, including their problem ‘spaces’, along with the resources and tools they utilized for getting through such spaces is important because these learning processes contribute to their emerging identities as FL teachers (Grossman et al., 1999). For purposes of this study, then, a problem is identified as “a difficulty that beginning teachers encounter” in their conceptualizations of FL teaching or teaching performances during ST (Veenman, 1984, p. 143). A problem ‘space’, then, is considered a particular area or realm of teaching in which PSTs encountered problems during ST. These spaces are presented in chapter 4.

Emerging teacher identities. Similarly, three patterns or categories emerged from the data which illustrated PSTs displaying certain characteristics and conducting certain kids of activities that lent themselves to specific approaches to FL teaching. While some PSTs crossed into all three categories on occasion, at least one of the categories emerged as what seems to be a primary overarching identity. These three categories included: carrying out FL teaching as grammar-based, FL teaching as communicative, or hybrid FL teachers. For example, during ST several PSTs gradually started teaching their FLs in predominantly grammar-based approaches for a variety of reasons which are considered in chapters 4 and 5. Some PSTs utilized the tools provided by their CTs and classroom environments and finished ST believing in the efficacy of such transmission approaches. Heidi’s experience, for example, was unusual in the sense that she was placed with a CT who utilized CLT in the classroom, but she left ST believing that a grammar-based approach is more practical and effective for teaching FLs. Heidi commented:
My CT is all about speaking. He puts everything into the target language, even if that means spending 10 minutes describing an activity because everyone is so confused. It's cool to be able to communicate with the students in the target language, but it definitely takes away teaching time. I think there needs to be more teaching in English for understanding and then letting them apply that in the target language...Since my CT is so against English in the classroom, I struggle to really teach the way that I want to. He comments on the amount of English that I use and it frustrates me because I think it's ok to teach things in English.

Mora, however, was placed with a CT who utilized a grammar-based approach to teaching FL, but in spite of that, she was able to maintain her belief in CLT as best FL teaching practices throughout ST. Despite learning to utilize the tools provided to her in the ST context, Mora chose to use these experiences as a basis for comparing methodologies, practices, and student learning outcomes. She claimed that she was often disappointed with what she observed under grammar-based instruction. For example, Mora said:

I would love to do more supplemental and do more, um, top-down approach because like, I, I think that the kids respond better to that just from, from what I’ve seen…I really do think that they (students) can be pushed harder, and not even necessarily really pushed harder like pushed to get through an activity or pushed to get through a certain concept faster not that, but I feel that the kids can be able to see it (French) in a different way but I think right now they see this class as like any other class, it’s like ‘Oh, we have to memorize stuff. We have to learn this and memorize this and we have to practice writing over and over this.’…So, my ideas for the future are as follows: I want to emphasize communication- real output- by giving real input. I want my activities and projects to serve a purpose- for there to be meaning- rather than providing mindless activities that do not truly teach the students to communicate. I found that it was all too easy to rely on the textbook.

Kate left ST believing in a more balanced, hybrid approach to FL teaching, rather, a combination of grammar and communicative approaches. I observed Kate teaching grammar explicitly in three of her four classroom observations. Most notably was her use of teaching an acronym-mnemonic to students to help the students remember the
conjugations of perfect tense verbs that must be accompanied by the French auxiliary verb ‘être’ (i.e., ‘DR. and MRS. VAN DER TRAMP’). While the use of an acronym-mnemonic does not necessarily render her teaching of this grammar aspect explicit, the way that she presented and utilized it did. Kate created a chart on the chalkboard with the acronym and all of the accompanying French verb conjugations. She then went through each French conjugation and translated the meanings into English. Her presentation of this acronym-mnemonic took nearly the entire 45 minute class period. Students were then given a tightly controlled grammar worksheet using these French verbs to complete for homework. The students at no time during the class used these verbs in meaningful communication; Kate did all of the talking, both in French and in English. During this observation she clearly emphasized grammar and accuracy over communication or communicative competence (CC) (Hymes, 1971) and negotiating meaning. During other classroom observations, however, Kate showed evidence of incorporating some aspects of CLT instruction. For instance, Kate presented a French poem to the class and used corresponding motions and gestures to ensure the students’ comprehension of the main ideas. These motions come from a method developed by Asher in the 70s known as Total Physical Response (TPR) (Shrum & Glisan, 2005). She then took the main ideas and allowed her students to formulate new ideas and modify the poem, a practice in line with CLT.
The final category of emerging identities used in this study pertains to more personal knowing or learning that took place—a sort of self-awareness. As I reread interview data, it was apparent that PSTs came away from ST knowing more about themselves as certain kinds of FL teachers and as individuals. For some PSTs, this personal learning, or self-realization, had bearing on their emerging identities, as well as their commitments to FL teaching. For example, Heidi’s exploration of self-realization and personal discovery during ST left her no longer wanting to teach. All PSTs referenced some degree of self-realization and personal discovery during ST.
Chapter 4: Analysis

Findings from a Cross-Case Analysis of Seven Preservice Foreign Language Teachers

This study of foreign language (FL) teacher education is grounded in activity theory (AT) which considers an individual’s goal-oriented actions carried out within specific contexts. In this study I examined the overlapping activity systems of the university undergraduate FL Education program and individual preservice teacher’s (PST) student-teaching (ST) settings. In particular, I examined how, when, and why FL PSTs learned to teach FLs within various settings including university classrooms as well as K-12 public schools. Within these settings I was interested in how the PSTs’ took up or resisted the use of teaching tools, such as a communicative or grammar-based approach to FL teaching, and how the communities, rules, and divisions of labor had bearing on PSTs’ learning to teach FLs. A central concern of this study is the development of teacher identities within the contexts of a FL Education program where belief and values are developed within such settings as they learned to teach and envision their futures as prospective FL teachers.

Grossman, Smagorinsky, and Valencia (1999) suggest that ST provides one of the most difficult contexts for PSTs to develop identities because PSTs are advised and evaluated by CTs and university supervisors, who may sometimes have conflicting goals for PSTs or different beliefs about learning to teach. Understandings of PSTs’
experiences of learning to teach FLs in different contexts has the potential to shed light on how they construct their identities as FL teachers, resolve tensions, and make sense of their roles as becoming certain types of FL teachers. Guiding questions are:

- What are the principal contexts in which PSTs learned to teach FLs?
- What overriding or dominant motives shape action within these contexts?
- What tools, concepts, and beliefs of FL teaching do PSTs develop during FL teacher education and during ST in order to take action toward the goals of the various contexts?
- How do the ways in which PSTs learn to teach FLs within various formal contexts (i.e., FL teacher education and ST) shape teacher identity development?
- How do PSTs’ beliefs, teaching tools, and commitment to FL teaching shape their identity development and vice versa?

This chapter reports the results of a cross-case analysis considering seven PSTs’ motives, use and appropriation of tools, learning, and emerging identities during ST. Derived from AT, the following concepts within AT frame the presentation of the data analysis: motives, tools, learning, and emerging teacher identities. The specific categories that came about after iterative cycles of analyses are presented below in Table 4.1. This chapter presents the analyses of data collected from language biographies, demographic questionnaires, document collection, interviews, blog responses, classroom observations, field notes, conceptual memos, and self-reported measures.
Table 4.1 Overview of chapter layout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motives</th>
<th>Tools (conceptual and practical)</th>
<th>Problem ‘spaces’</th>
<th>Emerging teacher identities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSTs’ goals</td>
<td>-use of national FL standards</td>
<td>-implementing standards-based instruction or CLT</td>
<td>-grammar-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-academic</td>
<td>-implicit grammar lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td>-hybrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-personal</td>
<td>-contextualized vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td>-communicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pedagogical</td>
<td>-integration of culture and language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTs’ goals</td>
<td>-use of schema activation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-expressed</td>
<td>-top-down approach, extension activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-unknown</td>
<td>-use of authentic texts, realia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-meaningful FL writing strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-TL as medium of instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-student-centered activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-personal reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-time management and organizational strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As explained in chapter 3, I focused on the teaching and learning of seven FL PSTs: Heidi, Kate, Paco, Chela, Mora, Sara, and Eva. While they were all teacher-learners (Florio-Ruane, 2001) from the same FL cohort, they each embarked upon ST differently. Each PST was placed by the university with a CT whose experience teaching
FLs ranged from 3 to 31 years. FLs taught by these PSTs included Spanish, French and German.

Motives, Teaching Tools and Appropriation, Problem ‘Spaces’, and Emerging Teacher Identities

Motives. Motive, also considered the purpose or intent of acting upon an object or working towards an outcome, is the driving force of activity systems (Gay & Hembrooke, 2004). Moreover, Leont’ev (1981) has argued that motive is a distant and essential aspect of his theory of activity. Ostensibly, all PSTs’ academic and professionally driven motives were initially to become FL teachers. As is the case for most university-based programs, achieving certified status as competent FL teachers meant the PSTs first had to complete the FL Education program in which they were enrolled, and second, they had to complete successfully the sixteen-week ST practicum in K-12 FL classrooms.

While these PSTs appeared to be striving towards the same academic outcomes, a closer look at their reasons for entry into the field sheds light on how they approached ST; that is, how they envisioned themselves as developing FL teachers. Findings from this study reflect Barnes’ (2005) suggestion that the predominant reason for entry among FL PSTs is the desire to share their passion for FLs and foreign cultures. Barnes found that nearly 50% of the FL PSTs in her study indicated their passion for FL as the main factor for entering the field; while findings from the study reported here showed more than 70% of the PSTs indicated such passion. Mora, for example, stated in her initial interview that she wanted to become a teacher since she was in elementary school. She
claimed that as a FL teacher she aimed to inspire her students with her love of French language and cultures. She explained, “I want the kids to feel like they have a teacher who’s really excited about the subject because they’re only going to be as excited as I am. I want them to know that I LOVE FRENCH!”

Few PSTs, namely Heidi and Paco, talked less about their personal interests in teaching FLs and more about how they perceived a lack of other FL-related career options. For example, in an interview Heidi mentioned that she chose FL education because “…there really isn’t much other than teaching you can use German for—unless you have a Business degree”. Paco, a non-traditional FL Education student, was pursuing his third career and indicated that he had always been good at learning languages.

In addition to academic aims motivating these PSTs, they also held many personal goals. Most PSTs initially viewed ST as their individual experience, that is, as their own time for personal growth and learning. All PSTs voiced personal goals that they wished to achieve during ST, such as increasing self-confidence, but they also held professional goals such as improving classroom management, developing skills to craft more effective lesson plans, among others.

Heidi, Chela, and Paco focused more on their roles as learners of teaching rather than on their students’ learning. Their main concerns initially were time and classroom management. For example, during Chela’s first interview she responded that her goals during ST were:

Organization, definitely…I have heard a lot of horror stories about people who get so swamped with everything and I am so not good with time management…I just want to have everything really organized so that I don’t get lost in a pile of papers. (1/13/08)
While her response alludes to her perceived weakness with organization, it also points to her perception of teaching as being consumed with grading papers, rather than having a focus on instruction or student learning. On the self-reported measure used prior to ST, Chela rated her confidence of FL teaching a 4 on a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 as the highest. When probed further for any student goals that she had, Chela responded, “Hopefully that they’ll be able to speak some Spanish (laughs) so that’s my main goal (laughs)…that I won’t kill the passion of whatever inside of them (laughs). Optimism, you know.” It seems that Chela’s low confidence and emphasis on her own learning experiences led her to focus more on her own learning during ST and less on setting pedagogical goals for her students.

Heidi, Paco, and Chela’s initial interview responses lacked references of having concrete student goals (pedagogical goals). They admitted being more concerned with how their students might perceive or react to them as student teachers rather than their students’ actual FL learning, a concern that Shulman (1986) suggests is common among novice teachers. Furthermore, Kwo (1996) observed PSTs’ tendencies to be more concerned with their projected (student) teacher images in the FL classroom rather than with their abilities to teach effectively. Heidi, Paco, and Chela’s self-reported lack of confidence and comments alluding to aiming for fun and engaging classes echo Kwo’s findings. For example, Heidi’s initial goals were:

I just want to build up my own confidence personally and feel comfortable in going in front of the class and know that I can do it. And for my students I just want them to have fun, learn about German, even if they don’t, even if it’s not their favorite class and least know it was a fun class. (Heidi, 1/13/08)
On the contrary, Eva, Mora, Kate, and Sara included pedagogical goals for their students’ learning while talking about their own personal goals—almost as if they were one in the same. These PSTs made frequent references in interviews of wanting their students “to learn the language,” “to see language as meaningful,” and “to appreciate the cultures”. Having pedagogical goals such as, aiming for meaningful target language (TL) communication in the classroom demonstrates these PSTs’ desires to project potential outcomes for both themselves as learners of teaching and for their students. These PSTs were cognizant of the nature of cooperative learning experiences during ST and of their roles within such learning processes; they were contemplating the FL learning of their students. Some researchers find such outward shifts in concern among PSTs and novice teachers as significant signs of teacher development (Hiebert, Morris, Berk, & Jansen, 2007; Moore, 2003).

When considering the context of ST, PSTs are often prompted to heed the authoritative calling of essentially two high stakes figures of authority—the CTs and university supervisors. While these two roles represent larger entities which sometimes overlap or (mis)align in their motives, trying to conform to differing FL teaching philosophies has the potential to create a problematic situation for some PSTs. PSTs are often regarded as student learners of teaching in one context (university) and as student teachers in the other (cooperating school). When motives from both learning-to-teach contexts align, PSTs are often more able to see the purpose of their university-based learning and practice. This comes about through guided use of tools, mediating practices, social interactions and individual problem-solving within learning-to-teach settings (Grossman et al., 1999; Newell et al., 2001).
All PSTs met their academic goals and collective outcomes during ST, in that they were recommended to the state for licensure. However, in order to achieve these outcomes some PSTs had to behave or carry things out differently than they perhaps would have done otherwise. To some extent, as can be expected, all PSTs had to compromise their beliefs, practices, or goals in order to be successful during ST.

However, not all PSTs achieved their personal or pedagogical goals. Mora, Eva, Kate, and Sara, who experienced overall positive teaching experiences during ST, were eager to begin teaching and to apply what they had learned during teacher education and ST to their own FL classrooms. They carried with them increased experience and confidence through success and personal reflections of their teaching. In many cases they also had changed perspectives about what types of FL teachers they were becoming.

On the contrary, Heidi, Paco, and Chela found their overall ST experiences challenging, that is, they had more conflicted experiences regarding their motives. Paco and Chela left ST willing to try FL teaching again in spite of lingering self-doubt. They reported wanting to build upon what they had learned during ST to improve their teaching, rather than what they had learned at the university. In many ways, Chela and Paco felt compelled to change their beliefs and teaching practices in order to fit into the reality of the FL classrooms they observed during ST. Finally, Heidi attributed her overall negative experiences during ST to her changing motives—which resulted in her decision to leave the field of FL education and pursue another career. Heidi faced personal conflict in realizing that she could not conform to the communicative-teaching ways of her CT and in that her German proficiency was not enough to carry out FL instruction through the TL. Her motives during ST changed from that of wanting to
become a fun and engaging, communicative German teacher to wanting simply to complete the ST practicum. Equally as important to the success of achieving PSTs’ motives is understanding the motives of the CTs also involved with this study.

PSTs and their CTs held a variety of personal and pedagogical motives. During interviews I discussed the CTs’ general goals for their PSTs’ learning and development during ST. Most of the CTs had similar objectives for their PSTs, such as, becoming consistent in their classroom management, establishing a rapport with the students, increasing confidence, being flexible with “non-teaching” routines (interview, Mora’s CT, 10/19/07), and developing their own styles of teaching, among others. In other words, these CTs genuinely intended to help their PSTs reach their goals and in doing so, consequently influenced these PSTs’ pedagogical beliefs and development.

Trying to understand the motives of two CTs (Paco’s and Heidi’s second CT) is more challenging due to the fact that neither CT had requested a student teacher to mentor. Last minute complications at the university or the cooperating schools resulted in these CTs being asked to supervise Heidi and Paco. Paco’s CT did participate in an interview; however her responses in the interview did not completely reflect the practices I observed in her classroom. Despite mentioning sound pedagogical intentions for their PSTs’ during ST, on several occasions I was able to see Paco, Chela, and Heidi working with their CTs in what appeared to be tense and at times unfriendly situations. Heidi, Paco, and Chela noted that their CT relationships were ones that bordered being unprofessional and often fostered a sense of tension, stress, and uncertainty. For example, Heidi felt that her first CT was overbearing and critical of her German proficiency. She claimed her second CT was seldom involved in planning or teaching
and rarely answered Heidi’s emails or phone calls. Much like Heidi’s situation, Chela and Paco’s CTs spent very little time with them in the classroom offering support or guidance. Influences of the CTs’ relationships and approaches to teaching FLs can be seen in the sections of PSTs’ Emerging Teacher Identities below.

**Teaching tools and appropriation.** During FL education, all PSTs had the opportunity to learn how to utilize the national FL standards to communicatively teach FLs. Specifically, they were asked to create meaningful FL lessons that were grounded in the national FL standards which included the incorporation of authentic texts, teaching grammar implicitly through content and context, and encouraging meaningful TL communication. In addition, PSTs utilized strategies for fostering TL proficiency, contextualizing students’ FL learning, as well as strategies for promoting interpretive reading within appropriate cultural contexts, among others. Additionally, PSTs participated in education courses specifically addressing classroom management and assessment. Table 4.2 below illustrates PSTs’ utilization of tools in several curricular areas of teaching. The tools I observed PSTs utilized during classroom observations are notated as such, and likewise, the tools PSTs referenced utilizing during interviews are differentiated in the table. I identified the curricular areas in which the observed or mentioned tools were used as grammar instruction, FL cultures, FL speaking, FL writing, FL reading, classroom management, lesson planning, and assessment.

It must be noted that the coding of classroom observations of the seven PSTs in this study, while given in numbers of frequency for observed use of tools and problem-solving by PSTs through a variety of curricula areas during ST, conclusions should not
be made on the basis of frequency represented in table 4.2. For example, three classroom observations were conducted on all PSTs with the exception of Kate who had four observations; rendering her frequencies as proportionately higher than the others. Also the length of PSTs’ classes varied; rendering the frequencies listed below as not equally representative. For example, Sara taught in a school using 90 minute block schedules while Heidi taught in approximately 27 minute Kindergarten FLES classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSTs</th>
<th>Eva</th>
<th>Kate</th>
<th>Sara</th>
<th>Heidi</th>
<th>Paco</th>
<th>Chela</th>
<th>Mora</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N= number of observations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO=not observed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools observed during classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use of national FL standards in lessons (C/P)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, not CT</td>
<td>4 yes 3 no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explicit grammar lessons(C/P)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implicit grammar lessons (C/P)</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaningful FL communication (C) (students)</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contextualized vocabulary (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decontextualized vocabulary (C)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integrated teaching of cultures (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Codes and frequencies of tools
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSTs</th>
<th>Eva</th>
<th>Kate</th>
<th>Sara</th>
<th>Heidi</th>
<th>Paco</th>
<th>Chela</th>
<th>Mora</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N= number of interviews</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fragmented teaching of cultures (C)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use of schema activation (P)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top-down approach with extension activities (C/P)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use of authentic texts (P)</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use of realia (P)</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL meaningful writing (C &amp; P)</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>target language use during class (C/ P)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grammar review worksheets (C/P)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation Response Evaluation (I.R.E.) (P)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drills: repetition and pronunciation (P)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use of textbook during instruction (P)</td>
<td>daily</td>
<td>daily</td>
<td>daily</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>daily</td>
<td>daily</td>
<td>daily</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student-centered activities (C)</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>N.O.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher-centered activities (C)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discipline as classroom management (C/P)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools—from interview data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use of personal reflection (P)</td>
<td>daily</td>
<td>weekly</td>
<td>daily</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>daily</td>
<td>weekly</td>
<td>daily</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time management/organizational strategies (P)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Codes and frequencies of tools
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSTs</th>
<th>Eva</th>
<th>Kate</th>
<th>Sara</th>
<th>Heidi</th>
<th>Paco</th>
<th>Chela</th>
<th>Mora</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem spaces</strong> from interview and blog data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementing standards-based instruction or CLT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grammar-based teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching target culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student learning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student motivation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT and student relationships</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perception of students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning lessons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project KLM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom management</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher identity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Problem spaces** from classroom observations |     |      |      |       |      |       |      |       |
| teacher identity             | 1   | 2    | 3    | 9     | 8    | 5     | 2    | 29    |
| classroom management         | 8   | 14   | 14   | 23    | 43   | 32    | 9    | 143   |

Because of my participation as an instructor in the FL Education program and as a result of PST and CT interviews, I was able to attribute where and how PSTs had learned to use these teaching tools. Such sources included the following: apprenticeship of observation (14) (Lortie, 1975), FL methods courses and instructor (23), general education coursework (11), FL cohort (15), cooperating teacher (61), university supervisor (8), state or school mandates (13), passion for FLs (26), personal effort or intrinsic motivation (15), and professional FL conferences (8). I was especially interested in the challenging and unsettled situations in which PSTs attempted to solve instructional
problems through the use of previously and newly learned tools. Such examination sheds light on the development of PSTs’ learning and identities as FL teachers. These situations, as reported by the PSTs during interviews throughout the study, included PSTs’ occasional resistance to learning and responsibilities within both activity systems, PSTs’ working relationships with students and CTs, the PSTs resisting or taking up other kinds of approaches to FL teaching, and some of the PSTs’ perceptions of the FL Education program’s accountability measures, among others. These problem spaces can be seen in table 4.2 (above).

The most common conceptual tool for teaching FLs utilized by the PSTs was either a grammar-based or hybrid approach. Despite not learning to teach FLs using a grammar-based approach during teacher preparation, most PSTs reported that they learned their FLs using that approach. What is more, seven (of the nine) CTs utilized grammar-based or hybrid teaching approaches which I noted during classroom observations. For example, I observed CTs offering explicit grammar lessons, emphasizing rote memorization for student learning, and writing and responding in English, among others. Not surprisingly then, when I observed the PSTs I also saw a great deal of teacher-centered, mechanical activities, as well as supplemental worksheets with sole focus on form, that is, students simply substituted words in a regimented manner.

Of concern is that only three of the nine CTs routinely implemented the national FL standards and only one CT utilized CLT during ST. All of the PSTs were required by their university supervisors to utilize the national FL standards in weekly lesson plans, but several PSTs admitted to me that their CTs had advised them to only utilize the
standards in their lesson plans when the university supervisors conducted classroom observations.

Conceptual and practical pedagogical tools from the national FL standards include fostering meaningful TL communication among student learners through the use of strategies such as, circumlocution, deriving meaning from context, and providing opportunities for interpreting and presenting real-world, purposeful communication. The national FL standards advocate tools such as, the use of authentic texts or realia to emphasize student understanding of the relationships among the practices, products, and perspectives of the cultures being studied with their own. The national FL standards suggest utilizing student-centered or student-directed activities to help learners foster their developing FL skills and to make connections with other disciplines, as well as be able to make comparisons and demonstrate understandings of the TLs and cultures with their own. Finally, the national FL standards promote the use of the TL as a tool for lifelong communication with other speakers of the language, essentially of becoming advocates of FL study and use (ACTFL, 2006).

During 19 combined classroom observations (not including Heidi’s) I observed 25 (lengthy) explicit grammar presentations and no extended periods which afforded students opportunities to creatively express themselves with the PSTs or other students. This is not in line with the direction of the national FL standards, nor CLT. Students’ language learning activity was typically reduced to minimal phrases, memorized or scripted phrases, and frequently conducted with the PST initiating close-ended questions, followed by one or two word responses from students. I observed only five attempts at fostering meaningful FL communication among the students—three occurred in Mora’s
classroom, one in Paco’s, and one in Kate’s. All five instances involved the students interpreting authentic texts (i.e., paintings by Monet, Spanish songs, etc.). Furthermore, my combined classroom observations showed 14 occasions of teaching vocabulary in isolation (word lists from textbooks presented by pronouncing the words and giving their English translations). Conversely, my observations showed that Mora, Eva, Heidi, and Paco did present vocabulary in a contextualized manner and set up meaningful tasks for student learning and utilization of vocabulary within appropriate contexts on six separate occasions. I also observed students’ vocabulary knowledge and learning being routinely assessed in ways not in line with CLT; that is, through the use of written quizzes consisting of simple translation and matching activities in English.

During the FL methods courses PSTs spent time discussing Banks’ (2003) four levels to teaching culture. Banks (2003) conceptualized four approaches to teaching multicultural education which included: contributions, additive, transformation, and social action. Teaching culture as a contribution focuses simply on the heroes, holidays, and discrete cultural elements of a target culture. The additive approach is one that adds cultural themes and perspectives into the curriculum without changing its structure. The transformation approach to teaching culture suggests that the curriculum is changed to enable student learners to conceptualize concepts, views, issues, and events (among other aspects) from the perspectives of target culture members. Finally, the social action approach, according to Banks (2003) suggests that teachers encourage student learners to make decisions on important social issues and to further take action to help solve such issues. The emphasis on deeper, more profound approaches to teaching and understanding other cultures is also in line with CLT which advocates that fostering
appreciation for target cultures is integral in shaping FL learners’ CC (Savignon & Sysoyev, 2005). During the FL methods courses PSTs practiced teaching culture through communicative-based lesson plans which reflected the national FL standards. PSTs were encouraged to promote student comprehension of the relationships between the practices, products and perspectives of FL cultures, to find similarities and differences, to draw comparisons, and to foster greater appreciation for cultures in general. At the onset of the study, the PSTs expressed believing that culture is entwined in language; that culture is not a separable entity. For example, the following excerpt from the first focus group interview (prior to ST) demonstrates several PSTs’ perceptions about the ease of integrating target culture into FL classrooms.

Mora 10:02: ...I think culture though is the one (of the 5 Cs) that is easy to kind of forget about because its embedded in language...so its always there. I mean, I don’t think for us but for the average teacher I think culture is hard to incorporate.

Sara 10:13: I think it will be easy to or easier to incorporate culture into lessons because we talked about the four approaches to teaching culture and how to help students make connections of the culture’s practices, perspectives, and products...you know, not just show students what people do but also why and how they do it. Culture is everywhere and can be easily integrated into language teaching. Plus now the textbooks are incorporating more culture into the chapters, so its easier to do little culture presentations...culture is always at our fingertips.

Eva 10:34: I mean you could easily do it [teach culture] every opportunity that you get. Like, if you are teaching something and all of the sudden something snaps...like I always think that if I’m teaching the word paper in French I want to turn around and be like, ‘Oh by the way if you buy a notebook in France they use graphing paper’. Just like that little thing of turning back just so every opportunity that you get you just kind of like throw it at them...its culture and language learning all in one. (first focus group interview, 8/20/07)

Despite several PSTs projecting the ease of teaching and integrating culture into their classrooms during ST, on 11 occasions I observed the PSTs’ delivering (in English)
cultural facts that were taken out of context. All PSTs utilized teaching culture techniques that mirrored their CTs’ teaching style. Most PSTs gradually began gravitating towards a conceptualization of teaching about cultures—that is, culture separable from language. Despite the tendency among the PSTs to teach culture as separate from language, there were occasions when some tried to integrate language and culture. For example, Eva and Sara both incorporated a small-scale cultural project; however, these lessons were not set up to allow for the discovery of the connections between practices, products, and perspectives of the FL culture as established by the national FL standards. Rather, they offered a familiarity with the practices or products of the target cultures. Mora, however, felt that her experience teaching about French cultures in English diminished the students’ excitement for learning French as well as her pleasure in teaching it. In many regards this experience fostered her conceptualization of CLT and teaching culture(s) through language as best FL teaching practices.

Table 4.2 (above) indicates that while the PSTs’ overall approach to teaching FL cultures and FLs was grounded in a transmission model of teaching, there was some evidence of standards-based, constructivist teaching taking place. For example, a strategy discussed in the methods courses was the use of a top-down approach to foster FL reading and negotiation of meaning and to promote communication using higher-level skills among the student learners. I observed that on seven occasions during the 19 combined observations Eva, Mora, Paco, Kate, and Chela used a top-down approach with extension activities to introduce cultures. To carry out best FL practices, as emphasized in CLT and the national FL standards, this approach should be conducted in the TL; however, these seven occasions occurred mostly in English. For example, Mora shared
several pieces of realia and had her students interact (in English) with each other to understand, generalize and relate knowledge about the purposes and perspectives of the objects from France. Kate, for example, presented a poem and helped guide her students in comprehending the main ideas. Then she used what they read as a basis for forming new ideas and modifying the poem. Through this process Kate was able to help the students attend to discrete language structures of the poem.

Another conceptual tool discussed in the FL methods courses is the principle behind communicative teaching practices is schema theory (Rumelhart, 1980; Anderson, 1994; Leaver & Shekhtman, 2002). Activating students’ schemata to help form connections for learning new linguistic and cultural concepts are deemed essential for meaningful communication. Dunsmore (2002) argued that “schemata are not recalled and evaluated in terms of their match to reality but are employed according to the social rules which govern how we engage in sensible and functional activity” (Meaning is Embodied section). He makes this argument based on the notion put forth by Harré (1984) of ‘Vygotsky space’; which suggests that a recursive relationship exits between individual knowledge in the mind and knowledge in the social environment. I observed the PSTs use of this strategy seven times during classroom observations. Included in the seven observances were: the discussion of Hispanic names, French celebrations, and the interpretation of French poetry, which touched upon aspects of language, grammar, and culture, among others. For example with Hispanic apellidos or last names, Chela spent time drawing her family tree on both sides of her family and explained how the last names would proceed in typical Hispanic tradition if her family had been Hispanic. This tradition differs from typical U.S. traditions in that children take the last names of both of
their parents. Similarly, when women marry in many Hispanic countries it is not the norm to take the last name of their husbands. With French holidays, for example, Eva spent forty minutes of a class period talking in English about the commonalities of the U.S. traditions of Halloween and the celebration of All Saints’ Day (November 1 and 2) in the U.S with how people in France also celebrate these holidays, noting the similarities and differences. In general, however, PSTs utilized bottom-up approaches (including textbooks) to teach culture and language during ST. For example, Kate and Paco often taught culture as it was presented in the textbook as ‘cultural tidbits’ and Mora routinely had to teach about Francophone cultures in the way of giving “cultural notes” in English once a week. Students were to copy down the “cultural notes” from the board and keep them in their culture notebooks. Little discussion or contextualization was done with these notes—in fact, these pieces of information were only recalled on the midterm. Mora lamented the fact that the midterm examinations for all French II classes consisted of 100 true or false statements in English regarding Francophone customs and culture. All PSTs had wanted to share their passions for the target cultures with their students but most found it difficult to implement during ST due to misconceptions they held about student learners, mismatches in teaching approaches with their CTs, and unforeseen demands for adhering to strict schedule expectations.

Another important and valued way to learn FLs promoted by the FL Education program is through written composition; more specifically interpersonal writing (Homstad & Thorson, 1996; ACTFL, 1999). In line with movements towards communicative or proficiency-based FL instruction, building proficiency in all language modalities (listening, reading, speaking, and writing) is emphasized; however, FL writing
in FL classrooms is often used mainly to support the development of oral proficiency (Homstad & Thorson, 1996). This was also the case during all the classroom observations I conducted—I observed no journals or specific FL writing activities. Only one PST, Mora, lamented to me that her students rarely wrote in French. The teachers at her ST placement had been asked to begin each class with writing prompts that required students to write a brief summary of a previous assignment. The purpose was to foster students’ analytic skills through writing in order to perform better on the state graduation test. Mora felt that her students were capable of responding in the TL, but her CT insisted that students compose their responses in English. This was a continual sense of frustration for Mora. The limited writing that took place in the other PSTs’ FL classes was reduced to sentential-level, rather than of meaningful composition and journal writing that was discussed in the FL methods courses.

In the CLT classroom, exposure to meaningful input in the TL is an integral part of FL learning (Krashen, 1982). For example, teaching grammar has a secondary role in FL classrooms that utilize communicative or proficiency-based approaches. However, I observed the PSTs’ teaching FLs largely through explicit grammar activities. Furthermore, I observed only two instances of providing students with exposure to meaningful input by native TL speakers. These two occasions included playing a video that accompanied the textbook. The purpose of the videos was to provide a context for the language and cultures being emphasized at the time.

Because the FL is a tool and a medium in FL classrooms, PST’s use of the TL can be considered as tool appropriation and also can be indicative of PSTs’ changing beliefs about CLT and the national FL standards. For example, the experience of trying to teach
in the TL led Heidi and Eva to reassess their FL proficiencies. They also reported that staying in the TL is not always practical or feasible in traditional secondary FL classrooms. By comparing PST’s anticipated (prior to ST) use of TL as they stated in initial interviews with the actual amount of TL PSTs actually used in the classroom (determined from audiotaped and transcribed classroom observations), and with the types of classroom activities PSTs utilized during instruction provides an avenue for establishing the methodological approaches (grammar-based, CLT, etc.) they were taking up during ST. This information can be seen below in Table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PST</th>
<th>Anticipated use of TL prior to ST as stated in initial interview</th>
<th>% of TL use during class</th>
<th>Types of activities observed during classroom observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mora  | As much as possible…because they have to leave their comfort zone. They can’t be comfortable and like improve—you have to challenge and make them a little uncomfortable. | 39%                      | **Textbook activities:** cloze procedure, fill in the blanks, short cultural reading, isolated cultural notes, explicit grammar lessons.  
**Non-textbook:** authentic texts, realia, pronunciation drills, textbook video, worksheets, group/pair work  
**Assessment:** art/text discussion and writing prompts (both in English) |
| Eva   | I plan on communicating by talking to my students in the FL as much as possible and as much as they can understand so that depending on the level and expecting them to respond back and to be consistent... | 33%                      | **Textbook activities:** cloze procedure, fill in blanks, matching, conjugations, cultural notes, isolated vocabulary.  
**Non-textbook:** culture reading in English, conjugation and pronunciation drills, games reviewing FL, explicit grammar |

Table 4.3 PSTs’ Anticipated and actual use of TL during classroom observations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PST</th>
<th>Anticipated use of TL prior to ST as stated in initial interview</th>
<th>% of TL use during class</th>
<th>Types of activities observed during classroom observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>As much as possible because the more they (students) hear the target language the more likely they are to actually use it.</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>Textbook activities: matching, conjugation practices, manipulation exercises, cultural notes, isolated vocabulary, explicit grammar lessons. Non-textbook: culture research project, worksheet packets, review games Assessment: cultural presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>As much as possible…I hope to stay very committed to staying only in the target language-- that will help the kids get to know and use the language better and earlier.</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>Textbook activities: manipulation drills, conjugation practices, culture notes, explicit grammar lessons Non-textbook: text interpretation, scripted dialogue, mnemonic studies, information gap activities, art work, worksheets Assessment: formal quiz, art work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paco</td>
<td>I really hope that I don’t use too much (English)…The textbooks say you have to speak in the target language from the very beginning as much as you can.</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>Textbook activities: conjugation drills, partner dialogues, culture notes, close ended activities, isolated vocab., explicit grammar lessons Non-textbook: linguistic PPT, text interpretation, textbook video, culture expansion, grammar worksheets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chela</td>
<td>92% of the time, easily!</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Textbook activities: conjugation and substitution drills, culture notes, explicit grammar lessons. Non-textbook: culture expansion in English, worksheets, explicit grammar. Formal assessment: matching, fill in blanks, decontextualized vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>I thought it was going to be really hard to speak in all German, but after watching him (CT) and the way he did it, I don’t think that it will be that hard. Hopefully, I’ll just have to act it out!</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Non-textbook: information gap activities, role play, review games, I.R.E., pronunciation drills, authentic texts, songs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 PSTs’ Anticipated and actual use of TL during classroom observations
Data show in Table 4.3 (above) that Paco, the only native TL speaker, conducted his classes in the TL 47% of the time—more than any other PST. With the exception of Heidi, who taught in a HS classroom where CLT was highly advocated, the other PSTs conducted their classes in their TLs less than 39% of the time. Heidi’s average TL use during observations was slightly over 45%; the higher percentage should be not taken at face value because two of Heidi’s sessions were significantly shorter in length (27 minutes). In addition, when Heidi used the TL she did so in the form of Initiation-Response-Evaluation (I.R.E.) (Shrum & Glisan, 2005). For example, the coding of her first classroom observation shows that Heidi initiated the German phrases “Wie sagt man…?” (How do you say…?) or “Was ist die antwort? (What is the answer?) on more than 100 occasions. Heidi coped with trying to stay in the TL by deferring to I.R.E. as her predominant strategy and form of classroom discourse. Shrum and Glisan (2000) suggest that I.R.E., although perhaps useful for the teacher to assess achievement of material taught in a particular lesson, often leads to mechanical and fragmented student discourse in the classroom. Furthermore, these authors argue that using this technique “does not lead to use of the target language for interpersonal communication as defined in Standard 1.1” of the national FL standards (2000, p. 70).

Finally, the PSTs who taught French spent considerable time doing repetition and recitation exercises. Mora, Eva, and Kate set up such drills which involved having students pronounce and repeat French words. While grammar-based teaching advocates correct pronunciation and use of the language, communicative approaches suggest that learning pronunciation is important but should be addressed within the context of real communication (Celce-Murcia, Brinton, & Goodwin, 1996). In the cases of the French
PSTs, little consideration for contextualization and meaning were made during these drills.

The examination of instructional practices within the FL classrooms during ST sheds light on how FL instruction is often framed pedagogically, and thus demonstrates an individual teacher’s evolving beliefs, about teaching and language learning. Most PSTs considered using the textbook as their guideline and “safety net” (interview, Chela, 4/17/08) for staying within the expected range of instructional content and timelines. On the other hand, very few student-centered activities were observed. Byrnes (1988) concurs that textbooks are powerful in guiding FL instruction and often dictate FL instruction in some FL classrooms. After completing ST, several PSTs reported that they would like to use the textbook less in the future because they found many of the activities boring, limiting, and at times irrelevant to students’ interests. In short, it is encouraging that the PSTs believe that strictly using textbooks during instruction lends itself to supporting a grammar-based approach.

With the rate of actual TL usage being relatively low during classroom instruction the use of English (as a tool) needs to be considered. While Paco averaged the highest amount of TL usage during classroom observations, his strategy was often to give instructions in Spanish and then revert to English. For example, although he tried to maintain his volition to speak in Spanish when possible, he often reverted to English as a means to get the students on task and in control. This suggests a connection that many PSTs made between the use of English and classroom management. Some PSTs voiced that they felt they could manage their classrooms easier if they spoke to the students in English. They felt there were fewer discipline problems or issues when directions and
instructions were given in English rather than the TL. Paco, Heidi, and Chela’s, combined classroom observations showed an average of 32 instances of classroom management difficulties; while the other four PSTs averaged fewer (only 12 per class) problematic instances of managing their classrooms. This ongoing challenge with classroom management had bearing on their use of the TL in the classroom in that these three PSTs felt that using the TL during class often led to an increased number of students losing interest, becoming disruptive, and as a result, frequently reverted to English during instruction.

As Feiman-Nemser (2001) observed, teachers often realize that what students learn in school is “directly related to what and how teachers teach; and what and how teachers teach depends on the knowledge, skills, and commitments they bring to their teaching” (p. 1014). The act of critically reflecting on their own teaching and learning experiences as well as on their students’ learning during ST brought a self-awareness to some PSTs that they had not become the FL teachers they had initially anticipated. For example, the act of reflecting gave Paco and Chela insight into how they might improve their classroom management and FL teaching in the future. Chela, after reflecting on her overall performance during ST, commented that,

I had always thought this is how I am… this is how its gonna be, no exceptions…and I guess its (ST) shown me that you can never, you can never say that because there’s always so many different things to take into consideration… I think as much as it, as much as this (ST) more than sucked at times, it’s been a really good experience as far as learning and finding out who I am as a teacher. I thought I was gonna be this way, but ya know, maybe I’m a little more that way. So I think it’s been …even the negative has been positive. (5/3/08)
For Heidi, the experiences during ST led her to reconsider her career path. Heidi acknowledged and accepted the fact that things were not ideal in her ST placements, but she frequently blamed others. For example, Heidi blamed both of her CTs for not guiding her better through the practicum and her university supervisor for not reviewing her weekly lesson plans and providing feedback. In addition, she found the scheduling challenging at both placements (i.e., the HS operated on a 90 minute class schedule and the FLES program on a 27 minute schedule), among her other complaints during ST.

For Eva, Mora, Kate, and Sara, critical self-reflection and guided support from their CTs helped them to routinely adjust their teaching, work through challenging issues, and work toward becoming the FL teachers they felt comfortable being. The connection between PSTs’ reflections and their personal and pedagogical learning during ST became clearer to them after ST.

How these PSTs learned their FLs combined with how they learned to teach FLs and utilize conceptual and practical tools during education coursework. This is important in order to understand how the PSTs approached ST and their potential to use resources to problem-solve, collaborate, and essentially continue learning how to teach FLs. The PSTs learned about CLT and standards-based instruction, theories of learning, creating and delivering engaging, contextualized FL lesson plans, and gradually envisioned themselves as becoming effective communicative FL teachers. During these courses, the PSTs and I worked together towards promoting and establishing in them a sense of who they were becoming as FL teachers. I worked carefully with all PSTs to ensure confidence and competence in them as prospective FL educators and in the use of CLT and the national FL standards, to the extent possible. For example, I modeled
communicative and proficiency-based FL lessons, reviewed and critiqued PSTs’ FL lesson plans, worked to provide scaffolding and negotiation of meaning strategies through individual conferencing, and provided multiple opportunities for reflection. However, the extent that the PSTs appropriated the conceptual and practical tools associated with CLT varied.

Utilizing Grossman et al.’s (1999) “five degrees of appropriation”, most PSTs (i.e., Kate, Eva, Sara, Chela, and Paco) in this study seemed to demonstrate appropriating surface features of communicative-based teaching during ST. This level of appropriation indicates that an individual has learned some or most features of a particular tool but does not fully understand how such tools contribute to the greater whole. These PSTs demonstrated various elements of CLT during some classroom observations, but not consistently. In addition, these PSTs were placed in predominantly grammar-based FL classrooms during ST which not only provided them with different practical tools and resources for teaching, but also at times, inhibited their opportunities to implement practices more in line with CLT. Additionally, Chela and Paco, for example, struggled to manage their classrooms effectively, which also had bearing on their limited use of the TL during instruction. In an excerpt from the Kate’s first blog response, Kate expressed her ideas about teaching French communicatively in her upcoming ST placement:

I want to use authentic texts whenever possible and try to incorporate materials from the cultures that pertain to the language as much as possible...use books, articles, music, videos or other similar materials as frequently as possible. Students should be exposed to these texts to practice their reading and listening skills, but through these means they can also learn the culture. I will also try to use the target language in the classroom as much as possible. While beginning students may not understand much, I can use actions and gestures to help them understand what they mean. I can set an example for the students so that they get used to communicating in the target language from the beginning, and they are
comfortable using it. I plan on trying to connect the class and the language with their lives—show them purpose for learning French and Spanish. It is also important to try to come up with ways to help the students learn the vocabulary, because for a lot of kids it is hard to remember and contextualizing lessons is always helpful...I hope to just make it as real for them as possible. (1/16/08)

Kate mentions some key points of communicative language teaching—using communication for meaningful purposes, utilizing the TL during instruction, contextualize learning, and utilizing authentic texts to learn language and cultures. During one classroom observation, I observed Kate using a technique known as T.P.R. (Total Physical Response) to help contextualize students’ understandings of words and concepts in the TL. As referenced earlier in this chapter, during another classroom observation I also observed Kate utilize an authentic text (i.e., a French poem) through which she helped guide her students in interpreting and negotiating meaning and comprehending the main ideas, and then modifying the poem. Although Kate was able to verbalize (in an interview) some important aspects of communicative teaching and demonstrate some ability to carry out such practices in the FL classroom, she also left out some aspects integral to successful communicative language teaching. It seemed that Kate, like most other PSTs in this study, made an effort to implement aspects she found important in communicative FL teaching, but for a variety of reasons (i.e., CT’s grammar-based approach, students low-level TL proficiency, and PST’s surface-level understandings of CLT) was unable to carry out effective communicative instruction during ST. These PSTs, for the most part, seemed to take on the identities of grammar-based and hybrid FL teachers.
Unlike most PSTs in this study, Heidi and Mora demonstrated appropriating tools at different levels during ST. Heidi’s appropriation of pedagogical tools associated with CLT seemed to be that of ‘appropriating a label’. Grossman et al. (1999) call this level the “most superficial type of appropriation” (p. 16). In Heidi’s language biography she explained why teaching German communicatively was important to her:

Although I loved my high school German class and teacher, I felt like I did not get enough practice speaking the language...I think it really put me at a disadvantage, because even in college I was not really forced to speak German all that much...Because of this, it is really important to me that I try to speak German to my students as much as possible. Not only will it improve their German, but also hopefully it will make them more comfortable with the language over time. However, during the first focus group interview Heidi alluded to teaching communicatively in her upcoming ST placement as simply being a matter of repeating and acting out expressions. She missed the conceptual underpinnings of communicative-based instruction.

I thought it was going to be really hard to speak in all German, but after watching him (CT) and the way he did it, I don’t think that it will be that hard. I mean the first couple of weeks the German One class will be a little hard teaching them all of the phrases but its just repeating the same thing over and over again everyday kind of, so...they pick it up. Hopefully, I will just have to act it out. (1/13/08)

Heidi struggled on many levels during ST—personally, linguistically, and pedagogically. Despite being placed into a CLT classroom with tools and resources similar to the ones promoted by the university, and in line with what Heidi claimed as her goal for better FL learning, Heidi was unable to take up the approach and identity of a communicative language teacher. Heidi had clearly oriented her thinking about German learning with respect to her apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975), but also realized during ST that her German proficiency was not what it needed to be in order to carry out CLT. In fact, Heidi finished the ST practicum believing in the efficacy of grammar-based
teaching. Heidi’s reasons for entry into the field of FL education were more superficial in nature—she reported choosing education as a means to use German since she was not interested in pursuing a career in business.

Unlike Heidi and the other PSTs in this study, Mora demonstrated a deeper level of tool appropriation during ST—that of ‘appropriating conceptual underpinnings’ (Grossman et al., 1999). Mora came to the FL Education program having learned French from a hybrid approach in middle and high school. However, Mora had been to France on a few occasions and was enamored with the people and cultures. She knew that she wanted to spend a year in France during college for study abroad. While Mora realized how much her French proficiency had improved as a result of studying abroad and living in France for a year. She entered the FL methods courses with excellent linguistic skills, an ardor for culture, and a deeper understanding of the importance of being immersed in a culture in order to better learn the language. Mora approached ST with great anticipation of utilizing a communicative approach to teaching French, as can be heard in the first focus group interview:

I want to make my classes as communicative as possible. I really want the students to hear the language as much as possible and be able to use the language inside and outside of class. I want to provide them with the opportunities for speaking, listening, reading, and really utilizing French in class. I don’t want it to be just about grammar...because then it gets boring and students loose interest. It should be about communicating. I want to show the kids that learning French is fun and meaningful and share my positive experiences with them. One thing that I think really helps to teach about the culture is by bringing in and showing them all of the cool things I brought back from France. Not just showing them the cool things, but really talking about them and helping them understand why they are important to the French... I also want them to feel like I am a fair teacher...kind of like we talked about in the methods classes, that the assessment matches my instruction and my objectives. (8/20/07)
In this excerpt, Mora’s imagined outcomes were those of wanting to make her French classes communicative in nature by providing students with meaningful input and opportunities for output. Mora aimed to focus her teaching of French around the skills necessary to communicate in French—in speaking, listening, and in reading the language, not just grammar. Mora also mentioned wanting to be a “fair” teacher—in that her assessment matched her objectives, thus showing a greater conceptualization of teaching and learning FLs as a whole.

Despite being placed into a grammar-based classroom during ST, Mora maintained her beliefs in the practicality and usefulness of utilizing communicative approaches to teach FLs. Throughout ST in blog responses and interviews, Mora made references to how she would teach French differently (not grammar-based) if she were “in charge of” her classes. For example, in the blog response below Mora describes how her CT teaches and how Mora takes what she sees valuable from her teaching while attempting to maintain her own approach to the extent possible.

My CT is very much a ‘type A’ personality when it comes to planning, instruction, etc. She is very methodical and organized. She instructs in the manner that one would cross things off of a checklist. Each day her goal is to cover point ‘a’, point ‘b’ and point ‘c’. If the students don’t know points a, b and c come test time, it’s their loss. (I don’t know, perhaps I am just too nice, but I don’t view teaching in that way at all). While I don’t think it’s bad to have a clear view of what one wants to accomplish, I feel like I view foreign language teaching and instruction more of a fluid, communicative process where the student is the center of most activities. It is easy to forget that teaching is not just about ‘covering’ points a, b and c, but about the student improving and growing from point ‘x’ to point ‘y’, all the while, learning points a, b and c. A more concrete example is that, recently, the students were made to take a quiz, a unit test and a midterm all on consecutive school days. I was teaching at the time, however, it is my CT who determines the ‘pacing’. I did not like or agree with the fact that the students had to complete so many assessments, literally, one right after the other...I feel that any teacher in that situation could still very easily change lesson plans around in order to give the students some down-time to study in between tests. I know
when I have my own classroom, I will not have students take quizzes or tests one right after the other. It does not make sense and is not conducive to learning—how can the students improve from quiz to test to midterm if they don't even have a day in between to correct their mistakes. Overall when it comes to being influenced by my CT, I ‘take the hay and leave the sticks’—I take the positive and leave behind the negative. (original parenthesis, 10/26/07)

Mora’s goals and expectations for the students during ST shaped what she anticipated learning from her experience; however, often these goals were not in line with her CTs. Her own meaningful experience learning French (for a year) in France contributed to her belief that utilizing a communicative approach is best for FL teaching. Mora referenced wanting to push her students harder and set higher communicative expectations for them, but she was unable to do so with the constraints of her CT who routinely let the students respond in English. Mora felt that the students would be more engaged and interested in learning French if the CT would utilize more authentic texts and bring in pieces of realia to show them more meaningful aspects of French culture. Mora grasped the conceptual underpinnings of CLT but was inhibited by her CT in terms of actually using it in new contexts and for solving the problems see perceived with regard to the students’ low FL proficiency, for example.

**Problem ‘Spaces’**. One of the focuses of AT is on the ways in which individuals take up the use of various practices and ways of thinking in order to solve certain problems within a setting (Leont’ev, 1981; Grossman et al., 1999). Within the context of this study, it is important to gain insight into the particular ways in which the PSTs perceived their own problems during ST. The encountered and perceived problems of the PSTs in this study often varied. For some PSTs, their problems during ST pertained
predominantly to those of navigating how to simultaneously appease both their university supervisors and their CTs. In other cases, PSTs encountered myriad problem spaces during ST relating to managing classrooms, building rapport with students, maintaining professional relationships with their CTs, and constructing teacher identities, among others. The PSTs often brought up and talked openly about these ‘spaces’ during interviews and blog responses; as they were often sources of tension and confusion. The classroom observation transcripts and protocols were then used as a way to confirm and further explore such spaces and understand the social interactions and utilization of tools that took place within such contexts. Problem spaces identified (by the PSTs) in this study were: the use (and lack of) of the national FL standards and CLT, grammar-based teaching, the fragmented teaching of FL cultures, issues surrounding student learning and motivation, constructing and sustaining teacher identities, classroom management, CT and student relationships, perception of students, making effective lesson plans, completing the university’s Project KLM, and issues of assessment and grading.

The PSTs who struggled during much of their ST practicum (namely, Heidi, Paco, and Chela) encountered many more problem spaces than did the other PSTs. Heidi, Paco, and Chela had higher combined references in interview data and instances during classroom observations of encountering problems with their CT and student learner relationships (25), constructing teacher identities (42), understanding student learning and motivation (16), as well as students’ perception of PST’s teaching (27), and planning effective lessons (16). In many cases, these PSTs were left to struggle through these issues on their own since they were not fully supported by their CTs. These PSTs resorted to teaching utilizing a grammar-based approach in part because it matched their
CT’s approach and also because it was the way in which they had learned FL during their apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975). These PSTs learned to implement pedagogical strategies that allowed them to teach in the moment rather than teach or plan for tomorrow and for student FL learning. During classroom observations I noticed that these PSTs struggled to keep students focused, on task, engaged, and many times, even in their seats. While I clearly saw this problem as one resulting from lack of classroom management, authority, and consistent discipline (among other aspects), these PSTs often did not see it in the same way. For example, these PSTs referenced (below) how they often saw the problem as one that resided in the students’ lack of interest and motivation in learning.

I often ask myself if I can be an engaging teacher. I think that experienced teachers get the respect of their students because of many factors: seriousness in class, feel for being cared for, good instruction and organization. Why do students see school as a hard, boring and tedious task? According to the books it is because we teachers are not giving it all. We are not able to fall in their level in their worries in life... What goes through their minds are often other issues: social issues, relationships, power relations, puberty, getting to know the toughness of real life. I have been happy with the response of the engaging students, but in big classes I always think that many of them don't enjoy the class, they are bored, or think that the book and videos are old, out of date, silly, meaningless, that the exercises are tedious, dull and repetitive. (blog, Paco, 10/1/07)

My (cooperating) teacher, and the kids like they just have no respect. And it’s like if you tell them you need to do this homework and you know this is a big portion of your grade, this is an easy grade and I check for effort! If it looks like you spent ten minutes on it I’m gonna give you the points. If you didn’t care enough to fill in blanks or at least pretend like you did it, then you know, you’re loosing a good chunk of your grade and you know, apparently that makes me mean. And you know it’s just like there are no expectations and none of the teachers are…it’s been my perception that the whole, the environment in the school is not conducive to…college. (interview, Chela, 3/27/08)
On the other hand, the other PSTs’ (Eva, Sara, and Kate) perceived problem spaces during ST that were often more related to FL pedagogical issues. During interviews they referenced their problems teaching communicatively and implementing the national FL standards in their ST placements. Their classroom observations corroborated their taking up of more grammar-based and hybrid approaches and teacher identities during ST. For example, Eva’s and Kate’s CTs did not follow the national FL standards, and therefore encouraged them to only incorporate the standards into their lessons when their university supervisor’s came to conduct classroom observations. Enacting separate practices and standards between the two learning-to-teach contexts quickly planted the vision of dissonance between the FL Education program and the ST practicum. Similarly, these PSTs talked more about classroom management and discipline issues in their classes, despite the fact that their classes were better managed than Heidi’s, Paco’s, and Chela’s classes. Eva, Sara, and Kate seemed to be more consciously aware of how they were managing their classes and paying attention to and addressing student problems as they arose during instruction—additionally, they tended to strive to curtail such problems either independently or with the help of their CTs. This can be heard in some of their responses below:

I presented a new ‘sleeping punishment’ (although I know punishment isn’t the word for it) last week because I was tired of kids putting their heads down on the desks and not paying attention. When I talked about it I told the kids that I go to class at Calico to learn how to make them learn and that sleeping through class is NOT one of the strategies I’ve been taught. So far I have only had to give it out twice, so it seems to have been pretty effective. (original parenthesis, Eva, 9/22/07)

The third period class they were so bad today...I was going to play jeopardy with them to review for the quiz today and I was like, ‘You know what, you can’t play
a game. Here’s a book activity!’ And I made them do work instead. I wasn’t going to reward them for bad behavior...they were like very chatty and rowdy. I was mad.  

(interview, Kate, 4/8/08)

Similarly, these PSTs perceived students’ learning and motivation as problem spaces. They collectively made 14 references to such issues during interviews, but these references were more in line with acknowledging student misunderstandings or misconceptions of the language, rather than not paying attention in class or doing the homework as referenced by Chela and Paco. When such issues did arise, these PSTs tended to resolve the issues by utilizing grammar-based practices to help explicitly and directly curtail the students’ confusion. During classroom observations I observed Kate and Eva using mnemonics, acronyms, and explicit grammar presentations to solve such problems on 9 occasions. For example, during one classroom observation Eva taught the students how to determine the use of demonstrative pronouns based on their grammatical functions in sentences. In the following excerpt Eva teaches a strategy for completing sentences (textbook activity) by identifying parts of speech rather than focusing on relevant meanings or contexts.

_Eva:_ So when we have ‘ce que’ what is followed by ‘ce que’? ‘Ce que’ plus…

_Students:_ Subject, infinitive, double negative

_Eva:_ Sub-ject-AH (enunciates) rhymes with ‘ce que’ (KAH). Remember, it’s ‘verbIE (emphasis) plus ‘ce-qui’ and subjectAH plus ‘ce que’ (KAH).

Eva’s explanations and strategies had become targeted towards student mastery of grammar.

Finally, Mora, who stood out from the other PSTs in several ways, also perceived different problem spaces during ST. For example, Mora perceived her CT’s grammar-based approach to teaching as problematic for both her and the students. She felt that
utilizing such approach during instruction was not pushing the students to their fullest linguistic potential. While the other PSTs tended to adopt such practices and began constructing identities as grammar-based or hybrid FL teachers, Mora continued to utilize the national FL standards in her planning despite the fact that her CT did not use them. Mora referenced during an interview “pushing the envelope” on occasion when her CT was absent and how she handled some unfavorable student behaviors in the classroom.

I really do think that they (students) can be pushed harder, and not even necessarily really pushed harder like pushed to get through a certain concept faster. Not that, but just... I feel that the kids can be able to see it in a different way. But I think right now they see this class as like any other class, it’s like, ‘Oh we have to memorize stuff. We have to learn this and memorize this and we have to practice writing over and over this’. So they don’t really see too much of like the big picture...and I don’t know, just the fun of it or the communicative aspect of it. They don’t see any of that except when I push the envelope with them on days when my cooperating teacher is out or absent! (Mora, 9/18/07)

For the most part I tried to watch, like you know, stand the whole class while I was talking to make sure that everyone was paying attention. I don’t think I saw anyone doing other work because I...lately I have been good about that. I will take away their work if they’re working on it. I’ll just take it away! Like, I won’t say anything, I’ll just walk over there and take it. That bothers me! (Mora, 9/18/07)

Most of Mora’s perceived problem spaces related to the lack of communicative-based teaching in her ST placement. For Mora, most of these perceived problems stemmed from her CT’s use of grammar-based instruction. Mora saw the students’ lack of motivation and hindered FL learning, as well as their disinterest in learning about French cultures as mostly being due to the approach in which the content and material was taught. Mora believed that utilizing a communicative approach to teaching these students would have resolved many of these issues. With regard to classroom
management, Mora felt that she had to continue managing the classroom in the same ways that her CT did. While Mora managed to carry this out, she felt that having such a tight control on the students in the classroom and the continual use of teacher-centered activities left the students unable to really explore and interact with the language and others as she would have liked them to do. Again, for Mora the use of CLT would have also resolved this problem space.

**PSTs’ emerging teacher identities.** Constructing a teacher identity, according to Coldron and Smith (1999) is partly achieved and partly given through active location in social contexts. The extent to which the seven PSTs were able to (re)construct their teacher identities during ST varied. Several factors influenced the (re)construction of PSTs’ professional identities during ST: how the PSTs made sense of their experiences during ST, their abilities to establish rapport with student learners, how the PSTs perceived the student learners responding to them, their relationships with their CTs, and finally, their abilities to carry out the roles of FL teachers in the classroom.

Learning is a process of making meaning that occurs when individuals participate in social and semiotic interaction. Often learning is derived from situations of confusion, curiosity, or conflict and an individual’s attempts to explain or resolve such situations (Jonassen, 2000). Further, Jaworski (1993) suggests that shared meanings develop through participation in and negotiation in learning environments. As I referenced in chapter 1, Lave and Wenger suggest that learning “implies becoming a different person with respect to the possibilities enabled by these systems of relations. To ignore this aspect of learning is to overlook the fact that learning involves the construction of
identities’ (1991, p. 53). The ways in which these PSTs made meaning out of their pedagogical experiences, social interactions, use and appropriation of tools, and through their participation in ST varied across contexts and individuals and contributed to the kinds of FL teachers they were becoming.

The influence of CTs and methods courses on PSTs has been studied by Veenman (1984), Almarza (1996), Johnson (1994), and Velez-Rendón (2002) and this research suggests that PSTs’ alignment and association with the beliefs and practices of CTs is not surprising. The professional relationships these PSTs cultivated with their CTs during ST varied. During interviews Eva, Mora, Kate, and Sara discussed having experienced firsthand intrinsic rewards from their ST experiences. These PSTs accredited their growth and pedagogical development during ST to their CTs’ ways of teaching and to the ways they were treated by them, that is, as if they were already FL teachers. Such positioning helped them to establish a sense of confidence and value in their work. These CTs provided meaningful pedagogical learning experiences, modeled their ideas of best FL practices, and shared opportunities for collaborative FL teaching in the classroom. These CTs worked toward achieving their collective goals and in doing so, influenced PSTs’ beliefs and approaches to FL teaching, as can be heard in their blog responses:

The ST experience definitely impacted the way I view both teaching in general and myself as a future French teacher…I became much more aware of many aspects that play a large role in student teaching. I did not realize, for example, how crucial and how large of a part classroom management plays in order to be an effective teacher…I became acutely aware of the physical, mental and emotional energy it takes to be a teacher-- especially a teacher who cares and wants to inspire, like my CT…Now, I have real-life experiences off of which to base my ideas for the future. My ideas seem very idealistic, but I know that they are feasible, provided I work hard at it. (Mora, original italics, 12/10/07)
My relationship with my CT is one of the best I could possibly ask for. She is so professional and willing to answer any of my questions, that it makes my part of being a new comer [sic] to the teaching profession so much easier… she has trusted me from day one, which is such a great thing…I feel very comfortable with her…Overall, she respects me as a colleague and a friend… (Sara, 12/01/07)

I feel really prepared because I was given a lot of freedom to make mistakes and do my own thing during ST. I was also given a lot of responsibilities…I think the most significant thing that made me feel prepared was my CT. She gave me a lot of confidence and made me feel like I was a really great teacher. Her confidence in me makes me confident that I can be a great teacher. (Eva, 12/08/07)

The CTs supported the PSTs through modeling effective classroom management practices and enabling them to become more accustomed to the non-teaching routines of the schools; however these CTs provided less support in developing instructional practices that focused on CLT and implementing the national FL standards. The PSTs under the mentorship of these CTs reported gradually seeing “the realities” of the FL classroom (interview, Eva, 12/08/07) and began perceiving the well-documented gap that often exists between the teachings of the university and practices of the cooperative schools (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985; Grossman et al., 1999; Newell et al. 2001). These PSTs gradually began merging their beliefs about FL teaching with those of their CTs. After ST only Mora maintained her previous idealistic visions of implementing CLT and the national FL standards in her future classroom.

Eva, Kate, and Sara left ST believing that while implementing communicative or proficiency-based approaches may be theoretically ideal for FL teaching and learning, it is not practical in the current state of FL education in the U.S. For example, Eva claims that while she still finds a communicative approach effective for FL teaching, she explains that she no longer believes that CLT:
…can be used effectively in our educational system…I think there needs to be multiple teachers for CLT to really work. Also, the current trend in educational assessment is cut and dry. In a CLT classroom, assessments would be mainly observational and they would be very subjective. I think many private language schools use CLT well because they do not need to do formal assessments and they have the resources to staff multiple teachers… (personal communication, 1/12/08)

Only Mora, whose CT utilized a grammar-based approach to FL teaching, has maintained her beliefs regarding the importance of CLT and the national FL standards in FL instruction. Despite being guided and positioned as a grammar-based FL teacher by her CT, Mora felt that utilizing CLT would have moved her students further along in their learning and in their abilities to communicate in French. She made consistent reference to her observations that the students could do more linguistically if they had been exposed to more FL content, encouraged to communicate in the FL, and if they had to perform to higher teacher expectations. Mora experientially learned pedagogical practices and strategies for managing a teacher-centered classroom, but philosophically she understood that learning through communicating and maximum FL exposure in student-centered classrooms is ideal for optimal FL learning. During ST these PSTs learned through using various cultural tools and from participating in discourses and social interactions within cooperating school contexts. These PSTs worked to master planning effective lessons, manage their time, improve assessment skills, and keep abreast of student issues and interests.

PSTs’ beliefs about FL teaching in general had become less idealistic as a result of their participation in ST. Eva, Kate, Sara, Heidi, Paco, and Chela no longer believe that it is plausible for teachers to conduct classes predominantly in the FL nor is it feasible to set up classrooms as if they were mock foreign communities. They perceived
too many limitations inhibiting the effective implementation of CLT and the national FL standards; such as, large class sizes, too many administrative interruptions in the schedule, difficulty in matching communicative FL instruction and assessment, and lack of FL resources.

Heidi, Chela, and Paco, in addition to having tense relationships with their CTs, also struggled to make personal connections with their students. These PSTs reflected upon these challenges and stated that they were often unclear of student development and situations, of classroom management techniques, and were often personally too friendly, too inconsistent, or too easy-going. These PSTs particularly learned through instances of trial and error, repetition, through critical advice from other resources (i.e., university supervisors, students, etc.), and eventually through self-evaluation. Much of what they learned “the hard way” (interview, Chela, 4/6/08) were things they felt were too vague and complicated in nature to remedy during ST. Therefore, Paco and Chela often referenced how they would teach, manage, and interact differently in the future as FL teachers. Heidi reported feeling unsuitable and uninterested in becoming a FL teacher. She felt unable to apply what she had learned during ST—but unlike Paco and Chela, she is not willing to make another effort.

Heidi, Chela, and Paco’s post ST ideas consisted of beliefs about FL classrooms as no longer necessarily being places where they can share their passion for FLs and foreign cultures, where FL learning and TL communication take place, or where students necessarily want to be and learn. In addition to envisioning FL teaching in more restrictive terms, Heidi, Paco, and Chela’s perceptions of FL teaching had also become more negative and apathetic. They reported observing that often typical HS students are
not interested in learning FLs; that teachers often teach FLs prescriptively, and that managing classrooms of disengaged students is quite challenging. An excerpt from Paco’s blog shows how he was struggling during ST and gives way to his general impression of teaching:

For me the toughest lesson to deal with has been and will be management and high standards. Grading, being consistent with the rules and keeping an interesting, meaningful class with the maximum amount of engagement. Often I believe I have failed in this mission. I have learned that I must be consistent, organized and strict [sic] about the class rules and grading policies...I know they (students) show frustration, stress [sic], depression, house tensions, puberty issues through their mean comments to us. This practicum has made me less sensitive and has created a thicker skin for me, has also shortened the amount of time I need to recover from a horrible class period—there have been several! It also has taught me to look at the positive side of the everyday class, to valuing little victories and to self reflecting about many issues related to: planning, acting, seating, position in the class, withitness [sic], technology, budgets, extra materials and so forth.

Chela’s excerpt illustrates her depiction of teaching grammar prescriptively.

…we’re doing the…present perfect, indicative, subjunctive, and the present progressive and so we had to review the subjunctive A LOT! We did this for like two days with the subjunctive before we introduced the present perfect subjunctive…we’re still covering the grammar that they (district) want…which is fine…they need it. (original parenthesis, 5/06/08)

Heidi, Paco, and Chela realized that teaching was not as they had expected and the overall experience left them questioning their suitability for the profession. It seems that the FL Education program had broadened their visions of FL teaching by providing them with theoretical frameworks and pedagogical tools to better inform their teaching.

However, the program and I had also perhaps provided a glorified view of FL teaching and consequently, a false sense of themselves as becoming communicative FL teachers.

All PSTs embraced ST with expectations of teaching FLs communicatively through incorporating the national FL standards and teaching to interested and intrinsically
motivated students. ST, on the other hand, provided the PSTs with a more pragmatic sense of realism; for Heidi, Paco, and Chela it became more negative in nature.

While Heidi, Paco, and Chela were often trying to salvage ineffective lesson plans, resolve poor classroom management issues, and cope with strained relationships with their CTs, they were simultaneously trying to sort out their identities as FL teachers. With that said, Paco and Chela’s previous visions of becoming communicative language teachers began to wane as they quickly fell into the more traditional teaching routines of their CTs. The teaching environments that they had been placed into during ST were ones that were not particularly conducive to implementing CLT or the national FL standards. Their student learners were accustomed to more traditional learning routines, routinely communicating in English, and following teacher-directed activities. In Heidi’s case, she realized that she was personally and linguistically unable to carry out CLT, despite being placed into an environment where the tools and practices were already in place. Heidi’s second ST placement at the FLES program left her struggling to teach in an environment in which she had not been adequately prepared for by the FL Education program. Moreover, Heidi, Paco, and Chela continuously struggled to manage their classes during observations to such extent that I observed minimal FL teaching taking place. For these PSTs struggling to realize their visions of becoming communicative FL teachers was only one of their challenges during ST. They also had to solve routine problems, sort out what they believed about FL teaching, reflect upon their teaching, and conceptualize what kinds of FL teachers they could become.

Research suggests that powerful learning for PSTs comes from guidance, careful modeling, and coaching during field experiences rather than from being left to learn
independently (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985; Britzman, 1991) much like Heidi, Paco, and Chela were during ST. For these PSTs, the lack of CT mentoring, their difficulty in connecting with students, and lack of order and consistency in the classroom during ST had bearing on how they conceptualized the practicality of utilizing CLT and the national FL standards. Heidi, for example, saw that proficiency-based instruction is plausible in FL classrooms, but that she personally could not carry out a communicative approach. What is more, she no longer believes that instruction in the FL itself is essential for FL teaching and learning. Heidi was unable to appropriate the tools necessary to fall in line with her CT’s use of CLT. Heidi blamed her inability to implement CLT in part due to a lack of German fluency and because of being “shy” (blog, 4/20/08). This excerpt from Heidi’s interview illustrates her frustration with her first CT’s use of CLT and the TL, and how consequently, she sees a place for English in the FL classroom.

Since my CT is so against English in the classroom, I struggle to really teach the way that I want to. He comments on the amount of English that I use sometimes, and it frustrates me because I think it’s ok to teach things in English.

Paco and Chela were placed into more traditional grammar-based classrooms where, as a result, they were not afforded opportunities to practice communicative FL teaching, nor to see its efficacy in progress. Their ST experiences have shown them that “in reality” (blog, Paco, 11/29/07) the textbooks, numerous assessments, lack of student interest and motivation, and the role of English in classroom management do not necessarily lend themselves to the nature of CLT in FL classrooms.

The PSTs credited their experiences of working with their CTs as the single-most impacting aspect of their learning during their preservice education. The PSTs realized
that ST is a collaborative learning experience where multiple actors (i.e., students, CTs, university supervisors, etc.) take part and learn in the process. For Chela this realization of the process of learning to teach during ST was remarkable. After ST she reported that the most important thing she learned was:

…how to tailor my instruction to their needs and help them succeed in class. I started out the year with high expectations and quickly realized that sadly sometimes high expectations weren't entirely reasonable… Emotionally, it (ST) has been really rough because of my CT - she is not very supportive and doesn't give praise-- ever. That magnifies the difficulty... I wish I had been prepared for the possibility that I wouldn't get along with my CT.

The PSTs tended to give credit to or blame their CTs for the nature of their learning experiences during ST. For the most part the PSTs recognized, accepted, and often tried to remedy their perceived individual weaknesses as novice FL teachers, but they also saw their ST experiences as directed, and to some extent, determined by their CTs.

During ST many of the PSTs did incorporate various lessons that included the national FL standards and some projects that included pedagogical communication tasks and student collaboration. By the end of ST, however, their approaches to FL teaching had become generally more traditional—focusing on learning the FL through explicit use of English, verb conjugation and substitution drills, and sentence completion drills, for example. A consistent pattern that I observed was that each PST (except Heidi) began prescriptively teaching FLs in ways that focused on grammar formulas and chunked expressions. For example, Kate began each class with a recitation exercise in the TL; however, the class routinely recited the same phrases—leaving no variation in the students’ script. A similar interaction shows more clearly how some of Eva’s students were missing some of the pragmatic components of her grammar instruction. The
students seemed to be familiar with labeling and referring to grammar in French, but often lacked comprehension of their meanings. The student learners were able to regurgitate grammar rules, but were often unable to utilize this knowledge to communicate beyond short scripted contexts. The following excerpt from a classroom observation portrays Eva explaining the concept of demonstrative adjectives to a student. The student’s response demonstrates that she has surface-level understanding of the grammar concept but little concern for pragmatics.

_student_: I don’t know the difference between ‘ce’ and cet’.
_Eva_: Between which ones?
_student_: You keep changing the demonstrative articles.
_Eva_: Do you keep on saying the same thing to someone?
_Eva_: Oui (yes)...and you’re taking it out on me?
_student_: Yes.
_Eva_: D’accord (okay).
_student_: I know how to do it. I just don’t know what they mean.
_Eva_: “Oh, so ‘le’, ‘la’ and ‘les’, is the ‘the’, oui (yes). ‘Un’ and ‘une’ mean ‘one’ or ‘a’. A book...a crayon. You can’t say ‘a crayons’ because its more than one that’s when you say ‘some crayons”. So ‘a’ and ‘some’ and now we’ve moved on to ‘this’, ‘that’ and ‘those’.
_student_: Oh, ok.
_Eva_: There’s all these little words that we don’t even think about when we say, when we say words in English...So you don’t have to think about it in English, but you kind of have to think about it in French-- but that’s why they label them, oui? Non? (Yes? No?)

Over the course of ST, many of the PSTs positioned themselves in the classroom and (re)constructed their teacher identities based on how they felt they were perceived by their students. While Sara, Eva, and Kate indicated that they acted or felt like teachers or had found their ‘teacher voice’ during ST, no PSTs referenced thinking or knowing like teachers (Feiman-Nemser, 2008); none mentioned feeling like communicative FL
teachers. While thinking, knowing, feeling, and acting like teachers are important aspects that contribute to developing teacher identity, Rodgers and Scott (2008) suggest that “teacher identity is shifting, multi-faceted, formed in relationships, influenced by contexts, constructed in stories” (p. 701). The PSTs’ identities waxed and waned throughout ST based on many factors including, how they perceived and reacted to students’ actions, their student and professional relationships, their use of tools within various settings, and through myriad experiences and social interactions.

The PSTs who were initially more concerned with their own performance and learning during ST rather than the learning of their students, also experienced stressed relationships with their CTs. Heidi, Chela, and Paco sensed that their students did not perceive them as the teachers in the classroom. These PSTs begrudgingly saw their roles during ST evolving more into that of entertainers—trying to make FL learning fun while keeping the students on task. Excerpts from these PSTs’ interviews illustrate how they perceived their effectiveness as student teachers based on their students’ reactions.

I felt like going over the worksheet...that was a little boring for them... I’m still figuring out how to make that more fun. It’s really hard. (Heidi, 2/11/08)

…the kids, like, they just have no respect…they expect every minute to be fun and it’s like sometimes I have to talk to you for ten minutes about a grammar structure…like there’s no two ways about it. Sometimes you’re gonna have to do activities that aren’t fun…so I’m sorry that sucks, but its life! (Chela, 3/12/08)

My use of humor here and there backfires...Sometimes I put on my sergeant [sic] outfit and they like it...sometimes they don't. I think that often the impression of some students spreads to the whole class for me. Let's say some kids are bored and not having fun, then I feel the whole class is suffering equally... (Paco, 11/2/07)
These excerpts portray some struggles faced by these PSTs during ST while they were trying to make sense of their roles as FL teachers and constructing their teacher identities.

On the other hand, on several occasions during ST, Eva, Mora, Kate, and Sara referenced that they truly enjoyed teaching, despite not liking some aspects of their cooperating schools. It seems that their long-term desire to teach, accompanied with their concern for students, passion for their content matter, mutual respect in their CT relationships, along with a personal sense of confidence and preparedness helped them conceptualize how to teach the students rather than simply “entertain” (blog, Chela, 3/19/08) them. Such understandings contributed to their more positive student relationships. Eva, Mora, Kate, and Sara felt they were generally well received by the students, which contributed to their overall confidence and informed their teacher identities. This can be heard in their blog responses below.

---

Every student has responded to me so well and has only treated me like a respected teacher…I act like a teacher and, thus, the students should respond well to me… I’m teaching responsibility and, um…acceptance and diversity, and I’m hopefully like building confidence and self-esteem and character… (Eva)

---

I have a great relationship with my students…In the beginning I could feel that the students didn't really see me as their teacher, even though they liked me…I have observed that the students trust me, respect me and see me as their teacher. They will address me and ask me questions before asking my CT…They have helped me learn and grow just as much (if not more) as I have helped them. I just try to be real with the students and show them that I care. (Mora)

---

I have a pretty good relationship with my students…for the most part they respect me and respond pretty well to me as their teacher. (Kate)

---

Overall I feel as if my students have accepted me as their teacher…When I first took over my fourth bell class got the idea that they could disrespect me and get away with it. I had to yell at them and let them know that even though I am the...
student teacher, I am their teacher and they need to respect me just as they would respect my CT. (Sara)

Eva, Mora, Kate, and Sara felt they had gradually earned their students’ respect. They attributed this success to their consistent behavior, high expectations, and CT’s support. In essence, these PSTs saw themselves as effective FL teachers and had taken on such roles. Only Mora still envisioned herself as utilizing CLT in the future.

To some extent all PSTs were concerned with how the students perceived them as teachers, but Heidi, Chela, and Paco regarded the students’ opinions as especially important. Lacking respect from many students had bearing on how these PSTs perceived their effectiveness in the classroom. Heidi, Chela, and Paco felt that in many ways they were not engaging or effective FL teachers; unlike they had felt in the methods courses. This perception seemed to thwart their willingness to take risks, utilize their own ideas in the classroom, and their teacher identity development. These PSTs’ perceived lack of competence contributed to the mismatch between their expectations and their perceived realities of FL teaching. For example, Chela positively recalled her own experiences as a high school student with an “excellent” Spanish teacher, but during ST she struggled to accept that her CT and students did not correspond with her fond memories. Borg claims that the apprenticeship of observation “provides student teachers with a powerful, albeit limited, intuitive understanding of teaching, which should not be underestimated” (2004, p. 275).

Heidi’s, Chela’s, and Paco’s perceptions of how their students responded to them during ST impacted their sense of themselves as FL student teachers and attributed, in
part, to their estimations of their abilities to teach FLs. A closer look at their blog responses provide insight into some difficulties they encountered during ST.

I feel more confident in my teaching, but I still do not want to be a German teacher...I am really bad at time management...I either spend too much time on one activity or I think it will take a long time and it only takes two minutes...I'm starting to learn not to get so stressed out about lesson planning, because you really don't know how it's going to go until you try it. (Heidi, 4/28/08)

(ST) has raised many doubts about wanting to be one (FL teacher) although I don't have many choices at this point. Mostly because I feel tired, disenchanted, stressed, without energy and that is no good for a teacher. I'm not looking forward to the next day of the week and I'm not looking forward to be [sic] with the kids...I'm not very surprised about the results as I never was a vocational convinced teacher want to be all my life...I see myself as I thought I would--too talkative, approachable, inconsistent, disorganized, boring, with no expectations...(Paco, 11/29/07)

Constructing and reconstructing teacher identities became at times, problematic for Heidi, Chela, and Paco. Coldron and Smith (1999) suggest that: “[P]art of the experience of teaching is continually constructing a sustainable identity as a teacher” (p. 714). Finally, Heidi’s experiences left her no longer wanting to be a FL teacher—hence she never fully brought to fruition the realization of becoming the FL teacher she had intended.

In sum, the PSTs (Mora, Eva, Kate, and Sara) who seemed to continually keep their student learners’ goals and interests in mind, conducted regular self-reflection, and had strong CT support during ST, tended to base their perceptions of their effectiveness as FL teachers on whether their students had reached their preconceived student learner goals. Conversely, Heidi, Chela, and Paco, mostly referenced themselves, how they felt they were teaching, how their students perceived them as student-teachers, and the general nature of learning to teach during ST without supportive CTs.
Summary

This chapter provided a cross-case analysis surrounding the seven PSTs’ motives, appropriation of tools, perceived problem spaces, and their trajectories towards teacher identity development as a result of having participated in ST. The experiences of utilizing and appropriating tools, developing teacher identities, and affirming (or not) commitment to FL teaching varied across all PSTs. Variation can be found in each case, and for this reason AT has been useful in illustrating how the contexts of learning-to-teach have played a role in PSTs’ development, commitments, and evolving conceptualizations of FL teaching.

All PSTs’ beliefs about FL teaching have changed as a result of participating in ST. PSTs initially wanted to implement CLT and the national FL standards during ST, however, many contributing factors precluded them from doing so. Most PSTs gravitated towards the tools and teaching approaches of their CTs—either grammar-based or hybrid approaches to FL teaching. Only Mora remained committed to implementing such instruction in her future FL classroom, while Heidi has decided to leave the field of education. PSTs who aligned themselves with and were well-supported by their CTs seemed to experience clearer understandings of how to teach in general and appropriated some of the tools associated with grammar-based and hybrid FL teaching. For the most part, data gathered from classroom observations and interviews showed these PSTs becoming hybrid FL teachers. The PSTs who struggled with CTs, students, teaching communicatively, and classroom management seemed to experience more vague surface-level appropriation and understandings of the tools used to teach FLs. For the most part, data likewise showed these PSTs as becoming more grammar-based FL teachers. With
regard to the overall teaching of FLs during ST, all PSTs’ experiences during ST, except for Heidi’s, involved developing and utilizing teaching tools not advocated by the university. Regardless of the methodological approach utilized by the CTs, all PSTs acknowledged the extraordinary time, effort, and dedication needed to carry out effective, communicative FL instruction.
Chapter 5: Findings and Implications

The first years of teaching are an intense and formative time in learning to teach, influencing not only whether people remain in teaching but what kind of teacher they become (Feiman-Nemser, 2001, p. 1026).

The purpose of this chapter is to connect the literature with the findings from this study of foreign language (FL) preservice teachers’ (PSTs) evolving beliefs about FL teaching, learning, and teacher identity developments during ST in order to rejoin the guiding questions. Implications for undergraduate FL Education programs and further professional development are presented in addition to suggestions for future research.

Contextualizing the Research: Teacher Education as a Learning Problem.

Much research has been conducted on formal learning-to-teach contexts and ways of preparing new teachers for today’s classrooms (Shulman, 1987; Grossman, 1990; Sumara & Luce-Kapler, 1996; Grossman, Valencia, Evans, Thompson, Martin, & Place, 2000; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Newell, Gingrich & Johnson, 2001; Burke, 2006; Zeichner & Conklin, 2008; Darling-Hammond, 2008; Ingersoll, 2008; Johnson, 2009). Despite progress in understanding learning, teaching, and learning to teach FLs, questions still remain about how individuals come to conceptualize learning and teaching, their roles within FL classrooms, and their evolving identities as certain kinds of FL teachers.
The process of becoming a teacher and gradually taking on a teacher identity is a complex issue that has been studied throughout several decades (Coldron & Smith, 1999; Sumara & Luce-Kapler, 1996; Britzman, 1991; Beijaard et al., 2004; Olsen, 2008). In a review of research Beijaard et al. (2004) conclude that most studies agree that professional identity development is an ongoing process that continually changes over time. Being a teacher is a matter of being viewed as a teacher by one’s self and by others, and of acquiring and redefining an identity that is socially legitimated (Coldron & Smith, 1999, p. 712).

Several areas of research were consulted in order to frame and conduct this study including: Activity theory (AT), FL Education, English Language Arts Education, and Identity Work, among others. AT provides a framework for understanding how formal learning-to-teach contexts shape FL PSTs’ emerging beliefs, learning, and teacher identity formations. In addition to examining formal contexts of learning to teach FLs, AT calls for consideration to be given to PSTs’ individual histories, their motives, how they learned and learned to teach FLs, and (re)constructed their teacher identities within such contexts. In contexts such as university courses and ST, where PSTs participate, learn, and practice teaching FLs, they are often faced with the dilemma of how to (re)construct their teacher identities as they consider a range of sometimes conflicting beliefs and motives (Grossman et al., 1999). The overriding motive for an activity setting may support or discourage particular ways of thinking, acting, talking, and teaching FLs.

Beeth and Adadan (2006) suggest that as teacher educators it is important to thoroughly examine PSTs’ learning experiences because “preservice teachers are usually
unaware of many of the situational problems that can arise in the classroom, although they expect their preparation to have addressed these problems before they are encountered in the field” (p. 104). Being unaware of potential problems in FL classrooms may provide additional opportunities for FL PSTs’ developing identities to be challenged or put in jeopardy. Gage posits that ST “has been considered to be the single best, though far from faultless, component of teacher education programs” (2008, p. 1141). He further recognizes that ST “has often been indicted as too unsystematic or unplanned, as unmanageable in its complexity, and as too much at the mercy of the idiosyncrasies of the cooperating and supervising teachers” (2008). With that said, AT provided a framework for this study that has allowed me to consider and examine the affordances, specific activities, rules, and pedagogical tools provided in each PST’s formal contexts of learning to teach. Examination of such growth and development among FL PSTs has the potential to highlight their evolving beliefs and practices and teacher identity development over time. Furthermore, such examination gives way to conceptualizing PSTs’ commitment to FL teaching.

Discussion of the Findings

Figure 5.1 presented below displays the conceptualization of the activity systems examined in this study from an activity-theoretical perspective. All elements within the activity systems (i.e., subjects, objects, tools, rules, communities, and division of labor) have been described as they were identified in this study.
Figure 5.1 Activity-theoretical perspective of activity systems examined in this study

FL Education Mediating Tools:
- communicative approach and pedagogical tools
- constructivist theories of teaching
- national FL standards
- FL as medium of instruction
- Project KLM

CSs Mediating Tools:
- grammar-based & hybrid approach
- transmission models of teaching
- CT’s resources & experiences
- FL as content (except for Heidi’s)

Object:
PSTs learn to connect theory to practice and to become competent, licensed communicative FL teachers. Meet criteria for licensure

Object:
PSTs learn to teach FL competently concurrent with student learners’ FL learning.

Subjects:
PSTs

Community:
- Teacher and FL Education department
- US

Division of Labor:
PSTs as students
- USs provide critique and guidance regarding PST’s teaching (more so than student learner learning)
- FL Education faculty

Division of Labor:
PSTs as teachers
- CT provides guidance and critique
- CS administration
- state guidelines
- only USs from Calico

Rules:
- for ST practicum
- course requirements
- pass Praxis exams
- NCATE/ACTFL, state and university rules and benchmarks

Rules:
- CS rules and regulations
- CT’s rules
- classroom rules
- state rules

Legend
US— university supervisor
CS— cooperating school
CT— cooperating teacher
PST— preservice teacher
- - - - - overlap in motives of activity systems
- - - - intersystem contradictions
- - - - - - - intrasystem contradictions
Question 1a: What are the principal contexts in which FL PSTs learned to teach FLs?

The context for FL education involved in this study reflects a broad spectrum. It encompasses the conceptual framework of the program’s overarching goals and philosophy of education, the available resources, specific ways and rules for accomplishing tasks, and external sites (cooperating schools) for practicing and learning to teach, among other aspects (Houston, 2008). Houston (2008) suggests that settings include the “totality of the places, people, and programs that are part of teacher education” (p. 388). The FL Education program in which these PSTs formally learned to teach FLs provides its teacher candidates with two years of general education study; followed by one year of methods courses specifically addressing the teaching of FLs. While much of their coursework consists of studying about constructivist theories of learning and teaching, and more specifically of communicative approaches to FL teaching during FL methods coursework, conceptual frameworks and theories are not ends in themselves. Therefore, teacher candidates are simultaneously provided limited experiential opportunities to practice FL teaching. Ideally, experiential field placements provide teacher candidates with opportunities to apply theory to practice; that is, learning to practice teaching FLs in more profound ways than can be expected through the study and discussion of pedagogy alone (Darling-Hammond, 1999; 2008; Johnson, 2009).

However, field experiences also pose serious and complex challenges for preservice teacher learning.

Field placements for these PSTs were as brief as one week observations and were as long as the 16-week ST practicum. According to a FL faculty member at Calico
University, FL teacher candidates participate in “three field placements and ‘hands-on’ experiences prior to student teaching” (personal communication, 5/12/08). As Rosaen and Florio-Ruane (2008) suggest referring to the field placements as “hands-on experiences”, in many ways, implies a differentiation in the conceptualization between what is learned and valued in field placements and university coursework; such that it runs the risk of rendering one activity system as experiential and the other as more analytical in nature (p. 712). When university faculty members refer to field experiences in this way, often PSTs take on similar perceptions. Then, the university may indirectly contribute to perpetuating the gap that many PSTs experience or perceive when initially placed into ‘real’ FL classrooms (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985).

Given that field placements often provide PSTs with experiences in learning to teach FLs, consideration must be given to the distinctiveness of the motives of specific contexts and how such contexts shape conceptualization of teaching and teacher identity development. These seven PSTs were placed into K-12 public FL classrooms that encompassed a range of FL practices and different methodological approaches. For example, these PSTs spent time in partial immersion programs, Foreign Language in the Elementary School (FLES) programs, and in more traditional FL programs beginning in middle and high schools. While experience and participation within these contexts may serve to widen the PSTs’ exposure to and beliefs about a range of FL programs, graduates of this FL Education program do not meet the licensure requirements of the state to teach in the first two types of FL programs; the partial immersion program or the FLES program. In some cases, this had bearing on how the PSTs perceived the value of these field placement experiences. Further, it fostered in some PSTs, a sense of irrelevancy
about why they were practicing teaching FLs in schools and programs in which they would not be qualified to teach after obtaining state licensure. With regard to the ST field experience, despite how the PSTs perceived their overall ST experience, all PSTs voiced believing that the ST practicum was the most important aspect of and contributor to their development during preservice education at Calico University.

**Question 1b: What overriding or dominant motives shape action within these contexts?**

In the FL Education program, prior to ST, teacher candidates spend nearly three years studying, participating, and meeting the requirements of the program in order to proceed to ST and eventually be recommended to the state for FL licensure. For the most part, PSTs have entered into such a program because of their passion for FLs, intrinsic motivation to work with children, or in some cases, for what is thought to be a potentially satisfying career. While in many cases the PSTs are en route to satisfy their own personal goals and motives for becoming FL teachers, at the same time they learn, practice, and develop ideologies about what the university sees as best FL teaching practices. In many regards PSTs try to maintain their personal motives, while they simultaneously try to achieve and satisfy the academic and pedagogical goals of those affiliated with the university (i.e., instructors, advisors, etc.). In general, those involved with the (FL) Education program at Calico University maintained motives that included the PSTs’ learning about theories, conceptual and practical tools, and about linking theory to effective practice. For the most part the Teacher Education program, attempting to operate in sync with and under the checks and balances of institutional
accrediting organizations (i.e., NCATE, ACTFL, and State department of Education) aims to develop quality and effective FL teachers. Although this is the overriding motive of this activity system, occasionally, inconsistencies, conflicts, and contradictions occur. Resolving such issues often leads to new mediating tools or new forms of knowledge (Tsui & Law, 2006; Johnson, 2009).

The dominant motive shaping activity during the context of ST, as it was examined in this study, appears to have been different from those associated with the university. Once the PSTs were placed into a new context or cooperating classroom, different rules, tools, actors, and motives dominated this context—they were no longer closely tied to the education program on a daily basis. The CTs, school administrators, state mandates, and sometimes student learners helped establish the dominant motives of the activity in each PST’s case. In most cases, the dominant motive was to teach FLs effectively (as the community envisioned) and to cover curriculum content while adhering to often strict schedules. Most CTs positioned and guided their PSTs toward taking on the similar ideologies and beliefs about FL teaching that they maintained. This context for learning to teach had the potential to further shape PSTs’ beliefs, learning, utilization of specific tools, and teacher identity development in part because PSTs were often regarded by CTs, administrators, and students as (student) teachers in the FL classrooms.

In the FL Education program, however, PSTs were regarded by faculty and supervisors as students or learners of teaching. Often differing roles, expectations, and motives were set in each of these contexts with regard to carrying out the same activity—FL teaching. Most PSTs tried to balance simultaneously appeasing both their university
supervisors and CTs during ST. However, in some cases, appeasing the CTs during ST meant PSTs had to abandon university-taught approaches and teach their FLs in ways that were similar to how they personally had learned their FLs during their own apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975). One PST, Mora, was able to acquiesce to her CT’s style of grammar-based instruction during ST, and at the same time was able to maintain her beliefs about CLT as best FL teaching practices.

Considering the overriding motives of each learning-to-teach context involved in this study lends itself to a discussion of the contradictions many PSTs experienced. Engeström (2000) suggests that deviations or disturbances often “indicate developmentally significant systemic contradictions and change potentials within the activity” (p. 964). Contradictions found in this study were on three levels: within the FL Education program itself, between the FL Education program and the cooperating schools, and among the FL Education program, the cooperating schools, and the state and national-level professional organizations (i.e., state department of education, NCATE, and ACTFL) that oversee teacher education and licensure. Several contradictions that had bearing on PSTs’ development during this study were identified: the role of the university supervisors, mismatch in CTs’ approach to FL instruction with that of the FL Education program, lack of assessing PST’s FL proficiency, and the ways in which some PSTs perceived and undermined Project KLM.

The role of the university supervisors is one that was contradictory within the FL Education program itself and caused tension among several of the PSTs. The three university-supervisors involved in this study, though technically members of the faculty at Calico University, do not teach on campus. These supervisors are former experienced
K-12 teachers who are responsible for representing the Teacher Education program and its goals through observing and evaluating the performances of PSTs in this triadic relationship during the ST practicum. Due to the fact that these supervisors did not teach any courses on campus nor participate at any time in the FL Methods courses, no prior relationships between the three supervisors and the PSTs existed prior to ST. The supervisor’s role was mainly to advise and confer with the PSTs, participate in the assessment process of the PSTs, and serve as a liaison between the university and cooperating schools (personal communications, university supervisors, 12/07). PSTs are expected to make their lesson plans available to the supervisor during classroom visits and have follow-up conferences afterwards. University supervisors are responsible for scheduling four seminars which cover general topics of interest to the PSTs. The seminars are intended to provide opportunities for the PSTs to reflect upon and analyze teaching with other PSTs. Finally, the supervisor is supposed to conduct (informal or formal) classroom observations approximately every two weeks during ST to observe and discuss individual progress and concerns with each PST and their CT (Licensure Handbook, p. 3).

The contradictions stemming from the role of the university supervisors within the FL Education program reside partly within the ways they worked on behalf of the Teacher Education program but had little or no affiliation with faculty from the FL Education department. These supervisors were not instructors within the teacher education department, but rather were experienced (often retired) teachers of secondary FL education. At no time while I was teaching the FL methods courses, did I come in contact nor have any communication with any university supervisors. University
supervisors are given guidelines for supervising PSTs that are based on state and NCATE benchmarks and standards, more specifically, the Praxis/Pathwise model which identifies teaching behaviors in four Domains: Planning, Environment, Teaching for Learning, and Professionalism (questionnaire, university supervisor A, 12/20/07).

While such indicators may be suitable for evaluating general pedagogical performance, it raises the question of assessing the nature of the FL teaching that was taking place. In the questionnaire that I sent to each university supervisor (A, B, and C), I asked them to provide a description of their conceptualization of what constitutes excellent FL teaching. While each supervisor provided description of characteristics FL teachers should possess, none of them specifically mentioned teaching FLs communicatively, CLT, or utilizing the national FL standards during instruction. It became clear that their conceptualizations of excellent FL teaching were different than what I, as the former FL methods instructor, had promoted as best FL teaching practices. Seeing the role of the supervisors as being directed and guided by mainly those within the Teacher Education department seems fragmented in the sense that the motives and goals of FL Education program and faculty were not fully represented.

Another example of motive fragmentation within the Teacher Education department was also in their use of university supervisors during ST, but pertained to the notion of the supervisors having appropriate subject content matter in the areas in which they were supervising. For example, Heidi referenced on two occasions (during follow up interviews) that she questioned her university supervisor’s ability to speak German. She had no communication with him in German at any time, but made these comments based on her perception of how little he commented or corrected her German lesson plans.
(which he requested weekly). She wondered how he could fairly assess her if he did not have an understanding of the content. Because Heidi struggled with both of her CTs, she relied more on her university supervisor than most other PSTs in this study. However, toward the end of ST Heidi began to wonder if her supervisor was reading her lesson plans at all. On several occasions she asked him for help in coming up with themes for her Kindergarten German classes (they did not use a textbook) and he offered suggestions of lesson topics of which she had already taught. She expressed that if he could read German, then he would have likely known such information; so she presumed that he either was not looking over her work or that he was but could not understand it. Kate, a PST who was seeking licensure in both Spanish and French, also commented on the inability of her university supervisor (who spoke French) to read and evaluate her Spanish lesson plans. Kate completed the first eight weeks of the ST practicum in a Spanish classroom and afterwards switched to a HS where she taught French. Kate felt uncertain about the feedback and direction she was getting during the first half of the practicum because of her supervisor’s unfamiliarity with Spanish language and cultures. With that said, Kate’s university supervisor (university supervisor B) explained in her questionnaire response (provided below) how she evaluates the PSTs who teach other languages but get assigned to her for supervision.

Since I evaluate all foreign language student teachers, but do not speak all of the languages, I look for characteristics that the student teacher exhibits which indicate good teaching strategies, effective planning according to state’s Standards, Benchmarks and Indicators, appropriate classroom management skills, as well as good rapport with his or her students. (12/11/07)
In similar ways that the university supervisors did not necessarily see communicative approaches as best FL teaching practices, neither did seven of the nine CTs involved with this study. The placing of PSTs into classrooms during ST is handled mainly by staff in the Student-teaching Office at the University. The Teacher Education department has criteria they use in order to solicit experienced and quality teachers in all fields of education and the staff do their best to meet those criteria. At times, though, the university has to make concessions when there are not enough classrooms in which to place PSTs. For example, Eva was placed with a French teacher who was beginning her third year of teaching—a compromise that the university had to make because they could not find another French (secondary) placement. If CTs espouse grammar-based and hybrid approaches to FL teaching, as did these university supervisors, and they are predominantly responsible for supervising and guiding PSTs’ learning and development during ST, then these collective motives now shape and guide PSTs’ orientation of the activity itself. In other words, the CTs and university supervisors (operating under state and NCATE benchmarks and indicators) serve as the ‘community’ who shares the same ‘object’ that shapes individual’s activity (i.e., one’s ways of teaching FLs) (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

The third contradiction identified in this study is one that occurred between activity systems and is seen as an unproductive contradiction, in that it failed to carry out the anticipated expectations for ensuring proficient and effective FL teacher candidates. For example, various professional organizations (i.e., NCATE, ACTFL, etc.) aim to improve the quality of teaching and teacher preparation and have established specific guidelines, procedures, performance-based assessments, and standards through which
NCATE-accredited schools and programs must adhere in order to recommend FL teacher candidates for licensure in the state. Although most criteria established by NCATE were implemented by the Teacher Education program and achieved or met by the PSTs in this study, one important criteria was skipped; the oral proficiency interview (OPI). The OPI is a required performance-based assessment of FL teacher candidate’s TL proficiency established by ACTFL and endorsed by NCATE. No PSTs in this study were required by the FL Education or Teacher Education departments to participate in such assessment interview. Official OPIs were not conducted at the time of this study due to a miscommunication and misunderstanding between the FL Education department and the multiple departments of modern languages.

In addition to participating in an official OPI, PSTs must achieve a score of ‘advanced-mid’ or better in order to advance to the ST practicum. Due to the fact that all of the participants in this study were juniors and seniors at the university at the time the OPI requirement was incorporated into the FL plan of study, they were therefore exempted from having to participate in the formal interview. The anticipated pressure of possibly having to take an OPI, a high-stakes oral assessment, was a topic of concern for several of the participants. Without mention, several PSTs (i.e., Heidi, Eva, and Kate) were relieved when they found out that were excused from having to conduct an OPI. Without an OPI rating, the only formal evaluation of these PSTs’ FL proficiency was gathered from the Praxis Content examinations. Given that Heidi, Eva, and Kate all commented on their weak FL skills both before and after ST, it is possible that if these PSTs had taken an OPI they may not have been allowed to participate in ST. Heidi realized that her FL skills were not proficient enough during ST, and as such she decided
to leave the field of education. Eva and Kate (in French only) also realized that their French skills were not proficient enough for their own personal goals of becoming fluent in French, but they both did see their limited proficiencies as sufficient for grammar-based French teaching in settings similar the ones in which they student-taught.

Finally, the fourth contradiction indicated in this study is one that also occurred between activity systems. Calico University follows the guidelines and standards put forth by NCATE (as described earlier in the contexts section of chapter 3). One such requirement is that the Teacher Education program demonstrates that PSTs are familiar with assessment models and are able to use them appropriately, and that they reflect upon such assessments

(http://www.actfl.org/files/public/ACTFLNCATEStandardsRevised713.pdf). In order to meet this standard, the Teacher Education department has implemented a project to be carried out during ST known as Project KLM (pseudonym). The Project KLM is the Teacher Education department’s way of showing that PSTs’ are able to measure their effectiveness in K-12 classrooms through providing evidence of examination of various assessment techniques and identifying strategies to use with students. The project attempts to demonstrate that PSTs are able to adequately measure initial student learners’ understanding, acquired knowledge during the lesson, and their measurable gains afterward. This project is a high-stakes assessment that is rated pass or fail by university supervisors. This project is required by all teacher candidates as a means to demonstrate their abilities to measure their effectiveness in teaching in classrooms. If projects are found to be unsatisfactory, a conference is set up with the candidate and a follow-up project is completed until mastery is reached (interview, FL instructor, 5/12/08).
The unproductive contradiction with the implementation of this high-stakes project is that many PSTs found ways to undermine the purpose of the project and in some ways the goals of the Teacher Education program. It is within this aspect of the study that several of the PSTs were more candid with me. This is perhaps due to the professional relationships I had cultivated with them during the previous year they had spent in my classes, but also in part due to the fact that during the time of this study I had no formal involvement with Calico University. Several PSTs (i.e., Chela, Paco, Sara, and Mora) made little reference during interviews to Project KLM. When referencing the project, they did so in ways that suggested they were genuinely completing the project and putting forth their best efforts to meet the requirements. The other PSTs (i.e., Eva, Kate, and Heidi), however, took on an air of indifference about the purpose and quality of the project and looked for short-cuts to take in order to satisfactorily pass the project. For example, Eva originally was excited about doing the project and wanted to use an idea that she had created for a project in one of the methods classes the year before. Just after ST began all PSTs were to attend a meeting with the university supervisors and the university-appointed NCATE coordinator to discuss the purpose and requirements of the project. One of the NCATE coordinator’s duties is to share responsibility for evaluating these projects. Eva found the project difficult to apply to FL teaching, and therefore, decided to share her idea and elicit feedback from the university’s NCATE coordinator. In Eva’s first follow up interview, she gave a depiction of what transpired at that meeting:

I know what I want to do and at the meeting I talked about it and I got a really different perspective on it. I really wanted to do a reading project because we learned so much in methods class about it and you know that’s the one type of thing that I can think of for pre and post assessments… I was asking her (NCATE
coordinator) if it was ok that I do it in three days and she said ‘Sure, but what are you gonna do for those three days?’ and I told her, ‘You know, my pre-assessment and my during’ and I just talked about the strategies that I wanted them (students) to use to read it and I said that you know, ‘I think that we’ll read it together and then we’ll...’ and she was like, she stopped me and she said ‘You said that word “together”...that’s not reading anymore, that’s called listening comprehension.’ ...So I said, ‘I’ll just turn it into a listening comprehension activity. I really don’t care.’ and she was like, ‘Well, make sure your indicators, you know, your assessments reflect your indicators and if you’re using a reading comprehension indicator then you better not say any of that selection out loud.’ And I’m like, ‘Well then how am I supposed to teach the selection?’ And she said, ‘Well, you can teach reading strategies.’ And I’m like, ‘So what? I am gonna spend a half day saying ‘Look for cognates, read the title, blah blah and just give them the thing and assess?’ I was like, ‘Then I didn’t do any teaching. The kids already know reading strategies, like, they’re not stupid!’ (interview, 9/22/07)

While Eva was disappointed with the university-appointed NCATE coordinator’s response to her FL reading idea for Project KLM, she felt that this type of project was difficult to apply to FL teaching and did not truly assess the teaching that Eva was doing during ST, but rather what her CT had already taught the students. Eva stated, “I want to more accurately assess myself” and yet, as a means to satisfy her university supervisor and the university-appointed NCATE coordinator, she subsequently mentioned having already thought of alternative ways to supersede the obstacle of Project KLM. Eva explained:

I can always like, manipulate the indicators and benchmarks after I’ve done it. I mean...it’s probably not the greatest thing, I probably should do it beforehand, but you know what?... I mean, I’m starting to realize that that’s not exactly how teaching really is. I should do them beforehand, but I mean our principal at our school doesn’t check lesson plans...never.

Eva later admitted to completing the reading project with the students and “fixing” the paperwork to meet the expectations of the evaluators of the project. It is clear that Eva’s motives had changed from how she approached the meeting and Project KLM with
excitement and a preconceived idea to effectively implement during ST to then only simply completing the project to pass the Project KLM—even if it meant having to alter her project’s findings. Understanding how Eva began perceiving the realities of FL teaching in conjunction with her changing motives during ST sheds light on the transformation that Eva was making towards reconstructing her identity as a predominantly grammar-based FL teacher. Additionally, the ways in which Eva attempted to resolve this contradiction raise some ethical concerns.

Heidi’s and Kate’s experiences with completing Project KLM also posed conflict and tension. While they both expressed ideas of uncertainty and frustration regarding how to complete the project, they also both alluded to how they perceived the project as being an ineffective tool and means of assessment. For example, Heidi explained:

It (Project KLM) was really hard. That was when I was doing the numbers actually...That’s why I was like freaking out because I wanted to make sure that I did a good job since it was for the Project. I got a 100% on it somehow (slight laugh)...The pre-assessment was really hard because like in kindergarten you can’t say, ‘This is a pre-assessment. You’re not going to know the answers, That’s ok.’ I told them that but they’re still...like a lot of them cheated so I had to throw out a lot of their papers. It was a mess!...I ended up, I put ten stars on the paper and I had various numbers on the stars from different... like I had kind of split the numbers into groups like one through twenty, twenty through thirty, and then thirty through fifty...I had a few from each of those ranges and then I would just say the number and they had to color the number that I said. And then I would show them what color I wanted to make sure that they knew what the color was so I wasn’t testing colors. (interview, 4/14/08)

Heidi’s frustrations with finding an appropriate topic for implementing Project KLM with kindergartners, and afterwards, with having had many students cheat during the task left her contemplating the validity of this project in terms of how it demonstrated her own effectiveness in the classroom. Despite feeling confused about how to craft and
implement the project, Heidi’s references to “freaking out” because she wanted to ensure that she did well on the project demonstrate that she continued to sustain her motive of completing ST and seeking licensure. This is important because Heidi had already decided that she no longer wanted to teach German. While Kate did not initially voice concern about Project KLM, the experience of creating and implementing the project in combination with several other external events that occurred during ST mediated her thinking. I asked Heidi in an interview how she implemented her project—her disregard for Project KLM can be heard below.

I got 45 out of 45…I put as minimal amount of work into as possible. Well, partly because Margaret (Student teaching coordinator) made me really mad. I finished it (Project KLM) last week and then I left on Tuesday after school. I went home for the rest of the week because of the funeral and then it was due on Monday. I emailed her like on Monday night or whatever when it (grandfather’s passing) happened and she was like, ‘Oh yeah, you know, take as long as you need…we’re scoring them on Thursday and Friday. So just make sure that you have it in by then.’ So I was like, ‘ok’. So, then with the blizzard I didn’t get back until…we had the funeral on Monday, so I got home on Monday after that and then she emails me like Monday night or Tuesday and was like ‘Kate, we need your project as soon as possible!’ And I was like, ‘Ok Margaret (Student teaching coordinator), you told me that it was due yesterday, but you told me that I could have until Thursday or Friday. I will get it in to you, but I’m kind of trying to start my new placement and you know, get my life together and this is really the last thing on my mind right now.’ So I did it, but it is the dumbest project ever that everyone just BSs…so, whatever. (interview, 5/1/08)

All three PSTs’ comments about their perceptions of the project illustrate the contradiction in what the university and NCATE deem as a performance-based assessment put in place to measure and evaluate PSTs’ effectiveness in the classroom during ST. The purpose behind such assessment is that PSTs demonstrate the ability to reflect upon the results of student assessments, to make adjustments to their instruction, and to analyze their own teaching. Not one of these three PSTs found real value in doing
their projects nor found these projects as representative of their effectiveness in the FL classroom. In order to resolve their perceived problems with the project, Eva made up and altered part of her project to appease the university-appointed NCATE coordinator and university supervisor, while Heidi attempted to do well but had misconceptions about how and what to do, and finally, Kate regarded the project as not much more than busy work. From the perspective of the university, the Teacher Education department created this key assessment as a means to meet the NCATE standards and to measure PST’s pedagogical development. However, when PSTs take alternative routes to completing this project new contradictions occur. In the case of this study, such alternative routes have led to issues of some PST’s ethical behavior, misunderstandings of FL assessment, and not taking self-reflection seriously.

As other published research and this study concur, when the motives from both learning-to-teach contexts align, PSTs are often more able to see the purpose of their university-based learning and practice (Grossman et al., 1999; Newell et al., 2001). This is important because during FL education PSTs gain theoretical understandings of FL pedagogy. The ways in which PSTs make sense out of such conceptual knowledge during and through their everyday practice combine with their theoretical learning during teacher education—thus, allowing PSTs to reframe their thinking and conceptualization of FL teaching and of themselves as FL teachers (Johnson, 2009). Rosean and Florio-Ruane (2008) caution that “[W]orking with conceptual tools without consideration of the practical tools needed to plan, and teach lessons or assess learners’ progress has the potential to make those tools seem distant, or irrelevant to the real work of teaching” (p. 714). Participation in both contexts provides avenues for PSTs to link their conceptual
classroom learning with their more practical classroom teaching, thus creating a more integrative and informed conceptualization of their practice (Johnson, 2009).

**Question 2: What tools, concepts, and beliefs of FL teaching do PSTs develop during FL teacher education and during ST in order to take action toward the goals of the various contexts?**

The FL Education program gradually cultivated among the PSTs a conceptualization of FL teaching that is aimed towards what the field envisions as best FL teaching practices—that is, a communicative-based approach to FL teaching. In the FL Education program at Calico University PSTs are guided through comprehensive study of the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* (ACTFL, 2006) and are asked to craft and deliver communicative-based, student-centered FL lessons. These standards aim to integrate visionary principles in FL classrooms that provide student learners with “ample opportunities to explore, develop, and use communication strategies, learning strategies, critical thinking skills, and skills in technology, as well as the appropriate elements of the language system and culture” (ACTFL Standards, 1999, p. 32). The national FL standards are presented as a set of tools to help guide PSTs’ FL instruction and to monitor student FL learning and proficiency. These standards encourage collaborative and contextualized FL learning, meaningful FL communication, and advocate life-long FL learning. The FL Education faculty promote the study and utilization of the national FL standards which help guide PSTs towards a conceptualization of the modes of communication (interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational) rather than considering each skill (reading, writing, listening and speaking) as separate. Through such conceptualization PSTs are expected
to learn to provide meaningful FL communication through incorporating real-world tasks and student-centered activities. The FL instructor modeled engaging, meaningful FL lessons that adhered to the national FL standards and PSTs were taught how to plan, craft, and utilize assessments that match instruction for effective FL teaching and learning.

While these tools are being developed during FL education, PSTs are also simultaneously provided with experiential field placements in K-12 FL classrooms in which they (ideally) apply the tools they learned at the university. Although the field placements are short-term venues for PSTs to apply theory to practice, often what happened during such field experiences was that the PSTs saw other approaches and tools used to teach FLs. Time and again different approaches to FL teaching are modeled during these experiences, thus perpetuating dissonance among what the PSTs learn in teacher education and what they encounter during field experiences (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985; Grossman et al., 1999; Newell et al., 2001; Rosaen & Florio-Ruane, 2008).

The ST practicum, on the other hand, provided a sense of realism to the PSTs, as evident in their shifting beliefs about FL teaching. In line with previous research (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985; Grossman et al., 1999; Newell et al. 2001; Watzke, 2007), ST led many PSTs in this study to believe that a gap exists between what is taught in the FL Education program and what occurs in K-12 FL classrooms. The experiences of working with CTs during ST who often did not utilize nor conceptualize CLT or the national FL standards as best FL practices, in many instances, diminished the PSTs’ beliefs about the practicality of utilizing such approach. Student-teaching under the
supervision of CTs with differing methodological approaches, motives, and tools had bearing on PSTs’ personal and pedagogical outcomes. For example, several PSTs, after working with CTs who utilized grammar-based approaches, consider utilizing the TL during instruction as somewhat challenging and problematic. These PSTs explained that conducting instruction in the TL takes considerable time and effort and often inhibits or delays student FL comprehension and learning. Student-teaching in such environments left most PSTs expressing belief in and a need for explicit grammar instruction and increased use of English in FL classrooms, a practice not advocated by the FL Education department, CLT, or the national FL standards.

Most PSTs implemented teacher-centered activities utilizing tools and strategies directly from the textbook. What is more, several PSTs began prescriptively teaching FLs, as their CTs typically did. Many PSTs now conceptualize a strong connection between managing an orderly classroom and the utilization of English rather than the TL, something Bateman also found in her study of PSTs’ attitudes towards utilizing TL during instruction (2008). The findings from this study concur with Bateman’s (2008) in that many of the PSTs became hesitant to implement student-centered activities or utilize the TL for fear of losing control in the classroom. All PSTs, except for Heidi, reported that the ST practicum provided them with experiential and pedagogical opportunities to engage in FL teaching practices that were not advocated by the FL Education program.

In short, what the FL Education program advocates as best FL practices, for the most part, were not modeled in the cooperating FL classrooms. It has been suggested (Lacey, 1977; Lortie, 1975) that the practices that novice teachers use on trial and error basis are often the ones they continue to depend on regardless of whether or not they
represent best practices (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). It is plausible to assume that these PSTs will continue to teach and envision FL pedagogy as they learned during ST; thus perpetuating the cycle of more traditional FL teaching in the 21st century. However, Watzke’s (2007) findings suggest a resurgence of communicative approaches in FL classrooms among novice FL teachers after several years in the field. Perhaps over time Mora will be rejoined by some of the PSTs, as Watzke suggests, in her conviction of CLT as best FL practices. This possibility is an important implication of my study—the need for longitudinal studies to understand FL teacher learning over time and across contexts.

**Question 3a:** How do the ways in which PSTs learn to teach FLs within various formal contexts (i.e., FL education and ST) shape teacher identity development?

Identity formation is shaped by and shapes action (Penuel & Wertsch, 1995). This occurs through a dynamic and complex interaction among the cultural tools and resources utilized during the action, the contexts of the action, the motives behind and embedded within the action, and in combination with how an individual chooses to participate in the action (1995). In terms of constructing a teacher identity, according to Coldron and Smith (1999), such construction is partly achieved and partly given through active location in social contexts. The ways in which PSTs learn to teach FLs within the contexts of FL education and ST inform their teacher identity development in several ways. First, the FL Education program is grounded in constructivist principles of teaching and learning FLs and advocates the utilization of communicative or proficiency-based instruction in FL classrooms. These seven PSTs studied, participated, and practiced in a positive learning environment (FL education) in which they were supported.
and positioned as capable, communicative FL PSTs. In essence many instructors
(including myself) involved in the Teacher Education program encouraged and supported
these PSTs and their learning and teaching efforts; to some degree this contributed to
their assured sense of confidence and competence in becoming communicative FL
(student) teachers.

Second, many PSTs held idealistic visions and expectations of FL teaching and of
themselves as FL student teachers. I, as the instructor of the FL methods courses,
encouraged the PSTs to craft creative and meaningful, communicative FL lessons. In
many ways, however, despite the fact that these lesson plans adhered to the national FL
standards, the PSTs often planned such lessons with unrealistic expectations of their
students and students’ attitudes toward learning FLs. This mismatch between ideal
notions of student learners and their actual behavior contributed, in part, to the gap PSTs
perceived in their own success as effective FL student teachers within the two learning-
to-teach contexts. PSTs expected their student learners to be highly motivated, stellar
students interested in learning FLs, much like remembered themselves being as former
student learners. This finding echoes Feiman-Nemser’s (2001) caveat that often the
“preservice program is a weak intervention compared with the influence of teachers’ own
schooling and their on-the-job experience” (p. 1014). With that said, most PSTs
referenced notions of disappointment and disillusion with some of their student learners’
characteristics. Many student learners did not seem genuinely interested in learning FLs
and foreign cultures; like the PSTs had anticipated. In interviews PSTs made 43
(combined) references (as seen in table 4.2) to perceiving problem spaces in the areas of
struggling to motivate some students in their classrooms and to understand their
difficulties and, at times, disinterest in learning FLs.

On the other hand, the extent to which these seven PSTs were able to
(re)construct their teacher identities during ST varied. PST’s motives for teaching and
their use of tools during FL education and ST play important roles in their developing
identities as FL student teachers. First, all PSTs entered into ST believing they would
continue developing as communicative FL teachers and utilize the national FL standards
they had spent a year learning how to implement. However, the contexts for learning
during ST were different from the FL Education program in that most of the CTs
maintained distinct motives, utilized other tools, and espoused different ideologies about
FL teaching. Second, most PSTs attentively positioned themselves in the FL classroom
and (re)constructed their teacher identities based on how they felt they were perceived by
their student learners and CTs. In essence most PSTs’ teacher identity formations grew
in parallel to how they perceived themselves as FL (student) teachers in the classroom
during ST. This is in line with Shulman (1986) and Kwo’s (1996) findings which
document preservice and novice teachers’ concerns for establishing rapport with their
student learners, how they are perceived by their student learners, and their abilities to
effectively take on the roles and responsibilities in the FL classroom.

These personal and professional concerns manifested themselves in ways that
further shaped some PSTs’ teacher identity development. For example, PSTs who
regularly experienced (or perceived experiencing) success in the classroom and close
guidance and encouragement from their CTs (regardless of the CT’s FL teaching
approach) gradually envisioned themselves as becoming successful FL teachers. They
talked frequently about their strengths, solutions during problem-solving, and confidence as becoming FL teachers during ST. Those who (re)constructed teacher identities as capable, effective, and successful FL PSTs gradually saw themselves as certain types of FL teachers (i.e., grammar-based, hybrid, etc.). Alternatively, PSTs who struggled to establish their roles in the classroom as effective FL teachers continued to refer to themselves as student-teachers throughout ST. They struggled to see themselves as classroom teachers and tended to focus on the more local and immediate problems and weaknesses of their FL teaching rather than on what kinds of FL teachers they were trying to become.

Furthermore, the practical experiences of learning to teach FLs during ST also shaped PSTs’ teacher identity developments. All PSTs referenced the value of having had first-hand experiences (positive and negative) during ST upon which to base future pedagogical decisions, conduct critical self-reflections, and consider taking up or resisting certain identities as they developed as FL teachers. For some PSTs the practical experiences of ST raised personal and pedagogical concerns about their FL teaching, led some to reconsider their confidence in their linguistic and pedagogical abilities, and led one PST to realize that the field of education is not a career to pursue.

For several PSTs in this study, the experiences of ST in predominantly grammar-based FL classrooms led them to utilize hybrid approaches to FL teaching, a sort of blending of grammar-based and communicative approaches. They utilized different tools, modes of instruction, and created themselves as different types of FL teachers during ST than they had envisioned. PSTs’ teacher identities can be seen as dynamic and shifting; their former identities as becoming communicative FL PSTs gradually meshed
and blended with their emerging teacher identities being shaped and nurtured during ST. Moje and Lewis (2007) argue that learning has “the potential to make and remake selves, identities, and relationships” (p. 18). Given that learning has the potential to (re)shape identities, the differing ways in which these PSTs learned to teach FLs during preservice education consequently contributed in part to their emerging teacher identities.

In sum, the ways the PSTs identified and situated themselves in both learning-to-teach contexts; the ways PSTs were positioned and supported by their mentors, how PSTs resolved tensions in their personal, pedagogical, and situational understandings of learning-to-teach experiences influenced how they eventually envisioned themselves as prospective FL teachers. It is possible that some of the PSTs who took up the practices and identities of grammar-based FL teachers during ST, much like Watzke (2007) observed, did so only temporarily because their experiences of learning to become communicative FL teachers during FL education still existed within their range of possible and potential ways of becoming FL teachers. Given that identities are dynamic, socially situated, mediated by tools, contexts, and interactions with others (Moje & Luke, 2009), it is plausible that previous identities (or development towards other identities) may reemerge given favorable social interactions, support, and contexts. With that said, their early career experiences are pivotal to the possibility of these PSTs reconstructing themselves as communicative FL teachers.
Question 3b. How do PST’s beliefs, teaching tools, and commitment to FL teaching shape their identity development and vice versa?

The findings from this study indicate that the relationship among PST’s beliefs, use of tools, commitment to teaching, and their teacher identity development may be reciprocal in nature. Beliefs are understandings and propositions that an individual holds to be true and often drive one’s actions (Zheng, 2009). Individual’s beliefs enable self understanding and understanding of one’s surroundings. In the context of FL teaching, what one believes to be effective ways of learning FLs plays out in the various ways they conceptualize and carry out FL instruction. While their beliefs about best FL practices include their memories of their own FL learning experiences, they also include what they have been taught in the FL Education program and what they have learned during ST. The FL Education program informed their beliefs about constructivist theories of learning and conceptual and practical tools in FL teaching, in this case, the use of CLT. The experience of ST often provided PSTs with another possible range of conceptual and practical tools to use during instruction, as well as exposure to becoming other or new types of FL teachers. The tools provided to PSTs during both learning-to-teach contexts shaped their activity. In the FL Education program they were provided with tools to implement CLT and utilize the national FL standards; during ST, they were often provided with conceptual and practical tools to carry out grammar-based teaching. In both settings, the tools utilized shaped the activity and the types of FL teaching.

Given that both the university and the cooperating schools have been constructed through historically and culturally grounded actions and social participation, PSTs’ participation in both contexts mediated their ways of thinking, knowing, and doing.
Ways of thinking, knowing, acting, and identifying one’s self as certain types of FL teachers essentially contributes to one’s identities as a FL teacher. Identities are constructed and negotiated through meaningful experiences across time and space, social interactions, participations in Discourses, from recognition by others, through gaining a sense of similarity and difference, and through experiences of learning and problem-solving.

The specific ways in which the PSTs in this study learned to teach FLs, learned to utilize various tools (aligned with specific ways of FL teaching), and gradually came to see themselves as certain kinds of FL teachers had bearing on their identity developments during ST. In sum, the (mis)alignment of beliefs many PSTs held about FL teaching, the tools provided and utilized in each context, how they saw themselves and were recognized by others as becoming certain types of FL teachers contributed to PSTs’ development. For example, most PSTs initially reported wanting to teach their FLs using CLT during ST, but this created conflict when they were placed into FL classrooms with CTs who did not utilize such instruction. Most PSTs were faced with the dilemma of choosing between teaching FLs according to the beliefs and expectations of their CTs or to those of the university. For some PSTs, choosing one context over the other also meant ignoring their own personal and pedagogical beliefs and expectations.

PSTs’ commitment to FL teaching and to their emerging teacher identities also played an important role in the outcomes of this study. Olsen (2008) suggests that teacher identity development is cyclical rather than linear and is a compilation of one’s past, present, and future goals, motivations, and beliefs as an emerging teacher. He suggests considering PSTs’ reasons for entry into the field and how such reasons for
entry continue to motivate and influence development as they transition into the first years of teaching in the field. In addition to their development as novice teachers, looking into PSTs’ reasons for entry into the field may also shed light on their commitment to teaching and to their identities as certain kinds of FL teachers. Demerath (2006) suggests that individuals are motivated to affirm their understandings of identities when something has occurred that challenges or puts those identities in jeopardy. She further suggests that individuals “are most likely to work to maintain those identities” (p. 497) to which they are most committed.

In combining the efforts of Olsen (2008) and Demerath (2006), I argue that looking at PSTs’ reasons for entry may have bearing on PSTs’ commitment to the field. For example, Heidi entered FL education because she liked German and felt that her options of utilizing German professionally were limited, and therefore chose the field of FL education. Heidi was placed into two cooperating classroom contexts where both CTs’ methodology aligned with what she had learned during FL education; however, despite the alignment, she struggled (personally and linguistically) to carry out CLT as she had envisioned. Her teacher identity, as she had been constructing during FL education, was challenged. Rather than working toward overcoming her personal and linguistic deficiencies, she decided to leave the field. In sum, her beliefs, inabilities to utilize tools provided to her during ST, along with lack of one CT’s support and guidance during ST hindered her conceptualization of herself as an effective, competent communicative FL teacher. Her weaker reasons for entering the field of FL education did not sustain her willingness or commitment to overcome her personal challenges during ST nor toward becoming a FL teacher.
On the contrary, Mora expressed stronger reasons for entry into the field of FL education: that of a lifelong vocational calling to teach, and for her passion and excitement for all things French. Her year abroad learning French, coupled with the ideologies she learned and the support she was given in the FL Education program led her to maintain her visions of best FL teaching practices and to construct a teacher identity as a communicative FL teacher. She was committed to these beliefs and identities despite being coupled with a grammar-based teacher during ST. ST provided Mora with a different approach and other tools to carry out grammar-based teaching forcing Mora to sort out and create a sustainable teacher identity during ST.

As Olsen (2008) suggests, teacher development occurs on a continuum rather than in a linear fashion. He posits that teachers rely on their understandings of themselves as teachers and that these understandings inform teachers’ beliefs, interpretations, and evaluations. Considering the broader picture or context of PST development, by including the construct of commitment, I suggest may further shed light on current issues of teacher development and teacher attrition. PSTs’ emerging beliefs, motives, use of tools, and personal commitment are intertwined and influence each other in ways that contribute to PSTs’ teacher identity developments. Herein lies the power of AT as an analytical framework—it provides an opportunity to visualize how each component within the activity system influences the others while simultaneously capturing the system as a whole (Johnson, 2009, p. 79). When these components within both situated activity systems misalign, as was mostly the case, opportunities exist for PSTs to problem-solve, to critically reflect upon their teaching and teaching situations, and to create, work towards, or recreate identities as different types of FL teachers.
Pedagogical Implications

The notion of dissonance that many PSTs perceive in their education coursework at the university and their field experiences teaching in K-12 schools has been termed the “two-worlds pitfall” by Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann (1985). All PSTs involved with this study perceived gaps in what they believed, learned, and practiced during FL education with what they experienced in their cooperating classrooms during ST. The following implications are proposed for filling in some of those gaps for PSTs in the future. These suggestions are not intended to be exhaustive but rather are meant to open the forum for discussing ways in which PSTs and novice FL teachers can be further supported in their learning, teaching, teacher identity developments, professional development, and future commitments to the field.

Considering the activity systems and the PSTs’ actions within such contexts as a unit of analysis provides a more cohesive look into important aspects of these seven PSTs’ experiences learning to teach FLs. First, in examining the undergraduate FL Education program I observed various patterns that often had bearing on PSTs’ learning to teach experiences and their teacher identity formations. There is general consensus about the importance of images, beliefs, and visions that teacher candidates bring with them into (FL) education (Lortie, 1975; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Sumara & Luce-Kapler, 1996; Barnes, 2005), but little formal examination or exploration of these preconceptions were considered during these PSTs’ study in FL Education. Some researchers have urged teacher educators of the importance of having teacher candidates conduct self-action research in order to help them become more aware of such beliefs, perspectives, and
reasons for their practices (Danielwicz, 2001; Britzman, 1991; Antonek et al., 1997; Rosaen & Florio-Ruane, 2008; Rodgers & Scott, 2008). However, in this study the PSTs engaged in little self-action research or reflectivity during FL education.

The notion of tracking the development of PSTs’ teacher beliefs, learning, and identity formations has been documented in the research (Grossman, 1990; Borg 2006; Zapata & Lacorte, 2007; Phipps & Borg, 2009), and such studies provide input for teacher educators regarding how to better prepare novice FL teachers. Tracking such development of PSTs as they enter into teacher education programs would allow them to more clearly visualize and assess their personal and pedagogical motives, development, and strengths and weaknesses over time. Tracking development and teacher identity formations should be conducted (and documented) by teacher educators and PSTs through one-on-one interviews, critical self-reflections, journaling, portfolios, examination of relevant case studies, and increased participation in professional development opportunities. In doing so, teacher educators would be able to be more proactive in providing additional support or intervention to PSTs questioning their evolving pedagogical beliefs, emerging teacher identities, classroom practices, or wavering commitments to the field.

The PSTs in this study spent little time reflecting about their guiding assumptions and underlying motives during FL education and ST. Feiman-Nemser (2001) suggests that without PSTs being engaged “in critical examination of their beliefs in light of compelling alternatives and help them develop powerful images of good teaching and strong professional commitments, these entering beliefs will continue to shape their ideas and practices” (p. 1017). Many of the beliefs and memories these PSTs entered into ST
with did come into play during ST, as I discovered during interviews I conducted during this study. During interviews several PSTs expressed that their university supervisors mostly focused on PSTs’ teaching in the moment rather than on their preconceived notions of teaching or former memories of schooling. Some PSTs’ preconceived ideas about best FL practices and their prospective roles as communicative teachers seemed superficial in nature, in that they were based on false assumptions of who their student audiences would be and that they would have the freedom to teach however they wanted in their cooperating classrooms. Teacher educators and university supervisors, in conjunction with CTs, must help set realistic expectations of and for PSTs within their teaching environments.

As teacher educators, we should help PSTs come to envision and experience K-12 learning environments as potential places of meaningful FL learning that can provide students with the tools and knowledge to become lifelong global citizens. In order to promote more global student learning, PSTs need to become advocates for their FLs and better understand the ways in which their FL teaching shapes student FL learning and attitudes (ACTFL, 1999). In setting practical expectations, PSTs need more time in the field working with student learners before they enter into ST. Teacher educators may also provide individual case studies of more and less experienced FL teachers for PSTs to study, examine, and critique. In addition, PSTs should be provided with multiple experiences of video-recording their own teaching and then conducting critical self-reflection (Bartlett, 1990). Several PSTs in this study expressed concern regarding the need for additional field experiences in K-12 classrooms before ST. In essence, making the claim that more experiences in the field might have helped them grasp a clearer
understanding of the expectations of student-to-teacher interactions, student-to-student interactions, and of managing individual and classroom behaviors in general.

In addition to more exposure to FL teaching during preservice education, PSTs should become more knowledgeable about and familiar with FL textbooks and supplemental materials. While the PSTs in this study often discussed the benefits of utilizing authentic texts and materials in the FL classroom and practiced incorporating such materials into their teaching, PSTs were not shown how to utilize, follow, nor select appropriate textbooks for optimal FL learning or teaching. During the FL methods courses the national FL standards are taught to guide PSTs’ FL instruction, not the textbook. This became a source of conflict for many PSTs after they began student-teaching because their CTs taught mostly from the textbook and therefore expected the PSTs to carry out the same type of instruction. During FL education (and thereafter) PSTs should be provided with guiding frameworks that inform their understandings not only about choosing textbooks and materials that align with their school’s program goals, but also understandings about how various types of textbook activities may (not) promote or encourage different types of FL learning (i.e., communicative, translation, etc.)

Another pedagogical implication that should be considered and more closely monitored in teacher education programs is the extent of PSTs’ pedagogical and language learning. Appropriate measures for assessing teacher candidates’ FL skills need to be in place in order to ensure FL proficiency in the classroom. While the PSTs involved with this study were required to obtain a certain score on the FL content Praxis examinations, they were not required to conduct a formal oral proficiency interview (OPI) as required by NCATE and ACTFL teacher standards guidelines. This created a conflict for several
PSTs in this study not only because they expressed concern for their FL proficiency and whether or not they would score well enough (as required by NCATE and the state department of education) on an OPI to proceed to the ST practicum. This raises the question of FL proficiency among PSTs—in the case of this study, the responsibility of PSTs’ FL learning and proficiency belonged to the various FL departments on campus. There was little communication between the FL departments and the FL Education department, which is integral in assuring that FL teacher candidates are linguistically prepared to take such FL proficiency examinations.

In addition to properly assessing FL proficiency, more stringent measures should be implemented to account for PSTs’ learning and appropriation of pedagogical tools during FL education. Some of the PSTs involved with this study seemed to have abandoned (at least during ST) their previous beliefs about best FL teaching practices because they had not fully appropriated the tools (promoted during FL education) necessary to carry out communicative-based pedagogy. Grossman et al. (1999) suggest that “[T]he extent of appropriation depends on the congruence of a learner’s values, prior experiences, and goals with those of more experienced or powerful members of a culture…” (p. 15) and in order to provide clearer depictions of the PSTs’ use of communicative FL teaching the five degrees of appropriation are being utilized. The proposed degrees of appropriation range from lack of appropriation to achieving mastery. Most PSTs in this study seemed to fit into the level of appropriating surface features (i.e., Eva, Kate, Sara, Paco, and Chela). However, two PSTs fit into other categories: conceptual underpinnings (i.e., Mora) and appropriating labels (i.e., Heidi). In many cases, the PSTs who had appropriated only labels and surface features of the tools
necessary to carry out communicative FL instruction had not formed allegiances to their beliefs about communicative FL instruction, nor did they have powerful images of communicative FL instruction modeled during ST. Guidance during FL education and ST in examining one’s emerging beliefs, understanding what constitutes effective FL teaching and why (and how), along with monitoring and supporting PSTs’ appropriation of tools would help provide PSTs with more profound and grounded pedagogical experiences and understanding. This could be done by more closely aligning and increasing the amount of time and support university supervisors give to PSTs or by arranging for greater involvement of the FL Education faculty with PSTs during ST. Ensuring these (university-oriented) principles would help take PSTs beyond obtaining surface level appropriation of the tools necessary to carry out CLT to appropriating the conceptual underpinnings of communicative FL teaching, and perhaps to gradually achieve mastery.

This segues into suggestions of ways to help move PSTs beyond appropriating only labels or surface features (Grossman et al., 1999) and fill in some of the gaps they perceive between the two learning-to-teach FLs contexts. It should be a main concern and priority of those involved in (FL) education programs to pay special attention to the placing of PSTs with CTs during field placements. As Farrell (2002) suggests, one of the most important contributors to the success of novice teachers is the role of teacher socialization. Farrell (2002) posits that guided support and mentorship are essential for new teachers during teacher induction, and further, that novice teachers who participate in mentor experiences tend to leave the profession at a rate lower than teachers who do not experience a mentorship.
It is clear that these PSTs’ initial expectations for ST were largely based on personal experiences and perceptions, as well as with university-oriented ideologies. Given that, “[T]he settings for teacher education are intertwined with their historic, cultural, and economic roots” (Houston, 2008, p. 389) greater examination of those underlying premises is need in order to more fully comprehend how PSTs develop and learn to teach FLs. Houston, in essence, reiterates one of the underlying premises significant in AT, which suggests the importance of examining the features of the contexts surrounding individuals in their learning-to-teach experiences. The FL Education department, in line with what NCATE and ACTFL deem as best FL practices, promoted and advocated such visionary goals and practices aimed at transforming the FL teaching profession. Only two CTs in this study utilized such instruction at the time of this study.

The role of CTs in this study (both positive and negative) clearly gave shape to the PSTs’ learning-to-teach experiences, their changing beliefs about FL teaching and their emerging identities as FL teachers during ST. As a caveat, most CTs reported what seemed to be altruistic motives for taking on the responsibilities of having a ST in their classrooms, despite the fact that they do receive a form of financial compensation for their efforts and time during ST. In this study, however, two PSTs were placed with two CTs who had not requested to have a PST in their classrooms during ST. This merits attention to the selection process for CTs utilized by the university. Much closer examination is needed—not only of the schools in terms of their curriculum offerings and geographical settings, but also of the CTs’ motives and their guiding philosophies of FL education. It is imperative that CTs’ motives and instructional approaches align to a
certain degree with those of the university if communicative FL instruction is to become a reality in tomorrow’s FL classrooms.

Furthermore, it was clear from this study that a need exists for more FL faculty involvement with PSTs during ST. The nature of the relationship of the university supervisors is one that has no personal or academic history to build upon with PSTs. With that said, the university supervisors had little prior knowledge of PSTs’ FL and pedagogical learning experiences, and what is more, they had no established personal connection. In some cases PSTs (Heidi, especially) felt inhibited by the new, impersonal, formal relationships they had to cultivate with their university supervisors. As a result, Heidi frequently turned to outside resources and to others (including me) to elicit help rather than turn to her university supervisor. Some PSTs perceived some tension in finding out that not all university supervisors required the same amount of work from the PSTs, for example, the student teachers of Spanish and German had to email their weekly lesson plans to their university supervisors, but the student teachers of French only submitted their lesson plans when the university supervisor came to conduct an observation. Another source of tension for some PSTs was caused by the fact that not all of the university supervisors spoke the FLs the PSTs were teaching. While the university supervisors argued that they based their classroom observation reviews on how well the PSTs performed pedagogically during ST, some PSTs felt disheartened wondering how supervisors could properly evaluate their FL teaching performances when they were not proficient in the FL.

On a final note, the FL Education program should require more participation in professional development opportunities for PSTs. Only four of the seven PSTs in this
study had attended one or more FL conferences during their study at Calico University. Each of the four PSTs reported that their experiences attending such professional organization conferences and workshops were motivating and informative to their development as FL teacher candidates. PSTs who had not participated in FL conferences attributed the following reasons for not having done so: expense, time restrictions, and a belief that such conferences were aimed towards teachers already in the field. Greater participation in professional organizations and professional development opportunities are needed to help PSTs and novice FL teachers continue in their lifelong development of FL proficiency, cultural awareness, and knowledge of FL teaching (Schrier, 2009).

Understanding the ways in which and the degree to which such changes in PSTs’ perspectives about FL teaching and teacher identity formations take place and further influence their commitment to the field of FL education is needed. More longitudinal studies examining FL teachers’ beliefs, appropriation of tools, and emerging identities over time and across development would help provide explanation for some reasons why a significant number of new teachers leave the field within a few years of teaching (Ingersoll, 2001).

Implications for Research

For the field of FL education, questions remain regarding best methods of preparing FL teachers to become effective, competent, and proficient FL teachers. Questions surrounding “how communication in the target language can occur in classrooms, how learners can be led to discover cultural perspectives, how language proficiency can continue to develop in a content-based classroom…” still need rejoining
In order to obtain possible answers, closer investigation into how novice teachers are learning and practicing to teach FLs during teacher education and teacher induction is needed. Further investigation, which looks into the possible relationships among approaches to FL instruction, student FL learning, and educational and administrative regulations and limitations of today’s FL classrooms, is merited.

Exploring preservice and novice FL teachers’ experiences, as stated in their own words, in studies which examine contexts of learning and teaching, personal beliefs, and FL practices during teacher education and teacher induction (over time) may provide a clearer understanding of the ways in which novice and experienced FL teachers’ identities are gradually constructed and reconstructed. Examining whether (and in which contexts) novice and preservice FL teachers may experience periods of time where they feel less committed to teaching is important to teacher educators and administrators in their understandings of teacher development and teacher attrition. It may shed light on if and how their early teacher identity developments have bearing on their motivation and commitments to FL teaching. Many questions still remain unanswered.

According to Franzak (2002), PSTs begin to construct an explicit view of his or her self as a teacher while attempting to balance multiple influences. It has been documented in the literature that factors such as, previous role models, prior teaching experiences, education courses, and former learning experiences give shape to teachers’ self-conceptions and further play a role in the success and transition of preservice teachers into novice teachers (Lortie, 1975; Franzak, 2002; Newell et al., 2001; White & Moss, 2003; Watzke, 2007). While these studies consider PSTs and novice teachers as the predominant actor in the teaching and learning context, the recipients of such teaching
should also be considered. Such studies should be taken further by considering how these FL teachers are simultaneously developing relationships with their student learners. Cochran-Smith and Fries (2008) suggest that further research in FL education is needed which not only attempts to untangle “the relationships between and among teachers’ knowledge and beliefs, their professional skill and performance in classrooms, and their pupil’s learning” as well (p. 1087). The PSTs involved with this study, as in Shulman’s (1986) and Kwo’s (1996) gave credence to how they were perceived by their student learners in the classroom during ST; however, little attention during teacher education was dedicated to learning about how to cultivate relationships with student learners. Such understanding is needed regarding how such relationships are built, maintained, and might have bearing on PSTs’ growth and practices as FL teachers.

Finally, PSTs’ beliefs about FL teaching, in combination with what and how they learn to teach during FL education and ST, contribute to their conceptualizations of themselves as novice FL teachers. Sumara and Luce-Kapler (1996) suggest that beginning teachers must negotiate at least three types of teaching identities: those that they bring with them into teacher education, those that they develop during their teacher preparation courses, and those that they develop during their student-teaching experience (p. 65). While many PSTs in this study did seem to develop or show at least three types of teaching identities during their time at Calico University, I would argue that one PST, Mora, gradually developed a core teacher identity over time and merits closer attention. Meaning that, for many years Mora’s motives for becoming a French teacher were aligned and supported by other significant contributing factors in her life—her extended time in France leading her to believe in the power of FL learning through immersion, the
FL Education program espousing a communicative approach to FL teaching, her love and passion of the content matter, and finally, her lifelong dream of working with children and becoming a teacher. While her experiences during her trajectory toward becoming a French teacher were not always easy, for the most part, these important elements of her learning to teach were in sync and supportive of each other in many ways. Such alignment contributed to the notion of a greater more unified understanding of what kind of FL teacher Mora wanted to become.

It was clear in the present study that PSTs’ teacher identities waxed and waned during ST; suggesting gradual, flexible, and dynamic identities that are influenced by many factors. It seems plausible that some PSTs were in the process of developing what Gee (2000) calls ‘core’ identities as FL teachers. Gee (2000) states that: “[W]hen any human being acts and interacts in a given context, others recognize that person as acting and interacting as a certain ‘kind of person’ or even as several different ‘kinds’ at once” (p. 99). He argues that individuals have and maintain multiple identities that are connected to their performances and behavior in society. Gee suggests that humans possess a “core identity” which manifests itself in ways through which individuals participate and are involved in various Discourses. Such Discourses, especially those in the field of education, are historical, social, and cultural in nature, and therefore, people’s multiple, varied, and timely experiences within such Discourses shape one’s multifaceted identity. Gee (2000) suggests that the visual fluidity of an identity, ostensibly having multiple dimensions, is actually situation-specific aspects of the core identity. I suggest that some of the teacher identities being (re)constructed in and through experiences over time during ST are perhaps done so in the form of tiers that develop or mold onto a core
teacher identity. When the motives and tools align within and between learning-to-teach FL contexts and the social interactions between the community and the PSTs are meaningful and supportive, learning and identity development have the potential to be more in sync—perhaps as in the way of layering onto an already emerging core teacher identity. When the contexts, motives, tools, and social interactions within the community and contexts do not align, PSTs often conceptualize other ways of teaching and begin taking on identities as other types of FL teachers. Taking on other identities as types of FL teachers would likely lead PSTs to eventually take up one or few and resist others, thus, implying more of teacher identity with many different layers.

In this study, for example, Mora had been constructing a core teacher identity for a long time. Mora dreamt about becoming a French teacher since early adolescence. She truly enjoyed speaking and learning French and about Francophone cultures and wanted to altruistically share her passion with others. She entered into teacher education believing in the power of learning a FL through immersion; essentially her year-long study-abroad experience showed her of the importance of language exposure and engagement in the FL. During FL education she was open to and enthusiastic about CLT and the national FL standards because they espoused many aspects of FL teaching that she found essential to engaging and successful FL learning (i.e., communication, cultures, connections, comparisons, and communities). Even while she participated in ST, with a CT who utilized grammar-based instruction in the classroom, her belief in and allegiance to CLT and the national FL standards as best FL teaching practices grew. She was able to complete ST believing and projecting herself as an effective and successful communicative FL teacher, as well as professing the value and visions of CLT. For
Mora, many crucial aspects were in place in her linguistic and academic preparation, pedagogical understandings, and practical experiences interacting with young learners. In Mora’s case, it seemed that she continuously developed, sustained, and expanded her evolving “core” identity as a communicative French teacher during both teacher education and ST.

Limitations of the study

Generalizations. Generalizations to other similar populations can not be made from this study due to the small number of participants and its’ qualitative nature. Lincoln and Guba (1989) suggest that qualitative researchers only provide the details and descriptions needed to enable someone else to make a transfer of the information gained from a certain context. It is the responsibility of the reader to transfer, with caution, the data or findings gathered from one study and apply them to a similar situation or group (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 2002).

Stimulated Recall. The stimulated recall technique used in this study may have engendered thoughts that were not representative of the self-reported levels of each PST’s confidence at the time of the original written assignment. Retrospective data must be approached with caution when interpreting the findings.
Coding. It must be noted that the frequencies of the coding of classroom observations of the seven PSTs in this study varied based on number of classroom observations (i.e., most PSTs were observed three times, however Kate was observed four times), length of class session (Mora and Sara taught on 90-minute block schedules, while Eva, Paco, and Kate taught on 44-46 minutes schedules, and still Heidi, at the Kindergarten placement was on a 27 minute class schedule), and student language levels (meaning that in some cases, such as Kindergarten German it would not be expected that Heidi would necessarily utilize the same tools as would Kate teaching a class of third year of French students at the high school).

Terminology. It should be worth mentioning that some in the field of FL education, particularly those whose advocate best teaching practices such as those put forth by ACTFL, now prefer the terms “modern languages” or “world languages” as opposed to “foreign languages” (ACTFL, 2006). I have chosen to maintain the utilization of “foreign languages” throughout this paper for it is such term that is readily understood by those in and out of the field.
Summary

This chapter revisited the literature and data from this study in order to discuss the beliefs, tools and visions PSTs develop about FL teaching during FL education and ST. This chapter discussed various ways in which PSTs’ experiences in learning to teach FLs within teacher education and ST contexts gave shape to their teacher identity development. Moreover, it considered how learning to use communicative FL instruction shaped PSTs’ teacher identity development, and finally, how teacher identity development may have bearing on PSTs’ commitment to FL teaching. It is Mora’s case, in particular, that gives FL educators hope for the possible resurgence of communicative-based FL teaching in K-12 classrooms, or hope that what is taught during teacher education is not lost when the contexts for learning to teach do not align. Her previous FL learning experiences, passion for French, and clear understandings of communicative FL teaching fostered by the FL Education program provided Mora with a conceptualization of best FL teaching practices that she was able to maintain despite a 16-week ST practicum in which she learned utilizing other FL methodology.

Pedagogical implications included (1) a perceived gap in learning to teach FLs contexts; (2) a need for tracking PST development (motives, pedagogical content knowledge, and teacher identity) over time; (3) measured FL skills and appropriation of tools; (4) a lack of practical experiences and exposure to K-12 FL classrooms prior to ST; (5) closer selection of CTs and cooperating FL classroom for ST placements; (6) a greater need for university presence during ST; and (7) a need for more professional FL organizational participation among PSTs.
Additional research is needed to better support FL educators in their teaching of PSTs; more specifically, research that covers a range of FL teacher learning and identity development spanning teacher education through teacher induction. Research that explores possible relationships between teacher identity development and commitment to FL teaching is encouraged. What is more, teacher education research that considers the dynamics of how PSTs attempt to construct and build relationships with their student learners in the classroom is also needed. And finally, PSTs’ motives (weak or strong) for entering FL education and becoming FL teachers have bearing on their teacher identity development and further commitments to FL teaching and should be considered early on during teacher education.
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Appendix A: Language Biography Prompt
Appendix A: Language Biography Prompt

Please describe your foreign language learning experiences up until this point in your life. Please consider the following important aspects that should be included in your language biography: how or why you became interested in learning your foreign language, what your middle and/or high school foreign language learning experiences were like, any particular teachers that were important to you (use a fake name), any travel experiences, study abroad experiences, unique or meaningful college foreign language learning experiences, favorite cultural aspects of the target language, and any other information that you feel is important to why you are about to become a foreign language teacher.

What methodological approach(es) (i.e., grammar-based, communicative, etc.) were used during your FL study at the high school and college levels?
Appendix B: Demographic Questionnaire
Appendix B: Demographic Questionnaire

1. What foreign or second languages have you studied? __________________________

2. How long have you studied this/these languages?
   (FL#1) ______ years    (FL#2) ______ years
   (FL#3) ______ years    (FL #4) ______ years

3. Have you studied abroad in a country where this/these language(s) were spoken as a first language by the majority of speakers? _____
   If so, where and how long were you there? ___________  _______________
   How old were you when you were there? __________

4. Have you lived in a country where this/these language(s) were spoken as a first language by the majority of speakers? ______
   If so, where and how long were you there? ______
   How old were you at this time? ______

5. Have you taken the Praxis Examination (PLT)? ______
   If so, what was your score? ______

6. Have you taken the Praxis Content Examination? ______
   If so, what was your approximate score? ______

7. Have you participated in an OPI in the foreign language that you are going to teach? __
   If so, what was your ACTFL rating? __________

8. Do you have any prior teaching experience? _______
   If yes, please explain.

9. Do you have any prior language teaching experience? ______________
   If yes, please explain.
Appendix C: Focus Group Interview Questions
Appendix C: Focus Group Interview Questions

1. In your opinion, what is the purpose of student teaching?

2. What do you envision as best FL teaching practices? Why?

3. What are you most looking forward to during student teaching?

4. What are you most apprehensive about before starting the practicum?

5. What personal goals do you want to reach or achieve during student teaching?

6. What goals do you have for your future student learners?

7. What kind of teacher will you be or do you want to be?

8. What is your vision of an ideal FL classroom?
Appendix D: Card-sort Tasks
Appendix D: Card-sort Tasks

Task 1. Please rank the education and FL methods courses in an order that depicts courses more meaningful to the formation of your visions of what effective FL teaching is and according to which classes may have most impacted your understandings or perceptions of yourself as a teacher (either positively or negatively). After ranking the courses take a few minutes to think about your choices and explain them by providing details about each of your choices.

Task 2. Each FL standard is written on a note card. You need to choose a card and talk about how that standard may inform your teaching or impact your lesson planning. Please explain how you envision meeting the (ACTFL) standards during your upcoming student teaching practicum. Also include how you conceptualize the five C’s (communication, cultures, comparisons, connections, and communities) from the ACTFL guidelines as part of an effective FL classroom and effective FL instruction.
Appendix E: Stimulated Recall Procedure
Appendix E: Stimulated Recall Procedure

Students will be asked to bring to the first interview any reflection papers or final projects from their FL methods courses that they wish to share and comment on. They will be asked to reflect upon the assignments and talk about the processes they went through while completing the assignments. They will also be asked to comment on how these projects may have provided them with new or different visions of what teaching entails in terms of preparation and planning.
Appendix F: Weekly Blog Questions
Appendix F: Weekly Blog Questions

1. What is your vision of a model foreign language teacher?

2. Describe your school’s climate. How do the teachers interact with each other and with students? Does it seem positive? Are staff and students generally happy to be there?

3. How do you feel around other teachers and administrators in the school? Why?

4. How do you feel that your students generally respond to you? Please explain.

5. What are the main things that you personally consider when planning lessons?

6. Describe or use a metaphor to describe how you personally are transitioning from being a full-time student to being a full-time teacher? Explain metaphor.

7. How much time beyond the usual contract hours of the school day are you spending for school-related things?

8. Are there noticeable differences in perspectives on teaching between you and your cooperating teacher? Has this impacted your teaching? If so, how?

9. What has been the most surprising interaction or event that you have witnessed so far during your student teaching placement?

10. How do you perceive your time management and organization skills? What has this experience taught you in regards to the above?

11. Describe your relationship with your students in general? Do you find it challenging to be an authoritarian rather than a peer? Why or why not?

12. What have you learned most from your students? What kinds of learning or experiences (positive or negative) has this experience provided you?

13. Have the prior expectations that you had for your students and/or of yourself, as the French/Spanish/German teacher, changed during the past 12 weeks? If so, please describe how and why.
14. Now that student teaching is nearly over, what do you feel have been your strongest assets as a new foreign language teacher?

15. In what ways, if any, has your student teaching experience impacted your sense of self as a foreign language teacher?

16. Is there anything that you feel was lacking from your student teaching experience? If so, please explain.

17. How well prepared do you feel for your first teaching job? What do you think has contributed most significantly to you feeling prepared (or not prepared)?
Appendix G: FL Classroom Observation Protocol
Appendix G: FL Classroom Observation Protocol

Student teacher _______________   Date: _________
Lesson #: _____   Week of Observation: ______
Day of the Week: _________   Period of the Day: _________
Foreign Language: _____   Level: _________
Number of students: _____   Length of class (minutes): ______

Describe the lesson (apparent purpose, unique features, content, etc.) and its apparent continuity with previous and succeeding lessons.

Describe the type of homework assigned and the apparent purpose (to practice skills, to extend lesson, etc.)

Describe evidence of state FL Academic Content standards/ACTFL guidelines in lesson.

Describe evidence of instructional strategies or techniques taught in FL methods courses used in this lesson.

Describe evidence of planning for this lesson.

Describe evidence of model (communicative) foreign language teaching.
Log of Class Activity

Use this form to record the sequence of activities in class, indicating major shifts by recording the time in the left-hand column. The right hand column describes the content and FL approaches used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description of activities</th>
<th>Observer’s Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Breakdown of class time: (to be filled in after transcription of class observation)

- Instructor uses English
  - _______%
- Instructor uses target language
  - _______%
- Students respond in English
  - _______%
- Students respond in target language
  - _______%
- Student time on collaborative work
  - _______%
- Student time working independently
  - _______%
- Time spent transitioning activities
  - _______%
- Time spent working from the book
  - _______%
- Time spent on or with target culture(s)
  - _______%
Appendix H: Cooperating Teacher Interview Questions
Appendix H: Cooperating Teacher Interview Questions

1. Please describe the climate of your school. How does foreign language learning fit into this climate? Is there a foreign language department?

2. Please describe your vision of ‘model foreign language teaching’.

3. How do you incorporate this vision of model FL teaching into your own FL classes?

4. Describe your approach to FL teaching? Do you modify this approach for any particular group of learners? If so, please explain.

5. In your opinion, how do most students best learn a foreign language?

6. How do you provide these types of learning opportunities for your students?

7. How do you typically plan your daily or weekly lessons?

8. What are your guiding policies or standards when creating lesson plans?

9. What strategies do you use for engaging all students?

10. How would you describe your approach to classroom management?

11. Do you see a connection or link between classroom management and student learning? Explain.

12. What are your goals for your student teacher while under your supervision?

13. How do you envision her role in your classroom?

14. What aspects are crucial for any foreign language student teacher to learn, know, or understand prior to starting his or her first teaching job?

15. How will you better prepare your student teacher to learn, know or understand this?
Appendix I: School Administrator Questions
Appendix I: School Administrator Questions

1. Please describe the school’s climate. How does foreign language learning fit into this climate?

2. How do you and other administrators try to create a positive teaching and learning environment for both teachers and students?

3. How do the parents and community work together?

4. What are your professional visions for this school and the staff?

5. Please describe your vision of model or excellent teaching and of FL teaching.

6. How is the hiring of foreign language teachers conducted in this school/district?

7. How are foreign language teachers held accountable for student learning?

8. In what ways, if any, do you feel that university teacher education programs in general could better prepare student teachers for meeting today’s students’ needs?
Appendix J: Interview Questions with FL Education Faculty

(Dean, FL methods Instructor, and University Supervisors)
Appendix J: Interview Questions with FL Education Faculty

Interview Questions for the Dean

1. What is your goal for the foreign language education ‘department’ within Teacher Education at this university?

2. How do you anticipate realizing this goal?

3. How is foreign language education as a field of study generally respected by other departments within your university? (For example, by individual language departments)

4. What are the steps that students enrolled in the Foreign Language Teacher Education program go through in order to become licensed foreign language teachers in the state? At what stage in their study do they begin their experiential pedagogical learning”?

5. How do instructors, supervisors, and faculty work together to provide meaningful language teaching experiences and knowledge for these students?

6. What do you feel are some of the biggest challenges in preparing these undergraduate foreign language teachers?

7. How does this program meet or attempt to meet those challenges?

8. What are some of the ways in which this Foreign Language Education program holds students accountable for becoming successful prospective foreign language teachers?

9. Does the foreign language education ‘department’ within Teacher Education incorporate the local community in preparing future foreign language teachers?

10. What is your personal vision of excellent foreign language teaching?
Interview Questions for FL methods instructor

1. Describe the nature of the FL methods courses that you teach.

2. What are the main components of the classroom instruction?

3. What are your goals or objectives for these courses?

4. Describe your vision of good or model foreign language teaching.

5. What do you feel the students gain (personally and pedagogically) from these courses?

6. What types of experiences do the field placements in the FL methods courses provide to the students? Are they complementary to the goals and objectives of the methods courses? If so, in what ways?

7. Is relevant information shared between the teacher education department and foreign language departments? If so, how?

8. What are the requirements that all FL teacher candidates must pass in order to be recommended to the state for licensure?

9. How are teacher candidates supported and encouraged to become effective FL teachers in this program?
University Supervisor Questionnaire

1. Please describe the nature of your relationship with the student teachers? Do you know them outside of this supervising context?

2. What is your professional role at the university?

3. Please describe your role as a student teacher supervisor. Are you a mentor, a facilitator, or an observer? Do student teachers receive a grade or direct feedback from you regarding their teaching performance? If so, when?

4. What specific qualities or abilities are you looking to evaluate when you conduct the classroom observations? Are they language or teaching related or both?

5. When conducting classroom observations for (name of student teacher) do you use a classroom observation protocol? Does the student teacher know ahead of time when you are coming to the classroom to observe and generally what your expectations are?

6. Do you evaluate other work from the student teachers besides their performance in the cooperating classroom?

7. Please describe the communication process that takes place between you, the cooperating teacher, the student teacher, and any other staff or faculty at the university in regards to the student teaching practicum.

8. Please describe your vision of a model foreign language teacher and of effective FL instruction.
Appendix K: Self-reported Measures (pre and post)
Appendix K: Self-reported Measures

Pre Student-teaching

1. How would you rate your knowledge of the target language? Circle one.
   Poor       good       very good       excellent       unsure

2. How would you rate your knowledge of the target culture(s)? Circle one.
   Poor       good       very good       excellent       unsure

3. How would you rate your knowledge of teaching the target language? Circle one.
   Poor       good       very good       excellent       unsure

4. On a scale from one to ten (ten being the highest) rate your level of self-confidence in teaching your FL prior to beginning student-teaching. Circle a number.
   1       2       3       4       5       6       7       8       9       10 (highest)
Post Student-teaching

1. How would you rate your knowledge of the target language? Circle one.
   Poor     good     very good     excellent     unsure

2. How would rate your knowledge of the target culture(s)? Circle one.
   Poor     good     very good     excellent     unsure

3. How would you rate your knowledge of teaching the target language? Circle one.
   Poor     good     very good     excellent     unsure

4. On a scale from one to ten (ten being the highest) rate your level of self-confidence in teaching your FL after student-teaching. Circle a number.
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10 (highest)