A Profile of Teacher Development in Literacy Instruction From Preservice Education to Beginning Teaching

Dixie D. Massey
University of Washington

A Profile of Teacher Development in Literacy Instruction From Preservice Education to Beginning Teaching

Abstract

The purpose of this research was to better understand and describe how three teachers navigated the transition from preservice teaching to the beginning years of teaching. I followed three teachers through their junior and senior years of undergraduate education and into their first four years of teaching. While the context of their entire teaching experience was important, particular attention was given to their literacy instruction, first as they conceptualized it in reading and language arts methods coursework, second as they practiced it in their student teaching experiences, and third as they practiced it in their own classrooms. A Profile of Teacher Literacy Development was developed to represent the knowledge teachers demonstrated and how they applied that knowledge. This profile was created to represent a more complete picture of teacher development than the existing stage models of teacher development, specifically as development related to literacy instruction. Based on the data collected and the Profile, challenges and implications are described as they apply to teacher education.

Creative Commons License

A Profile of Teacher Development in Literacy Instruction From Preservice Education to Beginning Teaching

Dixie D. Massey
University of Washington, Seattle, Washington

Abstract

The purpose of this research was to better understand and describe how three teachers navigated the transition from preservice teaching to the beginning years of teaching. I followed three teachers through their junior and senior years of undergraduate education and into their first four years of teaching. While the context of their entire teaching experience was important, particular attention was given to their literacy instruction, first as they conceptualized it in reading and language arts methods coursework, second as they practiced it in their student teaching experiences, and third as they practiced it in their own classrooms. A Profile of Teacher Literacy Development was developed to represent the knowledge teachers demonstrated and how they applied that knowledge. This profile was created to represent a more complete picture of teacher development than the existing stage models of teacher development, specifically as development related to literacy instruction. Based on the data collected and the Profile, challenges and implications are described as they apply to teacher education

The purpose of this research was to better understand and describe how three teachers transitioned from preservice teaching into their beginning years of teaching. I followed three teachers through their junior and senior years of undergraduate education and into their first four years of teaching. While the context of their entire teaching experience was important, the focus of this particular study was given to their literacy instruction, first as they conceptualized it in reading and language arts methods courses, second as they practiced it in their student teaching experiences, and third as they practiced it in their own classrooms.

This research focused specifically on the preservice and beginning years of teaching. These years are critical, for it is when the foundations of instruction are formed. We know that many preservice teachers may find jobs outside the field of education based on personal, financial, and other reasons. Those who do go into teaching have a high attrition rate within the first few years of teaching. These reasons make it critical that we take an ongoing look at the challenges teachers are facing in those years and how they respond to those challenges.

In particular, I focused my attention on these three teachers' literacy instruction. Literacy instruction is critical to a teacher's success in today's classrooms. High-stakes testing has made reading and writing curriculum and consulting big business. Many schools devote the most instructional time to literacy; however, that

instruction is quite often skill and drill or test-practice based. Teachers are often judged on how well their students score on the high-stakes tests, and as in the case of these three teachers, they receive monetary bonuses for certain levels of achievement. Unfortunately, within this testing environment, there exists an increasing divide between what is taught in teacher education programs and what teachers are expected to do within their classrooms. While higher education instructors often model and teach a balanced approach to literacy instruction, relying on teachers as decision-makers (Donovan, 1999; Zeek & Wickstrom, 1999), K-12 schools are frequently looking for teacher compliance (Duffy, 2005) to curricular and school-wide programs. This creates a challenging environment that teachers must navigate as they begin their careers.

Theoretical Framework

This research was guided by the literature on teacher knowledge, teacher development, and effective teacher studies. Particular attention was given to knowledge, development, and effective teaching with the literacy field. Shulman's (1987) work on teacher knowledge suggested seven categories of the teacher knowledge base. Knowledge about teaching is critical because it does influence student achievement (Owings, 2003). Knowing how to teach is at least as important as knowing what to teach. While teacher education courses have long been criticized for ineffectiveness in developing the knowledge of what and how to teach, many studies suggest teacher education does impact candidates' teaching (e.g. Anders, Hoffman, & Duffy; 2000; Duffy-Hester & Atkinson, 2001; Grossman, Valencia, Evans, Thompson, Martin, & Place, 2000; Massey, 2003). In spite of a positive impact of teacher education courses on teacher knowledge, there is no set list that includes everything a teacher needs to know about content and instruction in order to teach. Research on the development of teachers shows

that learning to teach is a process that takes years (Kagan, 1992; Lidstone & Hollingsworth, 1992). Development is encouraged when preservice teaching candidates are provided with supportive environments, but environments that do not provide easy solutions (Duffy & Hoffman, 1999; Roskos, Risko, & Vukelich, 1998). Once they become teachers, there is still a need for supportive environments where the teachers are encouraged and allowed to reflect on their instruction and then adapt their instruction to meet diverse needs (Duffy, 1993a; 1993b), not just follow a prescribed set of rules.

It is during the first years of teaching that we see the knowledge gained from teacher education courses either put into practice or discarded. Unfortunately, there is still little research on what happens to graduates of teacher education programs during their first years of teaching (Grossman, Valencia, Evans, Thompson, Martin, & Place, 2000). In her compilation of research and commentaries on the status of teacher education and research, Cathy Roller (2001) discussed the need for longitudinal studies of teacher education and development that examine how graduates of teacher education programs teach reading in their classrooms. In addition, Pearson (2001) concluded that "we need longitudinal studies of teacher learning if we are to develop theories of teacher development that are conceptually based, empirically driven, and not simply a compendium of opinions regarding what develops" (p. 18). Traditionally, stage models have described the development of teachers over time (Fuller, 1969; Fuller & Brown, 1975; Huberman, 1989; Kagan, 1992; Levin & Ammon, 1992; Lidstone & Hollingsworth, 1992; Duffy-Hester & Atkinson, 2001). Among the most common stages used to describe teacher development, two common themes emerge. First, the teacher's focus shifts between students, content, and management. Second, teachers base their initial instruction on personal background, not on student needs. However, most stage models were developed prior to the extreme focus on

high-stakes accountability and increasingly narrowed curricula and may no longer adequately describe the development of new teachers.

This research, then, adds to the existing literature in two ways. First, it considers the development of three teachers across a span of six years, encompassing both preservice coursework and inservice teaching. Second, this study revisits the stage models that have been used to describe teacher development in light of the changing focus of schools on high-stakes testing. The questions guiding this research were: (a) Is there an observable ongoing impact of methods courses on beginning teachers' instruction? (b) What patterns are observable in the development of these teachers? (c) What causes changes in teachers' development? That is, are there impetuses for moving teachers along a developmental trajectory?

Methodology

The research began with three preservice teachers in their junior year of college. These same teachers agreed to participate in ongoing research and were in their fourth year of teaching at the end of the research reported here. The three participants in this study were exemplary preservice candidates. I purposefully selected these three teachers based on their academic performance in their undergraduate methods courses and their exemplary performance in their internships and student teaching observed by other university-based personnel, their school-based teachers, and myself. Location also played a role in the selection of these three candidates, since it was important that I be able to observe each of the candidates. Grossman (1990) found that studying a distinctive group actually benefited her study. "By selecting teachers who were more or less equally intelligent and well prepared in their subject matter, we can begin to untangle what, if anything, teacher education can contribute to the process of learn-

ing to teach" (p. xi). Similarly, the participants in this study were motivated to pursue a graduate degree, write articulately, well informed of current trends, and active in their schools. Certainly, there are limitations to the selection process. Because they knew me, the teachers may have tried answering questions in a way they thought I wanted to hear. Their similar backgrounds and teaching placements do not show the diversity of teaching experiences faced by teachers. However, in keeping with case study methodology, the findings from this study are meant to serve as a starting point for examining how I think about my own instruction and to further the discussion about teacher education, not as generalizable results. As such, the case study findings from such uniform participants enhance the need for further research.

Data Collection

Data sources included initial and ongoing interviews, classroom observations, teacher lesson plans, field notes from observations during the preservice teaching and during inservice teaching, and informal conversations and emails. During their undergraduate coursework and student teaching, I communicated with each student at least once a week, collecting lesson plans and assignments, visiting them in their internship and student teaching classrooms, and completing formal and informal observations. After they graduated and began their inservice teaching, I visited each class a total of six times during the first year and a total of five visits during year two. During years three and four, I made one classroom visit. During the first visits of each year, I spent most of the morning (when they were engaged in the bulk of the literacy instruction) in these classrooms, getting a feel for the classroom routines. In addition, I interviewed the teachers at the end of their student teaching, at the beginning of their first year of teaching, at the end of their first year of teaching, at the beginning and end of their second year of teaching, and once

a year for the two successive years, resulting in seven interviews with each participant. The interviews focused on three areas: descriptions of the literacy instruction being used/planned, descriptions of learning about teaching in general and literacy in particular, and descriptions of plans for changes to instruction in general and literacy in particular. In addition to these broad questions, I also used the interviews to follow-up on observations, asking the participants to explain what I observed, their goals, the needs of students, and other relevant information they wanted me to know. In addition to the formal interviews, I emailed and/or phoned each teacher to learn about her instruction, her students, and any other classroom changes in informal conversations throughout the year.

Data Analysis

Case study was chosen as an appropriate methodology for describing and exploring learning and teaching within the real-life contexts of classrooms (Yin, 1994) because, "Case studies . . . are generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes . . . and the investigator's goal is to expand and generalize theories"(Yin, 1994, p. 21). I was further informed by an ethnographic stance, in particular, LeCompte & Schensul's (1999) emphasis of research examining the social and personal aspects of the participants' lives and how the social and personal levels affect the teaching in the classrooms. My ongoing interaction with these three teachers gave us a familiarity that allowed them to share many personal events with me, leading us to discuss how events "outside the classroom" influenced their teaching. Such a stance ensured that I collected and examined all types of data that could possibly inform the research, including participant personal stories, descriptions of families, and their "nonacademic" talk. Data analysis occurred recursively in three broad phases. The results from each phase informed the next phase of data analysis. For clarification, each phase is described separately.

Phase One. The role of this phase was to build grounded theory. I began by compiling all of the data collected over six years and coding the data, writing analytical and methodological memos on the data sources. Once the broader context was established, overall patterns were pulled from the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). These patterns were identified as ways of instructing and were labeled: (a) rejecting the curricula they were given and finding or creating their own; (b) accepting the curricula they were given; and (c) appealing for outside help. It was during this analysis that I began to wonder about the impact of high-stakes testing and personal events on the teachers' instruction.

Phase Two. Following the identification of common instructional patterns in Phase One, I compared the three instructional stances to the literature on teacher development through stage models. This was intended to place the current research within the context of educational research. As I reviewed the patterns established from Phase One, I realized that the patterns these teachers exhibited in their instructional choices were extremely influenced by high-stakes testing and the resulting narrowed curricula. I hypothesized that events in the teachers' personal lives, as well as the current political climate, was affecting the development of the teachers in such a way that it could no longer be described using the traditional descriptors. The task of Phase Two was to develop a profile that more fully captured the development of these three teachers than the traditional stage models.

I developed a Profile Matrix (Table 1) that reflected the common patterns of the stage models. For example, teacher knowledge is represented in three different areas instead of the either/or focus of the Lidstone and Hollingsworth model (1992) where teachers focus their attention and energy on either knowledge

of students or knowledge of curriculum and management. Further, the Profile was developed as a matrix rather than a sequential stage model to capture various applications on teacher knowledge. That is, while stage models do not capture the strength of particular instruction, the matrix allowed me to capture varying degrees of instruction, from rote to context-specific application. This variation reflects research and theory completed since the stage models were developed, particularly Darling-Hammond and Bransford's (2005) work on teacher education. To ground the work in literacy, I also relied on the effective teacher studies (*Learning to Read* by Pressley, Allington, Wharton-McDonald, Collins-Block, & Morrow, 2001 and *Reading to Learn* by Allington & Johnston, 2002).

Once the profile matrix was developed, I returned to all of the data I had collected. I recoded the data, this time using the Profile as a guide. I created a separate matrix for each teacher, tracking evidences of particular types of knowledge as well as what year of teaching such knowledge was applied.

Phase Three. The purpose of Phase Three was to conduct a cross-case analysis of the three teachers using the coded Profiles from Phase Two. By looking across the cases, I wanted to identify commonalities and differences in teacher knowledge and application of that knowledge. Because the three teachers had similar backgrounds, educational experiences, and teaching settings, variations in knowledge and application would be particularly helpful to trace the ongoing development of these three teachers. As part of my data analysis, I recoded the data, looking across the profiles to identify common themes across all three cases (see Table 2 for examples of each application of knowledge across the three profiles). Second, I began identifying factors influencing why the three teachers were demonstrating the levels of knowledge and application their profiles showed.

Participants

In addition to their successful academic and internship work in their undergraduate coursework, the following descriptions provide an overview of their experiences. These snapshots purposefully include some personal life events since often these events created tension within the first years of teaching.

Paula. Paula was in her mid-twenties, married, with one pre-school-aged son when she started the education program at the university. Paula had a very successful student teaching experience in a low-income school. She was recognized by the school administrators as someone who would try new ideas. In fact, the literacy facilitator found that Paula began implementing Writer's Workshop in the classroom. The literacy facilitator where she student taught then asked if Paula would model her instruction for other teachers.

Paula was hired by a school demographically similar to the one where she student taught. The school was a low-income school, designated as a magnet school to attract a mix of ethnic and socio-economic students. Paula taught third grade for one year. The stress of high-stakes tests given at the end of the year was so severe for Paula that she asked to be moved to a non-tested grade. She was transferred to a first grade classroom, where she has remained. In her fourth year of teaching, she made her first attempt at passing the National Boards, but did not pass three of the four sections.

Darcy. Darcy was also in her mid-twenties and single when she started the education program. Of the three teachers, Darcy was slightly weaker academically (As and Bs instead of all As), as demonstrated by her grades and her writing. She was open about not feeling comfortable with upper elementary math and

grammar. Her student teaching experience was in a third-grade classroom where she introduced literature circles into a basal-only literacy program. Students and her supervising teacher responded enthusiastically to Darcy's instruction.

Like Paula, Darcy was also hired in a magnet school, a school that was in the middle of the oldest African-American subsidized housing area in the county. The school was dedicated to the arts, so each week students participated in dance class, electronic music (composing using computers and synthesizers), and drama, in addition to computers, library, physical education, and art for a total of seven specials a week. Darcy began teaching in a second grade classroom. After two years, she was moved to a third grade classroom. She thrived on the challenge of helping students prepare for the final reading and math tests. At the end of her first year in third grade, all of her students passed the final test, including two students who had been retained twice and had failed the same test twice. In the fourth year, she started teaching third grade for three weeks. On a Friday afternoon, she was called into the principal's office, told the numbers were too low, and she would be teaching first grade starting the next Monday. The move created much unhappiness among the third grade parents and students, as well as for Darcy who felt ill-prepared to teach first grade.

Whitney. Whitney was in her late 20s when she started the education program. She was married to a middle-school teacher. They did not have children. Her student teaching occurred in a kindergarten classroom with a supervising teacher who took a student teacher almost every year. The supervising teacher was described by the principal as one of the strongest teachers in the district. In the classroom, Whitney took over all of the instruction right away and continued the literacy practices, including literacy centers, journaling, word family work, and silent reading.

Whitney, too, was hired at a magnet school. Her school was notorious in the district for high teacher turnover. In the year prior to her hiring, the entire kindergarten went through five teachers and a single fifth grade class had eight different teachers. Each year, there was a high turnover with up to as many as a third of the staff leaving or transferring. Whitney was told by a school administrator that she was "too good to be here" and Whitney was frustrated by the school context, so she asked for and received a transfer to a new school. At the second school, she taught kindergarten, the grade of her choice and the grade in which she did her student teaching. During this year, she took the final two months off for maternity leave for the birth of her first child. At the beginning of her second year teaching kindergarten her father died suddenly. She took eight days away from school to help make funeral arrangements and attend the funeral. The principal told her that she took more days off than were needed. Whitney was extremely upset by this and began searching for a new job. In the middle of her third year of teaching she took a job in another district as a part-time Title I reading teacher. The funding ran out at the end of the school year, so Whitney searched for and found another Title I part-time teaching position in a rural district. In her fourth year of teaching the funding again ran out and she took a part-time job working with 3-5th graders who were in danger of failing the high-stakes reading test. She split her year between two different schools in order to create one part-time position. Though she expressed a desire to go back to a full-time teaching position, she was committed to staying home with her son. She also wanted to have another child before she actively pursued a full-time position.

These three teachers began their undergraduate teaching experiences with similar backgrounds. They were each Caucasian females raised in middle-class, two-parent homes. They

were all between the ages of 22 and 28 when they began the program. They took all of their education courses together, so they shared the same academic coursework given by the instructor (also the researcher). They each had field experiences and student teaching experiences at the same two schools. They were each successful in their undergraduate academic and teaching experiences. Their first positions were all in magnet schools designed to help integrate the neighborhood schools. Each of these schools were similar—largely minority, predominantly African American, followed by Hispanic immigrants. Based on these initial experiences, one might predict very similar teaching approaches and development; however, this was not the case.

Findings

From Phase 1

Phase One provided an overall look at the data across six years. From this macro-look at the data, three stances towards literacy instruction were identified. The three teachers alternated between (a) rejecting the curricula they were given and finding or creating their own; (b) accepting the curricula they were given; and (c) appealing for outside help. In student teaching, both Paula and Darcy accepted some of the curricula that they were given while at the same time creating and implementing some of their own ideas—ideas they attributed to their teacher education courses (See Massey, 2004 for further discussion). Whitney accepted the curriculum and instructional patterns she was given by her supervising teacher because she described herself as philosophically and instructionally similar to her supervising teacher.

At the interviews given at the end of their student teaching, the teachers all described wanting to implement literacy instruction that was similar to the instruction they gave as part of student teaching. They also described additional ideas that they wanted to implement in the literacy program. These ideas could all be traced back to the teacher education courses. However, once in their own classrooms, their literacy instruction was strongly influenced by mandated reading curricula. They described being unhappy with the prescriptive nature of the literacy curricula but were unsure how they could adapt it. As a result, they swung between full implementation of a strict curriculum or abandoning it entirely for a week or two when they thought administrators would not notice. What was clear from this phase of analysis is that the development of these three teachers did not follow the traditional trajectories described in any of the stage models.

Phase Two

Phase Two began as a way to capture a complex view of teacher development that took into account the influences of high-stakes accountability. The traditional stage models did not address how these teachers developed when mandated to use specified (and often very narrow) curriculum and held accountable for student scores on high-stakes tests. By using the Profile, I was able to verify that all three teachers demonstrated rote and context-specific application of knowledge of learners, knowledge of subject and curriculum, and knowledge of teaching.

Paula-Exemplar of Rote Teaching. Paula spent her first year of teaching in the third grade. This grade was under a lot of pressure to perform well on high-stakes tests. As such, the third grade teachers planned together and grouped their students as a whole grade. Paula was given some of the lowest students. For her reading group, she followed what the team planned. During other class time, such as science, she began teaching comprehension strategies. She had her students use sticky notes and make predictions about what they would read and what would happen. This

was what she planned on her own without the grade-level team influence. She also planned her own spelling instruction based entirely on what she had done as part of her methods coursework and student teaching. As the test approached, she did almost no instruction that she planned on her own. Instead, the entire third grade did the exact same test preparatory activities and read selections from the same test packet, regardless of student reading level. Asked if this was effective, Paula said it was not and she would prefer having her students read from different materials. However, she did not want to upset her fellow grade-level teachers by not following along.

Paula felt that if she moved to first grade, she would be able to teach the way she wanted, intimating that she could use more of her own ideas such as starting writer's workshop as she had in her student teaching, using more word study, and grouping her own students instead of switching groups. However, when Paula moved to the first grade, she did not find that she was able to teach in the ways she had imagined. First, she struggled with classroom management saying, "I have horrible kids." As she settled into routines, she found she still was not getting to the instruction she had planned because first grade required ongoing assessment and portfolio documentation in reading, writing, and math. Paula described feeling like she was assessing all the time and not getting to instruction. Again, the first grade teachers planned together and Paula adopted what ideas they suggested. By the third year of her teaching, Paula talked less and less about wanting to do things other than what her team planned. The school started studying *Strategies that Work* (Harvey & Goudvis, 2000) as part of an emphasis on reading comprehension and Paula commented that she wished she had learned those ideas long before. She felt that she missed many important ideas in her undergraduate work and was just now learning them through district inservices and team planning.

Paula's instruction most often fell on the rote or context-specific levels of application. This was not surprising initially, as she was trying to adjust to teaching on her own, expectations of a low-performing school, a new grade level in her second year, and challenging behaviors. However, Paula did not show a shift towards comprehensive teaching. Instead, she seemed to offer fewer and fewer of her ideas. Classroom observations verified that she taught in ways that accepted what her school and team suggested and saw the other teachers and her district as her primary source of knowledge. Of special interest was that the longer she taught, the more likely she was to demonstrate rote teaching. As time went on, she felt that her undergraduate educational experiences were less and less helpful.

Whitney-Exemplar of Context-specific Teaching. As previously stated, Whitney's student teaching occurred with a supervising teacher who was very strong. The influence of her supervising teacher continued to be obvious throughout Whitney's teaching. She even stated, "I'm doing everything that my supervising teacher did when it comes to literacy instruction." Whitney established some strong routines. She was a strong advocate of running records. When other teachers used faster assessments, Whitney stuck with conducting running records. She established literacy centers, had students write stories even in kindergarten, and divided her students into ability-level reading groups for reading instruction. Her instruction utilized studying individual letters and then studying word families, reading new books, and rereading familiar books. She relied heavily on leveled books for reading instruction, even purchasing her own when the school did not have a guided reading library. When she moved into part-time instruction, she continued the same routines when working with small groups of students. She refused to do what other teachers were doing if she did not feel that it fit her routine or her students. Her instructional routine remained

similar, if not identical, throughout her student teaching and during the following four years of instruction, and she did not look for ideas and ways to vary her routine. For example, when other first grade teachers were moving toward family instruction, Whitney continued to teach individual letter sounds. This did not always make her popular among her working peers. At various times, she was in direct opposition to her veteran aide, the other grade-level teachers, and even the principal when it came to literacy instruction. However, Whitney remained confident in her ability to teach reading and in the effectiveness of her routine. She attributed her knowledge to her undergraduate methods and her supervising teacher and felt that the district trainings and school inservices were often a waste of time. She found ways to fit the training into her routines if absolutely required.

Darcy-Exemplar of Movement toward Comprehensive Teaching. Darcy was committed to finding what worked for her students. When she was given the *Success for All* curriculum in her first year of teaching, she hated it but said, "I just teach what they tell me." After using it for a few months, she began to supplement during other instructional times. Darcy was always looking for ways to engage her students and make them excited about literacy. She purchased hundreds and hundreds of dollars worth of books because her students did not have books at home and the library books were accessible only at limited times. Once she had a large classroom library, she began requiring that her students pull out a book and read whenever they were done with their work. Darcy's curricula changed from no writing to a standardized writing program; from *Success for All* to a basal series and various other literacy-related programs. Darcy always seemed to find a way to integrate enough of the program to keep her administrators and other team members satisfied while adding whatever worked for her students. A prime example of this came when she started working to get her

students to write to prompts. She did not argue with the prompts. Instead, she began noting that her students could not write to prompts that they did not know anything about. She set out to help them have more experiences. During her third year of teaching, she excitedly described taking her students to see a movie at the theatre (an opportunity she funded and arranged for her class because as she stated, "Most of them have never seen a movie in a theatre"). After her students watched the movie, they came back to school and started writing about the movie. Darcy told me, "Did you know they write so much better if they've all had the experience? These prompts that they have to write to [part of the state writing test] are often about something they have no experience with, but when we've all shared an experience, they write so much better." She regularly created her own spelling curriculum because there was no guide and the rest of the school did not emphasize spelling in a systematic way. Darcy credited her knowledge to her undergraduate methods coursework, to the teachers she worked with in her internships and student teaching, and to her students. During years three and four of her teaching, her conversations with me were full of what she was learning from her students.

What Phase Two suggested was that all three teachers began with very similar levels of knowledge. All three teachers demonstrated knowledge about all three areas (knowledge of learners, knowledge of subject, and knowledge of teaching). Because of similar backgrounds, similar ages, and similar undergraduate training, the knowledge that each of the teachers had looked very similar. It was in the application of that knowledge where the teachers differed, explored further in Phase Three.

Phase Three

The purpose of Phase Three was to conduct a cross-case analysis of the three teachers

using the coded Profiles from Phase Two. By looking across the cases, I wanted to identify common themes across all three Profiles. Across all three profiles, the three teachers demonstrated rote and context-specific applications, beginning in their junior year of college and continuing into their fourth year of teaching. However, Darcy was the only one to demonstrate flexibility in her teaching, while Paula remained much more rote in her teaching. Why? In this case, I had minimized the impact of teacher knowledge as a differentiating factor by examining such closely matched cases. Instead of teacher choice and personality dictating a focus, four themes were evident influences on how the teachers applied their knowledge: mandated curricula, literacy coursework, attitude toward assessment, and personal factors. With the exception of literacy coursework, these areas remained outside of what has been traditionally considered in stage models, highlighting our need to look at different and more complex ways to describe teacher development.

Influence one: Mandated curriculum or no curriculum. Mandated curriculum continued to be a major influence on how these teachers were applying their knowledge. The teachers felt the pressure of school requirements. Paula told me, "I do what they tell me. I'd like to use more of my coursework, but I just don't have time," and later she confided, "I rely more on what others tell me." Darcy voiced a similar statement, "I just teach what they tell me."

Opposite of the mandated curriculum was the missing curriculum. Darcy and Paula both reported having no adopted spelling curriculum, nor was spelling assessed in any formal way. When given the freedom to create lessons, Darcy and Paula both created spelling programs for their students that mirrored the word study lessons they used in tutoring elementary students as undergraduates. Whitney's schools did have curricula for all subjects but Whitney still felt

free to create some of her own lessons because she said, "I stopped telling them what I was doing."

Influence two: Undergraduate coursework. A second reason why these teachers applied their knowledge in certain ways tracked back to their interpretations of undergraduate coursework. To what the three teachers attributed their knowledge and what they saw as offering ongoing opportunities for learning provided critical insight into their placement within the profile. This was more easily examined since all three were students in a cohort that took the same college methods courses together. Thus, they were all exposed to the same teaching about literacy. What was especially striking was that Paula and Darcy were in the same district and sat in the same district-wide inservice trainings. These included inservice trainings on using comprehension strategies and using a guided reading model. At the beginning of Paula's fourth year of teaching, she emailed me a note stating that she knew I was always looking for ways to improve my own college-level teaching. Her suggestion was that I should demonstrate how to teach guided reading. She went on to say that she was taking an inservice training session on guided reading as part of the district's professional development plan. She felt that guided reading was an important method for teaching reading that she had never learned about in college. Darcy sat through the same training and said she did not learn anything she had not already learned in the methods coursework. Paula often spoke of her college learning as "not helpful," while describing the inservice trainings as more applicable to what she needed to know. Paula also gained a lot of knowledge about teaching from her teaching colleagues.

In contrast, Whitney and Darcy attributed a major portion of the way they taught literacy to their college methods instruction. Whitney and Darcy both spoke about coming back to

the same university they graduated from for a master's degree in reading. They both stated that they wanted to learn more about what to do with struggling readers and better methods of teaching readers. They described school inservice trainings as useless and a waste of time. Whitney emailed about an inservice on taking running records, "[The district] wasted money brining someone in to tell me to teach what I already know how to do." In fact, Darcy's school participated in the same inservice training on guided reading as Paula's school. What Paula found so useful, Darcy found useless. Darcy commented to me that she had not learned anything yet in an inservice that she had not already learned in her college literacy methods courses.

Influence three: View of assessment. A third reason why the teachers applied their knowledge in certain ways was linked to their views on and uses of assessments. In Darcy and Whitney's cases, they used assessment to inform instruction and saw it as a tool, while Paula's lesson plans were not dependent on the information from the assessments. Whitney and Darcy valued assessment that was individual and ongoing. Whitney was very careful to assess each of her students in an ongoing rotation each year of her teaching. She viewed the assessment as crucial to what instruction she would plan and refused to let her students "just memorize" a book so that they would score well on the quarterly assessments for kindergarten and first grade. Whitney wrote, "I believe that if you do not assess then you can't teach reading correctly."

Darcy demonstrated a similar commitment to assessment, even viewing high-stakes . assessment as an opportunity. Darcy stated that she enjoyed the challenge of getting students ready for the test. In Darcy's class, all 14 of her students passed the end-of-grade reading test. Paula did not share Darcy and Whitney's view of assessment. In Paula's case, she left the third grade because she felt the end-of-grade assessments were too stressful. Once in the first grade, she viewed the informal assessment as time-consuming and something to get through as quickly as possible. She stated, "Assessment keeps me from teaching like I want to."

Influence four: Personal factors. The final major influence in why these teachers applied their knowledge in particular ways resided in personal factors, both inside and outside the school. Inside the school, all three teachers commented on the support that they experienced within their contexts. For Whitney and Darcy, they described their support systems as being non-existent or apathetic. They did not borrow ideas from other teachers. Instead, they felt that knowing how to teach reading and writing came from what they learned from their teacher education coursework, from their student teaching mentors, or from their own creativity.

Paula described a very different situation—every year she described feeling "very supported" by her grade-level teams and the personnel in the school. They planned guided reading and whole group reading lessons together. However, this support often meant that she did exactly what the rest of the grade level planned. If she did not agree with one of their decisions, she chose to follow what was expected by the grade-level team.

Outside relationships and factors were also critical to the support that the three teachers perceived—and thereby influenced the instruction that they delivered. Darcy experienced a very public broken engagement, followed closely by a second engagement to a coworker. Whitney gave birth to her first child and lost her father unexpectedly within a four-month period. Darcy turned to work as a way to relieve the stress, while Whitney wanted to focus only on family until the immediate emotions calmed. Paula experienced the influence of personal life in a different manner. Her personal life was relatively stable, having been married and a mother

before she started the education program at the university. Her extended family was close and often helped both with the care of her child and in Paula's classroom. This support network was highly important to Paula. When her mother and nephew were in a minor car accident, she told me, "I haven't been focusing on school because I was so worried about them." She simply followed what the other team members had planned or provided copied worksheets for students to finish. Paula sought meaningful connections with her co-workers, treating them as extended family. Finding these relationships with whom she worked meant that she did not want to neglect their recommendations and the established ways of doing things.

Discussion and Implications

With the exception of literacy coursework, the influences evident from the cross-case analysis remained outside of what has been traditionally considered in stage models, highlighting our need to look at different and more ways to describe teacher development. The Profile used in this study offers one possibility for capturing a more complex means of describing teacher development in literacy instruction. In addition to including the traditional components of knowledge and focus, this study suggested expanding the stages to include attention to application of knowledge. While teachers must possess current knowledge about teaching and learning, we can no longer concentrate only on what teachers know. As Pearson (2007a) wrote, "[Teachers] must possess a disposition for lifelong learning and continual inquiry" (p. 153).

Why did these teachers who had the same undergraduate courses with the same teachers, who experienced very similar student teaching situations, and who were hired in very similar schools offer such varied profiles? Part of the answer may be found in the ongoing attention to teacher dispositions. Researchers remind us

that dispositions (habits of thinking and action; responses), and not just knowledge, are critical components of what makes teachers effective (Hammerness, Darling-Hammond, Bransford, 2005; Pearson, 2007a). In particular, two dispositions may explain why the teachers responded as they did: attitudes toward ongoing learning and responses to stressors.

Ongoing learning is a critical disposition when considering how teachers apply their knowledge. For example, according to the Profile, Darcy was the only one of the three teachers who exhibited instances of flexible metacognitive application of her knowledge. While Whitney and Paula treated knowledge as something to be gained from someone else, Darcy was the only one of the three who evidenced learning from her students as a source of her deepening knowledge in all areas. In addition to using what she learned in college methods courses, Darcy increasingly viewed her students as having something to teach her. Darcy's conversations with me were full of things she had learned or was learning from her students and the knowledge changed the way she taught. The lack of evidence of flexible metacognitions from the other two teachers suggested that this phase takes multiple experiences and learning to demonstrate, as supported by the stage model theories.

In addition to the three teachers' attitudes toward learning, their responses to stressors were a critical disposition. While they each faced similar stressors related to their situations—support/lack of support, assessment, and personal challenges—their responses to these situations were very different. Paula's largest stressor was student performance on final assessments. Whitney's largest stressor was lack of support both in her teaching and in her personal changes. Darcy's largest stressor came from her personal life. Paula sought to conform in order to preserve relationships within her school, in

spite of stating that she was not teaching the way she wanted to be teaching. Whitney sought new situations to find support and ended up moving to four different schools in four years of teaching. Her profile showed a very advanced level of knowledge in each area early in her career. Most notably in her student teaching, she was already at a contextual application point with much of her literacy knowledge. However, she did not continue to advance towards a flexible metacognition application of her knowledge throughout the next years. Darcy's personal life created an ongoing saga in the school, but Darcy focused on students and began demonstrating growth in all areas even though she began the education coursework as arguably the weakest of the three teachers.

From the research on these teachers, it is clear that all three demonstrated each of the areas of knowledge and each of the applications of that knowledge. What cannot be stressed enough is that the teachers did not move from rote application to the more complex applications in a straight developmental trajectory. Instead, they moved back and forth between the applications. The movement was linked to stressors in their lives. That is, when professional and/or personal situations created high levels of anxiety, the teachers often resorted to rote application as a means of survival. We may draw several implications for researchers and teacher educators from this understanding.

Implications for Researchers. One of the first things we must continue to challenge is the notion that teacher knowledge is enough. Emphasis on teacher knowledge may overlook the application of that knowledge. Second, we must move away from models that suggest that teacher development can be captured in linear stages. Further, just as we emphasize the importance of a P-12 student's life beyond school, such as their home culture, we must continue to examine how teachers' lives beyond school influence their development. In addition, while

short-term research can help aid our understanding of teacher development, we must commit to longitudinal studies of teachers and teacher education. Additionally, some stage models have suggested hard stages of continuous development while other stage models suggest a more recursive, cyclical pattern. Lacking in both is the impetus for movement, something that is critical for teacher educators and those who support teachers' inservice experiences. We need specific research that examines catalysts for change that can be recreated, in either pre-service teacher education or ongoing inservice education. Finally, research needs to examine how student achievement is (or is not) impacted by the teachers' knowledge and applications of knowledge. This critical component of teacher development is difficult to capture. How should student achievement be measured? Only by standardized tests? For example, both Darcy and Paula taught third grade and all of Darcy's students passed the state-required test, while Paula had several students who did not. However, Paula taught third grade during her first year of teaching and Darcy taught third grade in her third year of teaching. Comparisons of this kind of achievement are easy to make, but laden with incomplete information.

Implications for Teacher Educators. Teacher educators are asked to do more and more to prepare teachers to teach an increasingly diverse population. In order to meet these increasing demands, the temptation is to resort to a knowledge-transmission model where we try to give copious amounts of information as fast as possible. However, our success or failure as teacher educators is measured by the application—not the regurgitation—of that knowledge. While covering all that we want teachers to know will always be a challenge, there are specific actions that can be implemented in teacher education courses. First, teacher educators can introduce their students to models of teacher development. Complex models of teacher devel-

opment highlight the premise that teaching takes time to do well and that it is an ongoing process of learning. Second, teacher educators can help teachers attend to what causes them to teach in certain ways, orienting them to the fact that some lessons may be contextually applied while other lessons may be rote application as a means of survival. Such movement does not denote regression in development. Third, teacher educators must continually provide contexts that allow teachers to apply their knowledge with flexibility in instruction and decision-making. Literacy curricula have become increasing narrow in many of the schools where teacher education students teach. Our teacher education students may not resist this narrowing since it provides the easy solutions that they often seek (Duffy & Hoffman, 1999; Roskos, Risko, & Vukelich, 1998). It is our job to provide situations where they can practice flexible application. Pearson (2007b) emphasized, "We will always need to promote flexibility and versatility." This is as true for teacher educators as it is for those whom we prepare to teach.

References

Allington, R., & Johnston, P. (2002). *Reading to learn: Lessons from exemplary fourth-grade classrooms.* New York: Guilford Press.

Anders, P. L., Hoffman, J. V., & Duffy, G. G. (2000). Teaching teachers to teach reading: Paradigm shifts, persistent problems and challenges. In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research, Vol. III,* (pp. 719-742). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, Associates, Publishers.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds.) (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world.* L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world* (pp. 358-389). San Francisco, CA:

Jossey-Bass.

Donovan, C. (1999). Learning to teach reading/language arts: Considering the impact of experience on understanding. In T. Shanahan & F. V. Rodriguez-Brown (Eds.), *National Reading Conference Yearbook 48* (pp. 451-465). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Duffy, A., & Atkinson, T. (2001). Learning to teach struggling (and non-struggling) elementary school readers: An analysis of preservice teachers' knowledges. *Reading Research & Instruction, 41*(1), 83-102..

Duffy, G. G. (1993a). Rethinking strategy instruction: four teachers' development and their low achievers' understandings. *The Elementary School Journal, 93* (3), 231-247.

Duffy, G. G. (1993b). Teachers' progress toward becoming expert strategy teachers. *The Elementary School Journal, 94* (2), 109-120.

Duffy, G. G. (2005). Developing adaptive reading teachers: Metacognition, visioning, and the expert's changing role. In C. Block, S. Israel, K. Kinnucan Welsch, & K. Bauserman (Eds.), *Metacognition and literacy learning.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Duffy, G. G., & Hoffman, J. V. (1999). In pursuit of an illusion: The flawed search for a perfect method. *The Reading Teacher, 53*(1), 10-16.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* Chicago: Aldine.

Grossman, P. (1990). *The making of a teacher: Teacher knowledge and teacher education.* New York, NY: Teacher College Press.

Grossman, P., Valencia, S. W., Evans, K.,

Thompson, C., Martin, S., & Place, N. (2000). Transitions into teaching: Learning to teach writing in teacher education and beyond. *Journal of Literacy Research, 32,(4)* 631-662.

Florio-Ruane, S. (2002). More light: An argument for complexity in studies of teaching and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53,* 205-215.

Fuller, F. F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. *American Educational Research Journal, 6,* 207-226.

Fuller, F. F., & Brown, O. H. (1975). Becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (Ed.), *Teacher education* (Seventy-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education) (pp. 25-52). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hammerness, K., Darling-Hammond, L., Bransford, J., (with Berliner, D., Cochransmith, M., McDonlad, M., & Zeichner, K.) (2005). *How teachers learn and develop.* In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world* (pp. 358-389). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Harvey, S., & Goudvis, A. (2000). *Strategies that work.* Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

Huberman, M. (1989). *The professional life cycle of teachers.* Teachers College Record, 91(1), 32-56.

Kagan, D. M. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 62*(2), 129-169.

Kaplan, L., & Owings, W. (2003). No Child Left Behind: The politics of teacher quality. *Phi Delta Kappan, 84*(9), 687-692.

LeCompte, M. D., & Schensul, J. J. (1999). *Designing and conducting ethnographic research.* Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

Levin, B. B., & Ammon, P. (1992) The development of beginning teachers' pedagogical thinking: A longitudinal analysis of four case studies. *Teacher Education Quarterly,* 19-32.

Levin, B. B. (2001, March). *The Ammon and Hutcheson model of levels of pedagogical conception.* Information presented at the meeting of the Curriculum and Instruction Colloquium, Greensboro, NC.

Lidstone, M., & Hollingsworth, S. (1992). A longitudinal study of cognitive change in beginning teachers: Two patterns of learning to teach. *Teacher Education Quarterly,* 39-49.

Massey, D. D. (2003). Preservice Teachers as Tutors: Influences of Tutoring on Whole-Class Literacy Instruction. In C. Fairbanks, J. Worthy, B. Maloch, J. Hoffman, & D. Schallert (Eds.), *National Reading Conference Yearbook* (259-271). Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference.

Massey, D. D. (2004). "You Teach!" Beginning Teachers' Challenges to Teacher Educators. *Reading Research & Instruction.*

Pearson, P. D. (2007a). An endangered species act for literacy education. *Journal of Literacy Research, 39,* 145-162.

Pearson, P. D. (2007b). The knowledge to support the teaching of literacy. Speech given at the College Reading Association Conference, Salt Lake City, UT. Retrieved November 8, 2007 from http://www.scienceandliteracy.org/papers/

Pearson, P. D. (2001). Learning to teach reading: The status of the knowledge base. In C.

M. Roller, (Ed.). *Learning to teach reading: Setting the research agenda.* (pp. 4 - 19). Newark, DA: International Reading Association.

Pressley, M., Allington, R., Wharton-McDonald, R., Collins Block, C., & Mandel Morrow, L. (2001). *Learning to Read.* New York: Guilford Press.

Roller, C. M. (2001). A proposed research agenda for teacher preparation on reading. In C. M. Roller, (Ed.). *Learning to teach reading: Setting the research agenda.* (pp. 198-206). Newark, DA: International Reading Association.

Roskos, K., Risko, V., & Vukelich, C. (1998). Head, heart, and the practice of literacy pedagogy.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*(1), 1-22. Reading Research Quarterly, 33 (2) 228-239.

Snow,C., Griffin, P., & Burns, M. (2005). *Knowledge to support the teaching of reading: Preparing teachers for a changing world.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Zeek, C., & Wickstrom, C. (1999). The making of a teacher: The influence of personal literacy development on students' current teaching practices. In T. Shanahan, & F. V. Rodriguez-Brown (Eds.), *National Reading Conference Yearbook, 48* (pp. 478-490). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Table 1 Coded Teacher Literacy Development Profile for Paula

		Rote Application-I teach from my experiences or what the book tells me	Contextual Application—context-specific techniques	Flexible metacognition-multiple techniques in various contexts
Knowledge of learners--development, language, and learning--who learns, how, and why				
	Developmentally appropriate practice	1: reading tutoring mimics classroom model. 3: no recess because told to use time to prepare to reading test 3-6: plans according to grade level, even though she doesn't like some of the practices	5: feels students not getting developmentally appropriate spelling words so creates her own curriculum—apart from grade level plan	
	Knowledge of the diverse needs of learners	2: "I just teach to the middle. I don't have extra hands." 3: They just don't have enough brain power to remember to the next day."		
	Knowledge about how to motivate students	4-6: Emphasis on copying lots of worksheets for reading and morning work so students have something to "do"	4-6: Writes multiple grants to get extra books, math manipulatives, and science kits so kids can have "hands-on" experiences; not evident in reading.	
Knowledge of curriculum what should be taught, why is it important, and how is this knowledge best organized				
		1, 2: buys and uses same books she sees modeled in methods class and in internships 3: excited about "Math Planner," a	2: plans her own Writer's workshop and implements it when no one else in her school does.	

		computer program that allows her to enter what she has to teach and the program creates a lesson plan for her 3. I'll do more creative things when I'm more confident. 5: created a week by week pacing guided for math so she would know where she needs to be in order to get through the curriculum; continues following grade level reading plans	5: planned her own spelling curriculum based on her knowledge from methods course. Started with short vowel word families, progressed through short vowels and then to long vowels.	
Knowledge of teaching--assessment, classroom management, content + pedagogy				
	Knowledge of assessment--what kind of evidence for learning students, teacher, parents, and others can use to see learning is really occurring?	1: uses informal reading inventories for tutoring, multiple assessment measures as modeled in methods class. 3: uses all the school test-preparation materials		
	Knowledge of Community--what kinds of classroom, school, and school-community environments enhance learning ; participation within community	3: I do what they (school, grade level) tell me.	3-5: Most parents aren't helpful/don't care 5-6 High participation within school community. On Special School Improvement Team at principal's request. 6: starts National Boards and begins looking for a support group at another school.	

18

Table 2 Examples of Applications across Profiles

	Rote Application and Situation-I teach from my experiences or what the book tells me in specific situations	Contextual Application and Situation—context-specific techniques in specific situations	Flexible metacognition and situations- multiple techniques in various contexts
Knowledge of learners	Paula's (1st year) school has asked teachers to eliminate morning recess to allow more time for test preparation. Paula takes a 5-10 minute break in the morning, allowing students to eat their snacks. She doesn't allow talking during this time.	Contextual: Whitney refuses to allow students to memorize leveled text just to pass the quarter benchmark. She starts them at lower levels than recommended, based on her own evaluations.	Comprehensive: Darcy "forgets" to send her students to resource/SPED, stating she can meet their needs in her room.
Knowledge of Subject and Curriculum	Paula buys the same books I use in methods courses for read alouds; still using them in first year of teaching.	Darcy is able to adapt her guided reading rotations to three different grade levels within four years. Still has trouble with appropriate centers.	
Knowledge of teaching	Paula carefully follows what grade level team plans.	Whitney uses district reading assessments and some of her own.	